

# **Final Evaluation Report on Second HASNA/GAP Training Program in Irrigation Management**

**Mark Svendsen and Dian Seslar Svendsen**

January 2003

Prepared for  
**HasNa Incorporated**  
3917 Ingomar Street NW  
Washington, DC 20015 USA

# Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Training Program Description</b> .....	<b>2</b>
2.1 <i>Goals and Objectives</i> .....	2
2.2 <i>Participants</i> .....	3
2.3 <i>Components</i> .....	3
<b>3 Evaluation Process</b> .....	<b>5</b>
3.1 <i>Purpose and Questions</i> .....	5
3.2 <i>Participatory Approach</i> .....	5
3.3 <i>Evaluation Approach</i> .....	6
3.4 <i>Workshops</i> .....	7
<b>4 Training Program Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations</b> .....	<b>9</b>
4.1 <i>Design of Program</i> .....	9
4.2 <i>Training Component Relevance and Effectiveness</i> .....	11
4.3 <i>Follow-up and Support</i> .....	18
<b>5 Cross-cutting Issues, Conclusions, and Recommendations</b> .....	<b>20</b>
5.1 <i>Training Target Group</i> .....	20

5.2	<i>Future of Program</i> .....	23
5.3	<i>Partnerships</i> .....	25
<b>6</b>	<b>Evaluating the Evaluation</b> .....	<b>26</b>
6.1	<i>Strengths and Benefits (Pomona, Turkey field work, Urfa)</i> .....	27
6.2	<i>Suggestions for Improvement</i> .....	28
	<b>Annexes</b> .....	<b>29</b>

## Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Nevzer Stacey, Hasna President, for her support and her resolute commitment to the evaluation process, and the GAP Authority, and Huseyin Demir of the Authority, for hosting us in Sanliurfa and making excellent logistic arrangements for the workshop there. Olivia Kew Fickus at Cal Poly and Dan Nelson and staff in Los Banos made excellent logistic arrangements for evaluation meetings in both places. We particularly want to thank the participants from both the first and second training groups for their active and enthusiastic participation in the evaluation workshop in Sanliurfa and for the wonderful lantern-light dinner that concluded it.

## Abbreviations

CDS	Center for Dispute Settlement
CLED	Center for Language Education and Development (GU)
CPP	California Polytechnic University - Pomona
DSI	The Turkish national water agency
GAP	Southeastern Anatolia Project
GAP-RDA	GAP Regional Development Administration
GAP MOM	GAP Management Operations and Maintenance Project
GU	Georgetown University
GS	General Secretary (of IU)
IU	Irrigation Union
PM&E	Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation
HP	Harran Plain

## Executive Summary

The second Hasna/GAP training program for Irrigation Union General Secretaries and others was successful. Training components were well-targeted and generally delivered well. Program organizers took on-board lessons learned from the evaluation of the first program and made positive adjustments in the second one, raising the overall quality of the training. Participants can cite numerous examples of how they are using their training in their professional and personal lives.

Against this backdrop of a successful training program loom three broader overarching issues that need to be addressed for the future. The first of these is that of the training target group. A training program originally designed for Irrigation Union General Secretaries (GS) now trains a roughly even mix of GS and government employees and contractors. This has negatively affected the quality and impact of the training, as presently designed. Organizers need to consider explicitly the purpose, objectives, and target group for the training and design the program and participant selection processes accordingly.

The second broad issue is the nature of the partnerships among program organizers. The programmatic relationship between Hasna and its principal partner organization, the GAP Administration, is informal and fluid. The parties appear to lack a common understanding on resource sharing, program objectives, and other issues connected with the training program, and no written agreement to record understandings reached exists. Hasna recognizes the need for a local NGO partner with which it can work in the field, but has so far been unable to identify one that is both interested and capable. Training program participants and other stakeholders in the field also point to problems of inadequate communication and mixed messages among parties. Program organizers need to sit together at a senior level to discuss and resolve these problems and record the understandings reached.

The third broad issue is the future direction of the Hasna program in Turkey. The upcoming program will complete training of GS in the largest contiguous irrigated block in the GAP region, leaving more scattered and remote areas for future programs. This will make it difficult to continue to apply the current training model. Moreover the need to demonstrate effects of the training on local residents requires an explicit program focus on impacts and sustainability. General Secretaries and others trained by the program represent a valuable resource that should be employed fully to achieve continuing impacts in the project area. This requires follow-up action and support. Taking into account all of these factors, it is time for Hasna to reassess its overall program in Turkey and to develop a medium-term strategy to guide its future work there.

Turning to the training program itself, a basic need is for program organizers to develop a set of clear overall objectives for the training program and to work with training

providers in linking these overall objectives with individual component objectives. This will help insure that all targeted topics are covered, eliminate duplication in coverage, and provide a sound basis for program evaluation. Hasna, as the lead organizer, should then assume a pro-active role in coordinating the design and integration of the various training components. Such coordination would have high payoffs in terms of training effectiveness and efficiency.

With respect to individual training components, participants and evaluators recommend that English training be lengthened and conducted entirely in Turkey. At the same time, organizers should consider involving an experienced American language trainer to work with the program in Turkey to strengthen quality and methods. The highly-valued internship component, in particular, requires a higher level of English skills than most participants in the second training program possessed to be most effective.

The conflict resolution training was on-target, well-conducted, and highly participatory. In both years, participants have valued this training highly and found it extremely useful in their professional and personal lives. Organizers should try to intensify this training (currently covering only 25 hours) during the week in Washington, and consider appropriate follow-up training in the field to extend its impact.

The management and irrigation training was of mixed effectiveness. Participants valued the conflict management portion of this component but were strongly dissatisfied with the content and methods of the management training. Participants felt that a 2-day field trip did not have sufficient new content to be worthwhile. Lack of clarity and agreement on overall training program goals and objectives and the role that the training provider was supposed to play were detrimental here, as were last minute changes in schedule and budget. Program organizers need to pay greater attention to training objectives and program coordination for this component in particular. Evaluators recommend that this component be more narrowly focused on organizational management and shifted to a non-university setting where specialized trainers employing participatory training methods can be utilized. Evaluators emphasize the importance of identifying skilled, participatory, and experienced trainers for the organizational management training.

Internships with managers of California irrigation districts were a new and highly successful component of the training this year. General Secretaries were enthusiastic about the value of being able to work directly with their U S counterparts through the week-long internship. English language skills of most participants were only marginally adequate for this component and learning from the internships would increase in proportion to strengthened English skills. US district managers' time is scarce and should be called upon judiciously. Some activities, such as visits to agricultural processing plants, could be consolidated and conducted by others to reduce demands on managers' time. Organizers could consider consolidating these joint activities from the internships and some of the agricultural training conducted at Cal Poly into a new agricultural training component, organized in conjunction with the internships.

# Final Evaluation Report on Second Hasna/GAP Training Program in Irrigation Management

Mark Svendsen<sup>1</sup> and Dian Seslar Svendsen<sup>2</sup>

## 1 Introduction

Southeastern Turkey is home to slightly over 6 million people (about 10% of Turkey's population). Continuous waves of migration over several centuries have made the southeast region a heterogeneous one. (More regional background is found in Annex Two.)

In this environment the US-based non-governmental organization, Hasna, has mounted training programs to further its aims of "promoting harmony and understanding among people and developing skills that lead to progress for all."

Under this program, two groups of Turkish trainees have now participated in Hasna-sponsored training programs designed to make them more effective both in their interpersonal relations and in their jobs. The two programs have been similar in some respects and different in others. The first program was evaluated last year by the present evaluation team<sup>3</sup>. Program sponsors acted on many of those recommendations, resulting in important positive changes in the program. The present evaluation assesses the second training program, including the changes made as a result of the first evaluation, and makes new recommendations for future programs. In addition, it identifies three broad crosscutting issues that will affect the Hasna program increasingly as it matures, and makes recommendations to address them. Conclusions and recommendations scattered throughout the evaluation are collected in Annex One.

Several terms used to describe various stakeholders in the training program are defined here. *Training organizers* or *training sponsors* refer to the organizations, led by HasNa, that planned, organized, and financed the training program. In addition to Hasna, this included the GAP Administration. *Training providers* or *trainers*, are those organizations and individuals who provided training on particular topics to program participants. *Participants* or *trainees*, are the Turkish professionals who received the training. In writing this report and framing conclusions and recommendations, evaluators have generally not attempted to allocate responsibility among program organizers. In

---

<sup>1</sup> Water Resources Consultant. Email: marksvendsen@aol.com

<sup>2</sup> Organizational Development Consultant. Email: disvendsen@aol.com

<sup>3</sup> Evaluators' experience is shown in Annex Thirteen.

responding to the recommendations, sponsors will need to organize themselves to allocate responsibility and take appropriate action. As the lead organizer, it would normally fall to Hasna to initiate this process.

## 2 Training Program Description

Hasna, a registered nonprofit organization based in Washington, D.C., was the lead agency in designing and organizing the training program being evaluated. Hasna was founded in 1998 with a mission to promote peace by improving job skills and opportunities and instilling a spirit of cooperation that reaches beyond the workplace. Hasna's current mission statement is shown in the Box at right. Hasna's programs target young adults of different backgrounds from areas where cycles of conflict and mistrust have hindered economic growth and community cohesion. This training program was aimed at irrigation managers in Southeastern Turkey.

### Hasna Mission

Hasna's mission is to break cycles of conflict and to reduce tensions between diverse groups of people who are separated culturally, ethnically or economically. Hasna brings these people together through programs that combine work-related education with structured training in conflict resolution.

### 2.1 Goals and Objectives

#### 2.1.1 Goals

Hasna articulates its program goals as the following.

- *To provide opportunities for people with different skills and knowledge levels so that they are able to compete in a global economy, regardless of their background*
- *To instill in participants the importance of continuous learning*
- *To teach social and economic cooperation*

Additionally, participants defined their own goals during the training. Participants in the first training program identified as their goal *To improve Irrigation Unions in the Harran Plain*. Because of the variety of participant perspectives present in the second training program, this group could not agree upon just one goal. This is discussed in greater detail later in this report.

#### 2.1.2 Objectives

The organizers of the training program did not specify output-oriented objectives for the training program. Trainers for most of the components did, nonetheless, develop formal training objectives for their individual components. The absence of well-defined overall training objectives made it difficult for providers to develop their own component-specific objectives, and the lack of component-specific objectives for some components made it difficult to harmonize the design of individual components with each other.



During the first monitoring and evaluation workshop for this training program, participants developed joint goals, objectives, and indicators for their subsequent work in the field. They then used these goals and objectives in evaluating their work. Because of the mixed composition of the second training program, however, participants found it impossible to agree on a single goal and associated objectives for themselves, as had participants in the first program. General Secretaries in the program developed one goal and associated objectives, while GAP and GAP MOM participants each created an additional set.

## **2.2 Participants**

The 13 participants in Group 2 included 7 General Secretaries of Irrigation Unions from Sanliurfa province in the GAP region, 5 GAP and GAP MOM employees, and one DSI employee. The General Secretaries were generally agricultural engineers, graduated from faculties of agriculture in Turkish universities. Twelve of the 13 participants were male.

## **2.3 Components**

The second training program consisted of four components as described below.

### **2.3.1 English Training**

English language training in Sanliurfa, provided by the private GAP English Center, preceded English training in the United States. Twenty-six people began the training course. Ten of these were from GAP (4 GAP and 6 GAP MOM), 9 were general secretaries, one was from DSI, and one from the NGO TEMAV. In addition 5 GS graduates of the first Hasna program attended the program to further their English study. Of the 26, 21 or 22 wound up attending fairly regularly.

Only one of the “new” General Secretaries had previously received English instruction, while 5 of the GAP participants had received some previous English training. The English Center divided the group into two classes to accommodate mixed ability levels. However, because the contract with the training center called for 200 hours of instruction, the Center divided this total into an 80-hour component for advanced students and a 120-hour component for beginning students. Beginning students thus did not receive the minimum 150 hours of language training originally desired.

The GAP English Center evaluated language ability at the end of the training with a score of 60 out of 100 set as the “passing” point. It provided scores to the training sponsors who used them as one basis for selecting candidates for the US portion of the training.

Because the US training component started later than was planned, the US English training portion was shorted to 3 weeks. Georgetown University conducted this training as in the previous year. The program consisted of 60 hours of training (4 hours per day, 5 days per week, for 3 weeks) The program included instruction in the following areas. See Annex Three for course objectives and detail.

- English for Specific Purposes
- Exploring Cultural Values
- Open Computer Labs
- Integrated Skills

### **2.3.2 Conflict Resolution and Mediation Training**

The Center for Dispute Settlement designed and conducted the conflict management portion of the training in the US. This weeklong training of 25 hours focused on participatory activities related to strengthening skills in communication, conflict management, mediation, and facilitation. Objectives and agenda for this component are shown in Annex Four.

### **2.3.3 Management and Irrigation Training**

The management and irrigation training component was added to the program for the second training in response to a recommendation of the first evaluation. Hasna solicited and accepted a proposal for this component from California State Polytechnic University Pomona (CPP or Cal Poly).

CPP designed, hosted, and managed the component, which was conducted during two sessions: April 8-13 and April 22-23.<sup>4</sup> See Annex Five for details on the CPP program. A CPP staff member in the International Programs office coordinated the program and served as the main Hasna contact throughout planning and implementation. CPP also coordinated scheduling with the organizer of the internship component. All training was conducted in English with sequential translation into Turkish. Translators accompanied participants on field trips.

### **2.3.4 Internships**

The western United States contains a number of irrigation districts that provide irrigation water supplies to their members. These districts are financially-autonomous farmer-governed entity similar in many respects to Turkish Irrigation Unions. Day-to-day operations of these districts are the responsibility of a hired general manager whose functions are very similar to those of the General Secretaries in Turkey.

Participants, in teams of two, spent a week as interns with general managers in California's San Joaquin Valley. The San Joaquin Delta Mendota Water Users Association, a consortium of irrigation districts which serves as a wholesaler of water to its member districts, organized the internships.

---

<sup>4</sup> These dates do not include travel days, the internships program in the central Valley (April 15-19), or the Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Workshop designed and facilitated by one of the evaluators (April 24-26).

During the week, participants accompanied the general managers and technicians employed by the districts as they performed their duties. They also attended meetings of the governing boards of the districts to observe the governance process and interactions between the general manager and the board. In addition, they visited agricultural processing plants and equipment dealers to view examples of agricultural technology. An agenda is shown in Annex Six.

### **3 Evaluation Process**

#### **3.1 Purpose and Questions**

The purpose of this formative<sup>5</sup> evaluation is twofold:

- To determine the extent to which participants were able to learn from and apply knowledge, skills, and awareness gained through participation in the Hasna/GAP Training Program
- To gain insight into needed changes in future Hasna/GAP efforts in terms of, content, methodology, location of training, logistics, and types/levels of participants

Program sponsors were also interested in assessing impacts of the training on local communities. However because of the limited scope of the evaluation and because of the mixed nature of the participant group, it was not possible to reach conclusions about the external impacts of the training during this evaluation.

#### **3.2 Participatory Approach**

Participants in the first training program indicated during the first evaluation that they appreciated and benefited greatly from the participatory monitoring and evaluation process used in that evaluation, so a similar design was followed this year, with adjustments made where needed and appropriate. The term “participation” has many nuances and connotations in development. When applied to evaluation, it implies, at the very least, that key players collaborate with stakeholders to design the evaluation and analyze the results. The following aspects of this evaluation help to make it *participatory*.

- The evaluation was transparent in process.
- The evaluation was context-specific, rooted in the interests, concerns, and questions of the key stakeholders, especially those involved in the program.

---

<sup>5</sup> Formative evaluations focus on ways to improve and develop projects and programs.

- Participants played key roles in deciding what information to collect and how to collect it and collaborated with evaluators in interpreting the data they had collected.
- The evaluation emphasized collective methods of knowledge generation rather than basing results solely on opinions and experience of the evaluators.
- All information was openly shared with participants throughout the process.

Participatory evaluation also builds capacity among those who participate to design and conduct monitoring and evaluation systems. Since this project focuses on building participants' capacity to more effectively do their jobs, the evaluation was also consciously designed to further strengthen participants' abilities to set monitoring and evaluation goals and objectives, identify indicators, collect monitoring data, and analyze that data to inform future planning.

### **3.3 Evaluation Approach**

Participatory evaluation was incorporated into the structure of the training program and comprised an integral part of it. The evaluation process thus served both to assess the training methods employed and the results of the training, and to provide participants with skills to conduct their own participatory M&E in the future.

Training in participatory M&E techniques and development of goals and objectives for field work was included in the US-based portion of the training in 2002, rather than being carried out in a separate workshop in Turkey following the participants' return, as it was for the first training program. This initial session in the spring was followed by a December workshop in Sanliurfa in which participants analyzed the data they had collected and their impressions and reactions related to the overall training program.

During the spring evaluation meeting at Cal Poly Pomona, one of the evaluators met with CPP instructors who were part of the Hasna training. Persons met are listed in Annex Seven.

Interviews focused on the following points.

- Description of assessment, objectives, design, evaluation and follow-up related to the instructor's portion of the program
- Greatest achievements of participants
- Changes in participants over course of program
- How their portion contributed to overall program
- Suggestions for future training programs

The second member of the evaluation team made a separate visit to California in May to meet with the irrigation managers hosting the internships in irrigation districts there. In addition to interviewing the organizer of the internships, Dan Nelsen, the evaluator held a

focus group session with four of the hosts using a semi-structured interview guide. This session covered hosts' impressions of the participants, their own reactions to the experience, communication between participants and hosts, coordination with other program elements, and concerns and suggestions for future programs.

Evaluators requested program information regarding their components from the head of the Georgetown English language program and the head of CDS in Washington, DC. The evaluation team was in regular telephone and email communication with Nevzer Stacey, president of Hasna, and her staff. Written materials reviewed by the team are listed in Annex Eight.

In addition to information from these sources, participants collected and analyzed data related to objectives and indicators that they developed themselves during the Cal Poly PM&E workshop. This process is described in the section on *Workshops* below. Outputs produced during the evaluation are shown in Annex Nine.

## **3.4 Workshops**

### **3.4.1 PM&E Workshop**

#### **3.4.1.1 Purpose**

Like last year's workshop that was held in Turkey, this workshop was designed to build skills among the participants in participatory monitoring thus enabling them to monitor their progress in applying learning from the Hasna training, as well as to provide data on the conduct of the various training program components. The workshop concluded the US portion of the training program.

#### **3.4.1.2 Design and Process**

The 3-day Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) Workshop was held on the campus of California State Polytechnic University (Cal Poly Pomona – CPP) from 23 to 26 April. The workshop utilized a participatory process that included small group work and provided hands-on experience in designing a participatory monitoring and evaluation system. The workshop was conducted in English with Turkish translation.

#### **3.4.1.3 Content**

Unlike last year, the program planned by CPP included training in basic project management skills. But since a couple of the participants had skills in this area, they convinced CPP that they did not need this part of the training. Unfortunately most participants did need this training as they had little familiarity with basic planning skills such as writing measurable objectives and developing indicators. As a result, much of the monitoring and evaluation workshop time was devoted to developing skills in writing measurable objectives and indicators.

Following an introduction to participatory monitoring, participants engaged in hands-on sessions enabling them to express their understanding of the project goal and develop

specific, measurable, realistic objectives for applying their learning through their work in Turkey. Participants then developed indicators for the objectives they generated and determined what information they needed to collect to establish a baseline and then monitor their progress toward achieving their objectives. The workshop closed with participants outlining next steps.

Unlike last year's group, almost half of the members of the second group were not IU General Secretaries. The others were from GAP and GAP MOM. As a result, and as desired by themselves, participants generally worked in two, sometimes three, separate groups. That is, the General Secretaries worked on their own goal, objectives, and indicators, and the others, separated into two groups, worked on objectives and indicators related to their jobs.

### **3.4.2 Data Analysis Workshop**

This workshop was held in the TEMAV Training Center in Sanliurfa, 11-13 December<sup>6</sup>. The purpose of this workshop was to identify program strengths and areas needing improvement by guiding participants in analyzing data they had collected related to objectives and indicators. As with the previous PME workshop, this one also was designed to build capacity among the participants by strengthening their data analysis skills. The purpose of this workshop was to identify program strengths and areas needing improvement by guiding participants in analyzing data they had collected related to objectives and indicators. The workshop focused on discovering what the participants had experienced during the growing season following the training; how their behaviors had changed; the impact of their work on the IUs; and what changes they would suggest for future training cycles.

Participants interviewed each other to determine times when they felt particularly good or excited about their work during the growing season and created a timeline using this information. They then created a "project map" illustrating the project goal, objectives, indicators and results and analyzed these results. After analyzing findings, most participants decided to modify their sets of indicators. Part of analysis involved using a tree as a metaphor to identify what elements nourished the project; what formed its roots; its life force; what were the new shoots and buds. Annex Ten contains results of this exercise.

### **3.4.3 Next Steps Workshop**

Ten people (one woman and nine men, with 6 from Group One and 4 from Group Two) participated in a 1-day workshop focusing on next steps for the Hasna program in the Sanliurfa area. After a brief description of proposal preparation, the group generated ideas for small projects they would like to implement. Each of two small groups then prepared a proposal outline for one of these ideas, which they would develop further after

---

<sup>6</sup> Photos of the workshop are shown in Annex Twelve.

the workshop. Participants also shared observations on the impacts of the training and suggestions for changes in the program.

## 4 Training Program Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This section summarizes information gathered during interviews, participant input during the two evaluation workshops, and review of documents. This information supports the conclusions and recommendations in this section of the report. Some participant reactions, in their own words, are shown in the box below.

### 4.1 Design of Program

Hasna should be commended for responding to the evaluation of the first program by incorporating a number of changes in the second program. Such changes included the following major ones. Effects of these changes are discussed under the results of each component.

- Conflict resolution training in Washington was given its own time slot
- Technical/management training was shifted from Arizona to California and the provider changed from a private firm in combination with a university to a (different) university
- Technical training on plant-soil-water relationships and computer models was dropped
- A new component on organizational management was added
- A week-long internship component was added
- The PM&E component was integrated more completely into the training program

These changes, in general, improved the program. Other areas also need to be addressed to further strengthen the training. Several of these areas were highlighted in the evaluation of Group One (see Annex Eleven) and still need to be addressed. Foremost

#### Participant Reflections on Training Impacts on Personal Life and Work

- We started to look at our jobs more positively
- I pay more attention to details
- I became more effective at work
- Able to evaluate activities
- Having understood the importance of group work, we paid attention to making joint decisions
- We receive more respect in our social circles
- When preparing a program, we pay attention to ensuring participation
- We had the opportunity to evaluate our country's standards and see where we stand
- We worked to transfer the positive aspects of the training to our environment
- I became calmer in the face of events
- One participant intervened in a marital dispute between friends and was able to use her mediation skills to avert a separation. She had practiced a role play of a similar situation during her conflict resolution training.

among needed changes for the future include development of clear training objectives for the program as a whole.

Linked with setting clear goals and objectives is the need for strengthened coordination of component activities. Individual training providers need to have a clearer understanding of the program as a whole and the contributions other training providers are making. They must coordinate their efforts because of the integrated nature of the training program. Hasna can greatly assist in helping to link the content and processes developed in the separate components. For example, both CDS and Cal Poly provided training in conflict resolution, but with little coordination between the two.

While some training providers attempted to measure end-of-training progress, most did not. In the future, it is essential for all training providers to develop component training objectives and end-of-training evaluations. The sponsor, in turn, has a responsibility to provide leadership and guidance for these tasks and to establish an expectation that they be carried out.

Another program design area needing strengthening for both Groups One and Two is that of supplying training providers with a clear picture of participants' roles in Turkey, their current skills levels, and how participants hope to use their new knowledge, skills, and attitudes in their professional roles at home. Having participants fill out biodata and interest forms prior to the training and providing this information to training providers would be useful, according to several training providers. With such knowledge, the providers will be better able to design learning experiences that best meet participants' skill levels, interests, and needs. Without it, they are guessing and making assumptions. For example, CDS trainers indicated, following both the first and second training programs, that they could develop more realistic and relevant role-plays if they better understood the work of the participants back in Turkey.

#### **4.1.1 Conclusions**

- Program organizers responded effectively to issues arising from the successful first training program, raising the overall quality of the second program
- Clear goals and objectives from the training organizers for the overall training program are needed to enable training providers to set their own clear and related objectives.
- Strengthened coordination among training components would result in a stronger overall program.
- End-of-training evaluations of individual components would help providers improve their programs, and would provide the evaluators and Hasna with more complete evaluative data.
- Training providers need to have a clear understanding of the professional roles that participants play in Turkey



### **4.1.2 Recommendations**

- Develop a set of measurable objectives for the third training program at its outset and work with training providers in developing component objectives that are consistent with the overall objectives
- Use the training objectives developed as a basis for coordinating the content of the various program components
- Ask each training provider to prepare an evaluation plan for its component
- Explore ways to better communicate participants' roles, interests, and training needs to training providers

## **4.2 Training Component Relevance and Effectiveness**

This section looks at the individual components of the training program and examines participant learning and resulting behavioral change. The section draws upon interviews and discussions with trainers, trainees, and other stakeholders. Components are covered individually below.

### **4.2.1 English**

Hasna articulates the following reasons for training participants in English<sup>7</sup>.

- To enable trainees to participate in the global economy and to access information available only in English in books, journals, and on the internet
- To foster cultural understanding
- To enable participants to perform day-to-day living functions while in the United States

Prior to the first training program, the implicit objective for English language training was to allow trainees to participate in the training courses which would be conducted in English. However while all trainees could perform day-to-day functions while in the US, such as ordering meals and taking busses, only a few reached a level of English comprehension which allowed them to benefit appreciably from courses taught in English. As a result, all of the technical and managerial training was sequentially interpreted. This same pattern held for the second training program, and all technical training, except the internships, was sequentially interpreted. Participants regarded the translation as generally of good quality. Evaluators had suggested the creation of a Turkish/English glossary of technical terms following the first training program. This was apparently not done and Cal Poly reiterated this suggestion in their Final Report on their component of the training this year.

---

<sup>7</sup> Hasna provided these reasons to the evaluators after reading the draft evaluation report. It is not known if this rationale was framed prior to the training and communicated to English language trainers or developed more recently.

The evaluation of the first program raised the question of whether the program should attempt to go beyond the last objective listed above in its English language training. The intention for the second program was to undertake an enhanced program of English training in Turkey to improve participants' ability level beyond that of the first group of trainees. Because of funding limitation and the division of available instruction between two class levels, however, the amount of language instruction provided in Turkey to beginning trainees did not increase appreciably over the level of the first program. Shortening the US-based English training from 4 to 3 weeks as a result of the delayed start of the overall program further reduced the amount of language instruction received by participants.

While emphasizing that Mustafa, of the GAP English Center, is one of the best English teachers in the region, participants urged bringing an American English teacher to Turkey for strengthened approach, accent, educational approach, work ethic, and variety in methods. They also pointed out that a non-Turkish teacher cannot explain things in Turkish, forcing students to communicate with their instructor in English. Participants also suggested that if they had opportunity to learn competent English in Turkey, others would not see a need to go abroad to learn English. They also felt that English training in Turkey, even involving a native-English-speaking instructor, would be more economical than conducting English language training in the United States.

In the December evaluation workshop, participants identified continuing language training as one of their highest priorities. The desire for English training appears to relate more to the desire for general personal improvement (and organizational advancement for GAP personnel), and access to information and future training opportunities than to needs directly related to the Hasna training program. Nevertheless, additional English language training for General Secretaries following the US training course is an important means to facilitate further learning by participants, an incentive to continue learning and innovating, and an ongoing connection between the Hasna program and the participants.

Several participants proposed, and most agreed with, the idea that English training for future Hasna training programs be conducted in Turkey and that the US English training component be eliminated.

#### **4.2.1.1 Conclusions**

- English language training could be effectively and economically provided entirely in Turkey
- English language training courses in Turkey could be strengthened, particularly with the involvement of a native-English-speaking instructor, and become more effective
- Levels of English ability reached by beginning trainees, even with an enhanced training program, will not be adequate to allow classroom learning in the United States without translation

- The most serious constraint associated with participants' limited English language capability comes in the internship component where professional translation is not available

#### **4.2.1.2 Recommendations**

- Consider eliminating the Georgetown English language training component entirely
- Concurrently, expand and strengthen the English training program in Turkey by:
  - Increasing the number of hours of instruction available to beginning students to 250 to 300 hours
  - Involving an American English training specialist in the training program in Turkey
  - Exploring ways to more closely tie language ability standards to English skill needs for the internship and for day-to-day interactions in the United States
  - Monitoring the English training program and more closely and provide strengthening inputs as needed
- Insist on a minimum level of English language skills for **all** program participants
- Create and regularly update a glossary of Turkish/English technical and professional terms for use by trainees, English trainers, and interpreters.
- Explore ways to subsidize ongoing English language training for returned program participants to facilitate access to information and continued learning

#### **4.2.2 Conflict Resolution**

This group of participants, like the first group, found the content and process of the conflict resolution training to be excellent. It remains one of the most highly rated program components. Participants gave the component high “end-of-training” marks in terms of content, process, and translation (See Annex Twelve for details) at the April evaluation workshop. At the December workshop, it became evident that participants had also been able to apply their conflict resolution learning.

In addition to the “conflict resolution” element of this training, participants also found the basic communication skills development quite useful. Some indicated that they are now ready, and eager, for more advanced training.

Group One participants indicated that conflict resolution should be given its own time slot, more time, and not enmeshed with English training, as it was done during the first training. It was given its own time slot this year, but when we look at hours spent on

training, we see that the time this year (about 25 hours) was actually less than last year (about 30 hours).

CDS explained that this was necessary because the rooms being used at GU were not always available for a full day. Given the expense of bringing trainees to Washington, and the importance of this training component, this constraint should be removed for the next program.

#### **4.2.2.1 Conclusions**

- The conflict resolution training was well designed and well received by trainees and constituted one of the most valuable parts of the overall program
- Participants are able to readily apply learning from this component to their work and daily lives
- This is an area in which participants have no prior experience or training
- Training time was constrained by meeting room availability

#### **4.2.2.2 Recommendations**

- Continue this component, expanding to provide more advanced training if possible
- Locate an alternative meeting location and intensify the training to cover 35 to 40 hours in a week
- Supply CDS with specific scenarios of conflicts typically faced by participants to allow them to develop more appropriate conflict resolution case studies and role plays
- Consider working with CDS to provide a training-of-trainers program in Turkey

### **4.2.3 Management and Irrigation Training**

#### **4.2.3.1 Content**

As noted in the box at right, the evaluation of the first training program called for the major emphasis of this new component to be on organizational management. But this focus shifted as the component evolved during interactions between Hasna and CPP. See Annex Five for a breakdown of hours by topic.

<p><b>Recommendation from 2001 Evaluation</b></p>
---

<p>“Develop a formal training component in organizational management skills and techniques and make it a centerpiece of the program.”</p>
---

Cal Poly trainers felt they had little information on the required content of the training. According to them, the most specific information they had regarding content came from the evaluation report on the first program, while no subject matter specifics came from Hasna. However, CPP evidently did feel it had enough information to proceed with the

training program design and implementation. There were overlaps with CDS on conflict resolution, and with the internship component with respect to irrigation and agriculture. While participants valued the field trip to Bakersfield, they strongly indicated that they did not need, and found redundant, the field trips to Coachella and Palo Verde. By this time participants were also weary of so much traveling without a break.

Both CPP management professors said they did not end up doing what they had planned to do because of budget cuts, schedule changes, and insufficient information related to participants' interests and needs. According to them, participants were not interested in what they had planned to do and insisted on more prescriptive content and process. As one professor remarked, "I wanted to focus on empowerment, but the participants said they felt very dis-empowered." He said they wanted "answers and quick fixes." Both management professors said participants were unwilling to engage in dialogue, explore diagnostic tools, etc., and reported that they were very frustrated with their situations in Turkey and needed answers, not discussion.

#### ***4.2.3.2 Coordination and Scheduling***

Delays in training created difficulties for CPP. They originally thought the training would fall during Spring break, which would have been ideal. As it turned out, the training fell during the regular CPP term when professors had regular classes and could not devote blocks of time to instruction for the participants. They were also not able to team teach as they had planned.

Instructors were pleased with CPP coordination and felt well informed from the CPP administrative side. However, staff changes at Hasna contributed to difficulty through communication breaking down somewhat. CPP felt that some things were agreed early on but changed midstream.

Professors were frustrated by late changes in schedule and budget plans, which resulted in changes in their planned programs. Also, CPP said that project management was not in original plan, but that Hasna added it later. CPP also felt that it learned what would be happening in the internships at a late date, making it difficult for them to coordinate content.

#### ***4.2.3.3 CPP Perceptions of Participants***

CPP did not see English as a problem. Most, if not all, instructors felt the participants understood much more than they could speak, helped each other, had good translators, and were thus able to function satisfactorily.

One professor commented, "Many programs come to the States for workshops. This one seems to know where it's going and we feel like we're contributing." In a similar vein, another said, "Many groups from other countries come mainly to play, and to learn a little. This group seemed very focused on learning, and wanted to play just a little."

#### **4.2.3.4 End-of-training Evaluation**

None of the CPP instructors solicited end-of-training feedback or conducted their own evaluation. During the April PME workshop, participants provided feedback on the content, process, and coordination of all components. See Annex Twelve for results.

#### **4.2.3.5 Conclusions**

- CPP did a good job in overall coordination of their component
- Parts of CPP training was useful, while other parts appear to have been redundant or irrelevant
  - Focus of the training was not primarily on organizational management as recommended in the prior year's evaluation
  - Trainees were very satisfied with the conflict management part of the organizational management training as well as the field trip to Bakersfield
  - Participants indicated strong dissatisfaction with the content and methods of the management part of CPP's training.
  - Trainees felt that a 2-day field trip to the Imperial Valley was repetitious and unnecessary. They felt this covered much of what they had experienced in the internships, and that the internship format was superior to field trips, in general.
- Cal Poly trainers felt uncertain about the purpose of the training program, the content to be covered, and what other components of the program were covering

#### **4.2.3.6 Recommendations**

- Place the focus of this component specifically on organizational management
- Consider moving the management training component to a non-university setting employing more participatory training methods
- Provide trainers with much better information in advance on participants, their jobs, and the context in which they work
- Sponsors should invest more heavily in program development and component coordination prior to the training
- To the extent possible, program organizers should know budgetary limits and scheduling details before finalizing arrangements with training providers and avoid late changes in arrangements

#### **4.2.4 Internships**

The internships for participants with California irrigation district managers were added to the program upon the recommendation of the first training program evaluation.

Participants felt strongly and virtually unanimously that the internships were useful and well organized, and recommended that they be extended in future programs (see Annex Twelve). Mentors commented that participants seemed weary and somewhat jaded upon arrival, but that by the beginning of the second day, they were eager and engaged. On the first day, mentors feared that limited English would be a serious problem. Subsequently, it became evident that many understood more English than they could speak. On balance, mentors felt that participants knew “just enough” English to make it work.

Participants were particularly interested in relationships between (a) district field staff and farmers and (b) the managers and their Boards. Additionally some participants were very interested in crop agronomy. Some local farmers expressed concern over sharing hard won expertise in crop production that could benefit potential competitors overseas who then take away market share, as had happened with apricots. It might be better to arrange future agronomic segments through a local agricultural university such as Fresno State to minimize the effect of this sensitivity.

A number of managers independently took their participants to visit agroprocessing facilities such as a packing facility for vegetables. Managers felt that doing this individually was inefficient and suggested that these kinds of visits be consolidated in future to reduce demands on GMs’ time.

All mentors interviewed commented that they were “glad they did it.” Several indicated that they too had learned a great deal from the exchange. In part this was a result of having to think through how they do things prior to explaining them. Warm relations developed between a number of the participants and their hosts. One host took his participants up in a small airplane to see the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and San Francisco Bay from the air and then to San Francisco to see Fisherman’s Wharf and other sights.

Mentors invested considerable personal time and energy in the internship process during what was a busy part of their work year. To some extent, their willingness to do this was probably a result of the novelty of the exchange. It is unlikely that all would be willing or able to make this commitment for a second year, though some would. There are a number of other districts in the area, however, which are also potential partners. One way of easing the burden on GMs’ time would be to involve retired farmers who have served or still serve on District Boards more heavily. These retired farmers are typically extremely knowledgeable and have available time.

The Water Authority organizing the internships received little guidance on the substance of the program from either Hasna or Cal Poly/Pomona. This left them free to design the program themselves based on what they had learned about the program and their own assumptions. This worked well on balance, though a few of the assumptions made, they said, turned out to be incorrect. The issues of planning and component coordination and

communication need to be addressed for future programs. General managers coordinated among themselves in the evening by phone. Coordination with Cal Poly was confined to logistic matters and logistics generally worked well.

#### **4.2.4.1 Conclusions**

- The internship component was a strong and useful addition to the training program and should be continued for appropriate participants
- The time of irrigation district general managers is a very scarce resource and must be called upon very carefully and for specific purposes
- Given general managers' time constraints, it is not appropriate to extend the internships themselves beyond the current 5 day duration as many participants requested
- English language capability of participants was only marginally adequate for a successful internship experience; stronger language capability would yield more productive internships

#### **4.2.4.2 Recommendations**

- Include internships in future training programs as long as a substantial majority of participants are IU general secretaries
- Strengthened English language achievement standards for trainees who participate in the internship component; make reaching these heightened standards a criterion for participating in the internship component
- Explore with the Water Authority ways to reduce the demands on general managers' time, such as using retired farmers/board members for some activities (see also following recommendation)
- Organize field-based training in agriculture through Fresno State University or the USDA Agricultural Research Station in Fresno rather than through the Water Authority, and consolidate visits to agro-processing facilities

### **4.3 Follow-up and Support**

The HASNA program continues to demonstrate the usefulness and importance of the training it provides. Participants have learned and applied some valuable skills which have resulted in measurable impacts. The second training program extended coverage provided by the initial training of GS in the HP, creating potential for changes in management approach to reach most of the HP irrigation system. Important in achieving this cumulative impact will be the linkages that develop between the two groups of GS trainees. While bonds within each group tend to form during the US sojourn, integration between the two groups will have to take place *in situ*. General Secretaries from both



groups now meet together monthly, a positive development, though groups still retain somewhat separate identities.

### Participant Suggestions for Next Training Program

- Lengthen hands-on training and observe more than one IU (7).
- Need more clarity on objectives of Hasna program (5).
- Continuation of program in Turkey after US training (4), including more advanced conflict resolution training, more project planning and management, and more English, with foreign teacher from time to time.
- Clear and explicit selection criteria for trainees (many)
- More technical training in Turkey with hands-on experiential training in the USA (3) (*Group one had also recommended this*)
- Adequate level of English reached in Turkey (2)
- Stay with families for language experience and to lower costs (2)
- Clearer understanding of program after return from US and arrangements for communication and support
- More complete and timely information to the field and within Turkey
- Consistent policies and information from Hasna to the field
- A channel for training requests
- Establish a Hasna point of contact in Urfa
- Clearer understandings and agreements between GAP administration and Hasna leadership.
- More comprehensive conflict resolution program
- Project planning and management training in Turkey
- More agrotechnical training in the US
- More detailed courses on agro-economics, conflict resolution, and project implementation.
- Stronger GAP voice
- Couple of days of free time in US
- Increase in daily spending money
- More social activities.
- Ensure qualified translators

Another important determinant of training impact will be the resources available to the GS and the type and quality of support they get from other organizations<sup>8</sup>. One important contribution to this could come from the small grants program that Hasna has suggested. To initiate this, the evaluation team provided training to in grant proposal writing to participants from Groups One and Two who attended the “Next Steps” workshop in

<sup>8</sup> The type and extent of support required depends heavily on the future program strategy adopted (see section 5.2).

Sanliurfa and worked with them to outline proposals to submit to Hasna and other sources for funding.

The Hasna training facility on the outskirts of Sanliurfa received some use during the year – notably for a young farmers training program last summer. Total extent of use is unknown. Computer equipment is available, but internet access is extremely slow, limiting the usefulness of the internet connection.

Hasna supported a four-day follow-up training session last fall in conflict resolution techniques in Sanliurfa for past participants in Turkey. The program was organized by CDS and was not included in this evaluation<sup>9</sup>.

#### **4.3.1.1 Conclusions**

- Concentrating training on the Harran Plain was a wise decision and a critical mass of trained GS is now present there
- GS have demonstrated capacity and willingness to work together and, given resources, could organize joint activities and programs to improve irrigated agriculture on the Harran Plain

#### **4.3.1.2 Recommendations**

- Follow through with the proposed program of small grants to returned participants for field-based development activities
- Offer ongoing training opportunities to returned participants in areas such as English language training, conflict resolution, and program planning and operation

## **5 Cross-cutting Issues, Conclusions, and Recommendations**

A number of important issues arise in this evaluation. Some of these relate to the training program itself, while others relate to the relationships among Hasna, program participants, and partner organizations such as GAP. A third set of critically important issues relates to the future direction of the program. Because of the general success and effectiveness of the training program itself, some of the most important issues arising relate not to the training program *per se*, but to relationships, ways of operating, and the future of the Hasna program in Turkey.

### **5.1 Training Target Group**

The program was originally conceived to affect and benefit Irrigation Union General Secretaries and, through them, farmers and farm families in the IU areas. There are, at the

---

<sup>9</sup> Participants reactions to the training could have been sought if evaluators had been aware of the training and had been asked to include it.

same time, a number of other organizations in the GAP area which work with and support farmers. The most notable of these are the GAP Administration and DSI. The latter operates the main irrigation systems serving the IUs. In addition, various NGOs and other government agencies operate in the Sanliurfa area. As the Hasna program in the region has developed, it has strengthened ties with the GAP Administration, which now provides some financial support for the program. The program remains only loosely connected with DSI, which is a limiting factor in terms of regional impact.

At the same time, the composition of the participant group has been shifting. The first training program consisted of 10 people, 60% of whom were General Secretaries. The second program comprised a slight majority of General Secretaries (54%), while most of the other trainees in the group were GAP employees or employees of the GAP MOM project. As the third training program currently shapes up, only 25% of the potential participants are members of the original target group for the training. This is a situation that requires immediate correction and, over the longer run, a more comprehensive reassessment of the purpose and intended target group(s) for the training<sup>10</sup>.

Any good training program is designed for a particular target group, and will generally not serve well the needs of other groups. Moreover, the presence of non-target group members in a training program can distort the program and weaken its effectiveness by broadening its focus and diluting its content. This is particularly true of a program which relies heavily on participatory training methodologies, as does the Hasna program. This dilution is evident in the second training program and was flagged in the CPP Final Report on the training as well as in the evaluators' own observations. This will be the dominant problem issue for the third program unless significant changes are made in the nature of the training program, the make-up of the participant group, or both.

This issue was raised by the evaluators during the evaluation in Sanliurfa and evoked a concerned response from GAP administrators. The GAP response involves two general notions. The first is the idea that GAP MOM, a contractor to GAP, performs work that is similar to that of General Secretaries and that its employees will therefore benefit from training targeted on the Secretaries. The second idea raised is, because training programs are now partially supported by GAP (15 to 20% of costs), that they should have measurable impacts on GAP objectives for the region and that these impacts should be assessed. In making the first argument, GAP implicitly acknowledges that regular GAP employees perform functions that are significantly different from those of GS and would not necessarily benefit from the same training other than to familiarize them with the program.

GAP MOM is a project operated by a contractor to the GAP Authority. It is charged with assisting the development of irrigated agriculture in the region. Its employees are generally based in offices in regional cities but work with agriculture in rural areas.

---

<sup>10</sup> As a result of a preliminary alert on this problem by the evaluators, program sponsors organized a new English program in Sanliurfa to pre-qualify more General Secretaries, potentially improving the balance among participants for the third training program.

General Secretaries, by contrast, are employees of Irrigation Unions and, by extension, the farmers the Unions serve. Their primary function is to supply irrigation water to farmers within their boundaries and keep irrigation and drainage systems in good operating condition. The nation-wide goal of the government is that IUs be permanent and self-reliant civil society institutions. As such, IUs and their staff are the targets of government (including GAP and GAP MOM) assistance efforts. GAP MOM is a project organized by the GAP Administration to strengthen these institutions, but is not intended to provide irrigation service to farmers directly or to be a permanent presence in the region.

Against this background, experience from the second training program suggests that the interests and needs of direct GAP employees often diverge significantly from those of the primary target group (GS) and tend to fragment training program focus. The interests and needs of GAP MOM employees are more similar to those of the GS but still differ in certain respects. These differences include primary focus (GS: service delivery, GAP MOM: longer term change in the region) and modality (GS: system operation, direct interaction with all irrigating farmers in the IU, GAP MOM: research activities, particular programs).

The principal implication of these difficulties and the mounting pressure to diversify the target group for Hasna training programs is two-fold. **First**, Hasna and its partners (GAP and other co-sponsors) must be clear and in agreement about the purpose of the training program. As a part of this assessment, the target group for the training must be explicitly delineated. In doing this, organizers should assume that all stakeholders in the irrigation management process in the GAP region could benefit from training of some sort. However, given Hasna's resource constraints and the range of other training opportunities (FAO and other) available to some of the stakeholders, the real question is where the Hasna program can make the most significant impact. In other words, where does Hasna's comparative advantage lie, given its status as a small but innovative and flexible player on a field crowded with other players?

**Second**, future programs must be based on an explicit analysis of the needs and interests of the intended participant group, with training differentiated to accommodate divergent needs. Differentiation among segments of the target group might consist of separate training programs for widely divergent interests, or separate tracks for more similar but still diverging interests. Either option will add complexity, and probably cost, to the training. Alternatively, preliminary actions might be taken in Turkey to develop shared programs that different role-players (GS, GAP and DSI employees, contractors, IU chairmen, etc.) would be trained together to implement. The training would then become part of a larger program of activities focussed not on the trainees themselves, but ultimately on local agricultural families whom the larger program would be designed to assist.

The second issue raised – evaluating program impacts against GAP objectives for the region – is a valid one that training program organizers should address. Evaluations to

date have been formative, focusing on ways to improve and enhance the program. The GAP concern is to understand the wider regional impacts of the training. To assess these impacts, it will be necessary to define explicit objectives for the program and to periodically mount an evaluation effort which extends beyond a single group of trainees to cover the region of interest. It should be noted that this type of evaluation is useful only when the intervention (in this case, the training programs) has covered a large enough target group to have a reasonable prospect of achieving a regional impact.

#### **5.1.1.1 Conclusions**

- Participant composition of succeeding training programs was seen to be shifting from a preponderance of IU General Secretaries to a preponderance of GAP and GAP MOM employees; some corrective actions appear to have been taken on this issue
- Training program design has not changed to accommodate the actual participant mix
- The participant role mix in the second training program led to a loss of shared focus in the training and an inability to work with common goals and objectives
- In the near future, it will be appropriate to evaluate the broader impacts of the training program in the Harran Plain area

#### **5.1.1.2 Recommendations**

- Act urgently to provide additional English language training, increasing the number of General Secretaries who could qualify for the third training program from one-quarter to at least two-thirds (and preferably higher) of participants
- Target training of additional GS on those in the Harran Plain who have not yet received training or qualified in English skills
- Consider the likely mix of participants in framing overall training objectives for the third program and make appropriate adjustments in training program design where needed and possible
- Over the longer run, develop clear training program goals and objectives and use those goals and objectives to define the target group for training
- Plan for a wider impact assessment of the training program in the Harran Plain area within the next 1 to 2 years

## **5.2 Future of Program**

Now that Hasna, together with its partners, has completed two training programs for GS and others in the GAP region, it is appropriate to consider the strategic direction the program will take in the future. The first two programs have afforded training to the

majority of the GS in the HP irrigation system, the largest contiguous irrigated area in the GAP region. The third program is expanding geographically into smaller irrigation schemes in the Diyarbakir area. Problems already encountered in this expansion into smaller more remote irrigation systems, such as the unavailability of English language instruction in some areas, indicate that a simple expansion to more and more areas in the GAP region may not be a viable strategy. Moreover, in the absence of follow-up and support in areas already affected by the training program, gains may not be sustainable.

This suggests that Hasna and partners need to take explicit steps to develop a coherent medium-term strategy for future irrigation-related operations in Turkey. The following broad options are possible directions for a strategy.

1. Continue to expand program to cover increasingly wide irrigated areas in the GAP region (**Simple Expansion**)
2. Strengthen the GAP capacity to provide training for GS within the GAP region similar to that provided by the Hasna program (**GAP-based Expansion**)
3. Expand the training program to areas outside the GAP region (**Turkey-wide Expansion**)
4. Deepen involvement in the HP by intensifying and diversifying training activities in conjunction with local IUs and other groups, reaching stakeholders such as IU chairmen and influential farmers (**Intensification**).
5. Bring the irrigation training program to a close and shift to other endeavours (**Withdrawal**)

Each of these options has strengths and limitations that need to be explored in a comprehensive way. Some principal ones are highlighted below.

1. **Simple Expansion.** Strengths include (a) continuity with current operations, and (b) expansion of impact within GAP region. Limitations include (a) working in small fragmented and remote systems, (b) sustainability of results, and (c) failure to consolidate and intensify results already achieved.
2. **GAP-based Expansion.** Strengths include (a) access to larger GAP financial resource pool, and (b) institutionalization of program. Limitations include (a) reduction or loss of programmatic influence by Hasna, (b) possible decline in dynamic evaluation-based program revision, and (c) possible limitations due to unavailability of locally-based training resources.
3. **Turkey-wide Expansion.** Strengths include (a) access to other large contiguous irrigated blocks (like HP), (b) influence in other regions of the country, and (c) opportunity to develop stronger partnership with bulk water supplier DSI. Limitations include (a) Challenge of developing new partnerships, (b) risk of over-extension, and (c) sustainability of results.

4. **Intensification.** Strengths include (a) building on previous results, (b) enhanced sustainability of results, and (c) increased likelihood of measurable impacts on public sector (GAP) goals. Limitations are (a) limited geographical impact and (b) need to design new types of interventions.
5. **Withdrawal.** Strengths include the ability to redirect resources to new programs. Limitations include (a) abandonment of a successful program, (b) need to begin over again on a learning curve, (c) threat to sustainability of past training results, and (d) need to develop new partnerships.

There is no obvious “best” approach to this challenge, though some alternatives appear stronger than others. Hasna and its partners need urgently to undertake a thorough review of these possibilities and develop a clear strategy for the medium-term future.

#### **5.2.1.1 Conclusions**

- The Hasna training program in Turkey has been notably successful in training IU General Secretaries and others in ways that change for the better their professional and personal lives
- Since the program has successfully reached most GS in the HP, it is becoming difficult to assemble groups of GS to go through both English and US training programs together.

#### **5.2.1.2 Recommendations**

- Hasna should undertake a careful review of its program options in Turkey and work with its strategic partners to develop a medium-term program strategy to guide its future efforts

### **5.3 Partnerships**

Hasna is relatively new, and is, unsurprisingly, still sorting out partner relationships. The first training program in Turkey was conducted under MOUs with the Rural and Urban Development Foundation (RUDF) of Turkey and the GAP Administration. The second program was conducted without new formal MOU agreements, although informal arrangements were made with the GAP Administration.

Issues that arose during the course of the training and the evaluation regarding cost sharing and programmatic control, indicate the need for direct senior-level discussion between Hasna and GAP over resource sharing, program goals and objectives, program design responsibility, and evaluation needs. Agreements reached should be formalized in an MOU. A similar procedure should be followed for new partners that come into the program in a significant way.

It would be useful for Hasna, as a US-based NGO, to partner with a Turkish NGO in organizing its programs in Turkey. While there are numerous NGOs in Turkey, they are often small, sometimes comprising a single individual. Moreover many are established

by public employees who operate the NGO on a part-time basis. These may function more like consulting firms than autonomous organizations with diversified funding sources. In addition, the national government places severe restrictions on fund transfers from international sources to NGOs organized in Turkey. All of these factors make it difficult to identify NGOs which would be suitable partners for Hasna in implementing its programs in Turkey.

#### **5.3.1.1 Conclusions**

- Persistent problems of poor communication and mixed messages between Hasna and its partners and training participants in Turkey have dogged the program from its inception
- Cost-sharing partnerships generate stronger requirements for clear and explicit agreements among partners than do arrangements not involving cost-sharing
- Hasna programs are handicapped by the absence of a local NGO partner who shares Hasna's philosophy and program objectives.

#### **5.3.1.2 Recommendations**

- As lead program organizer, Hasna should initiate a dialog with its partners in Turkey, particularly the GAP Administration, to develop clear high-level understandings of program objectives, resource sharing arrangements, and decision making processes
- As lead program organizer, Hasna should take steps to improve communication with the field by broadening the range of partners receiving communications, communicating and summarizing in writing (via email), insuring consistency among messages, and consider opening a local Hasna liaison office as a local point of contact
- Partners in Turkey should organize to facilitate rapid response and authoritative decision making in carrying out co-sponsorship responsibilities
- Hasna, as lead program organizer, should continue to seek a responsible and capable NGO as a additional local partner organization

## **6 Evaluating the Evaluation**

At the end of the December workshop in Sanliurfa, the evaluation team asked participants to evaluate the evaluation process through anonymous written responses. These were then translated and sent to the team. Participants clearly valued the participatory and capacity building nature of the evaluation, and also see the application of goal and objective setting as well as monitoring and evaluation to their work. It is significant that they are beginning to see PM&E as an integral part of their work, not something added



on externally that they must do. Following are some of the participants' end-of-evaluation comments, in their own words (translated from Turkish).

## **6.1 Strengths and Benefits (Pomona, Turkey field work, Urfa)**

### **6.1.1 Participatory Process**

- In both Pomona and Urfa the evaluation work was done with the participants. This helped us to see our mistakes and missing points immediately
- Evaluation work in Pomona was very well prepared
- What was important in this evaluation was to get participation. This allowed for different thoughts to meet on common points. The flow of the training to this point created an incomplete picture. PM&E made understanding and conceptualization easier. We understood the importance of evaluating through group work – how different perspectives on one topic could converge on one point.
- Evaluation techniques utilized in Pomona were different and effective. Without knowing how we should describe and what we should do, we actually evaluated what we've experienced during this process. We found the opportunity to tell about things that we were not able to say before or could not think about.

### **6.1.2 Built Capacity**

- Our ability to monitor and evaluate criteria (indicators) improved
- Evaluation work in Pomona also helped in terms of developing the success of our group work and ability to communicate
- During the evaluation we were able to create a project without (you) influencing our thoughts, but just giving us direction
- During the evaluation process in Urfa, in a way we could evaluate ourselves

### **6.1.3 Appreciative Approach**

- In terms of the evaluation in Urfa, the fact that we started by seeing the positive aspects – this was something opposite/contrary to my character. It will be very beneficial to me.

### **6.1.4 Other**

- I can't compare with others because this is the first evaluation I've been a part of
- At Cal Poly, many of the seminars and courses we had were very similar. But project development and evaluation was beneficial for improving the IUs

## **6.2 Suggestions for Improvement**

- It's necessary to further strengthen this ability of ours for making plans and programs. Because of this, it would be beneficial to provide further project planning training in Sanliurfa
- It's good that participation is achieved in monitoring and evaluation. It would be helpful for it to be repeated once in a while
- To continue practical, hands-on training

# Annexes