



Report to USAID/Bolivia

Ted Ward

Concerning a Field Assignment in Bolivia, January 8 – February 18, 1977
For Servicio Nacional de Desarrollo de la Comunidad
(National Community Development Service)

Participants:

Richard Crespo
Manfred Thullen
Ted Ward

Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Purpose

The *purpose of this activity* with the National Community Development Service (SNDC) is to assist the SNDC in instituting a simple and functional evaluation system for its Training Division. Michigan State University's original proposal for this activity (proposed by MSU and accepted by USAID/Bolivia in 1976) comprised six phases, the first of which was carried out in Bolivia, January 8 – February 18, 1977. The following is a report of the first phase of activities:

The *purpose of this first phase* was to confirm MSU's expectations of the task with SNDC and USAID/Bolivia and to gather data on current evaluation activities in the Training Centers; on the what SNDC want to evaluate; to identify important variables to be evaluated; to discover SNDC personnel's preferred evaluation system; and, finally, to obtain a description of the training activities at the Training Centers and in the communities.

Background and History of Request

The background of this activity goes back several years. Dr. Ted Ward participated with the SNDC through USAID sponsorship in the development of a plan to improve the training component of the SNDC through evaluation. As a result, a number of summative evaluations were conducted, including one on the Training Division in 1975, by a team from MSU: Drs. Manfred Thullen and Mel Buschman. As a result of these evaluations, SNDC made a number of changes in its structure and operations. One of the major recommendations made in 1975 was that SNDC began to carry out on-going evaluations of its own. As a result, in 1976 a request came to MSU from the then USAID Community Development Chief, Dave Bathrick, for assistance in developing a workable evaluation system for the SNDC training programs which the SNDC staff themselves could manage. In response to this request, a proposal was submitted by MSU (Appendix A) and accepted by USAID/Bolivia. In January of 1977, the first phase began with a six-week survey conducted by the MSU team.

What Was Done

The survey of training programs and data collection in regard to evaluation was conducted during a six-week period from January 8 to February 18. A team of three from MSU participated in this first phase. Dr. Thullen assisted Mr. Crespo for the first ten days, and then Mr. Crespo carried out the bulk of the survey. In the last week, Mr. Crespo was assisted by Dr. Ward.

During the first ten days, a series of meetings were held with USAID/Bolivia personnel in the Community and Cooperative Development Division and SNDC administrators. MSU coordinated their activities with the long-term technical assistance contractor team from Robert Nathan Associates. Finally, a visit was arranged with the four Training Center directors to discuss the nature of MSU evaluation activities.

The *purpose of these meetings* was to reach a common understanding of the purpose, responsibilities, and desired outcomes of MSU involvement in this evaluation activity. The MSU team was especially concerned that everyone in SNDC understood that MSU was not to evaluate training programs but, rather, to assist in developing an evaluation system.

A description of the project and a list of the major possible variables that could eventually be evaluated were translated into Spanish. (Appendices B and C) A questionnaire was then designed for use in obtaining data from the Training Centers' staff and from some of the regional and zonal office staff. (Appendices D and E) The procedure for using the questionnaire was as follows:

1. Meet with staff as a group.
2. Hand out statement of purpose and review it.
3. Review questionnaire, as a whole, before asking questions.
4. Obtain staff responses to the questionnaire.

The questionnaire for the *Training Center* staff requested data on the courses being offered at the Training Centers and in the community, on the extent of the participation of regional and zonal staff in training; on evaluation activities being carried out; on the staff's understanding of evaluation and views on education; and, finally, on their responses to which were the important variables that needed to be evaluated.

The questionnaire for the *regional and zonal* staff requested data on communications with the Training Center staff, on their contributions to training; on evaluation activities being carried out; on training needs; on training impact in the field; and on their ideas of what should be evaluated. They were not asked to respond to the listing of variables that could be evaluated, prepared by MSU, as was the Training Center staff.

Summary Of Findings

Following is a summary of findings from the interviews of SNDC training staff, and regional and zonal staff. The findings are organized under three major headings which synthesize the findings from the two different questionnaires.

1. Summary of Findings about the Training Programs

Courses given by the Training Center personnel in the community dealt exclusively with cooperative activity and organization. Note: *The importance of this finding is in the fact that none of the instructors have experience in cooperatives and their knowledge is limited to the course outline given them from the central office.*

Objectives and goals for courses on cooperative organization.

Objectives—Level I (To be carried out in the community, 3-4 days/course.)

- To communicate basic concepts on cooperative organization and its advantages.
- To advise the community of their rights and ability to make their own decisions.
- To identify potential leaders and to identify those people best qualified to receive further training at the Training Centers.

Objectives—Level II (Four Training Centers, 1 week/course.)

- Participants gain basic knowledge and abilities in cooperative organization, administration, and leadership.
- Participants gain a basic understanding of the material so as to leave the group with a homogeneous understanding on the management and structure of cooperatives.
- To select those best qualified for further training.

Objectives—Level III (Four Training Centers, 2 weeks/course.) The specialized training in administration offered in these courses is designed for those selected from the Level II courses.)

- Managers become capable of administrating cooperatives through a series of courses.
- To train the cooperative administrative council.
- To train auxiliary administrators in cooperative documentation.

Note: *Level III contemplates training managers with three grades of training: Basic, Intermediate, and Advanced.*

Plans for 1977 call for expanding training programs according to the following outline:

- Training in community development.

- Training in community organization.
- Training in various aspects of production (agricultural, crafts, industry, etc.)
- In-service training for SNDC personnel.

Regional and zonal personnel claimed that the campesinos expressed a need for training in areas other than cooperative organization—especially in topics related to agricultural production practices.

2. Summary of Findings about the Evaluation of the Training Courses

- Training Center evaluation activities were different at each center. There was no overall purpose or direction to evaluate at the Training Center level. The instructors at each center made up their own evaluation instruments. Almost all evaluation consisted of different kinds of testing arrangements, intended to measure participants' mastery of subject matter covered during courses.
- Training Center personnel's understanding of evaluation does not include use of the evaluation data for making decisions in regard to improving training.
- Training Center personnel's understanding of how evaluation fits in with education generally is in regards to determining the sufficiency of education.
- Training Center personnel considered the following to be the most important evaluation activities:
 - Ability to compare the success of the training program participants in the classroom with their success in the field.
 - Ability to measure the utility and effectiveness of their teaching methods.
- Regional and zonal personnel considered evaluation of the impact of training to be the most important evaluation activity.
- Regional and zonal personnel suggested a great variety of methods for gathering evaluation data. Most of the suggestions were for measuring increased use of various new practices.
- No person (neither training staff nor regional or zonal personnel) suggested either the regional or national office as the appropriate unit to evaluate the trainee's use of new skills and knowledge.
- There was no consensus on who should evaluate training in terms of the trainee's use of new skills and knowledge.

3. Summary of Findings about Relationships between Training Center and Regional/Zonal Offices

- Zonal personnel were responsible for recruiting training course participants, but there were uniform complaints from the Training Center that the zonal personnel were not adequately fulfilling their job.
- Regional and zonal personnel claimed that communication difficulties resulted from poor timing, inadequate mail service, and some delegates sending substitutes to training courses.
- Regional and zonal office suggestions on how communications could be improved with Training Center were:
 - Send course flyers with more lead time.
 - More personnel interchange with Training Center staff.
- Training Center personnel claimed regional and zonal personnel look down on them and give little importance to training.

E. Regional and zonal personnel reported minimal input into Training Center planning.

Some Conclusions And Recommendations

From the fieldwork in Phase I of this project, several issues and problems were identified related to policy and formal arrangements. The problems are more a matter of function; they range from matters of logistics and communication to matters of concept and expectations about outcomes.

1. The Issues

Issue #1—Breadth of the Evaluation System

One of the four specifications which define the purpose of the project refers to “developing competent cooperative leadership.” We observed that, while the SNDC has a more broadly defined mission, the USAID supports are concentrated largely on the development of rural cooperatives. The question that arises is whether the evaluation system is to be similarly confined or concentrated on this one portion of the SNDC operations.

On this issue, we suggest that a too narrow restriction will be unworkable. There are ways to concentrate the focus of the evaluation system on the learning needed for the cooperatives, but there is so much inter-relatedness that an arbitrary delimitation would likely emasculate the evaluation system. We feel that the evaluation system should be concerned with the whole range of the training services, and that it should be designed to impact on all aspects of training, staff selection, in-service training, and job assignments.

Issue #2—Relationship of the Robert Nathan, Inc. Specialists

Closely related to the first issue is the fact that the Nathan team has one person assigned to the SNDC training section. The importance of the Training Centers and their currently undeveloped state merits far more substantial consultative input. Whatever else is done for evaluation for in-service, improvement of the trainers must somehow be interlocked with the training consultation provided by the Nathan team.

Issue #3—Responsibility for Upgrading the Training Centers

The value of an evaluation system lies primarily in its potential input to upgrade training. It is not clear who has the responsibility for such upgrading. While the national-level office has a division for training and a sub-division for the Training Centers, it is not clear that the coordination at this level has a specific linkage into upgrading. It is likely that a greater potential emphasis on in-service training and improvement of materials and courses exists at the regional level. To whom is the director of each Training Center responsible for matters of instructional effectiveness? It is apparent that the regional directors have much at stake in this issue.

Issue #4—Integration of the Evaluation system and the Management Information System

An information system for management purposes is being discussed and planned. No doubt, it will include a significant overlap into the data needed for an evaluation system. Coordinated planning between the management information system and the evaluation system could assure that the overlap does not become bureaucratic duplication. Further, the concept of an effective evaluation system sees evaluation as a specific set of inputs to management decision-making. In other words, these are not separate functions, but all part of the same whole system.

The issues described above are subject to executive decisions and should be seen as requests for clarification.

2. The Problems

The problems stated following are of a different sort. They will not yield to executive decision-making alone, but will require a series of persistent efforts to deal with them.

Problem #1—Relating Evaluation to Program Improvement

Evaluation is not an end in itself. Evaluation is one component of the much larger task of educational improvement. In the particular project in Bolivia, the rationale for evaluation is integral to the need for improvement of the training sector of the SNDC.

The *purpose is to create* a workable evaluation system. “Workable” refers to two concerns:

- A. The procedures and materials of the evaluation system must be useable within the technological and conceptual grasp of the technicians of the SNDC.
- B. The evaluation system must work toward improvement of the effectiveness of SNDC’s training activities. The reasons for the evaluation are stated in terms of the following:
 - Integrating training program objectives with the overall objectives of SNDC.
 - Adapting training programs to the abilities and needs of the students.
 - Making the training procedures increasingly effective, and
 - Adapting the training program to the needs for developing competent cooperative leadership.

Problem #2—The Need for In-service Education Competencies

The need for specialized “know-how” in nonformal education is well illustrated in the SNDC. The educational components of the Servicio are especially weak and held in low esteem by other components. Perhaps there is good reason for this judgment. No amount of good intentions and administrative commandments will substitute for the lack of educational skills of the training staff. There is an apparent lack of understanding of the problems and processes of non-formal education.

The educational problems (for example, need for the learning that is required for effectively participating in a credit cooperative) are seen as “school-teaching” tasks rather than adult-learning tasks that can be approached more efficiently through out-of-school instructional methods. Since educational problems are seen this way, the Training Division is staffed largely by people from school-type backgrounds and training.

The procedures used for training are outdated. Even those whose high positions suggest that they should be setting good examples have very simplistic and uninteresting approaches to teaching.

Problem #3—Developing the Basic Commitments and Skills

A major reform of the training program seems essential. Following are five specific parts of the reform. Each of these is essential for the effectiveness of the evaluation system.

- *Commitment to improvement of the training.* Without this commitment, evaluation will be useless.
- *Valuing the input of data.* An evaluation system can provide data, but the usefulness of the data will depend on whether or not decision-makers and technicians intend to see themselves and their work change on the basis of evidence.
- *Skill in gathering and processing relevant data.* Establishing an evaluation system depends on training technicians to gather and process data. While a “once daily” evaluation could depend on outsiders, a functional system will require that particular people be trained in each regional Training Center.

- *Analysis and determination of the implications in terms of needed change.* Training staff and their administrators will need to be trained in the analysis and use of evaluative findings for improved operations.
- *In-service training of the training staff.* The first level of usefulness of evaluative findings is the trainers themselves. If evaluation processes can be tied directly to in-service training, the evaluation system has high probability of successfully relating to the improvement of effectiveness of the training programs.

Problem #4—Low Institutional Priority given to Training

The proposed evaluation system will have little impact if something is not done to recognize the importance of the training activities of the SNDC. It requires no further evaluation to determine that the effectiveness of training is sub-standard because of the following evidences of lack of institutional commitment to training:

- Poor co-ordination between regional Training Centers and the regional and zonal offices.
- Inadequate equipment and, especially, transportation.
- Inadequate recruitment procedures for courses.
- Low financial support (including slow and inadequate funding of training courses, per diem, and travel costs for community-level courses.

3. **Recommended Next Steps**

MSU recommends to USAID/Bolivia the following particular actions:

Recommendation #1—Refinement of the Overall Plan for the Development of the Evaluation System

Recommendation #2—Completion of Phase II

Recommendation #3—A “Regional Model” Approach to Phase III

The original plan called for pilot-testing in Phase III. We are now proposing that pilot tests be undertaken in two regional centers and that initiation for evaluation be granted (delegated) to the regional centers. Further, it is recommended that the evaluation activities be integrated with in-service training in the three centers. Such a procedure would take account (1) the difficulty in providing sufficient creative leadership for educational improvement from the national center office level; and (2) differences among the several regions which demand some sort of differentiation of the procedures and materials among the regional Training Centers.

Recommendation #4—Funding for Phases III, IV, and V

APPENDIX A

MSU Proposal for Assistance to SNDC

This proposal is a response by Michigan State University's Nonformal Education Project to a request made by the USAID/Bolivia Community Development Division (CDD) for assistance in developing an ongoing system for evaluating the effectiveness and efficiency of the training programs that the Servicio Nacional de Desarrollo de la Comunidad (National Community Development Service) provides for the Bolivian campesino. This evaluation system would be built into the new SNDC's four-year plan (1976–1979.) The evaluation system would provide short-range and long-range feedback on the educational needs of the campesino and the Small Farmer Organization, on training course efficiency and utility, and on the impact of the training program in the community. This system would serve to guide SNDC staff in ongoing course development and improvement.

The evaluation system would include information-gathering methodology and instruments, data analysis procedures, and training for SNDC management in the implementation of the system.

Plan Of Activities

The proposed Plan of Activities would include five phases:

Phase I:

1. Consult with SNDC staff in order to clarify SNDC training objectives.
2. Work with SNDC staff in developing these objectives in measurable form.
3. Together, design an approach for data gathering that would coincide with the reality of the Bolivian situation.

Phase II:

Develop preliminary instrumentation for data gathering and data analysis which would provide feedback on the training objectives developed in Phase I.

Phase III:

1. Pilot-test the evaluation system within a limited setting in Bolivia.
2. Evaluate the pilot model for effectiveness and efficiency and make appropriate changes in preparation for full implementation.

Phase IV:

Implement the evaluation system within the training component of SNDC on a nationwide scale. This would include training SNDC local, regional, and national staff in all phases of the evaluation system.

Phase V:

1. After the first six months of implementation, make an assessment of the evaluation system as to whether it is providing useful and accurate feedback, and as to whether the feedback is being processed and utilized by SNDC staff.
2. Be of assistance to SNDC staff in making needed adjustments in the evaluation system.

A preliminary data-gathering instrument could be developed and introduced at the time of the initial consultation (Phase I) to gather basic data to provide direction for the development of the evaluation system. The basic data gathering would be in two parts: (1) Demographic data on participants, such as: number of participants, ages, sex, occupation, location of residence, organizational membership, status in community. (2) Evaluative data that would be provided by simple evaluative questionnaires that would begin to supply relevant feedback on the training component.

Staff Plan

Dr. Ted Ward would serve as Project Coordinator; Dr. Manfred Thullen would serve as the primary resource person from MSU; and Richard Crespo would serve as MSU's Field Coordinator.

Budget

MSU/NFE contract money will cover international travel and salaries for MSU staff, and secretarial support for work done at MSU. USAID/Bolivia will cover in-country travel expenses and secretarial support.

APPENDIX B
Proyecto Para El Desarrollo De Un Sistema De Evaluacion
Para La Division De Capacitacion Del Sndc
(Description of Project for use with SNDC Personnel)

Objetivo Del Proyecto

Este proyecto tiene el objetivo de asistir al Servicio (SNDC) y particularmente a su Departamento de Capacitación y Promoción, para diseñar e implementar un sistema funcional para poder evaluar los programas y las actividades de capacitación.

Quien Lo Va Hacer

Tres organizaciones trabajarán juntas en este proyecto:

1. El Instituto Internacional de Educación de la Universidad del Estado de Michigan (MSU) en los EE.UU. Particularmente el Sr. Ricardo Crespo y los Drs. Manfred Thullen y Ted Ward.
2. El SNDC. Esperamos que todos los que pueden disfrutar de un sistema de evaluación puedan ayudar. Especialmente esperamos poder trabajar con el Jefe del Departamento de Capacitación y Promoción, los Directores e Instructores de los Centros de Capacitación y los Jefes de las Oficinas Regionales.
3. USAID/Bolivia particularmente los señores Wingert y Thornton. El Sr. Perez, de Robert R. Nathan Associates, también participará.

Etapas Del Proyecto

Está propuesto que este proyecto se pueda cumplir en cinco etapas.

La Primera Etapa—tiene el objetivo de averiguar lo siguiente

1. Los métodos de evaluación presentemente utilizados en los programas de capacitación.
2. Los objetivos y los curriculums de los programas de capacitación.
3. Las ideas de los empleados del SNDC sobre evaluación, sus métodos, factores importantes, que desean ver en un sistema de evaluación.

Esta etapa se cumplirá en Bolivia, y el Sr. Ricardo Crespo será el responsable, con ayuda del Dr. Thullen al principio de su estadía y del Dr. Ward al fin de la misma. Empieza el 1 de Enero y se completará el 18 de Febrero.

La Segunda Etapa—tiene el objetivo de diseñar un sistema funcional de evaluación

El Sr. Crespo tendrá la mayor parte de la responsabilidad de esta etapa, con ayuda de los Drs. Thullen y Ward. La otra parte de esta etapa se realizará en MSU, en los EE.UU.

Una vez que se haya diseñado un sistema para proponer al SNDC, está previsto que el Sr. Crespo (y el Dr. Thullen o el Dr. Ward) regresarán a Bolivia para consultar con el SNDC. Con la ayuda del SNDC y de USAID/Bolivia, se propone refinar el sistema de evaluación, antes de ensayarlo.

La Tercera Etapa—tiene el objetivo de ensayar el sistema propuesto, dentro de uno de los centros de capacitación, para ver como funciona. Entonces, en base al ensayo, hacer los ajustes al sistema. Esta etapa se cumplirá en Bolivia, dirigida por el personal del SNDC con asistencia del Sr. Crespo. Esta etapa está propuesta para los meses de Junio y Julio de 1977.

La Cuarta Etapa—tiene el objetivo de implementar el sistema de evaluación en todos los centros de capacitación, las Oficinas Regionales y la Oficina Central en La Paz. El Sr. Crespo seguirá asistiendo al SNDC en esta etapa durante los meses de Julio y Agosto de 1977.

La Quinta Etapa—tiene el objetivo de ver como funciona el sistema y, si es necesario, ajustarlo para que funcione mejor.

APPENDIX C
Algunos Factores Que Se Pueden Utilizar En La
Evaluación De Programas De Capacitación
(Factors to be Evaluated)

Efectividad De La Capacitación

1. Poder comparar el rendimiento de los participantes en los cursos de capacitación con el éxito de los participantes en su trabajo a nivel comunal.
2. Poder establecer la oficina de la metodología utilizada, en terminos de tiempo y costos empleados, tomando en cuenta la capacidad de aplicación práctica para los participantes como resultado de esta metodología.

La Aplicabilidad Del Programa De Capacitación

1. Poder establecer como se ajustan los objetivos y curriculos de los programas de capacitación a todo nivel con las tareas que hay que cumplir en el campo (promoción, cursillos de campo, cooperativismo, etc.)
2. Poder relacionar los objetivos de los programas de capacitación a todo nivel con los objetivos del SNDC.
3. Poder comparar los objetivos y curriculos del Departamento de Capacitación y Promoción con las actividades y programas que se llevan a cabo en los centros de capacitación.

La Aplicabilidad Del Programa De Capacitación A Los Grupos Atendidos Por El Sndc

1. Antes de iniciar el curso, poder averiguar cuan preparados están los partitipantes para absorber y aplicar los contenidos del mismo.
2. Averiguar si el proceso de selección para los cursos de capacitación está respondiendo a los objetivos y metas del SNDC en cuanto a la población que debe ser atendida por sus programas.

APPENDIX D
Questionario Para El Personal De Los
Centros De Capacitación
(Questionnaire used with Training Staff)

Propósito De La Visita

1. Hacer un inventario sobre los programas y actividades de capacitación y especialmente sobre las actividades de evaluación, con el propósito de poder diseñar un sistema de evaluación conforme a la realidad del Departamento de Capacitación y Promoción, el Servicio y las condiciones del país.
2. Adquirir sus ideas en cuanto a mejoramiento del sistema de evaluación actual, con el fin de poder ajustar los programas de capacitación en una forma dinámica para el bien del campesino y para cumplir las metas del Servicio.

A. Qué se está haciendo actualmente en los programas de capacitación?

1) Qué tipos de cursos se ofrecen en el centro de capacitación?

a. Quién los dicta? _____

b. Cuáles son los objetivos de cada curso? _____

c. Cómo y quién diseña estos objetivos? _____

d. Cuáles son los curriculos de cada curso? _____

e. Cómo y quién diseña estos curriculos? _____

f. Cómo se determina quiénes deberían asistir a cada curso? _____

g. Qué duración tiene cada curso? _____

h. Cuántes veces al año se ofrece cada curso? _____

i. Cuántas personas han asistido a cada curso? (o qué se piensa asistirán en este año)

2) Cuáles son los cursos que se ofrecen a nivel de comunidad?

a. Quién los dicta? _____

- b.

Cuáles son los objetivos de cada curso?

- c.

Cómo y quién diseña estos objetivos?

- d.

Cuáles son los currículos de estos cursos?

- e.

Cómo y quién diseña estos objetivos?

- f.

Quién determina:
 (1)

Qué cursos se darán?
 (2)

Dónde?
 (3)

Cuándo?

- g.

Cuántos cursos se ofrecen al año?

- h.

Cuántas personas asisten a estos cursos?

- i.

Cuántas personas serán capacitadas por estos cursos de nivel de comunidad on va año?

- 3)

De qué manera participant las oficinas regionales c zonales?

 a.

En los cursos qué se diseñan en los centros de capacitación?

- b.

En lo qué se enseña en los cursos de nivel de comunidad?

- c.

En la selección de los alumnos para cursos en el centro?

- d.

En la selección de las comunidades y los alumnos dentro de ellas, para los cursos de nivel comunidad?

B.

Cuáles métodos de evaluación se usan en la actualidad?

- 1.

Qué formularios de evaluación se usan actualmente?

2. Qué propósito tiene cada formulario?

 3. A quién se aplica cada formulario?

 4. Quién diseña estos formularios?

 5. Quién usa la información generada (los resultados) de estos formularios?

 6. Cómo y para qué se utiliza la información de los resultados de estos formularios?

 7. Piensan que los formularios que usan actualmente están bien formulados?

a. Cómo se podría mejorar? _____

 8. Piensan que los resultados de los formularios que usan actualmente dan la información que requieren? Por qué?

- C. Queremos informarnos sobre sus ideas y conocimientos en cuanto a la evaluación?
1. En términos generales, ¿qué son sus ideas y pensamientos sobre lo que es evaluación y cómo entienden este concepto?

 2. ¿Cómo piensan que la evaluación se coordina con sus ideas en cuanto a la educación?

- D. Quisieramos obtener sus ideas y pensamientos sobre lo que se pudiera hacer en un sistema de evaluación en el futuro.
1. Por favor lean la lista de factores que hemos preparado:
 - a. ¿Qué impresiones generales tienen?

 - b. Tienen algunas sugerencias en cuanto a cambios, factores adicionales, etc?

 2. Considerando cada uno de los factores, queremos sus ideas sobre:
 - a. ¿Cómo se pudiera medir este factor?

- b. Qué criterios se pudieran usar para medirlo?

 - c. Qué datos serían necesario obtener para poder medir este factor?

 - d. Cómo se podría obtener los datos requeridos?

 - e. Quién los podría obtener?

 - f. Quién podría usar estos datos?

 - g. Cómo se podría utilizarlos, para qué fines?

3. Teniendo en cuenta toda esta lista de factores:
- a. Cuáles de ellos son los más importantes para el uso en el Centro de Capacitación? Porqué?

 - b. Cuáles de ellos son los más importantes para el uso de la oficina central de La Paz? Porqué?

 - c. Cuálas de ellos son los más importantes para el uso en las oficinas regionales o zonales? Porqué?

GRACIAS!

Appendix E
Questionario Para El Personal De Las
Oficinas Regionales Y Zonales
(Questionnaire used with Regional and Zonal Staff)

Propósito De La Visita

1. Hacer un inventario de los medios de comunicación entre esta oficina y el centro de capacitación, y de los medios de participación de esta oficina en los programas de capacitación.
2. Adquirir sus ideas en cuanto a mejoramiento del sistema de evaluación actual, con el fin de poder hacer ajustes en los programas de capacitación en una forma dinámica para el bien del campesino y para cumplir las metas del Servicio.

A. En general, como se comunican el personal del centro de capacitación?

1. Sobre qué cosas? _____

2. Con qué frecuencia? _____

3. De qué manera? _____

B. Cuáles son sus ideas sobre como tendrían que ser las comunicaciones con el personal del centro de capacitación?

1. Sobre qué cosas? _____

2. Con qué frecuencia? _____

3. De qué manera? (cartas, informes, indirectamente por La Paz, personalmente, visitas al centro, visitas del centro, etc.)

C. De qué manera contribuyen a las decisiones en cuanto a:

1. Lo qué se debiera enseñar, en los cursos del centro y los cursos a nivel de comunidad?

2. La selección de personas que se capacitarán, en los cursos del centro y cursos a nivel de comunidad?

D. De qué manera pudieran contribuir a las decisiones en cuanto a:

1. Lo qué se debiera enseñar (en al centro de capacitación y nivel comunal)

2. La selección de personal qué se van a capacitar (en el centro y comunidad)
-
-
- E. Qué ayuda dá el personal de la oficina en la enseñanza de:
1. Los cursos de capacitación en los centros? Cómo?
-
-
2. Los cursos a nivel de comunidad organizados por el centro de capacitación? Cómo
-
-
- F. Cuántos cursos de capacitación, a nivel de comunidad, se organiza sin la ayuda del centro da capacitación?
-
-
1. Porqué se organiceo estos cursos?
-
2. Cómo evalúan el éxito de estos cursos?
-
-
- G. En cuánto a la evaluación qué se lleva a cabo actualmente:
1. Ayudan de alguna manera en la evaluación del éxito de cualquier curso de capacitación? Cómo?
-
-
2. Reciben sugerencia en cuánto a materiales o temas de capacitación de parte de los campesinos y/u organizaciones con quiénes trabajan?
-
-
- a. Tienen datos?
-
- b. Los comunican a alguien?
-
3. Les piden sugerencias en cuánto a materiales o temas de capacitación a los campesinos y/u organizaciones con quiénes trabajan?
-
-
- a. Tienen datos?
-
- b. Los comunican a alguien?
-
4. Tienen información o datos sobre los tipos de trabajo qué requieren capacitación?
-
-
- a. Cómo los consiguen?
-
-

- b. Cómo se podría conseguir?

- c. A quién los comunican?

- d. A quién se deberá comunicar?

- 5. Tienen datos o información que indican si las personas que se ha capacitado han podido aplicar sus nuevos conocimientos en las tareas que tienen?

- a. Cómo los consiguen?

- b. Cómo se pudiera conseguir?

- c. A quién los comunican?

- d. A quién se debería comunicar?

- 6. Cuáles son sus ideas sobre:
 - a. Lo que sería lo más importante de evaluar en cuanto al éxito de programas de capacitación?

 - b. Cómo se podría medir estos éxitos?

 - c. Quién lo podría medir?

GRACIAS!