



The Medical Education Partnership Initiative

Evaluating Community-Based
Medical Education Programs:
Workshop Report
Kampala, Uganda
April 1-3, 2014

May 2014

Christopher Deery, Rebecca Bailey, and
Heather Ross, IntraHealth International,
and Zohray Talib, MEPI Coordinating Center



MEPI Coordinating Center

The views expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This workshop was carried out after much thought, planning, and collaboration by representatives from many organizations. Below are the individuals, listed in alphabetical order, who especially deserve recognition for their efforts in the organization and successful completion of the community-based education (CBE) workshop.

Rebecca Bailey (*CapacityPlus*, health workforce development team lead)

Ms. Bailey provided technical oversight to the MEPI/*CapacityPlus* community-based education leadership group and contributed critical expertise from an education and workforce perspective to the team. She led the development of the workshop agenda and all templates and workshop materials.

Rhona Baingana (Makerere University College of Health Sciences, coordinator, MESAU COBERS evaluation)

Ms. Baingana represented the Medical Education for Equitable Services to All Ugandans (MESAU) consortium of collaborating MEPI schools in Uganda. She presented the methodology and results from the recent MESAU COBERS evaluation baseline study. Ms. Baingana also organized the visits to Makerere University's CBE sites.

Ian Couper (*CapacityPlus*, Wits Health Consortium, director of the Center for Rural Health)

Prof. Couper provided technical inputs into the strategic design of the workshop as well as the development of the agenda and all materials. He also compiled the compendium of tools used for evaluating community-based medical education programs, which was one of the key resources presented to the workshop participants.

Christopher Deery (*CapacityPlus*, health workforce development officer)

Mr. Deery provided support to the MEPI/*CapacityPlus* community-based education leadership group coordinating the planning, preparation, and in-country logistics for the workshop as well as the post-workshop feedback from participants.

Lydia Kaweesa (IntraHealth International, Uganda Capacity Program)

Ms. Kaweesa provided in-country logistical support before and during the workshop.

Debra Nestel (Monash University, professor of simulation education in healthcare, School of Rural Health/HealthPEER)

Prof. Nestel was the lead facilitator at the CBE evaluation workshop, introducing the methodology and approaches and tools for program evaluation. She also provided technical inputs into the development of the agenda and all workshop materials and templates.

Heather Ross (*CapacityPlus*, senior technical officer)

Ms. Ross contributed to the development of technical materials for the workshop including the logic model and evaluation plan templates. She also served as co-facilitator of the workshop.

Atiene Solomon Sagay (University of Jos, MEPI community-based education technical working group co-chair)

Dr. Sagay co-facilitated the CBE technical working group meeting and provided overall guidance and leadership to the workshop.

Zohray Talib (MEPI Coordinating Center)

Representing the MEPI Coordinating Center, Dr. Talib served as a co-facilitator for the workshop and CBE technical working group meeting. She also contributed to the development of the strategic design, agenda, and workshop materials.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Executive Summary	v
Introduction.....	1
Workshop Objectives and Expected Outcomes.....	1
Participants and Facilitators.....	1
Pre-Workshop Activities	2
Workshop.....	3
Practices, Approaches, and Tools for CBE Evaluation.....	3
Developing CBE Evaluation Plans.....	4
Strengthening the Community of Practice	5
Outcomes and Next Steps.....	5
Evaluation Plans	5
Collaboration.....	5
Next Steps	5
Workshop Evaluation.....	6
Appendix 1: MEPI Community-Based Education Evaluation: Workshop Agenda	7
Appendix 2: List of Participants	11
Appendix 3: CBE Program Review Questionnaire.....	14
Appendix 4: Participant Expectations	18
Appendix 5: Logic Model Template	20
Appendix 6: Evaluation Plan Template.....	23
Appendix 7: Workshop Evaluation	27

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) Medical Education Partnership Initiative (MEPI) is a five-year (2010–2015) initiative supporting 13 medical schools in 12 African countries with the aim of increasing the capacity and quality of African medical education, improving retention of medical graduates, and promoting regionally relevant research through locally-led innovative programs. MEPI is funded by PEPFAR and by the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

In collaboration with the MEPI community-based education (CBE) technical working group (TWG), the PEPFAR-funded USAID *CapacityPlus* Project and the MEPI coordinating center organized and conducted a CBE evaluation workshop in Kampala, Uganda, from 1-3 April 2014. The objectives of the workshop were to:

1. Share good practices for CBE evaluation relevant to the needs of MEPI institutions
2. Identify approaches and tools that can be used for CBE evaluation in the African context
3. Strengthen a supportive network of CBE collaborators.

The workshop brought together representatives from 11 MEPI-supported institutions and consortiums in 7 countries. The participants consisted of faculty members, administrators, and educators at the MEPI institutions who are champions of CBE at their institutions. These delegates were nominated because of their wide experience, knowledge, and understanding of the current situation and future needs for CBE at their institutions and ability to draft a CBE evaluation plan for their institution.

Prior to the workshop, participants completed preparatory activities to focus their thinking on their programs and evaluation. The workshop then used a variety of participatory lectures, small and large group activities, role-plays, round tables, mini-presentations with feedback sessions, and an interactive Facebook group to encourage discussion and development of the CBE community of practice. This diversified approach allowed participants to be exposed to different types of CBE programs being implemented at various institutions across Africa, receive formal training in developing logic models and program evaluation plans, and receive feedback from fellow participants and facilitators.

Each school departed the workshop with a draft evaluation plan to be further refined and presented to relevant stakeholders and leadership at the various institutions. In addition, participants agreed to and were enthusiastic about utilizing the Facebook group as a forum to exchange materials and tools, communicate with the facilitators for feedback, and also coordinate with other participants.

Moving forward, workshop participants will finalize their evaluation plans with appropriate stakeholders at their institutions and subsequently present these plans to their institutions' leadership to receive buy-in and agree on next steps for the evaluation process. *CapacityPlus*

will work with the MEPI coordinating center and CBE TWG leadership group to give thorough feedback on the institutions' evaluation plans, support the community of practice, and provide technical assistance to the MEPI institutions as they move ahead with evaluation of their CBE programs.

INTRODUCTION

In 2010, the US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) launched the Medical Education Partnership Initiative (MEPI), funding 13 medical schools over five years in 12 African countries to improve the quantity, quality, and retention of their graduates in an effort to strengthen health systems in those countries. MEPI is funded through the Office of the US Global AIDS Coordinator in the State Department and by the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The initiative is administered by both the NIH Fogarty International Center and the HIV/AIDS Bureau of the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) in the US Department of Health and Human Services. George Washington University, based in the US, and the African Center for Global Health and Social Transformation (ACHEST), a nongovernmental organization based in Uganda, jointly serve as the coordinating center for the initiative.

In collaboration with the MEPI community-based education (CBE) technical working group (TWG), *CapacityPlus* and the MEPI coordinating center (MEPI-CC) organized and conducted a CBE evaluation workshop from 1-3 April 2014 at the Golf Course Hotel in Kampala, Uganda (see workshop agenda, Appendix 1).

Workshop Objectives and Expected Outcomes

The three primary objectives of the workshop were to:

1. Share good practices for CBE evaluation relevant to the needs of MEPI institutions
2. Identify approaches and tools that can be used for CBE evaluation in the African context
3. Strengthen a supportive network of CBE collaborators.

The workshop had two expected outcomes:

1. A draft CBE evaluation framework and plan for each participating school
2. Agreement on concrete next steps for continued collaboration between the participants.

Participants and Facilitators

Workshop attendees included representatives from 11 MEPI institutions in seven countries: Botswana, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. Five of the participants represented schools belonging to the consortium of MEPI schools in Uganda; two participants represented a consortium of five medical schools in Nigeria. The workshop participants consisted of faculty members, administrators, and educators who were champions of CBE with wide experience, knowledge, and understanding of the current situation and future needs for CBE at their institutions and who were capable of drafting a CBE evaluation framework and plan prior to and during the workshop. In addition, five representatives from three partner organizations—USAID, ACHEST, and IntraHealth International—attended the workshop. In all, 19 participants attended the workshop (see Appendix 2 for list of participants).

The workshop was led by one lead facilitator and two co-facilitators. The lead facilitator, Prof. Debra Nestel, has broad experience in the evaluation of medical education programs. The co-facilitators, Dr. Zohray Talib and Ms. Heather Ross, represented the CBE teams from the MEPI-CC and Capacity*Plus*.

Pre-Workshop Activities

Prior to the workshop, organizers asked participants to carry out the following four preparatory activities:

- Complete a CBE program review questionnaire
- Conduct a preliminary stakeholder mapping exercise
- Conduct a meeting of relevant stakeholders to agree on key issues before attending the CBE evaluation workshop
- Locate any existing lists of learning objectives for their institution's CBE program.

Questionnaire

The program review questionnaire (Appendix 3) allowed participants to provide a comprehensive description of their existing CBE program using a template adapted from the Collaboration for Health Equity through Education and Research (CHEER) methodology. CHEER is a peer-to-peer evaluation approach, previously applied at nine institutions in South Africa, which enables schools being evaluated to learn from a preparatory self-assessment and to understand which CBE practices are more or less effective in a given context. The goal of this exercise was to provide the participants with a firmer understanding of the components and characteristics of their institution's CBE program within the context of its parent organization, including how the program operates and whom it serves.

Mapping exercise

Workshop organizers instructed participants to develop a preliminary stakeholder map to identify groups or key individuals with a vested interest in their institution's CBE program or its evaluation. The participants were requested to develop a visual depiction of those stakeholders and their relationship to each other.

Stakeholder meeting

Participants were requested to meet with relevant stakeholders (if possible), and to complete the following activities:

1. Review, validate, and fill in the gaps of the draft CBE program review questionnaire and stakeholder mapping exercise
2. Agree on "Who is the evaluation of the CBE program for?" and "Why do they want the evaluation?"
3. Identify where their CBE program currently is in relation to the typical life cycle of an educational program and, based on this determination, make a preliminary decision about what type of evaluation would be most appropriate and feasible to conduct

4. Identify appropriate members for the institution's evaluation working group.

CBE program learning objectives

Finally, participants looked into whether their institution had formal defined learning objectives for its CBE program.

Participants submitted the pre-workshop products to the workshop organizers, who reviewed and analyzed the products in order to inform development of the workshop activities.

Organizers also invited participants to list their expectations for the CBE evaluation workshop personally, for their school and/or country, and for the MEPI network as a whole (see Appendix 4 for a summary of participants' pre-workshop expectations).

WORKSHOP

Practices, Approaches, and Tools for CBE Evaluation

The workshop format consisted of a variety of participatory lectures, small and large group activities, round table sessions, and mini-presentations. The workshop was highly interactive, with discussions and questions encouraged by the facilitators. To begin the workshop, the group heard inspiring opening remarks from Dr. Nelson Sewankambo, professor of medicine, principal of Makerere University College of Health Sciences and principal investigator of the MESAU consortium. Afterward, the participants were introduced to the facilitators, walked through the agenda, reviewed the workshop methodology and expected outcomes, and introduced themselves using a descriptive image or photograph.

Prof. Debra Nestel, lead workshop facilitator, presented on the theoretical approaches to program evaluation to develop a common understanding of the different evaluation approaches that can be applied to CBE programs. Participants then listened to representatives from the MESAU consortium in Uganda and the University of Zambia, who presented the methodology and framework used to conduct recent evaluations of their CBE programs. These presenters reviewed successes and challenges of their evaluations as well as early results, both of which were presented to the group for feedback and discussion.

Dr. Zohray Talib, co-facilitator from the MEPI-CC, moderated the next workshop session. Participants gave mini-presentations using photographs to describe the CBE program at their school, discuss the stage of the program in the program life cycle, and explain why the stakeholders at their school are interested in evaluating the program. This session exposed participants to the different types of CBE programs being implemented by their colleagues and highlighted the successes and challenges faced at the various programs. Participants had the opportunity to share their experiences, sharing not only good practices but also other approaches that did not always work in their settings. A discussion about the nature and definition of CBE arose from this session.

Ms. Heather Ross, co-facilitator from CapacityPlus, led a session on developing logic models as the basis for an evaluation strategy. The purpose of the logic model was to capture the assumptions, context, inputs, activities, outputs, and expected outcomes of the various CBE programs. Participants were split into small groups, provided with a template (see Appendix 5), and asked to work collaboratively on developing logic models for their CBE programs. This allowed for exchanging of ideas and feedback as participants filled in the templates. The facilitators divided themselves up so that each was assigned to a small group to provide immediate guidance and feedback as participants developed their models.

Following this session, the facilitators guided participants in using their logic models as foundation documents in drafting their evaluation plans. While creation of the logic models and evaluation plans were a main focus of the remainder of the workshop, the participants and facilitators also continued to share good practices and promising approaches during the sessions focusing on barriers and facilitators to evaluation, challenges and strategies for data collection and analysis, and common evaluation questions and tools.

On the final day of the workshop, the group visited two of the CBE sites outside of Kampala. Participants encountered two periurban health centers—one private non-profit and one public institution—where health professional students from Makerere University College of Health Sciences complete rotations. Upon return from the site visits, the group discussed how these CBE examples could be evaluated using the approaches introduced during the workshop.

Developing CBE Evaluation Plans

On the second day of the workshop, participants began drafting CBE evaluation plans using a template provided by the facilitators (see Appendix 6). The participants were first paired according to the level of maturity and type of CBE program at their respective institutions. Facilitators asked the pairs to describe the scope and purpose of their evaluation, develop broad evaluation questions, and define specific measures of CBE program evaluation. The process required the participants to explore key areas of program evaluation including quantitative and qualitative data collection methods, evaluation designs, sampling, analysis, and reporting. At this time, a compendium of tools used for evaluating community-based medical education programs was presented and given to the participants as a resource. This compendium was a result of a targeted search for peer-reviewed and grey literature to identify good practices and tools for the evaluation of CBE programs applicable to the African context. The search identified relevant tools that could be useful to MEPI schools for CBE evaluation and included them in the comprehensive compendium. Participants also received a copy of the compendium and the full-text articles identified from the literature search on a flash drive to take home to their respective schools.

Participants used their draft logic models to inform the development of their evaluation plans, supported by the facilitators who circulated between groups and provided important expertise when needed. Each school departed the workshop with a draft CBE evaluation plan to be further refined and shared with stakeholders and leadership at the various institutions.

Strengthening the Community of Practice

The workshop provided a forum for strengthening the MEPI CBE community of practice. The participants were given ample time to interact and discuss their CBE programs (both informally and through mini-presentations), exchange ideas for CBE evaluation, discuss good practices for CBE from their experiences, and provide and receive feedback.

Dr. Zohray Talib introduced the participants to the MEPI CBE Facebook group, describing how they could use the site during the workshop and beyond. All participants were given access to the Facebook page, and throughout the workshop, facilitators and participants posted resources, comments, and photos in real-time. The participants were enthusiastic about the Facebook page as a forum for ongoing collaboration and communication, including sharing their draft evaluation plans with the group. This community platform will continue to be used after the workshop as a way for schools to share information and materials, ask questions, or solicit feedback from the TWG and facilitators.

Participants departed the workshop with a strong sense of collegiality and collaboration, pledging to maintain an ongoing dialogue related to CBE and program evaluation as indicated in the evaluation forms (see Appendix 7).

The workshop concluded with inspirational closing remarks from Professor Francis Omaswa, executive director of ACHEST.

OUTCOMES AND NEXT STEPS

The workshop achieved both of its expected outcomes, with participants producing draft evaluation plans and identifying avenues for collaboration.

Evaluation Plans

Each school departed the workshop with a draft CBE evaluation plan to be further refined and disseminated to stakeholders and leadership at the various institutions.

Collaboration

Participants agreed to maintain communication through the Facebook group and identified concrete areas for collaboration moving forward (see Next Steps).

Next Steps

On the last day of the workshop, the participants met as a group to discuss next steps for each of their schools moving forward as well as for the MEPI CBE TWG. Facilitators asked participants to discuss what their next steps would be three months after the workshop and eighteen months after the workshop when the MEPI initiative ends. Facilitators also asked what resources or support participants would need from each other and from the MEPI/*CapacityPlus* collaboration.

Immediate next steps (3 months)

- Share lessons learned from the workshop with students and various stakeholders to enhance buy-in both for CBE evaluation and the CBE programs generally
- Agree on next steps for the evaluation process with school leaders and identify an instrument for evaluation
- Share evaluation tools and materials with the broader community of practice through the Facebook group
- For the schools that recently conducted a CBE evaluation, disseminate the results of their evaluations and the tools used to the group.

Long-term next steps (18 months)

- Institutionalize monitoring and evaluation of CBE at the schools
- Utilize completed plans to evaluate program activities once those plans are approved by institutional decision-making bodies
- Conduct a CBE curriculum review using the results of the program evaluation
- Publish the results from the program evaluations.

Support needed

- Guidance and technical input from the group and facilitators on the plans and implementation of the evaluations
- Articles, examples of evaluation tools and instruments, and any other additional materials.

WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Fourteen participants completed an evaluation form at the end of the workshop. The evaluation requested feedback in four areas: the workshop objectives and expected outcomes, workshop methodology, logistics, and impact and next steps (see evaluation results in Appendix 7). In general, participants reported that the workshop achieved its objectives and that the workshop met or exceeded their expectations. The participants agreed that the workshop was highly effective in guiding them through the development of draft CBE evaluation plans and that the workshop was very successful in strengthening the MEPI network for ongoing CBE collaboration. On the whole, participants responded that the workshop methodology was effective. The participants were particularly impressed with the expertise of the facilitators in developing their understanding of program evaluation and developing CBE evaluation plans. Participants also were satisfied overall with the workshop logistics. Finally, participants expressed satisfaction with the workshop in preparing them to evaluate the CBE program at their respective institutions moving forward.

APPENDIX 1: MEPI COMMUNITY-BASED EDUCATION EVALUATION: WORKSHOP AGENDA

Kampala, Uganda, Golf Course Hotel
April 1-3, 2014

Workshop Objectives:

1. Share good practices for CBE evaluation relevant to the needs of MEPI institutions
2. Identify approaches and tools that can be used for CBE evaluation in the African context
3. Strengthen a supportive network of CBE collaborators.

Expected Outcomes:

1. A draft CBE evaluation framework and plan for each participating school.
2. Agreement on concrete next steps for continued collaboration between the participants.

Day 1: Tuesday, April 1, 2014

Registration and opening		
<i>Aim: To establish a collaborative approach to working through introductions of all participants and the agenda</i>		
Time	Activity	Facilitator/Speaker
8:30–9:00	<i>Registration</i>	
9:00–9:15	Welcome and opening remarks	Nelson Sewankambo
9:15–9:25	Introduction to workshop facilitators	Facilitators
9:25–9:40	Overview of workshop agenda, methodology, and expected outcomes	Debra Nestel
9:40–10:00	Introductions to workshop participants	Participants
Session 1: Theoretical approaches to program evaluation		
<i>Aim: To develop a common understanding of different theoretical approaches to evaluation that could be applied to CBE programs</i>		
Time	Activity	Facilitator/Speaker
10:00–11:00	Overview and activity: theoretical approaches to program evaluation	Debra Nestel
11:00–11:15	<i>Coffee/tea break</i>	
Session 2: Communicating the results of program evaluations		
<i>Aims: To share the results of recent evaluations in Uganda and Zambia, and raise awareness of the needs and challenges in communicating evaluation results</i>		

Time	Activity	Facilitator/Speaker
11:15–12:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to the session • Presentation of recent MEPI CBE program evaluation results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Uganda (10 minutes) ○ Zambia (10 minutes) • Moderated discussion on dissemination of evaluation results 	Debra Nestel Rhona Baingana Moses Simuyemba Debra Nestel
12:15–13:15	<i>Group photo and lunch</i>	
Session 3: Characterizing the state of CBE programs <i>Aim: To characterize CBE programs and identify similarities and differences, especially in the evolution and overall program lifespan</i>		
Time	Activity	Facilitator/Speaker
13:15–14:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to the session • Mini-presentations (5 minutes per participant) to briefly explain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The CBE program at their school ○ The stage of the program in a program life cycle ○ The purpose of the evaluation as identified through discussions with stakeholders • Discussion of similarities and differences among the programs 	Zohray Talib Participants Debra Nestel
Session 4: Developing a logic model <i>Aim: To develop draft logic models that capture program assumptions, context, inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes</i>		
Time	Activity	Facilitator/Speaker
14:30–15:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview and discussion: The role of learning objectives in program evaluation • Logic models in the context of MEPI • Introduction to group work 	Debra Nestel Zohray Talib Heather Ross
15:00–15:15	<i>Coffee/tea break</i>	
15:15–17:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small group work on logic models • Plenary group discussion of benefits and challenges in developing the logic models 	One facilitator per group Debra Nestel
17:00–17:15	Summary of the day and introduction to Day 2	Debra Nestel
19:00	<i>Welcome dinner</i>	

Day 2: Wednesday, April 2, 2014

Day 2 Introduction		
Time	Activity	Facilitator/Speaker
8:30–9:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recap from Day 1 Feedback from evaluation Knowledge burst 	
Session 4 (continued): Developing a logic model		
<i>Aim: To develop draft logic models that capture program assumptions, context, inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes</i>		
9:00–9:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q & A on logic models 	Heather Ross
9:15–10:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Break into work groups Refining logic models in small groups 	Heather Ross One facilitator per group
Session 5: Identifying evaluation barriers and facilitators		
<i>Aim: To ensure that barriers and facilitators are considered before defining the scope of the evaluation and developing an evaluation plan</i>		
Time	Activity	Facilitator/Speaker
10:00–10:30	Introduction and activity: Evaluation barriers and facilitators	Debra Nestel
10:30–10:45	<i>Coffee/tea break</i>	
Session 6: Drafting the evaluation plan		
<i>Aim: To define the scope, purpose, broad evaluation questions, measurements, and measures of CBE program evaluations, including identification of data collection methods and evaluation design</i>		
Time	Activity	Facilitator/Speaker
10:45–12:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction to the elements of the evaluation plan and discussion Group or individual work on evaluation plans 	Heather Ross One facilitator per group
12:30–13:30	<i>Lunch</i>	
13:30–13:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of compendium of evaluation tools 	Zohray Talib
13:45–14:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group or individual work continues Plenary discussions to address specific challenges in the individual/group work 	One facilitator per group Debra Nestel
14:45–15:00	<i>Coffee/tea break</i>	
15:00–16:00	MEPI CBE TWG meeting	Solomon Sagay Zohray Talib
16:00–17:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group or individual work continues Plenary discussions to address specific challenges in the individual/group work 	One facilitator per group
17:15–17:45	Summary of the day and introduction to Day 3	Debra Nestel

Day 3: Thursday, April 3, 2014

Session 6 (continued): Drafting the evaluation plan <i>Aim: To define the scope, purpose, broad evaluation questions, measurements, and measures of CBE program evaluations, including identification of data collection methods and evaluation design</i>		
Time	Activity	Facilitator/Speaker
8:30–9:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction to the day Parking lot 	Debra Nestel
9:15–10:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential challenges for data collection and shared strategies Group work 	Debra Nestel
10:00–10:15	<i>Coffee/tea break</i>	
Session 7: Presentation of draft evaluation plans <i>Aim: To share draft evaluation plans and provide an opportunity for participants to give each other feedback on their plans</i>		
Time	Activity	Facilitator/Speaker
10:15–11:10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction to the session Mini-presentations to explain each evaluation plan Discussion and feedback from participants 	Debra Nestel Participants Debra Nestel
Session 8: Common questions and common tools <i>Aim: To foster the CBE community of practice</i>		
Time	Activity	Facilitator/Speaker
11:10–12:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Common questions and tools 	Zohray Talib
12:00–15:30	<i>Lunch and visit to a CBE site near Kampala</i>	
Session 9: Discussion of the CBE site visit <i>Aim: Drawing from the evaluation approaches introduced during the workshop, discuss how the CBE example presented during the site visit could be evaluated. Share similarities and differences between the participant's programs and the site visit example.</i>		
Time	Activity	Facilitator/Speaker
15:30–16:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion of the site visit 	Heather Ross
Session 10: Next steps for CBE evaluation <i>Aim: To reflect on the progress made toward establishing CBE evaluation plans and the next steps that should take place at individual schools and at the level of the CBE TWG community over the next 6 to 12 months</i>		
Time	Activity	Facilitator/Speaker
16:00–17:00	Agree on priority actions for finalizing plans and implementing evaluations over the next 6 to 12 months	Zohray Talib
Closing session <i>Aim: To reflect on the goals of the workshop and provide constructive feedback on the extent to which the workshop was able to achieve those goals</i>		
Time	Activity	Facilitator/Speaker
17:00–17:15	Closing remarks	Francis Omaswa
17:15–17:30	Workshop evaluation	Participants

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS



Medical Education Partnership Initiative (MEPI) Community-Based Education Evaluation Workshop Golf Course Hotel, Kampala, Uganda, 1-3 April 2014

#	Name	Affiliation	Title	Country	Email	Phone
1	Dr. Danjuma Bello	University of Jos	Lecturer, Department of Community Medicine	Nigeria	dabblous@yahoo.com	+234-803-706-6199
2	Ms. Victoria Bukirwa	African Center for Global Health and Social Transformation (ACHEST)	Research Associate, Monitoring and Evaluation	Uganda	vbukirwa@gmail.com	+256-414-237-225
3	Dr. Aluonzi Burani	Kampala International University	Director of Academic Affairs, Western Campus, Department of Business and Management	Uganda	aluonzi1974@yahoo.com	+256-772-888-625; +256-701-888-625
4	Ms. Margaret Kigge	Busitema University Faculty of Health Sciences	Lecturer and Chairperson, Community-Based Education, Research and Service (COBERS), Mbale Campus	Uganda	mkigge@yahoo.co.uk	+256-772-460-385
5	Mr. Antony Matsika	University of Zimbabwe College of Health Sciences	Senior Administrator, MEPI Program	Zimbabwe	antony.matsika@gmail.com	+263-470-7285
6	Dr. Mpho Mogodi	University of Botswana, School of Medicine	Lecturer, MBBS Phase I Public Health Coordinator, Faculty of Health Sciences	Botswana	mpho910@gmail.com	+267-355-4552; +267-7129-3834; +267-7311-1365
7	Dr. Kien Alfred Mteta	Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Center	Professor and Chair, Department of Urology, Dean Faculty of Medicine	Tanzania	akamteta@hotmail.com	+255-754-305-720; +255 27 2754377/80

#	Name	Affiliation	Title	Country	Email	Phone
8	Mr. James Henry Obol	Gulu University	Lecturer and Head, Department of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine	Uganda	obolh@yahoo.com	+256-701-972-991
9	Dr. Vincent Ojoome	African Center for Global Health and Social Transformation (ACHEST)	Head, Monitoring and Evaluation	Uganda	vincentojoome@yahoo.com	+256-414-237-225
10*	Prof. Francis Omaswa	African Center for Global Health and Social Transformation (ACHEST), MEPI Coordinating Center	Executive Director, ACHEST, Principal Investigator, MEPI-CC	Uganda	omaswaf@achest.org	+256-777-564-268
11	Mr. Hussein Oria	Makerere University College of Health Sciences (MakCHS)	Chair, Department of Pharmacy, School of Health Sciences, Chair COBERS Committee, MakCHS	Uganda	husmoyi@yahoo.co.uk	+256-772-945-455; +256-714-945-455; +256-758-862-466
12	Dr. Wilberforce Owembabazi	U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)	Program Management Specialist, Health System Strengthening	Uganda	wowembabazi@usaid.gov	+ 256-772-138-541
13	Dr. Gad Ndaruhutse Ruzaaza	Mbarara University of Science and Technology	Program Coordinator, COBERS	Uganda	gadruzaaza@yahoo.co.uk	+256-772-621-302
14 [^]	Prof. Nelson Sewankambo	Makerere University College of Health Sciences (MakCHS)	Professor of Medicine, Principal (Head) of MakCHS	Uganda	sewankam@infocom.co.ug	+256-782-366-751
15	Prof. Atiene Solomon Sagay	University of Jos	Professor, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, College of Medical Sciences	Nigeria	Atsagay58@yahoo.com	+234-803-451-9740
16	Dr. Moses Simuyemba	University of Zambia, School of Medicine	Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, MEPI Program, Public Health Consultant	Zambia	mosessimuyemba@yahoo.co.uk	+260-961-880-880
17	Prof. Susan van Schalkwyk	Stellenbosch University	Associate Professor, Deputy Director, Center for Health Professions Education, Stellenbosch University Rural Medical Education Partnership Initiative	South Africa	scvs@sun.ac.za	+27-21-938-9874

*Provided closing remarks

[^] Provided opening remarks

Workshop Organizers and Facilitators Contact List

#	Name	Affiliation	Title	Country	Email	Phone
1	Ms. Rhona Baingana	Makerere University College of Health Sciences (MakCHS)	Lecturer, Biochemistry Department, Coordinator, MESAU COBERS Evaluation	Uganda	rbaingana@gmail.com	+256-792-405-152; +256-776-405-152
2	Mr. Christopher Deery	CapacityPlus	Health Workforce Development Officer	United States	cdeery@intrahealth.org	+1-919-433-5729
3	Ms. Lydia Kaweesa	IntraHealth International/ Uganda Capacity Program	Administrative Assistant	Uganda	lkaweesa@intrahealth.org	+256-414-347-959
4	Prof. Debra Nestel	Monash University	Professor of Simulation Education in Healthcare, School of Rural Health	Australia	debra.nestel@monash.edu	+61-3-9902-6201; +61-(0)-404-465-959
5	Ms. Heather Ross	CapacityPlus	Senior Technical Officer	United States	hross@intrahealth.org	+1-202-407-9439
6	Dr. Zohray Talib	MEPI Coordinating Center, The George Washington University	Assistant Professor of Medicine and of Health Policy, Faculty, MEPI-CC	United States	zmtalib@gmail.com	+1-571-216-1835

APPENDIX 3: CBE PROGRAM REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Based on the Collaboration for Health Equity through Education and Research (CHEER) Questionnaire

Form completed by _____

Title or Position _____

Department _____

Date _____

1. GRADUATE OUTCOMES

1.1. Name of Programme:

1.2. Which, if any, of your Programme Goals (general curricular statements of intent) aim to prepare students for a future career in rural or under-served areas?

Rural area: where the health service is in the district far away from referral centres and where most health care is provided by generalist practitioners with limited or distant access to specialist resources and high technology support.

Under-served area is characterized by

- i) a lack of basic health requirements, eg. clean water, adequate food and shelter, etc;
- ii) limited access to health services
- iii) high ratios of patients to facilities (hospital beds) and health personnel.

These can occur in rural, peri-urban or urban areas.

a) Programme goals or outcomes that **explicitly** refer to preparing students for rural or under-served areas:

b) Programme goals or outcomes that **indirectly** relate to preparing students for rural or underserved areas (e.g. PHC approach, equity, human rights, community-oriented care or community responsiveness, health and poverty, etc):

2. RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION OF STUDENTS

2.1. Does your student **selection policy** make any explicit reference to rural or underserved areas?

YES ___ NO ___ IN PART ___ NOT SURE___

2.2. Does your student **recruitment process** include strategies (e.g. marketing, scholarships) to identify students with a preference for a future career in rural or under-served areas ?

YES ___ NO ___ IN PART ___ NOT SURE___

3. CURRICULUM

Please enclose a copy of a written description of those aspects of the curriculum you consider relevant to preparing students for a future career in rural or under-served areas. This may be in the form of a catalogue for students, a more lengthy description of relevant courses or any papers, published or unpublished, that discuss or evaluate these aspects of your curriculum.

Content/Themes, Educational Methods, Learning sites, etc

PLEASE COMPLETE THE CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK PROVIDED AT END OF THIS APPENDIX

4. CURRICULUM PLANNING AND TEACHING

4.1. Have Faculty staff been employed with specific responsibility for developing aspects of the curriculum that are relevant to preparing students for a future career in rural or under-served areas?

YES ___ NO ___ NOT SURE___

If 'yes', please specify:

Academic Levels

(eg. tutor, lecturer, professor),
PHC)

Job Title

(e.g. Community-based education, Rural Health,

4.2. Which departments at your university, other than your own, are most involved with curriculum planning for rural or under-served areas at the various levels of health care?

4.3. Are there other members, not employed by the university, who are involved in **curriculum planning**?

YES ____

NO ____

NOT SURE ____

If yes, please indicate with a tick below:

____ Health Professionals

____ Health Administrators

____ Community Health Workers

____ Community Development Personnel

____ Students (either contemporary or previous years)

____ Other (please specify) _____

4.4. Are there other members, not employed by the university, who are involved in **teaching/facilitating learning**?

YES ____ NO ____ NOT SURE ____

If yes, please indicate with a tick below:

- ____ Health Professionals
- ____ Health Administrators
- ____ Community Health Workers
- ____ Community Development Personnel
- ____ Students (either contemporary or previous years)
- ____ Other (please specify) _____

4.5. Is sustainability of the Programme being addressed?

___ Not at all ___ Partially addressed ___ Systematically

5. EVALUATION

5.1 Are you evaluating whether the graduate outcomes are being achieved?

YES ___ NO ___

If YES, please enclose any written material you may have.

Thank you for your valuable participation in this project.

APPENDIX 4: PARTICIPANT EXPECTATIONS

What are your expectations for the MEPI CBE Evaluation Workshop? What do you hope to get out of this workshop personally, for your school or country, and for the MEPI Network as a whole?

Participant #	Expectations
1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I hope to, at the end of the workshop, be able to conduct an evaluation of our version of CBE. 2. I hope to learn more about CBE and its practice in other parts of Africa/World. 3. Personally, I would like to develop skills in CBE evaluation that will be useful in evaluating other educational programs in our institution. 4. Networking with professionals in the field will also be appreciated.
2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At the end of the workshop I expect that we would have come up with evaluation tools which the participating institutions can share to evaluate the basics of CBE. 2. Personally, and for my Institution I expect to have basic knowledge to evaluate CBE, come up with a model of how to implement it which can be used in the country and its sustainability
3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To come out of the workshop with a clear direction of establishing a CBE M&E system. 2. To share good practices and understand CBE programs in other schools 3. To learn more on the processes involved in CBE M&E. 4. Establish networks with other schools for future collaborations
4	<p><u>My expectations for the MEPI CBE Evaluation Workshop:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To be capacitated to refine (develop and evaluate it) my institution's CBE program so that it becomes relevant to the Botswana health system 2. To get skills and tools to improve the CBE program to make it attractive to all faculty members and be able to show my colleagues the importance of CBE in the current training of our medical doctors. 3. Learn how to evaluate health professions education programs <p><u>What I hope to get out of this workshop:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Personally: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a newcomer in academia, learn the current trends in health workforce training and how to deliver those so that our graduates truly become the change agents that my country needs. • Network with colleagues from experienced institutions and benchmark. 2. For my school or country: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get skills and tools that are desperately needed to bring about the much needed competencies in our trainees and students and thus improve the health system in the long run. 3. For the MEPI Network as a whole: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share our experience with colleagues in the network and participate actively.

5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My expectation is mainly to learn best practices from other schools but the overriding expectation is to get a tool for formal evaluation of the CBE activities/program across my college.
6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By the end of workshop, I should be able to conduct evaluation for our CBE program. 2. By the end of the workshop, I will have learnt how other Institutions are running their CBE program. 3. By the end of the workshop, I hope to adopt good practice in the implementation of the CBE program for our institution.
7	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Personally <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to critically examine CBE approaches in order to draw lessons for practice • I would like through a comparative approach to think through the different theoretical perspectives that inform CBE internationally that could be adapted to the local context • I would like to reflect on CBE practices at Mbarara University that could further enhance MESAU best practices 2. For Mbarara University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reflect on the organization, processes and delivery mechanisms of CBE • To draw some lessons for Mbarara University CBE / COBERS program • To establish some benchmarks for monitoring and evaluation of MUST CBE program 3. For Uganda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enhance collaborative effort on CBE in Uganda • To examine progress of CBE engagements in Uganda • To critically review CBE progress within MESAU Schools in Uganda • To develop a CBE framework for Uganda • To examine and critique CBE models for Uganda 4. For the MEPI Network as a whole <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enhance collaborative effort on CBE • To critically review CBE progress • To contribute to informing CBE best practices
8	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Personally, I hope to gain more insight into evaluation of CBE. 2. I hope to return from Kampala with a generic evaluation template which will be adapted for use in all 6 schools of MEPIN consortium. 3. My hope is that the instrument will find use in other medical schools in Nigeria as well.
9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Personal</u>: to learn from my colleagues; to hear what others are doing so as to benchmark our activities 2. <u>School</u>: the opportunity to plan for the summative year of our five year evaluation project and also to discern a way forward to evaluate our entire CBE initiative 3. <u>MEPI</u>: to share best practice and identify opportunities for collaborative and, importantly, comparative research/evaluative activities.

APPENDIX 5: LOGIC MODEL TEMPLATE

Logic Model Worksheet						
Name of Program:				Name of Evaluator:		
Program Goals (5+ years)	Inputs	Activities	Outputs	Intermediate Outcomes	Outcomes	Impact
Assumptions:						
Context:						

Logic Model Worksheet: GUIDE & EXAMPLE

Name of Program: Example Name CBE Program				Name of Evaluator: Heather Ross		
Program Goals	Inputs	Activities	Outputs	Intermediate Outcomes	Outcomes	Impact
<p><i>These are the big-picture ideas underlying your CBE program. What change will the program make?</i></p> <p>Example: More health workers will provide quality community-level care during careers in underserved locations</p>	<p><i>These are the key resources of your program.</i></p> <p>Examples: Staff Curriculum Partner institutions Funding Facilities</p> <p>Indicate in parenthesis those resources provided through MEPI - for example, (with MEPI funding)</p>	<p><i>These are things done by your program that reach participants or others</i></p> <p>Examples: Workshop on {topic} Research project Clinical practical experience</p> <p>Indicate in parenthesis the activities supported by MEPI – for example (MEPI activity)</p>	<p><i>These are tangible products/ by-products of activities (but not whether students learned anything)</i></p> <p>Examples: Certificates of completion Records of actions by participants (i.e. log books) Number of students at clinical site</p> <p>Indicate in parenthesis when each output should have been, or should be, achieved – for example (by May 2014)</p> <p><i>Evaluation of outputs most closely aligns with level 1 of the Kirkpatrick model.</i></p>	<p><i>This is learning connected to activities</i></p> <p>Examples: Students understand {topic} Students are able to {skill}</p> <p>Indicate in parenthesis when each outcome should have been, or should be, achieved – for example (by May 2014)</p> <p><i>Evaluation of short-term outcomes most closely aligns with level 2 of the Kirkpatrick model.</i></p>	<p><i>These are effects connected to activities or intermediate outcomes such as changes in behavior, action or decision making</i></p> <p>Examples: Graduates apply knowledge to {context} Graduates use new method to perform {action} Graduate chooses to practice in {geographical area}</p> <p>Indicate in parenthesis when each outcome should have been, or should be, achieved – for example (by May 2014)</p> <p><i>Evaluation of medium-term outcomes most closely aligns with level 3 of the Kirkpatrick model.</i></p>	<p><i>This may be ultimate impacts, connected to medium- and short-term outcomes.</i></p> <p>Examples: Better care of patients More graduates working in community</p> <p><i>Evaluation of long-term outcomes most closely aligns with level 4 of the Kirkpatrick model.</i></p>

Assumptions: *Beliefs and thought patterns about how and why a program is expected to succeed which are not otherwise explicitly stated; also, things that would prevent a program from achieving long-term outcomes.*

Examples: The approach to learning used in this program is effective for our students. The program will have access to the resources needed through funders and partners for the entire program cycle.

Context: *Information about the setting or history of the program; the environment in which the program takes place; and the participants. Paint a good but concise picture of the program.*

Example: Program is held within a rural hospital affiliated with the university. Students are in their third-year of earning an MBCHB.

APPENDIX 6: EVALUATION PLAN TEMPLATE

Title of Evaluation Plan

Organization Name

Program Name

Version and Date

1. Description of the program

1.1 Long Term Goal of the CBE Program (5+ Years)

- *The goal statement should be concise and clear, specific to the program and not to the larger organization.*
- *Convey the "big picture" motivation for the program.*

1.2 Program description

- *Main program activities and the expected results of each activity with regard to student knowledge, attitudes, and behavior.*
- *Information about participants – students, faculty, clinicians, community representatives, etc.*
- *Basic information about program logistics (how is it actually implemented)*
- *Community context of the program*
- *History of the program (briefly)*

2. Evaluation Purpose and Questions

2.1 Evaluation purpose statement

- *Short description of your evaluation effort that describes what is, and is not, being evaluated*
- *Describes the goal and purpose of the evaluation*

2.2 Evaluation questions

- *List the questions you will ask in your evaluation below. The number of questions you ask should be considered carefully, as it effects:*
 - *The cost of your evaluation*
 - *The time involvement*
 - *The personnel involvement*

- For each question, consider the following:
 - How clear is the question?
 - How feasible it is to answer the question?
 - What sort of claims would be possible if the evaluation yielded favorable evidence for the question?
 - How well is the question aligned with the program's lifecycle stage?

Questions:

- 1) Question 1
- 2) Question 2
- 3) Question 3
- 4) (etc.)

3. Measurement and Measures

- Describe the type of measure you will use for each of the above questions. For instance:
 - Written survey
 - Observational Checklist
 - Structured interview
 - Numerical data point (i.e. attendance number)

Questions:

- 1) Type of measure for Question 1
- 2) Type of measure for Question 2
- 3) Type of measure for Question 3
- 4) (etc.)

4. Sampling Plan

- Describe the sample you will use for each of the above questions.
 - Composition
 - Size
 - How you would recruit the sample?

Questions:

- 1) Sample to measure for Question 1
- 2) Sample to measure for Question 2
- 3) Sample to measure for Question 3
- 4) (etc.)

5. Evaluation Design

- Lay out the sequence and timing of each observation (when measures will be/are implemented).
- State the design type for each observation (e.g. post only, pre/post, pre/post with comparison group, etc.).

Questions:

- 1) **Sequence, timing and design for Question 1**
- 2) **Sequence, timing and design for Question 2**
- 3) **Sequence, timing and design for Question 3**
- 4) **(etc.)**

6. Data Management and Analysis Plan

- *How will each part of the measurement data be:*
 - *Collected & stored*
 - *Coded / input*
 - *Analyzed to obtain credible answers to each evaluation question*

Questions:

- 1) **Handling and analysis of Question 1 data**
- 2) **Handling and analysis of Question 2 data**
- 3) **Handling and analysis of Question 3 data**
- 4) **(etc.)**

7. Evaluation Reporting Plan

- *In what format will the results of each question be shared internally and externally?*
- *When and how often will each of the questions be shared internally and externally?*

8. Implementation Plan and Schedule

- *State timeline for each question activity in calendar time (rather than relative terms). It will serve as a work planning calendar for each of the above measures/question evaluations.*
- *Include all of the following information to allow you to judge feasibility and to consider resource allocation. You may wish to use the calendar format on the next page.*
 - *"Start" dates for each question's measurement effort*
 - *"Start" and "end" dates for identifying the sample*
 - *"Start" and "end" dates for recruiting the sample*
 - *"Start" and "end" dates for collecting data*
 - *"End" dates for analysis of the data for each measurement*
 - *Date by which data will be formatted for sharing*
 - *Date(s) for sharing of results from each question internally*
 - *Date(s) for sharing of results from each question externally*

APPENDIX 7: WORKSHOP EVALUATION

1. Workshop Objectives and Expected Outcomes

Note: Figures in the tables indicate the number of participants who selected that response choice.

1.1 Did the workshop meet your expectations? (circle only one response)

Did not meet expectations	Somewhat met expectations	Uncertain	Mostly met expectations	Fully met expectations
0	0	0	5	9

Briefly explain your response in the space below:

- My pre-workshop expectations were exceeded!
- The learning was on point- exactly what we came for. The process was not stressful.
- I had looked forward to coming out with an understanding of developing M&E systems and sharing good practices and that has been realized.
- All my objectives have been met- and then some!
- Most of my expectations have been met. I look forward to the networking that will develop moving forward.
- I learnt very new things about the evaluation process.
- My objectives for the workshop were met.
- My expectations were: (1) evaluation tool- this has been achieved through the logic model; (2) basic knowledge- which I got; (3) sustainability- which was discussed during the TWG meeting.

1.2 To what extent did the workshop succeed in sharing good practices, approaches, and tools for CBE evaluation that are relevant to the needs of your institution?

Not at all	Limited extent	Uncertain	Some extent	Large extent
0	0	0	2	12

Briefly explain your response in the space below:

- Barring time constraints, well shared.
- The various descriptions of CBE from the various schools have improved my understanding of CBE.
- Everything was useful- appreciate the openness of everyone to share their wisdom and their work.
- The compendium that was prepared for this purpose.
- Those were user friendly! Hands on approach as well as sharing with fellow participants.
- Facilitators were expert in their presentations and materials shared. Participants were active. Facilitators encouraged interaction and sharing ideas and experiences.
- From the onset using photographic interpretations of the CBE sites, institution implementation presentations, pairing groups, and the design of the logic model.

1.3 To what extent did the workshop succeed in guiding you through the development of a draft CBE evaluation framework and plan?

Not at all	Limited extent	Uncertain	Some extent	Large extent
0	0	1	1	11

Note: One participant did not respond

Briefly explain your response in the space below:

- Step-by-step guidance was highly appreciated.
- The line between the logic model and evaluation plan was made really clear- or became clear.
- Went through a practical process of preparing an evaluation framework. I am leaving the workshop with a draft plan which needs beefing up only.
- Almost done!
- My evaluation plan is virtually complete. Time for action!
- Draft evaluation plan is essentially ready.
- The workshop was really interactive and educational.
- Already had an evaluation plan- but got additional insight.
- The workshop guided us through the logic model form. The materials and the group discussions were wonderful and educational.
- I did it practically through guidance from the facilitators. This made it easy to realize mistakes I had made.

1.4 To what extent did the workshop succeed in strengthening the MEPI network for ongoing collaboration on CBE?

Not at all	Limited extent	Uncertain	Some extent	Large extent
0	0	0	0	12

Note: Two participants did not respond

Briefly explain your response in the space below:

- It has strengthened group discussions and group interactions.
- I suppose time will tell but I have made many new friends (not just colleagues).
- The strengthening of the TWG through communication modalities such as the listserv and Facebook. Discussing next steps of the TWG.
- The networking, the CBE TWG meeting, the decisions that were made, and agreement to continue discussions.
- The facilitators integrated activities that nurtured ongoing CBE collaboration.
- We have email addresses for communication; we have Facebook for sharing good and bad practices to help each institution; participants are eager to contact and help each other.
- Community talking together. Relationships formed and clarity gained.

1.5 What is the most valuable skill, concept, or piece of knowledge that you gained from this workshop? (write your response in the space below)

- Methodology of conducting the workshop supported by materials. Quality of the facilitators was impressive and the organization level was wonderful.
- Collaborative learning.
- Drafting an evaluation plan.
- How to develop a logic model and the importance of evaluating CBE (COBERS) and modules that promote it (sustain).
- Writing a logic model.
- A different view of the logic model.
- Evaluation plan. The strength of the evolving CBE story from Africa.
- Contribution of MEPI in improving quality of training and retention of health workers.
- The development of the logic model, the evaluation plan, and linking the two.
- Link between the logic model (project or program plan) and evaluation plan.
- How to develop simple, user friendly logic model that feeds into an evaluation plan.
- Defining evaluation for our CBE program. Filling in the logic frame.
- Kirkpatrick model.

2. Workshop Methodology

2.1 How effective were the pre-workshop activities in preparing you to work productively during this workshop?

Very ineffective	Ineffective	Neutral	Effective	Very effective
0	0	1	6	6

Note 1: One participant did not respond

Note 2: Comments from one participant: "Although it was a lot of work!"

2.2 How effective were the opening sessions of the workshop in setting the tone and direction of the workshop?

Very ineffective	Ineffective	Neutral	Effective	Very effective
0	0	0	7	7

2.3 How effective were the plenary sessions for informing the development of your draft CBE evaluation framework and plan (e.g. theoretical approaches to evaluation, communicating results, characterizing CBE programs)?

Very ineffective	Ineffective	Neutral	Effective	Very effective
0	0	0	5	9

Note: Comment from one participant: "Kirkpatrick above my head!"

2.4 How effective were the group work sessions for developing a draft CBE evaluation framework and plan (e.g. logic model, evaluation plan)?

Very ineffective	Ineffective	Neutral	Effective	Very effective
0	0	0	4	10

2.5 How effective were the facilitators in developing your understanding of program evaluation and assisting you in drafting a CBE evaluation plan?

Very ineffective	Ineffective	Neutral	Effective	Very effective
0	0	0	1	13

3. Logistics

3.1 How satisfied are you with the following workshop logistics?

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
1. Communication about and invitation to the workshop	0	0	0	1	13
2. Pre-workshop information package	0	0	0	1	13
3. Travel arrangements	0	0	0	2	9
4. Airport transfer/ transportation	0	0	0	3	7
5. Lodging	0	1	0	2	8
6. Reception dinner	0	0	1	2	9
7. Lunches/tea breaks	0	0	0	8	6
8. Meeting rooms	0	0	0	6	8
9. Workshop materials (handouts, articles, etc.)	0	0	0	2	12
10. Audio visual equipment	0	0	0	4	10
11. Responsiveness to questions and needs	0	0	0	3	11

Note: Some of the Uganda participants may not have responded to the questions related to travel, lodging, and airport transfer.

If you have any comments or suggestions, please let us know in the space below:

- I have liked the idea of bringing the photos which eases the tiredness.
- A similar approach is required for medical education sooner to enhance collaborative learning.
- Lodging- room needs improvement especially in accessories.
- The training content was too much for the time available. Allow more time for discussion and exchanges of participants.
- Reimbursement for incidental expenses needs to be improved because we travel away from home and yet we have other businesses we run. Here we are given money which is too little compared to what we make outside our working time.

- Chris was amazing!

4. **Impact and Next Steps**

4.1 **To what extent did this workshop prepare you to evaluate the CBE program at your institution?**

Not at all	Limited extent	Uncertain	Some extent	Large extent
0	0	1	1	12

Note: Two participants did not respond

Briefly explain your response in the space below:

- I had no knowledge of CBE evaluation but now at least I have the basics. After revising the evaluation plan it can inform me to conduct it.
- It is not going to be business as usual.
- I have all I need to move forward.
- I have learnt the logic model. Having the evaluation form is going to be useful.
- I have learnt how to design an evaluation for CBE.
- I am ready to go because I have experienced the process of knowing. I have back-up support at the click of a button.
- I have basically completed an evaluation plan.
- I have the knowledge and expertise now. I think I can convince my school to institutionalize evaluation of CBE.

4.2 **In the next six months, how will you use what you learned from this workshop?**

- Kick off the CBE program and ensure it succeeds.
- Develop tools still needed. Refine existing data collection activities. Finalize Year 5 evaluation.
- Finalize and disseminate evaluation results effectively. Continuous M&E of CBE program.
- Develop a well-structured CBE and its evaluation plan. Champion others to jump on with CBE.
- I will design an evaluation for our CBE program and share the findings with others.
- By making sure it is applied and encouraging faculty members to embrace it for their various courses.
- Make the evaluation plan concrete.
- Commence evaluation of our CBE program.
- Conduct an evaluation of the CBE components of our program.
- Improve the linkage of MEPI outcomes with other players.
- Curriculum re-orientation. Link CBE more to health needs. Enhance research linked to CBE. Adapt evaluation tools.
- To "evaluate" the evaluation we did.
- Train faculty members and write a proposal for an evaluation.

4.3 In the next six months, how will you work with others in the MEPI network to strengthen your school's CBE program?

- Share tools and other processes, reports.
- Engage on Facebook. Keep in touch. Work on the joint article of CBE.
- Will seek help for evaluation report and manuscript writing.
- Share experience. Share materials. Contribute meaningfully to discussions.
- I will share any CBE materials and request for assistance in areas where I need support.
- Sharing our journey- success to continue appreciating it and take steps to help fill the gaps.
- Technical assistance in logic model and evaluation.
- Social media networking and collaboration on developing a manuscript.
- Exchange ideas, collaborate, and keep communicating.
- Vibrant CBE committee. Consult for technical support. Seek collaboration and resource support. Review MESAU COBERS evaluation results.
- Share tools for critique.
- We will share information and seek advice.

4.4 What additional information, resources, or support from the MEPI network does your institution need to achieve its CBE goals?

- Expertise.
- Not sure right now.
- Not sure at the moment other than above.
- Relevant papers. Faculty development materials. Templates (focus discussion interviews).
- I don't have one for now but will use the network to ask colleagues for assistance on a case-by-case basis.
- Will raise questions as I work on the evaluation plan.
- Continuous technical support.
- Need more information on the package of services offered by MEPI to universities. This will help leverage resources and decrease duplication with other universities.
- Reading materials. CBE resource center.
- Generally being willing to answer questions, give advice, etc.
- More knowledge or training on CBE.

Thank you!



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



CapacityPlus
Serving health workers, saving lives.



CapacityPlus is the USAID-funded global project uniquely focused on the health workforce needed to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. Placing health workers at the center of every effort, CapacityPlus helps countries achieve significant progress in addressing the health worker crisis while also having global impact through alliances with multilateral organizations.

The CapacityPlus Partnership



CapacityPlus
IntraHealth International

1776 I Street, NW, Suite 650
Washington, DC 20006
T (202) 407-9473
F (202) 223-2295

6340 Quadrangle Drive, Suite 200
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
T (919) 313-9100
F (919) 313-9108

www.capacityplus.org
info@capacityplus.org