

REPORT ON

**TRAINING WORKSHOP CONDUCTED FOR THE POVERTY MONITORING
AND ANALYSIS (PMA) COMPONENT OF THE ZAMBIA SOCIAL
INVESTMENT FUND (ZAMSIF) OF THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (MoFNP)
AND THE CIVIL SOCIETY FOR POVERTY REDUCTION (CSPR)**

Facilitated by

John T Milimo

PARTICIPATORY ASSESSMENT GROUP

**Held at PAIDESA, KABWE
26TH to 30th August 2002.**

1. Background

The Civil Society for Poverty Reduction (CSPR), together with other stakeholders have been involved in the formulation of Zambia's Poverty Reduction Strategic Paper (PRSP), a process that was facilitated by Government. CSPR has been keen to monitor the impact of the various PRSP interventions. To this effect, CSPR, with the generous financial support from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) organized a workshop in January (2002) whose purpose was to impart skills which would enable participants who had been drawn from a number of civil society organizations to effectively monitor progress of the said interventions.

The Zambia Social Investment Fund (ZAMSIF), through its Poverty Monitoring and Analysis (PMA), has been thinking of carrying out a participatory poverty assessment for some time. The idea has been to carry out this assessment in the nine pilot districts scattered in the nine provinces of the country. It was, therefore, decided that the two organizations, ZAMSIF and CSPR combine forces and carry out the PRSP monitoring together.

2. Opening of Workshop and its Objectives

Two representatives from the two organizations, which were sponsoring the workshop, made opening remarks. Mr. Fidelis Mwewa Mwape, the officer in charge of monitoring and evaluation at ZAMSIF welcomed the participants and spelt out the objectives of the workshop. In summary the objective of the Workshop was to prepare the people who were going to participate in the impending poverty monitoring in the nine selected pilot districts. The preparations were to consist of fully grasping the participatory research and monitoring tools that were going to be used

Mr. Gregory Chikwanka, the Acting Coordinator of the CSPR, also welcomed the participants and confirmed the Workshop objectives. He recalled the January 21st to 26th Workshop held at Barn Motel during which members of CSPR Steering Committee were trained in the use of qualitative participatory research and monitoring methods and tools. A one-day training had also taken place a week or so prior to the (Kabwe) workshop during which the Steering Committee members went through the tools for monitoring each of the PRSP interventions.

3. Participants

A total of 45 people participated in the workshop. 18 of these came from the nine pilot districts and were mainly District Administrative Officers and District Planners. These had been sponsored by ZAMSIF, which was also represented by two other officers, namely, the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and the Poverty Information and Documentation Specialist.

The Unit responsible for poverty reduction activities in the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning was represented by two people. Fifteen (15) came from the C SPR; the majority of these came from the four poorest provinces, namely, Eastern, Luapula, Northwestern and Western. These provinces will be the main focus of C SPR poverty activities. A few, including the Acting Coordinator came from Lusaka. These represented the C SPR Steering Committee.

Eight participants represented the Participatory Assessment Group (PAG). These were to act as Team Leaders during the actual research. The men outnumbered women participants by one to four. Most of the participants were already familiar with participatory approaches to development, research and monitoring. A list of the Workshop Participants is appended as Annex 1 of this report.

4. Workshop Organization

In order to provide a hands-on training, the Workshop consisted of both theory and practice. The theoretical, classroom training ensured that participants got an adequate understanding of the origins, evolution, theory and philosophy of participatory approaches to both research and development generally. Sampling procedures, which are appropriate to qualitative participatory research, were discussed; so was the need to cross check information generated, known as *triangulation*. The strengths and weaknesses of participatory methods were also noted.

A considerable amount of time, i.e., two full days, was spent on going through the 15 or so participatory tools that were going to be used in the participatory poverty assessment and monitoring. Participants were provided with the training materials, which contains all the above-mentioned topics.

The materials or training manual also discussed other important. These included practical issues during fieldwork, good facilitation, how to take notes, relationships between the research team and the researchers and among the researchers. Time did not, however, allow any discussion on data analysis and report writing. Neither was the format of the nine reports discussed and agreed upon.

The practical aspect of the Workshop consisted of:

- (a) Workshop trainees practicing the monitoring tools among themselves soon after the tools had been explained, and
- (b) Workshop participants going out into the field, one day in rural Chief Chamuka's area in Chibombo district, the other in a peri-urban area of Kabwe. Participants used the tools they had learnt in the field with close supervision of the facilitator and the members of the PAG team who later in the day commented on the process, pointing out where participants needed to improve.

A number of devices or techniques were used to ensure success of the Workshop. These included the following:

- Note-taking. A rapporteur was appointed each day to record what transpired during each day and to report on this at the beginning of the next day. This was aimed at keeping a record of what was taking place and thus reminded participants of this the following day.
- Daily monitoring. The purpose of daily monitoring is to assist workshop participants, facilitators and organizers to assess the workshop activities with a view to improving upon them on subsequent days. Each participant filled in a one page form or
- Questionnaire at the end of each day of the workshop. The monitoring looked at issues like time keeping, relevance of tools, involvement of participants in the different workshop activities, involvement of community members on days when there had been a field trip, skills learnt by participants. The monitoring also enabled the workshop organizers and facilitator to know what aspects of the workshop participants liked most and those they disliked most. This was with a view to improving these aspects in subsequent workshop days. A copy of the monitoring form together with the findings of the monitoring is appended at Annex 2 of this Report.
- The “eye” and the “ear”. Each day one participant played the role of the eye, that is, observed things, which were thought relevant to the running of the workshop while another person kept note of what they heard other participants say about the workshop. This exercise was also meant to contribute towards the successful running of the workshop.
- Games and energizers were played and acted in order to keep participants concentrate on the issues being discussed/taught.
- A final self-evaluation of the workshop was conducted at the end of the Workshop. Annex 3 has the form that was used during the final evaluation.

The following is a brief summary of the findings of the final self-evaluation, which the participants made at the end of the Workshop.

i) Value of workshop to my job:

This scored the highest points as 78.1 per cent of the participants said it was excellent. The remaining 21.9 per cent gave it a score of 4 out of 5 indicating that they thought the value of workshop in their jobs was high.

ii) Workshop achieving its objective:

Scores were more spread out here. 50 per cent thought it was excellent, 37.5 per cent said the workshop had achieved its objectives well and the remaining 12.5 per cent gave a “fair” score to the workshop achieving its objectives.

iii) Presentation methods used:

Here again the scores were spread out. 40.6 per cent gave it an excellent score; 37.5 per cent good and 21.9 per cent fair.

iv) Facilitator’s ability to transfer knowledge

59.4 per cent of respondents that the ability of the facilitator to transfer knowledge was excellent; 37.5 per cent said they were good and 3.1 thought they were fair. The first daily monitoring revealed that some participants were not particularly happy with the idea of reading the materials in class!

v) Usefulness of fieldwork.

This issue’s scores were similar to those in number iv) above, indicating that the majority of the participants (97.1%) rated high (excellent and good) the value they found in the two days of field practical experiences.

vi) Time management

In comparison to other issues time management was rated rather lowly. Only 6.3 per cent thought it was excellent. 37.7 per cent said it was fair, 53.1 per cent said it was good. Some 3.1 per cent felt that it was actually poor.

vii) Space management

On management of space 53.1 per cent thought the workshop had managed the space available well; 21.9 per cent thought they had managed excellently; 18.8 per cent felt the available space had been managed poorly and the remaining 6.2 per cent thought the management of space was rather poor. Space management

here meant use of the workshop room, which was somehow congested. Reference was also often made to the residential quarters, which were felt not adequate.

viii) Interaction among facilitators

The largest group of workshop participants (59.4%) interaction among participants were good; 34.4 per cent thought it was excellent and the remaining 6.2 it was fair. No in depth investigations were made to find out the rationale of these scores.

ix) Participation of workshop trainees

Half of the participants gave themselves the score of 5, indicating excellent participation in the workshop. The rest thought their participation was good.

x) Usefulness of PRA tools in community mobilization

Slightly less than half of the participants thought that the participatory research/monitoring tools they had learnt or revised were excellent at community sensitization; the rest thought the tools were either good (43.8%) or fair (9.76%)

xi) One's views being listened to

Participants were keen that their views were listened to. In fact this was one of their Workshop Expectations. Only 31.3 per cent gave this issue the score of 5, which denoted that their views were well. 24 of the participants thought that their views had been quite well respected by the other participants. The rest thought there was poor listening to each other's views.

xii) Value of training materials

More than half (53.1%) percent thought the handout or training materials were excellent; 37.5 per cent thought they were good and 9.4 per cent thought they were fair.

5. Preparation for Future Work

As part of the preparations for the field practices, which were to be undertaken on the last day of the Workshop, the participants divided themselves according to the districts they were going to work in. Then on the last day they went out and met members of the research communities. A member of the Participatory Assessment Group joined each of the teams. Annex 4 contains the names of the various district teams as they were identified during the workshop. The lists are, however, to be treated only provisionally as more discussions were still going on, especially with regards C SPR personnel.

The different district teams were also requested to identify three different communities or sites in which they were to conduct the monitoring in their respective districts. The three

sites were to be as different as possible in terms physical topology, climate, rural/urban, livelihood models, etc. Annex 5 indicates these sites.

The districts teams were then asked whether they would find suitable vehicles in their respective districts, which they would use during the two weeks of fieldwork. All, except Chongwe and Kalomo said they would find the required transport.

They were then asked to estimate the cost of fuel for this transport; this they did and the information is appended at Annex 6.

6. Some Workshop Recommendations

In the course of the five days of workshop, participants made several observations some of which, they insisted should be presented as recommendations. These include the following:

- Introductory letters should be written by the Ministry of Finance and addressed to Provincial Permanent Secretaries who will then issue relevant letters to the District Administrators of the selected pilot study districts;
- Wherever and whenever possible, the same people should do the PRSP monitoring in the coming years;
- A better venue than PAIDESA should be selected for future similar workshops.

Annex 1: List of Workshop Participants

1. Emmanuel Chabu, Petauke
2. Beston E.C. Mapulanga
3. Allan K. Kasongo, Chipata
4. Mulope Muyunda
5. Mwiya Mwandawande, Lusaka
6. Kebby Kalima, Mongu
7. Fredrick Inambao Lubasi, Senanga
8. Biggie Imasiku Nana, Senanga
9. Mary Mumba, Chipata
10. D. Mumbi Chansa, Chipata
11. Florence Molobeka, Mansa
12. Peggy Mumba, Mansa
13. John Chinyanta, Chongwe
14. Joshua Kamanya, Solwezi
15. Kabika M. Kakunta, Solwezi
16. Anthony Kanunsya, Solwezi
17. Patrick Mashila, Solwezi
18. Martha I. Linyando, Ministry of Community Development/PAG, Lusaka
19. Josephine Sinjwala Malumo, Mongu
20. Roggers Z. Kapila, Ministry of Finance, Lusaka
21. Michael Chongo, Chongwe
22. Sophie Kasonde-Ng'andu, UNZA/PAG, Lusaka
23. Mabel C. Milimo, UNZA/PAG, Lusaka
24. Moses Daniel Nyirenda, Petauke
25. Samson Zimba, PAG, Kabwe
26. Justus D. M. Phiri, Kalomo
27. K. Ngalande, Kalomo
28. Theresa C. Luswili, Ministry of Finance, Lusaka.
29. Felix W. M. Machiko, Mkushi
30. Angela Kangwa, Luwingu
31. Kaweme P.Mumbi, Luwingu
32. Martin Y. Mwewa, Samfya

33. Rodrick Kalasa, Mansa
34. Anthony Mwenya, Samfya
35. Noel Muchimba, Mkushi
36. Emmanuel Kasongo, Lusaka
37. Mwape D. Kasanda, Mufulira
38. Kelvin Tembo, Mufulira
39. Mukosha T. Mukwansha, Mwinilunga
40. Namucana C. Musiwa, Lusaka
41. Hope Nkatya Kasese, Lusaka

9

42. Fidelis Mwewa Mwape, Lusaka
43. Kaputo (Ms), Lusaka
44. Edward Mwanza, Kabwe.
45. Gregory Chikwanka, Acting Coordinator, CSPR, Lusaka.

Annex 2. The Daily Monitoring Form

At the end of each day (except the final one) kindly complete this form which is aimed at assisting workshop participants, facilitators and organizers to assess the workshop activities and processes with a view to improving upon them on subsequent workshop days.

1. What did you like the most during the day?
2. What did you dislike the most?
3. Please use the following guide to evaluate aspects of the workshop:

Poor	1
Fair	2
Good	3
Excellent	4

- Time-keeping
- Relevance of PRA tools
- Involvement of participants.

(after field days)

Rate the following in a similar manner

- Participation of community members
- Participation of field facilitators , i. e., workshop participants
- Achievement or impartment of the required skills.

10

The results of the first day of monitoring were as follows:

- 50 per cent of the participants thought time-keeping was good; 24 per cent said it was fair, 15 per cent excellent and only 11 per cent said it was poor;
- 48 per cent said the tools they had learnt were relevant;45 per cent said the tools were very relevant; 5 and 2 per cent said they were fairly and not very relevant, respectively;
- 45 per cent felt that workshop trainees participated excellently; 39 per cent said the participation was good; 11 per cent fair and 5 per cent poor;
- Things participants did not like most included delayed lunch (22%), fact that there were no soft drinks at tea-break (12%), low voice of the facilitator (6%). The majority of the participants (38%) said there was nothing they disliked while the rest included the following in their “dislike” list: poor meals, using tea cups for drinking mazoe, poor adherence to the stated workshop programme and so on.
- What participants liked most included: discussion on participatory research tools (24%), the mapping exercises (22%). The participatory learning atmosphere (19%),the good facilitation (12%), the presentations after group exercises (11%), and so on.

Annex 3: Workshop Final Evaluation Form

We are grateful to you for responding positively to the daily monitoring form which has enabled continuous improvements in the conduct of our workshop. Now we are asking you to take some time to fill out this form which is intended to help the workshop facilitators and organizers plan better for the next workshop, taking into account that for the next few years PRSP monitoring will continue.

Please rate on a score of 1 to 5 (1 being very poor and 5 excellent) the following issues:

ISSUES**SCORE OUT OF 5**

1. Value of the workshop to my job
2. Workshop has fulfilled its objectives
3. Presentation methods used
4. Facilitator's ability to transfer knowledge
5. Usefulness of fieldwork
6. Time management
7. Space management
8. Interaction among participants
9. Participation of workshop participants
10. Usefulness of PRA tools for community sensitization
11. My views/opinions were listened to
12. Value of the handout/training manual

11

Annex 4. List of Names of District Teams**Senanga:** Martha Linyando (team leader)

F. I. Lubasi
B.N Imasiku
K. Kalima
J. Malumo

Samfya: Sophie K. Ng'andu (team leader)

Fr. Martin Mwewa
Anthony Mwenya
Charles Kabamba
Florence Mulobeka

Petauke: Samson Zimba (team leader)

M. D. C. Nyirenda

Dawn Chansa
Allan Kasongo

Mwinilunga: Edward Mwanza (team leader)
B.E.C. Mapulanga
Joshua Kamanya
T. M. Mukosha
Patrick Mashila

12

Mfulira : Namucana Musiwa (team leader)
Mwape Kasanda
Kelvin Kasanda

Mkushi Mabel C. Milimo (team leader)
Noel Muchimba
Felix W. Machiko
Peggy Mumba
Anthony Kanunshya

Luwingu: E. Kasongo
Kaweme Mumba
Angela Kangwa
Fr. Kalasa
Mwiya Mwandawande

Kalomo: John T. Milimo (team leader)
Kingsley Ngalande
Jastus Phiri
Mary Mumba

Chongwe : Hope Kasese (team leader)
John Chinyanta
Michael Chongo
Kakunta Kabika

Annex 5: Sites Selected for PRSP Monitoring in the Nine Districts

1. Chongwe: Chongwe peri-urban, Shikabeta and Rufunsa
2. Kalomo: Siampondo, Nkandanzovu and Kalomo peri-urban
3. Luwingu: Nsombo, Kaseya and Luwingu peri-urban
4. Petauke: Msanzala, Kapoche and Nyika Ward

13

5. Mkushi: Itala Compound, Old Copper Mine and Ching'ombe
6. Mufulira: two peri-urban communities and one rural to be determined later.
7. Mwinilunga: Lwawu, Kakoma and the township
8. Samfya: Chishi Island, Miponda and Samfya peri-urban
9. Senanga: Nalisimwa, Namalangu and the township

Annex 6 Transport Requirements for the Fieldwork by District

1. Senanga: To use a GRZ vehicle from Lusaka; will require a total of K3,201,000.00 for fuels and driver's costs
 2. Samfya: To use a District vehicle within the district; it will require 440 litres of fuel at a cost of K1,540,000.00.
 3. Petauke: To use a District vehicle which will require fuels to cover some 200 kilometres.
- Mwinilunga: To use a District vehicle whose estimated fuel costs are K2,046,000.00.
- Mufulira: To use a "PAG" vehicle to cover some 900 kilometres are the usual ZAMSIF rate of \$0.60 per kilometer.
- Mkushi: To use a District vehicle with estimated fuel costs of K2,200,000.00.
- Luwingu: To use Father Kalasa's vehicle whose fuel costs will be K926,000.00.
- Kalomo: To use PAG vehicle to cover some 1,030 kilometres

Chongwe: To use PAG vehicle to cover an estimated total of 500 kilometres.