

# **Evaluation Report HasNa Turkey Irrigation Managers Training Program: Group III**

**December 2004**

Dian Seslar Svendsen<sup>1</sup>

Mark Svendsen<sup>2</sup>

## **1 Introduction**

### **1.1 Training Program Overview**

This report documents evaluation activities of the third HasNa training programs designed to train Turkish irrigation managers and supporting staff. Like earlier programs, this one included English language training, training in interpersonal communication and conflict resolution, and irrigation management. This program also included, for the first time, extensive training in agricultural skills, including organic agriculture, direct marketing of output, and a brief introduction to “holistic management.”

English language instruction in Turkey included separate programs in Sanliurfa and Diyarbakir. The Washington, DC--based Center for Dispute Settlement conducted the conflict resolution training. ALBA, a training center located near Salinas, CA, organized the agricultural training. The San Luis Delta Mendota Water Authority (SLDMWA), Los Banos, CA, arranged visits for participants to engage with managers from US Irrigation Districts, which are similar in many respects to Turkish Irrigation Unions. See Attachments One, Two, and Three for detailed training schedules.

### **1.2 Evaluation Overview**

The evaluation consisted of four parts:

- Post-Training Assessment in California - 2003
- Interviews with Trainers in California- 2003
- Post-Fieldwork Data Analysis in Turkey - 2004
- Input from other stakeholders in Turkey - 2004

The purpose of the Post-Training Assessment was to determine participants’ reactions to the training upon completion and before returning to Turkey to begin their fieldwork phase.

Interviews with trainers provided insight into their perspectives on successes and challenges of the training. The Post-Fieldwork Data Analysis provided Group III participants the opportunity to reflect back over the year of application of learning to determine what had proven to be most useful. Other stakeholders in Turkey,

---

<sup>1</sup> Human and Organization Development Consultant, Email: disvendsen@aol.com

<sup>2</sup> Water Resource Consultant, Email: marksvendsen@aol.com

including participants from Groups I and II, provided further data related to the most enduring benefits of HasNa training

### **1.3 Participant Preparation for Participatory Monitoring**

The authors also facilitated a participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) workshop at the conclusion of the US portion of the training in Monterey, CA. See Attachment Four for this training schedule.

## **2 Evaluation Process**

### **2.1 Approach**

This evaluation, like previous ones, used a participatory approach that involved participants in collecting and analyzing assessment data. To engage in PM&E, participants must understand basic concepts of the monitoring and evaluation process. Consequently, the evaluation included training in PM&E, during which the participants developed an evaluation plan for their portion of the larger program evaluation.

### **2.2 Participants**

Participants included six general secretaries of Turkish Irrigation Unions (IUs), all male, and 4 GAP Management Operations and Maintenance (MOM) project staff (2 females and 2 males) (Attachment Five). All were from the Southeastern Anatolian Project (GAP) area and were university graduates in an agricultural field. This year's group comprised only two different roles -- General Secretaries and GAP MOM employees -- in contrast with last year's group which comprised three different roles -- General Secretaries, GAP MOM trainers, and GAP direct-hire administrators.

### **2.3 Translation**

All training and workshops were conducted in English with Turkish translation. Some written materials, such as all monitoring and evaluation materials for the Post-fieldwork phase, were in English and Turkish.

During initial training, participants indicated that the translators used were effective. Having translators enabled them to understand all subjects more completely. However, some participants pointed out that having a translator limited their use of English. Some participants obviously needed translation in order to function at all, while others could have managed with English and would have strengthened their language skills in the process.

### **2.4 End-of-Training Assessment**

#### **November 2003, Monterey, CA**

Participants assessed each of the four components of training (English in Turkey; Dispute Resolution in Washington; and Organic and Sustainable Agriculture, and Irrigation in California) in terms of content, methods, and training effectiveness. (Attachment Six)

## **2.5 Interviews with Trainers**

One member of the evaluation team interviewed San Luis Delta Mendota Water Authority (SLDMWA) Coordinator, Dan Nelson, and the one district manager. SLDMWA organized and conducted the “job shadowing” component of the water district management program.

The evaluator and the Executive Director of HasNa also interviewed Brett Melone, ALBA, who organized the training and conducted many of the sessions focusing on sustainable agriculture and holistic management.

## **2.6 Preparation for PM&E**

The 3.5-day workshop conducted at the end of training in the US aimed to strengthen capacity of participants to design and conduct PM&E through developing a set of goals, objectives, and indicators to help them monitor and evaluate their application of learning from the HasNa training program. See Attachment Seven for pre- and post-workshop assessments and Attachment Eight for end-of-workshop evaluation.

## **2.7 Field Work Related to Application of New Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes (KSAs)**

Group III Participants returned to Turkey in November 2003 with the understanding that they would be implementing activities related to their goals, objectives, and indicators that would reflect their understanding of HasNa skills. Evaluators would then meet with them in late 2004 to assist with analysis of monitoring data that they had collected.

## **2.8 Post-Fieldwork Data Analysis in Turkey**

The evaluators met with seven<sup>3</sup> participants (all males) from Group III at the DSI Guesthouse in Sanliurfa, Turkey, in December 2004. See Attachment Nine for Participants and Attachment Ten for end-of-workshop evaluation. The intended purpose and expected outcomes of this workshop follow.

### **Purpose**

To examine project progress in order to determine successes, needed change, and to build upon what works.

### **Expected Outcomes**

- Identified successes and challenges
- Revised goals, objectives, and indicators
- Suggested next steps
- Personal action plans
- Collective action plans with participants

However, evaluators learned on the first day that unlike Groups I and II, none of the Group III participants had collected monitoring data to determine the extent to which they had applied HasNa training. Participants reported that one participant had

---

<sup>3</sup> Two of the seven were there for only a brief time. So there were basically five participants.

collected some data, but he did not attend the workshop because of a death in the family.

Because participants had no monitoring data to analyze, which was the main purpose of the workshop, the evaluators revised the original schedule (Attachment Eleven) and replaced it with the following:

### **Day One**

- Introductions and Expectations
- Workshop Overview
- Introduction to Appreciative Inquiry
- Discovering Successes
- Relating Successes to Training Components

### **Day Two**

- Review data collection process – highlights and challenges
- Project planning cycle
- Setting new goals, objectives, and indicators
- Developing personal and collective action plans

## **2.9 Input from other stakeholders**

### **2.9.1 Previous Participants**

In December 2004, seventeen past participants<sup>4</sup> from Groups I, II, and III met with the evaluators for 3 hours. The purpose of this short workshop was to 1) reflect on the impact of HasNa training at this point in their lives, what they now see as the most useful parts of the training – what has endured over time; 2) review HasNa progress related to past recommendations, 3) identify what they need to continue to develop professionally, and 4) make recommendations to HasNa.

### **2.9.2 Other Stakeholders**

Evaluators conducted a focus group that included one participant from the GAP administration, one from the GAP-MOM project, two IU Chairmen, three farmers, one IU General Secretary, and one DSI administrator. Four of the group members were past HasNa training program participants.

## **2.10 Reporting**

An interim report documents results of training and the preparation for PM&E Workshop conducted in 2003. The present report addresses overall results.

# **3 Findings**

These findings reflect input from participants and stakeholders at two points in time -- November 2003 and December 2004. Between Phases One (training) and Two (fieldwork, data collection and analysis), HasNa initiated a new training program the elements of which do not necessarily reflect findings in this report., Some conclusions

---

<sup>4</sup> Breakdown by Training Group: 3 from Group I (trained in 2001), 6 from Group II (2002), 6 from Group III (2003), and 2 from Group IV (2004).

and recommendations contained herein may thus be moot from HasNa's point of view. Nevertheless, evaluators have reported findings from the evaluation of the third training program here in their entirety.

### **3.1 Training Content and Process**

#### **3.1.1 Importance of agriculture and irrigation training**

While the program was initially designed as an irrigation-focused training program, the prominence of irrigation has given way to a focus on agriculture. But, old and new participants alike demonstrate and report that the most enduring benefits of their training resulted not from the irrigation and agricultural portions of the program but from conflict resolution, and, to a lesser extent, monitoring and evaluation for the following reasons:

- These skills have wide applicability, both personally and professionally.
- Conflict resolution is a new topic; whereas they already know something about the technical topics
- IUs generally don't have the resources to apply ideas from their agricultural training

Even though participants responded quite favorably to the PM&E training and process, the specific "usefulness" they identified in their overall evaluation of the PM&E process relates more to planning than to monitoring and evaluation.

### **3.2 Training Effectiveness and Application of Training**

Participants and other stakeholders report that major changes in lives and work relate to improvements in interpersonal communication, especially in terms of listening and self-confidence. Such strengthened interpersonal skills apply to interactions with farmers, colleagues, and families. Participants attribute these changes to the conflict and dispute resolution training they received. To a lesser extent, participants also indicated significant changes related to improved planning, which they attribute to the PM&E training they received.

The evaluators noted striking differences, in some cases, between participants' perceptions of training immediately following the training and their later perceptions of training usefulness following the period of application. In many cases, particularly those related to agricultural training, participants rated the training as useful immediately afterwards, but later experienced difficulty applying or using the training for a variety of reasons, including cost, absence of markets, and reluctance of farmers to try new techniques.

## **4 Past Participants and Others' Perspectives on Application of Training**

### **4.1 Stakeholder Perspectives on Past Participants**

IU Chairmen and farmers indicated that General Secretaries had more credibility on agricultural matters when they returned because they could cite US examples. They also mentioned that the returned GS had better communication skills and visited farmers more often. A DSI participant noted that returned participants were more participatory and more action-oriented.

## **4.2 Past Participants' Perspectives**

All three groups of past participants participating in the half-day workshop strongly agreed that the part of their training that had proven to be most useful over time were those skills they had learned through their conflict resolution training. Conflict resolution was new but also practically useful. This training filled a largely unmet need and participants responded eagerly. Some General Secretaries noted that they now saw new possibilities and that they had used skills learned in solving personal problems, for example marital disagreements.

Groups II and III added PM&E as an area with lasting impact, particularly in terms of preparing projects. Group III added holistic management, especially the systematic approach to analyzing and understanding their work environment, to their list of those areas having lasting impact.

Many felt they had not progressed in English because they do not have opportunities to practice and receive additional training. GAP staff members have progressed more, according to some, because they interact more with foreigners.

Some General Secretaries reported that it has been difficult to apply agricultural training and irrigation training because of their working environment and context. Group I felt that, there was little lasting impact from the engineering and agricultural training. Group III also reported that they felt they had gained little new information on technical subjects in the US.

General Secretaries also mentioned an interesting, and somewhat negative, impact of the HasNa training. Because the groups participating in the training programs have generally developed a strong internal cohesiveness, the overall solidarity of General Secretaries has diminished. Groups now tend to be more exclusive. Projects carried out by the groups tend to exacerbate this tendency. By getting to know each other better through traveling and learning together, some bonds strengthened, some weakened.

## **5 Recommendations to HasNa**

### **5.1 Past Participants**

Past participants suggest that there are two types of skills in HasNa training: 1) those general skills that help in personal and professional lives, and 2) more specialized skills such as irrigation management, marketing, and organic agriculture.

They also agree that it is difficult to be “an expert” in many things. Someone suggested that perhaps HasNa should focus its training on those skills that have broad application, such as leadership and management development, project planning, and conflict resolution. The evaluators strongly support this suggestion.

Past participants had the following suggestions for HasNa. Most of these suggestions were made by more than one person; however there was not necessarily consensus on them.

#### **English**

English course should be prepared and taught by foreign teachers

Offer intensive course on English

### **Conflict Resolution**

Offer more training in conflict resolution with mediation

Provide more detail on conflict resolution

### **Planning**

Offer a training program related to project planning cycle (including presentation, communication, and M&E)

Offer training on project preparation

### **Leadership and Management Development**

Offer training in development management training

Offer leadership training

Offer training in organizational management

### **Agriculture**

Offer training in organic produce

Offer training in marketing

### **Other**

Offer training related to technical issues (e.g. plant and crop protection, computer skills)

Train trainers in training and facilitation methods

Provide training in organizing and advising farmers in forming organizations

## **5.2 Other Stakeholders**

### **5.2.1 Understanding of HasNa**

Chairmen and farmers in the focus group had a general idea that the program involved training in participation and coordination and technical training on agricultural topics, but their responses did not evidence a detailed understanding of the training approach or content.

### **5.2.2 Future Training**

Farmers suggested that more IU engineers be trained in the US. Farmers also suggested that farmers be trained in the US to broaden the impact on others. A Chairman argued that farmers would have more credibility than a General Secretary when arguing, for example, for reduced water use. A GAP staff member thought that farmers and Chairmen should go the US together. A GAP-MOM member suggested bringing foreign specialists to Turkey to train IUs in irrigation management. Dutch agricultural experts had done this through TEMAV and this was beneficial.

Some Chairmen and farmers did not have a clear enough picture of what HasNa is or could provide and so had difficulty offering suggestions.

### **5.2.3 Training for Chairmen and farmers**

Chairmen, farmers, and past participants suggested that Chairmen and farmers' training include (a) technical training in irrigation, drainage and salinization, crop production, and (b) management and communication skills. These, of course, are the areas currently covered by the training. Farmers tended to focus mostly on the technical issues. When asked about the possibility of conducting such training in Turkey, chairmen and farmers united in arguing for the importance of seeing situations substantially different than those in Turkey, i.e. the United States.

# Conclusions and Recommendations<sup>5</sup>

## **Content**

### **1 CONCLUSION**

Past participants strongly indicate that irrigation and agricultural training have not had lasting effects on their lives and work. But, they have learned much about listening, interpersonal relations, conflict resolution, and activity planning through HasNa training that has had a lasting impact on their lives and work.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

HasNa should focus more tightly on those skills that have broad application, such as listening, interpersonal relations, leadership and management development, project planning, and conflict resolution. These skills can be applied in the absence of broader programs (and outside resources) and are often not readily available locally, while agricultural training is.

### **2 CONCLUSION**

Sound training providers are now in place for all four components of the training. Alba provides a capable and sensitive participatory training capacity that University partners had been unable to supply.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

HasNa should build on this.

- Content of the training components, particularly the Alba component, may need to be adjusted to address larger HasNa program goals and objectives and to reflect participants' actual roles in the field.
- Participants expressed desire for more training in applied irrigation management theory prior to going to the field. This could be added to either the Los Banos or the Alba components.
- Evaluators should further explore participant interest in "holistic management" to better understand what aspects particularly interested participants so that satisfy this interest in the future.
- The expectation that the majority of participants would be able to learn directly from training conducted in English continues to be unmet as all sessions continue to be translated.

### **3 CONCLUSION**

Technical training desired by participants varies widely and it may be impossible to offer a single technical training program that satisfies all participants. Training needs should be assessed in relation both to participants' interests and to the interests and needs of other stakeholders such as Chairmen and farmers.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

HasNa should undertake an impact assessment of the program to date and use it to re-design the technical component of its training programs (if any).

---

<sup>5</sup> NOTE: Some of these conclusions and recommendations appeared in the draft report covering 2003 training and M&E activities. Hasna has taken a different direction making some of these points moot, but we have retained them here as they do represent participants' and evaluators' opinions at that time.



#### **4 CONCLUSION**

HasNa has developed a set of goals and objectives for the training -- a very positive development.

##### **RECOMMENDATION**

Additional work is needed to put objectives into operational form and to link goals and objectives with larger program objectives for HasNa's GAP-area program.

#### ***Coordination and Communication***

#### **5 CONCLUSION**

Trainers still express confusion related to what other components are doing and how to best coordinate efforts.

##### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Face-to-face interaction among training providers during planning would help significantly to coordinate and integrate the content of the different US-based components.
- The relationship between SLDMWA and HasNa needs to be detailed more explicitly and arrangements made to relieve SLDMWA of the unfunded logistic burden of supporting participants.

#### ***Application***

#### **6 CONCLUSION**

Participants in the different roles (General Secretary, GAP, GAP-MOM) generally do not work extensively together in the field in Turkey, limiting the potential synergism of training together.

##### **RECOMMENDATION**

HasNa should explore ways in which the different types of participants could be brought together in common programs in the field following their training.

#### **7 CONCLUSION**

Chairmen and farmers in the focus group have a general idea that the program involved training in participation and coordination and technical training on agricultural topics, but their responses did not evidence a detailed understanding of the training approach or content.

##### **RECOMMENDATION**

Target chairmen and farmers with information to elicit their support of past participants and increase their openness to new ideas. Develop training programs for Chairmen to complement the training received by General Secretaries.

#### **8 CONCLUSION**

Participants often find training useful immediately following training, but are unable to apply the training, particularly the agricultural and irrigation technical training, because of the context within which they work in Turkey

##### **RECOMMENDATION**

For HasNa training to have a lasting impact, it should focus on those areas that cannot be supplied locally, have broad application to participants' lives, and can be easily adapted and adopted.

**ATTACHMENT ONE:**  
**Dispute Resolution Draft Training Agenda**  
**October 2003**

**AGENDA**

**Introduction of Trainers** - 5 minutes

*Exercise: My Best Friend* – 10 minutes

**Introduction of Participants** – 15 minutes

**Conflict**

**Lecture and discussion** - 30 minutes

**Conflict Management Styles**

*Small group Exercise* - 30-40 minutes

*Exercise: Arm Wrestling* – 15 minutes

**Communication Skills**

*What is Communication?* – 10 minutes

**Listening**

*Active listening exercise* – 30 minutes

*Listening for feelings* – 15 minutes

*Asking Questions Exercises* – 15 minutes

*Reframing Exercises* –20-30 minutes

*Reasons not to give advice*

*Use Value Line exercise* –15 minutes

*Good guy/Bad guy exercise* – 10 minutes

**Communication Stoppers**

*Small group exercise* –30 minutes

**Sending an effective Message**

*Exercises* – 30-40 minutes

*Exercise: How far to Push* – 10-15 minutes

**Positions and Interests**

**Basic Needs – Origins of Conflict**

*Exercises and Discussion* – 30-40 minutes

**Points of View**

*Discussion* – 10 minutes

*Drawbridge Exercise* – 20-30 minutes

**Don't Get Mad..... Get Effective**

*Read and discuss*

**Possible Ways to defuse power struggles**

*Read and discuss*

**Conflict Management Model**

*Read and discuss*

## **ATTACHMENT TWO: ALBA Training Agenda**

**October 2003**

### **ALBA-HasNa Program**

Dear Participants:

On behalf of ALBA, I'd like to welcome you to California. We have prepared an interesting program for you to learn about California agriculture while you are here. Below you will find a day-by-day program that provides information on the content and field trips of each training day. Upon your arrival, we will be giving each of you a binder which will contain a more detailed lesson plan for each day, as well as reference material and a bibliography on the topic.

**Some important logistical information, meals and weekend activities:** While you are participating in the ALBA portion of the training, you will be staying at a hotel in Monterey, well located to enjoy beautiful Monterey. Each morning, ALBA staff will pick you up from your hotel at 8 am to bring you to ALBA's Rural Development Center, located just south of Salinas, about a ½ hour drive from your hotel. Most training days will involve a field trip/site visit, after which you will be brought back to your hotel.

On training days, breakfast will be on your own, ALBA will provide a coffee break in the morning, lunch will also be provided by ALBA, while dinner will be on your own. All weekend meals will be on your own. On Saturdays, ALBA will provide the option of venturing out to a nearby tourist destination as an entire group. Sundays will be left for you to rest and pursue other activities.

Deborah Yashar, ALBA's Executive Assistant and Outreach Coordinator, will be your main contact for any logistical or programmatic issues during business hours. She can be reached at ALBA's office at 831-758-1469. In case of an emergency after hours, you may contact her on her cellular phone at 831-345-7957, as well as myself, Brett Melone, at 831-682-6808 (cell phone), or Patrick Troy, at 831-643-9033 (home).

October 25, Saturday

**Arrival from Washington DC**

Northwest **flight #349** to **San Jose Airport** via Detroit,

Departing at 12:45 pm

**Arriving at 5:17 pm**

Estimated Time of Arrival to Casa Munras Hotel in Monterey, **7:30 pm**

Dinner on your own.

Casa Munras Hotel  
700 Munras Avenue  
Monterey, CA 93940  
(831) 375-2411

October 26, Sunday

**Free day-**

Numerous options exist for sightseeing, hiking, shopping, beaches, etc.

October 27, Monday

**WELCOME HASNA PARTICIPANTS!**

**Orientation-**

Introductions and logistics, ALBA's curriculum, ALBA and HasNa participant exchange.

**Lecture-**

Introduction to agriculture and water management in California.

**Site Visit-**

**Agricultural Research Service** to demonstrate various irrigation delivery and functionality systems.

**Local greenhouse production facilities** exemplifying vegetable transplant production and cut-flower operations.

**Presenter-** Patrick Troy – ALBA's Senior Agronomist

October 28, Tuesday

**Lecture-**

Agroecology and Sustainable Agriculture

The growth and setbacks to organic agriculture in the United States, Integrated Pest Management, and the localization of our food system.

**Site Visit-**

**Mission Organics lettuce fields in Watsonville-** to exemplify and evaluate larger-scale models of organic farming.

**High Ground Organics family farm in Watsonville-** to demonstrate smaller-scale, diverse farming practices.

**Community Alliance for Family Farmers (CAFF)** center visit- an important resource and support for sustainable family farmers in California.

**Presenter-**

Rebecca Thistlethwaite – ALBA’s Natural Resources Manager

October 29, Wednesday

**Lecture-**

Principles and Systems of Irrigation in Salinas Valley

Farm equipment that can be utilized by small farmers, drip and sprinkler irrigation demonstration at ALBA’s Rural Development Center (RDC).

**Site Visit-**

**Golden State Irrigation Company-** presentation on irrigation supplies and options available to growers.

**Presenter-**

Florentino Collazo – ALBA’s RDC Farm Manager

Guest speaker- Conrad

October 30, Thursday

**Lecture-**

Soil Fertility & Conservation

Various methods to maintain soil fertility, understanding the difference between fertile and unfertile soil, and the composting process.

What soil conservation practices are used in Turkey - Question & Answer  
Explanation of various soil conservation practices used in the Elkhorn Slough.

**Site Visit-**

**Farm in the Elkhorn Slough Watershed  
Sunland Composting Facility**

**Presenter-**

Rebecca Thistlethwaite – ALBA’s Natural Resources Manager

October 31, Friday

**Lecture-**

The origins, applications and process of Holistic Management for farming and ranching operations and its relationship with concepts of organic agriculture, sustainable agriculture, and conventional agriculture.

**Presenter-**

Brett Melone – ALBA’s Executive Director

**Site Visit –**

ALBA’s Demonstration Plot and shadowing RDC farmers

November 1, Saturday

**Organized Weekend Activity-**

Monterey Bay Aquarium tour or hike in Big Sur Wilderness with Rebecca Thistlethwaite.

In addition, numerous options exist for sightseeing, hiking, shopping, beaches, etc.

November 2, Sunday

**Free day-**

Numerous options exist for sightseeing, hiking, shopping, beaches, etc.

November 3, Monday

**Lecture-**

Growing Techniques for Various Crops I

Basic production determinations, crop selection and nutrition, ALBA/HasNa exchange, and practicum in Rural Development Center’s demonstration field.

**Site Visit-**

**Tanimura and Antle Farms-** Visit large lettuce, fennel, and broccoli fields and explore the possibilities for efficiencies in each system with regard to varieties, diversity, nutrition, and rotations. Specialization and marketing mechanisms of Tanimura and Antle Farms.

**Earthbound Organics-** Marketing outlets and strategies of this expanded organic wholesaler.

**Presenters-**

Patrick Troy – ALBA’s Senior Agronomist

Guest Speakers- Marisha Bannister-ALBA Demonstration Plot Coordinator, Carlos Zavala- Tanimura and Antle

November 4, Tuesday

**Lecture-**

Growing Techniques for Various Crops II

Management Techniques in Orchards, fruit tree production, strawberry, cranberry, and vineyard production

**Site Visit-**

**Apple orchard in Watsonville.**

**Grape vineyard visit and wine-tasting in the Santa Cruz Mountains.**

**Presenters-**

Patrick Troy – ALBA’s Senior Agronomist

Rebecca Thistlethwaite – ALBA’s Natural Resources Manager

November 5, Wednesday

**Lecture-**

Marketing Avenues- Exploring diverse markets and how to service them. Direct market, wholesale, brokerage, and Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) marketing options. General overview of wise business practices that aid in profitable marketing.

**Site Visit-**

**Phil Foster’s Farm** visit to demonstrate exemplary marketing techniques.  
**Santa Cruz Farmers’ Market**

**Presenter-**

Dina Izzo - ALBA’s Marketing Coordinator

November 6, Thursday

**Lecture-**

Post Harvest Handles the Profits

The importance of post harvest is to the overall success of any marketing plan.

**Site Visit-**

Day long field trip to local farm using outstanding post harvest methods as well as simple and effective equipment. Observation of neighboring farm’s holistic farming methods. Visit a siltation pond and discuss its effect on the environment.

**Presenter-**

Dina Izzo – ALBA’s Marketing Coordinator

November 7, Friday

**Training Evaluation-**

Revisit training expectations, discuss plans for application of concepts learned, provide feedback to ALBA regarding participant satisfaction with training program.



**Site Visit-**

Harvest from ALBA's Demonstration Plot and preparation of lunch as a group with ALBA Staff, HasNa participants and resident farmers.

**Presenter-**

Brett Melone – ALBA's Executive Director

November 8, Saturday

**Organized Weekend Activity-**

Visit to San Francisco for the day.

In addition, numerous options exist for sightseeing, hiking, shopping, beaches, etc.

November 9, Sunday

**Free day/Travel day-**

You must check out of your hotel this morning and prepare to depart for Los Banos in the afternoon. You will be free until **2:30 pm**, at which time we will travel from Casa Munras Hotel in Monterey to the San Luis Delta Mendota Water Authority Office in Los Banos.

November 10-14, Monday - Friday

San Luis Delta Mendota Water Authority, Los Banos.

November 14, Friday

**Travel Day-**

In the afternoon, ALBA Staff will pick you up in Los Banos to return to the Casa Munras Hotel in Monterey.

November 15-16, Saturday & Sunday

**Free days -**

There is a possibility that a program donor will visit with participants one of these days. Otherwise you are free to enjoy Monterey this weekend, and prepare for the Monitoring and Evaluation Workshop that will take place at the Casa Munras Hotel beginning on Monday, November 17.

# ATTACHMENT THREE: SLDWA Training Agenda

## HasNa Turkish Training Program Draft Schedule for Participating Districts November 9<sup>th</sup> - 14<sup>th</sup>, 2003

SUNDAY, Nov. 9<sup>th</sup>, 2003

Van Arriving from San Francisco, Check into John Jay Inn, 5:00 p.m.

**Optional dinner at Woolgrowers, 6:30 p.m. (All trainees together)**

MONDAY, Nov. 10<sup>th</sup>, 2003, a.m.

**Orientation / SLDMWA admin office, 9:00 a.m. (All trainees together)**

- Broad discussion on
  - Overview of California Water Resources
  - Overview of CVP, SWP
  - Overview of SLDMWA
  - Role of the Districts

MONDAY P.M. (*All trainees together*)

- Tour of the Authority's Facilities
  - Review of Maintenance Program
  - Tracy Pumping Plant
  - Delta-Mendota Canal
  - San Luis Reservoir
  - Overview of Crops Grown / Climate / Cultural Practices, etc.

TUESDAY, Nov 11, 2003, A.M. / (*Trainees to go with delegated Participating District*)

**Water allocation / delivery / water accounting**

- General discussion on Role of the District
  - Allocating water / costs equitably
  - O&M of district facilities
  - Advocacy for district
  - Relationship of district with fed, state, regional organizations
  - Relationship of district with land owners / water users
  - General summary of key issues facing the district
  
- Discussion as to how water is allocated by district to farmers
  - Summary of supplies available to the district
  - Review of district policies for how those supplies are allocated to farmers.
  - Review of policies / processes for farmers to order their water from district
  - Review process on how districts order water from CVP
  - Review correspondence/communications with water users regarding their allocation

- Field tour
  - To demonstrate how water is physically delivered from district to grower
  - How deliveries are metered / process for documenting meter readings
  - How canals are operated to meet deliveries
- Discussion as to how farmer water use is accounted for.
  - Accounting process for tracking use by water user.
  - Review correspondence/communications with water users updating their use.
  - Review dispute resolution with water users over meter readings, allocations, etc.

**TUESDAY, P.M.**

**Governance**

- Discussion as to the nature and authority of the Board of Directors
  - How is the Board elected
  - Board officers / roles of officers
  - Terms of directors
  - Authority of the Board
  - Review of policies / policy development
  - Relationship of board with general manager / staff
  - relationship of board with landowners / water users

**WEDNESDAY, Nov. 12, A.M. & P.M. (*All Trainees Together*)**

- Tour of local ag. production and processing plants
  - Cotton Gin
  - De Francesco's Processing Plant
  - Farm Operations

**THURSDAY, Nov. 13, A.M. (*Trainees to go with delegated Participating District*)**

**Fiscal Issues**

- Discussion about district fiscal issues
  - Budgeting Process
  - Cost allocation policies / procedures
    - Capitol Costs
    - Annual O&M costs
  - Review of Accounting procedures
  - Audits
  - Billing procedures / policies
  - Communication with land owner / water users
  - Dispute resolution with land owners / water users about cost allocation

**Water Conservation / both field level and district level**

- Field tour
  - Farming / irrigation practices in the field.

[Probably want to link up with a farmer(s) who could describe how/why they irrigate like they do. May want to look at a variety of crops and a variety of methods of irrigating. Try to show them some of the more advanced technology in use. You may want to coordinate this tour with other participating districts - we'll discuss at orientation].

  - Irrigation district conservation improvements such as lining of canals, recirculating tail water, etc.
- Discussion regarding district conservation efforts
  - Review of district policies / programs regarding water conservation including tiered pricing, loan programs, educational programs, etc.

THURSDAY P.M.

**District Communications / Relationship with land owners and water users.**

- Discussion regarding district communications and relationships
  - How to avoid disputes with water user / landowners through good communication.
  - Newsletter
  - Regular correspondence to keep water users / landowners up informed.
  - Verbal through field reps

**District Maintenance Program**

- Routine Maintenance Programs
- Capitol/Long Term Programs

FRIDAY, Nov. 14, 2003, 9:00 a.m.- noon (*All Trainees Together*)  
**Summary / wrap up of program at SLDMWA admin office..**

## **ANNEX FOUR: PM&E Workshop Schedule**

### **November 2003**

#### *Day One -- Monday, November 17*

##### ***PART I – INTRODUCTIONS AND OVERVIEW***

Introductions and Overview  
End-of-USA-Training Participant Evaluations  
Feedback and closing

#### *Day Two -- Tuesday, November 18*

##### ***PART II – WHAT IS PM&E AND WHY DO IT***

Overview of the Day  
Participant-led Review of Previous Day  
Participatory and Conventional Approaches to Monitoring and Evaluation

##### ***PART III – PLANNING THE PM&E PROCESS***

Introduction To Monitoring  
Overview of Steps Involved in PM&E  
Participant Roles and Functions: Differences and Similarities  
Feedback and closing

#### *Day Three-- Wednesday, November 19*

Overview of the Day  
Feedback on Feedback  
Participant-led Review of Previous Day  
Setting Goals and Objectives  
Feedback and closing

#### *Day Four--Thursday, November 20*

Warm-up and Overview of the Day  
Participant-led Review of Previous Day  
Setting Indicators  
Determining Baseline Data  
Data Collection  
Workshop Evaluation and Closing

## **ATTACHMENT FIVE: Group IV Participants**

### **1. Mehmet Yildirim**

Mehmet is from Sanliurfa. He has been an agricultural engineer and rural development expert with GAP for 10 years. He attended the University in the Faculty of Agriculture, Dept. of Zootechnics Erzurum. He also has been trained in project management, irrigation, fertilization and rural development. Three areas where Mehmet has difficulty at work are: 1) in the development of rural projects, 2) conflict resolution and 3) lack of access to literature. He would like to improve his skills in: 1) the project management cycle, 2) conflict resolution/communication, and 3) planning and resource management. Mehmet would like to see the White House.

### **2. Metin Kanatli**

Metin is an agricultural engineer from Sanliurfa. He attended Harran University and focused on sciences involving soil. He has worked with GAP for seven years and is a rural development expert with responsibility for reporting on planned projects. His specialization is with all aspects of agriculture that concern pistachios. While in DC he would like to see the White House, and museums concerning history and astrology. His favorite places to visit are historical sites.

### **3. Ibrahim Sahin**

Ibrahim is from Sanliurfa and has been the Department Manager at the Directorate General of State Hydraulic Works (DSI) for 10 years. He attended the University in the Faculty of Agriculture, Dept. of Agricultural Structures and Irrigation. He also pursued his Masters in irrigation engineering at Utah State University (USA). Additional areas that he has studied include: basic training for irrigation drainage, business engineering, environmental studies, and total quality management. Three difficulties he finds in his work are: 1) bureaucratic barriers, 2) lack of an institutional structure for irrigation unions, and 3) communication/working with different community members. Areas where he would like to improve are: 1) total quality management, 2) irrigation management, and 3) planning and resource management. He would like to see the White House.

### **4. Mehmet Arzu**

Mehmet is from Diyarbakir. He is an agricultural engineer and has been a General Secretary of the Irrigation Union for 7 years. Mehmet attended the University in the Faculty of Agriculture, Dept. of Zootechnics-Adana. His additional studies include: management of irrigation unions and English language courses. The land over which he holds responsibility is approximately 35,000 hectares and is farmed by 250 farmers. The average farm size is 75 hectares. Major crops grown are wheat and cotton. The environment/ecology of the region is inclined, making irrigation difficult. There are no trees and the summers are warm and dry. Three problems he encounters in his work are: 1) unconscious water usage, 2) lack of timely collection of water fees, and 3) conflict between farmers. Areas where he would like to improve include: 1) irrigation management, 2) crop diversification, and 3) irrigation systems. While in the U.S. he would like to meet American farmers, practice his English and learn about

American social life. He would also like to see the Capitol, the White House, The National Museum of Art and the National History Museum.

### **5. Aydin Benzer**

Aydin is an agricultural engineer and has been an irrigation management expert for 4 years with the Tektek Irrigation Union. He attended the University in the Faculty of Agriculture. His additional studies include planned water distribution and water usage. The area over which he holds responsibility includes 154.000 hectares and 1250 farmers. The average farm size is 60-150 hectares. The major crops grown are cotton, wheat, lentil, sesame, corn, some vegetables, soybean, melon and watermelon. The environment/ecology of the region is temperate in winters, warm and dry in summers. There is irrigation with channels from the Ataturk Dam. The plant pattern is as follows: cotton, corn, and wheat with some greenhouse development. Three difficulties Aydin encounters in his work are: 1) low educational level of farmers, 2) low educational level of Irrigation Union presidents, and 3) lack of timely collection of water fees. Areas where he would like to improve include: 1) mediation, 2) communication techniques, and 3) institutional productivity. Aydin would like to see the White House.

### **6. Firat Korkut**

Firat is from Diyarbakir. He has been with GAP – MOM for three years and is responsible for projects. He attended the University in the Faculty of Agriculture, Dept. of Soil, in Antalya. His additional studies include: training for irrigation and fertilization, enterprise management, maintenance and an English language course. The area affected by his work includes 55.500 hectares. Five families maintain half of the area. In total, 836 farmers work the land. The average farm size of a non-family farm is 70-120 hectares. Major crops grown on the land include cotton, wheat, vegetables, chickpea, soybean, sunflower, and barley. The environment/ecology is stony. Irrigated fields are limited. Primarily dried agriculture is used. Cotton production is generally in irrigated areas. Vegetable production is only for family consumption. Three difficulties he encounters with his work are: 1) lack of plant patterns, 2) conflict between institutions, and 3) underdevelopment of irrigation systems (management, distribution, planning). Areas where he would like to improve include: 1) irrigation management, 2) agronomic studies, and 3) irrigation systems and projects. Firat would like to see the White House.

### **7. Mustafa Kosar**

Mustafa is from Sanliurfa. He has been an agricultural engineer with (GAP) for seven years. He attended the University in the Faculty of Agriculture, Dept. of Arable Field Plants. His additional studies include: plant production techniques, irrigation and fertilization, seed production and stocking, irrigation timing and planning. Three difficulties he finds in his work include: 1) the low educational level of farmers, 2) the closed viewpoint of farmers to innovations, and 3) irrigation timing and rotation. Areas where he would like to improve include: 1) English, 2) project preparation techniques and implementation, and 3) irrigation techniques. Mustafa would like to see the White House.

### **8. Cetin Taner**

Cetin is from Diyarbakir. He has been an agricultural engineer with GAP-MOM in operations management for seven years. His responsibilities include helping farmers plant crops and irrigate. While in Washington he would like to see the White House, the Potomac River and boats. During HasNa's training, he would like to improve his skills in conflict resolution and the English language.

### **9. Mehmet Tolon**

Mehmet is from Sanliurfa. He has been an agricultural engineer for three years and works with the Irrigation Associations. He would like to learn more about different irrigation systems and improve his English language skills. While in Washington he would like to see the White House and history museums.

### **10. Yusuf Guden**

Yusuf is from Diyarbakir. He has been an agricultural engineer for six years and works with the general secretaries at the Irrigation Associations. While in the U.S., he would like to see the White House, history museums and American irrigation systems.

### **11. Omer Cihat Bilgin**

Omer is from Sanliurfa. He has been an agricultural engineer for eight months and works with the general secretaries at the Irrigation Associations. While in the United States, he would like to see the White House. During HasNa's training, he wants to improve his English skills and conflict resolution skills.

### **12. Inci Avsar**

Inci is from Ankara and is an animal expert at GAP. Her responsibilities include working on animal projects involving livestock and sheep, project planning and extension/outreach to help farmers raise animals. While in the U.S. she would like to see the White House, history museums and shop at stores for women.



## ATTACHMENT SIX: End-of-Training Assessment – November 2003

	English Training in Turkey	Dispute Resolution	Sustainable and Organic Agriculture	CWD Internships/Job Shadowing
<p><b>CONTENT</b> Was the content relevant, appropriate, and at the right level—please explain?<sup>6</sup></p>	<p>(Urfa) Appropriate and at the correct level hard to apply Would like 3-4 months advanced English when we return to Turkey (Diyarbakir) levels different no practical application</p>	<p>Related to job Appropriate to level and applicable Used good examples to explain context; time was limited resulting in some issues being processed too fast</p>	<p>Organic farming and holistic management issues should be handled as separate issues and require separate training Irrigation training was below our level Too much time on unnecessary details Some subjects below level – more like a high school course, e.g. just visiting a farmers’ market and “letting us go”</p>	<p>Relevant to our work would like to have interacted with UC consultants who work with farmers because that’s what we do Technically insufficient for subject provided Too much focus on the structure of the water district</p>
<p><b>PROCESS and METHODS</b> Were the processes and methods effective, easy to understand and at the appropriate level? Please explain your responses</p>	<p>(Urfa) sufficient time, clear, and good practice; effective and easy to understand. Would be more beneficial to provide more training after returning from the U.S. Could benefit from adding conversational classes. (D.Bakar) Sufficient time; not enough practice; classes contained different levels</p>	<p>Good use of time. Mediation time insufficient; effective; could have been longer Could spend more time on mediation issues and provide more examples.</p>	<p>Time not used effectively, i.e. important subjects took too long; Methods good in the field; Provided input, but they didn’t adjust; Some parts relevant, but at too low a level Too many concepts in too little time (especially irrigation systems and marketing. Show and tell approach effective No “closure” to holistic management</p>	<p>Time used well; methods not good; not clearly understood; the way they divided group into small groups created disconnection; more of a technical trip than training. More focus on training than on “field trips” (related to irrigation management and administrative management issues) Effective and easy to understand, but time was too short.</p>

<sup>6</sup> Too easy? Too difficult? Just right?

	English Training in Turkey	Dispute Resolution	Sustainable and Organic Agriculture	CWD Internships/Job Shadowing
<b>TRAINERS</b> How effective and easy to understand were the trainers?	Mustafa especially good – knew how to teach what he knew. At the right level and clearly understood	Superb and at right level; Effective. Body language excellent.	Subject priority was not good. The level of irrigation management was not at the right level. Holistic Mgmt. above level	Effective and easy to understand; no “trainer” as such – more administrative and manager. However, the managers explained the concepts and their obvious interest was very clear.
<b>COORDINATION</b> What were the strengths of coordination and how could it have been improved?	(Urfa) Organization good but there were some disconnections in general Excellent coordination, timing and schedule (Diyarbakir) Organization was poor	Coordination very good, but would have preferred a university setting.	Trainers uncoordinated with each other; asking each other what was taught; went to same fields; not enough coordination with HasNa about interests Coordination could have been improved in terms of transportation and between places visited and the trainers.	Excellent Strong coordination, but lack of communication among the small groups established.
<b>OTHER COMMENTS</b>	Would have liked 1-2 weeks English training in the US	Would have liked training in a college, not a house; more emphasis on mediation; extend	Should know expectations of participants	We were treated like family (very positive point) More emphasis on education aspects

## ATTACHMENT SEVEN: Pre and Post PM&E Workshop Self-Assessment, November 2003

At the beginning of the workshop, participants indicated, on flip charts posted in the room, their perceptions of their levels of ability in relationship to PM&E skill areas. Then, at the end of the 4-day PM&E workshop, they once again indicated their perceptions of their skill areas. The following illustrates their “pre-workshop” and “post-workshop” self-assessments. Numbers in parentheses (x) indicate the number of participants self-assessing themselves at that point on the ability continuum.

### 1. Understanding of PM&E.

#### Pre-workshop

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	a little	OK-but still have questions	good	very good understanding
(1)	(1)	(2) (4) (2)		

#### Post-Workshop

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	a little	OK-but still have questions	good	very good understanding
		(1)	(2)	(4) (2)

### 2. Ability to write measurable objectives

#### Pre-workshop

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	a little	OK-but still have questions	good	very good understanding
	(5)	(3) (2) (1)	(1)	

#### Post-Workshop

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	a little	OK-but still have questions	good	very good understanding
		(1)		(2) (5) (1)

### 3. Ability to develop indicators.

#### Pre-workshop

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	a little	OK-but still have questions	good	very good understanding
(1)	(3)	(3) (1)	(1)	

#### Post-Workshop

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	a little	OK-but still have questions	good	very good understanding
		(1) (4)	(1)	(2) (1)

### 4. Ability to write goals.

#### Pre-workshop

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	a little	OK-but still have questions	good	very good understanding
		(1) (1) (2)	(3)	(2) (1)

#### Post-Workshop

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	a little	OK-but still have questions	good	very good understanding
			(2)	(3) (4)

## 5. Ability to decide what baseline data to collect for M&E

### Pre-workshop

1 Not at all	2 a little	3 OK-but still have questions (5) (1)	4 good (2)	5 very good understanding (2)
-----------------	---------------	---	------------------	-------------------------------------

### Post-Workshop

1 Not at all	2 a little	3 OK-but still have questions (1)	4 good (3)	5 very good understanding (3) (2)
-----------------	---------------	---	------------------	---

## 6. Ability to plan data collection for M&E

### Pre-workshop

1 Not at all	2 a little	3 OK-but still have questions (3) (3) (2)	4 good (2)	5 very good understanding
-----------------	---------------	---	------------------	------------------------------

### Post-Workshop

1 Not at all	2 a little	3 OK-but still have questions	4 good (4)	5 very good understanding (3) (2)
-----------------	---------------	----------------------------------	------------------	---

## 7. Ability to make a PM&E plan with others

### Pre-workshop

1 Not at all	2 a little	3 OK-but still have questions (1) (3) (1)	4 good (2)	5 very good understanding (1) (2)
-----------------	---------------	---	------------------	---

### Post-Workshop

1 Not at all	2 a little (1)	3 OK-but still have questions	4 good (4)	5 very good understanding (3) (1)
-----------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	---

## **ATTACHMENT EIGHT: End-of-PM&E Workshop Evaluation – November 2003**

### **1. What was the most useful part of the training for you?**

- All parts of this training seminar were definitely beneficial.
- Arriving at a conclusion after a group work, through a group discussion.
- We used to apply monitoring and observation together before this training. We learned in this training that they are actually two completely different things. Also, we learned that anything you do must have a plan, schedule and a monitoring process, no matter what the topic is or it is a daily, monthly, annual or a long term project.
- We understood the importance of working through a participatory approach when trying to reach a goal, and this was strengthened by examples.
- In this training, we learned that we have to apply certain criteria when we establish our goals, also the reasons of not being able to reach our goals. We also learned that the objectives should be established before establishing a goal and then approaching the goal according to those objectives.
- (a) I learned which criteria should I look into when designing a project or a plan; I also realized that no matter how easy I thought designing a project can be, it may be quite difficult in reality, but it becomes very easy once the criteria are established. (b) The goals and objectives are very important when starting a project. (c) The importance of collaboration (transfer of information)
- Monitoring-Observation: We learned the clear meaning of goals and objectives and where they are used. I also realized what a significant role goals, sub-goals, objectives and indicators can play; as well as going through the phases of baseline, monitoring, and data analysis; in successful completion of a project.
- Everything I learned will be useful, of course. What was particularly beneficial was that following this training, now we have the ability to differentiate concepts such as Monitoring-Observation and Goal-Objective from one another, as well as setting them up in a certain priority.
- As a result of this training, I learned that PM & E is a holistic process; and our goals and objectives are measurable and they can be evaluated based on their features.

### **2. How will you apply what you have learned at home?**

- I will try to apply the information I learned here, especially the elements of the SMART Objectives, such as goals, sub-goals, objectives and indicators, as much as I can.
- I can describe the concepts of monitoring my goal and my objectives. I can apply them on a project now.
- Stakeholders, collective and participatory evaluation, creating a strong local community, and of course, seeing the individual as the first priority.

- I can say all of it. However, I will benefit the most from knowing where I am, or the indicators, as I am going towards the established goal.
- I will personally try to apply the knowledge I obtained in regards to goals, objectives and indicators. I will also try to teach people around me as much as I can. Because it is very difficult to reach goals in Turkey without systematic rules.
- I will try to apply all.
- I will try to apply the sequence of factors as I described above during my work on project design.
- To bring this information into life by putting them in the right order in the new approaches that we will apply in projects where we will be working on.
- I will use all of the information I obtained. It is actually a part of my job.

### **3. What changes in the M&E training would you recommend for next year?**

- My suggestions for the next year:
  - The training time must be extended.
  - There must be a break after every hour.
  - Group works/projects should be assigned after showing a simple example on the task wanted from participants.
- This training should be given for two weeks.
- Turkish translations of the Subjects and Heading that we will go through.
- More training time.
- It is obvious that this training should be spread over a longer time frame.
- I would recommend for the next year that the training time should be extended, the small groups should be 3 people at most and consisting of individuals with similar work (homogenous); also providing the participants with documentation in their own language at the end of the training with a real example of the program taught.
- Extension of the time for this training (2 weeks).
- The Monitoring-Observation training should be at least 7-8 days next year, helping the participants to digest the information provided.
- Our most important suggestion is to extend the time frame for Monitoring-Observation training next year by at least twice as much.
- It would be better to extend the time for the next year's training.

### **4. Other comments**

- I would be happy if a sample project describing the various stages of this project is written in Turkish and sent to me.
- We learned a lot of things from our teachers; I hope we will try to meet the efforts provided to us by HasNa. We would like to thank everyone who helped us.
- I can say that this training was very clear and easy to understand, although I had not received anything similar before. Thank you.
- During the training, you were asking different questions to the participants in order to make certain things more clearly for you. However, the explanation or expression of certain things through translations can be very difficult. Please

do not ask the participants too many questions that could lead the participants to certain directions.

- I thought the idea of having people who worked in small groups work towards a joint project was a good idea, and it created an enjoyable atmosphere.
- I believe I was not able to understand some concepts clearly since too much was packed into the training on Monitoring-Observation.
- Small groups should be more heterogeneous for getting more productive work from the participants. There could be joint projects by this approach as well.

**ATTACHMENT NINE: Participants in Sanliurfa  
December 2004 Sessions**

**Post-Fieldwork Workshop  
Sanliurfa, Turkey  
December 2004**

1. Suleyman Kilic, Tek Tek Irrigation Union, Sanliurfa (part of one day)
2. Umit Murat, Sevimli Irrigation Union, Akcakale
3. Cuma Yildik, Topcu Gurdas Irrigation Union, Akcakale
4. Celal Kaya, GAP-MOM Project, Sanliurfa
5. Cetin Sen, GAP-MOM Project, Sanliurfa
6. Ahmet Eyyup Yamanca, Imam Bakir Irrigation Union – Sanliurfa
7. Mehmet Town, Tek Tek Irrigation Union, Sanliurfa (part of a half day)



**Past Participants<sup>7</sup> Workshop  
Sanliurfa, Turkey  
December 2004**

Group I

- |    |                  |                   |
|----|------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | A. Kadir Alaybyi | General Secretary |
| 2. | Mehmet Demiral   | General Secretary |
| 3. | Fatih Yildes     | GAP               |

Group II

- |    |                   |                   |
|----|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | Servet Abrak      | GAP-MOM           |
| 2. | Murat Dolas       | General Secretary |
| 3. | Kadir Baygeldi    | General Secretary |
| 4. | Halit Kilic       | General Secretary |
| 5. | Mustafa Kugukoglu | General Secretary |
| 6. | Huseyin Demir     | GAP               |

Group III

- |    |                |                   |
|----|----------------|-------------------|
| 1. | Celal Kaya     | GAP-MOM           |
| 2. | Cetin Sen      | GAP-MOM           |
| 4. | Cuma Yildik    | General Secretary |
| 5. | Umit Murat     | General Secretary |
| 6. | Ahmet Yamanca  | General Secretary |
| 7. | Suleyman Kilic | General Secretary |

Group IV

- |    |                     |                   |
|----|---------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | Ferhat Aydin Benzer | General Secretary |
| 2. | Omer Cihat Bilgin   | General Secretary |

**Stakeholder Focus Group  
Sanliurfa, Turkey  
December 2004**

- |    |                       |                      |
|----|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 1. | M. Fatih Yildiz       | GAP                  |
| 2. | Cetin Sen             | GAP-MOM              |
| 3. | Arson Aslan           | Chairman, Tek Tek IU |
| 4. | Muhittin Beyaz        | Farmer               |
| 5. | Mehmet Demirtas       | Farmer               |
| 6. | Abdurezzek            | Farmer               |
| 7. | Ali Ciftsi            | Chairman, Suayb IU   |
| 8. | A. Kadir Alaybeyi     | General Secretary    |
| 9. | Fethi Deniz (briefly) | DSI                  |

---

<sup>7</sup> All participants were male although 3 females have participated in the HasNa training.

# **ATTACHMENT TEN: End of Workshop Evaluation**

## **(Translated into English from Turkish)**

### **Post-Fieldwork Workshop**

#### **Sanliurfa, Turkey**

#### **December 2004**

#### **How has the whole PM&E process been useful to you?**

- I have learned especially how to use goals and objectives in systematic way. I have learned also what goals, objectives, and indicators mean and how to use them. I understood the importance of those methods in all steps of our life.
- PM&E helped us to work in more realistic and appropriate way and to choose an explanatory way in projects. We have learned that we could never select an objective without a goal. I think we can have successes through evaluation.
- It helped us to carry out our work in more planned and programming way. Especially it helped us to have more effective results of ongoing activities.
- I am trying to apply M&E in more planned, programming, and systematic way. I was carrying out the M&E works, but the sequence of works was not clear. I am now able to work on more efficient M&E

#### **How could the process be improved?**

- It could be improved through more practice and explanation of topics in more detail.
- M&E is well understood when applied periodically through practicing and having positive results. It could be improved if applied to our life.
- The time for M&E training should be longer. It should be applied step-by-step through a case study. The goals, objectives, and indicators should be later prepared by participants.
- The way of explaining is very good and understandable and it could be improved through more examples.

**ATTACHMENT ELEVEN: Intended Schedule—  
Post-Fieldwork Workshop Sanliurfa, Turkey  
December 2004**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Session</b>
<b><u>DAY ONE</u></b>	
½	Warm-up and Overview of Day
1 hour	Re-connect and Workshop Overview
1 hour	Introduction to Appreciative Inquiry
3 hours	Discovering Successes
2 hours	Discovering Change: Baseline Comparisons
½	Feedback and Closing
<b><u>DAY TWO</u></b>	
½	Warm-Up And Overview Of Day
2.5 hours	Data Analysis And Use
2.5 hours	Revising Goals, Objectives, Indicators
2 hours	Review Of Posted Data And Collection Process: Highlights And Challenges
½	Feedback And Closing
<b><u>DAY THREE</u></b>	
½	Warm-up and Overview of Day
2 hours	Hopes For The Future
1 ½ hours	Integrating Results
2 hours	Writing Possibility Statements
1 hour	Delivering Information On Results
1 hour	Personal Action Plans
½ hour	Evaluating the PM&E Process