

Preliminary Evaluation Report  
Turkey Water Users Association Manager Training 2005

**Introduction**

This report documents the evaluation of the fifth year of the Water Users Association (WUA) management training program. In each of the prior years from 2001 to 2004, staff of WUAs and government agencies involved in water distribution in southeast Turkey have traveled to the United States to develop their professional skills. In the U. S., each cohort has received 3 to 4 weeks of training in conflict resolution, English language, and in technical topics related to water and agricultural management. Training is contracted out to carefully selected organizations that are experienced in the respective training subjects.

In 2005, the participants were the chairmen of nine WUAs and one was a member of the Turkish government agency that has oversight responsibility for all WUAs. The travel time of these executives was constrained, so English language was eliminated and their training was limited to 2 weeks, occurring in the first two weeks of May 2005. Because most of the participants in this training cohort did not speak English, all training was done with the use of translators.

The first week included four days of conflict resolution training and one a day of project planning and leadership. Some afternoons included visits to U. S. and Turkish government agencies in Washington D. C. For the second week, the group traveled to California for four days of observation of management of a large, non-profit water distribution authority agency serving farmers in the San Joaquin Valley.

**Evaluation questions and methods**

This preliminary project evaluation was guided by the following three questions:

1. What were the participants' reactions to the training?

Three types of data were to assess participant reaction. First, participants were asked to rate how well they liked the training. Second, a focus group was held to determine what the participants had learned from conflict resolution training. Third, the instructors were interviewed about participant behavior in their sessions.

2. What problems occurred in planning, coordinating, and conducting the training?

The contracted instructors who provided the training were interviewed about the overall management of the project by HasNa and about any logistical, communication, or support problems they experienced.

3. To what extent did the participants use their training after leaving the program?

Participants were asked to develop action plans for how they will apply the knowledge and skills they learned in the training after they returned to their organizations. The action plans

contained specific tasks to be accomplished with due dates, who are responsible, and how they will evaluate the success of their plans.

## **Evaluation Findings**

### **1. Participant reactions**

At the end of the first week, the participants were asked to rate how much they liked the conflict resolution training on a three point scale where 3 meant “like it a lot,” 2 meant “like it a little,” and 1 meant “did not like.” Eight rated it a 3, two rated it a 2, and none rated it a 1 indicating a highly positive reaction.

In the focus group session also at the end of the first week, participants were asked to list the skills they had learned in conflict resolution training. Their group list was compared to a list of skills provided by the conflict training instructor and the two lists matched. It was concluded that the participants as a group were able to completely recall and identify the key skills they were taught in conflict resolution training. It cannot be concluded however that the participants had mastered these skills in one three day training session, nor was this expected.

Interviews with the instructors indicated that the participants showed attentive and willing engagement in the training activities. All instructors were very pleased with the participants’ behavior and viewed their training sessions as successful. They reported that need to translate between English and Turkish made instruction go more slowly than in prior years.

### **2. Training management problems**

All instructors acknowledged the limited amount of time for their training sessions and offered a number of suggestions for how the training could be even more effective with more time.

The instructors all reported that they had no problems with HasNa’s planning, coordinating, and supporting the training. Logistically, things went a lot smoother than in some previous years. There was good coordination and better hand-off of the participants as they transferred from one instructor to the next. The few logistical problems that occurred the year before were all fixed this year.

### **3. Participant application of training**

Data collection to address this question is in process at this time. Initial telephone interviews of the nine chairman participants conducted in August 2005 suggest that several are behind schedule in carrying out their action plans, but that all are still committed to completing them.