

No.

Terminal Evaluation Report
on
the Third Country Training Program
in Oral Health Promotion
in Sri Lanka

July 2008

Faculty of Dental Sciences, University of Peradeniya

**Japan International Cooperation Agency,
Sri Lanka Office**

SLO
JR
08-006

Abbreviations

TCTP	-	Third Country Training Programme
FDS	-	Faculty of Dental Sciences
UPSL	-	University of Peradeniya, Sri Lanka
JICA	-	Japan International Cooperation Agency
NCTP	-	Neighboring Country Training Programme
UGC	-	University Grants Commission

CONTENTS

	Page No.
1. Chapter 1 - Outline of the Evaluation process	01
1.1. Objectives of the evaluation study of the TCTP	01
1.2. Members of the Evaluation Team	01
1.3. Period of evaluation	01
1.4. Methodology of the evaluation study	01
2. Chapter 2 – Outline of the Third Country Training Programme	04
2.1. Background of the TCTP	04
2.2. Goals, Project Purpose and Expected Outputs	04
2.2.1. Overall Goal	04
2.2.2. Project Purpose	05
2.2.3. Expected Outputs	05
2.3.1. Requirement for Admission	05
2.3.2. Teaching Methodology	06
3. Chapter 3 - Achievements of the Training Programme	07
3.1. Implementation frame work of the project	07
3.2. Achieved results in terms of output	08
3.3. Achievements in terms of activities	10
3.4. Achievements in terms of inputs	12
4. Chapter 4 - Evaluation Results	14
4.1- Evaluation based on 5 criteria	14
4.1.1. Relevance	14
4.1.2. Effectiveness	16
4.1.3. Efficiency	17
4.1.4. Impact	19
4.1.5. Sustainability	21

4.2. Promoting and inhibitory factors of Project Outcomes	24
4.2.1 Factors related to the promotion of Project Outcomes	24
4.2.1.1 Factors related to the project design plan	24
4.2.1.2 Factors related to implementation	24
4.2.2 Inhibitory factors of Project Outcomes	24
4.2.2.1 Factors related to design and planning of the Project	24
4.2.2.2 Factors related to implementation	25
5. Chapter 5 – Conclusions	26
5.1. Lessons learned	26
5.1.1 Lessons learned related to the country situation and Project management.	26
5.2. Recommendations	26
5.2.1. Recommendations to the FDS/UPSL (Sri Lankan counterpart)	27
5.2.2. Recommendations to JICA	27
5.3. Conclusion	27
Annexure: Evaluation forms	
Annexure I Annual Evaluation form for trainees	30
Annexure II Results of Annual Evaluation form for trainees	37
Annexure III Annual Evaluation form for trainers	51
Annexure IV Results of Annual Evaluation form for trainers	54
Annexure V Terminal Evaluation form	62
Annexure VI Results of Terminal Evaluation	67



University of Peradeniya



Faculty of Dental Sciences



Some of the participants with JICA and UPSL officials



Foreign and local participants with the FDS and JICA officials at the inauguration of one of the programmes



A TCTP trainee treating a patient



Participants in the 'Restorative Management in Paedodontics Course' observing demonstrations by instructor



Participants in the 'Diagnosis and Management of Periodontal diseases' course



A view of the Restorative Dentistry Clinic at the Dental Hospital

Chapter 1

Outline of the Evaluation process

1.1 Objectives of the evaluation study of the TCTP programme:

The primary objective of this exercise was to evaluate the final outcome achieved at the conclusion of TCTP programme in Oral Health Promotion which extended over a period of 5 years from 2003 - 2007.

The second objective of the evaluation study was to learn the shortcomings of the programme in order to address them with a view to overcome them in the future projects of this nature.

1.2 Members of the Evaluation Team:

It was decided to appoint 5 course coordinators to the evaluation team with the Dean in Chair. Accordingly, the Evaluation Team consisted of the following:

1. Professor E.A. Prasad D. Amaratunga, Dean FDS (Chairman)
2. Professor Deepthi Nanayakkara, Coordinator 2003
3. Dr. U.B. Dissanayake, Coordinator 2004
4. Dr. M.A.M. Sitheequa, Coordinator 2005
5. Dr. V. Vijayakumaran, Coordinator 2006
6. Dr. J.A.V.P. Jayasinghe, Coordinator 2007

1.3 Period of evaluation

The evaluation study was carried out over a period of three months, starting from December, 2007. There was a delay in receiving the responses from the trainees and from their higher officials. As such, the study took much longer time than expected.

1.4 Methodology of the evaluation study

All 14 courses in various fields of dentistry offered by the FDS of the UPSL during the above specified period were evaluated. The evaluation was focused on the

relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project. The key questions that were to be answered were:

1. Has the project transferred the knowledge and skills as expected initially?
2. Are the knowledge and skills gained relevant to the type of work carried out by the trainees in their home countries?
3. Are the facilities in home country adequate for the trainees to practice what they have learnt during the training programme?
4. What are the major drawbacks of the programme?

To carry out the evaluation and to find the answers to above questions, the evaluation team gathered information from the following stakeholders:

1. Trainees who participated in the TCTP courses during the period of 5 years
2. Heads of the Institutions in the candidates' home countries who nominated the candidates for the training programme
3. Course coordinators of the training courses
4. Resource persons

Necessary information was obtained by sending structured questionnaires to trainees and Heads of the Institutions. In addition, the results of the evaluation conducted at the end of each training course were also utilized. Information from Course Coordinators, Resource Persons and Project Coordinators in Sri Lanka was gathered by interviewing the relevant parties.

The annual evaluation forms (both for training participants and trainers) and the results, and the terminal evaluation questionnaire form and the results are attached as annexure to this report.

The terminal evaluation questionnaire forms were sent to all the ex-participants (excluding those from Sri Lanka) through the JICA office and also directly by the

FDS if their current contact is available. The total number of responses obtained was 22 (Cambodia, Kenya, Laos, Maldives, Myanmar, Nepal, Tanzania, Vietnam).

Chapter 2

Outline of the Third Country Training Programme (TCTP)

2.1 Background of the TCTP

The Project for the improvement of teaching facilities of the FDS, UPSL under the Japanese government grant aid was completed in June 1998. The project included the building of new Faculty/Dental Hospital complex, supply and installation of equipment. After the grant aid project, 5 year technical cooperation project was implemented from 1998 – 2003.

Having recognized the capacity of the Faculty staff and the high standard of the equipment in the new facility, both the JICA visiting experts and their Sri Lankan counterparts felt the appropriateness of extending a helping hand to the neighboring countries by offering them short term training in various disciplines of dentistry. Accordingly, Neighboring Country Training Programme (NCTP) for the neighboring countries in Asia was held in the year 2002 through the generous sponsorship of JICA. The NCTP was a grand success and was highly commended by the participants. There were also requests for similar training programmes from African countries. Following a proposal submitted by the FDS, Japanese government approved the TCTP programme to be conducted in the FDS, UPSL annually for a period of 5 years starting from the year 2003.

2.2 Goals, Project Purpose and Expected Outputs

2.2.1. Overall Goal

Knowledge, technologies and skills related to the various disciplines of training are applied and disseminated by participants for the improvement of oral health status of communities in neighboring countries of Asia and Africa.

2.2.2. Project Purpose

The knowledge and skills of participating dental surgeons are improved through the training carried out by the TCTP courses offered by the FDS.

2.2.3. Expected Outputs

Output 1: *The level of understanding of the knowledge, techniques and skills of participants in the field of training are improved*

Output 2: *Participants apply and disseminate the knowledge, techniques and skills acquired during the training courses in their work /clinical dental practice.*

Output 3: *The exchange network among participants, resource persons and FDS is established and strengthened.*

2.2.4. Requirements for Admission

Required qualifications the participants are expected to have	Must hold BDS/DDS degree
Expected language ability	Must have a good command of spoken and written English
Desirable current position/duty	Preferably employed as a teacher in a Dental Education Institution
Length of experience after qualifications	A minimum of three years experience as a dental surgeon
Age limit	Under 45 years of age
Health requirement	Applicant must be in good health both physically and mentally in order to complete the course.
Additional requirements	Must be nominated by applicant's governments through appropriate channels.

Table 2.1: Requirements for Admission

2.2.5. Teaching Methodology

The courses were conducted in the English language in the form of lectures, clinical demonstrations, chair side clinical discussions, hands on experience sessions at the FDS and study tours.

Chapter 3

Achievements of the Training Programme

3.1. Implementation frame work of the project

The project was proposed to train Dentists from invited countries with knowledge and technology in the different disciplines of dentistry. The selected countries had in common the fact that they are considered “developing” or “less developed” countries.

The team of JICA Sri Lanka Office and the Faculty of Dental Sciences represented by the Dean and the Project Coordinator met in April/May of each year in order to plan the implementation of the TCTP for the particular year.

The budget for the TCTP of the particular year was prepared by May/June and submitted to the JICA Sri Lanka Office. Once approval of the budget is obtained, an agreement is signed between the JICA and the FDS, UPSL.

Subsequent to the signing of the agreement, the selection process of trainees began. Relevant information in the form of a brochure (General Information) of the TCTP of the particular year was dispatched through JICA and the Sri Lanka Ministry of Finance through its Department of External Resources to the relevant countries.

The applications were received at the FDS through the above channels and the applications were scrutinized by a committee chaired by the Project Co-coordinator and the suitable trainees were selected. Travel arrangements and hotel reservations were done by the FDS TCTP Office. The applicants arrived the day before the commencement of the course. The courses were developed through lectures, clinical demonstrations, hands-on practical work and study tours. At the end of each course, participants presented a working plan, which could be developed after returning to their country of origin.

In terms of evaluation and monitoring, the TCTP office in conjunction with Dr. Toru Nagao, Visiting Evaluation Expert from JICA, carried out an evaluation process with participants and instructors at the end of each year’s programme.

3.2. Achieved results in terms of output

Due to the nature of this type of technical cooperation, which does not count with a Project Design Matrix (PDM), it was necessary to elaborate a scheme of reference questions for the verification of Outputs achieved. We mention the referred tool and the results gathered as follows:

Output	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
1. Has the level of understanding of the knowledge, techniques and skills of participants in the field of training improved ?	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved
2. Are the Participants applying and disseminating the knowledge, techniques and skills acquired during the training courses in their work /clinical dental practice?	Partly achieved	Partly achieved	Partly achieved	Partly achieved	Partly achieved
3. Was the exchange net-work among partici-pants, resource persons and FDS established and strengthened?	Achieved to a great extent	Partly achieved	Achieved to a great extent	Partly achieved	Partly achieved

Table 3.1: Achievement in terms of outputs

As regards Output 1, the results of the terminal evaluation carried out among participants showed that 77% of the participants have stated that the level of both theoretical and practical knowledge has improved (Annexure VI, Q5). Only 9% have

said only their theoretical knowledge was increased and 14% have said only their practical skills have improved. Thus 100% have gained improvement in one or both of these domains.

In the terminal evaluation, 68% rated the knowledge acquired in the programme as excellent/sufficient (Q10).

Evaluation of participants by the TCTP office at the end of each annual programme (Annexure II, Q A-14) showed more than 90% of the participants assessed the applicability of the techniques and the knowledge they have gained through the programme in their country as very good and the rest evaluated the same as good. .

The Evaluation Team therefore considers this output largely achieved based on the results of the annual evaluation and the terminal evaluation at the end of the five year period of TCTP.

In relation to Output 2, 100% of the participants in the terminal evaluation mentioned that they are able to apply/deliver the knowledge and skills gained (Annexure IV, Q7). However only 32 % of the participants stated that they are able to achieve this to the “maximum” and 68% stated that their achievement in this regard is “average”. Most of them cited the lack of equipment, material, infrastructure, and finances for the less than “maximum” achievement. Some also do not have laboratories, and human resources to attain a high level of transfer of knowledge and skills.

In respect of the questionnaire sent to Heads of Departments or Institutions in the respective countries of origin of the participants, only few heads had responded and they are very happy about the training of their staff. They prefer to have the training programme in their own institution as more trainees can participate. However they stated that the facilities needed are not sufficient to sustain a project at their institution. Lack of finances and lack of laboratories are also some of the difficulties.

The Evaluation Team considers that it is important to highlight the fact that complete achievement of Output 2 is hampered by external factors to the TCTP training referred to above. As a result, it is possible to evaluate the output on the use of knowledge and skills acquired during the TCTP only as “partially achieved” notwithstanding the above limitations.

Regarding Output 3, the information received from instructors shows that a substantial number of participants maintained communication with their trainers and vice versa. It is estimated, albeit anecdotally, that about 30-40% maintains such contact. It must be remembered that the TCTP at the FDS involves multiple courses with maximum of one or two participants in each. In this situation a lack of contact by the single participant can give a high percentage of lack of contact in that course. So when the percentages are averaged it is likely that lack of contact may be reflected by a higher percentage. It has been observed that establishment of communication is higher with participants with good command of English than those with lower skills in the English Language.

The Evaluation Team considers that Output 3 is achieved to a great extent or at least partly depending on the year. It does not consider this as a negative point for reasons discussed in the last paragraph.

3.3. Achievements in terms of activities

The TCTP began in 2003 and continued until 2007, thus lasting for 5 years.

The TCTP was initially of 4 weeks and subsequently lengthened to 6 weeks. However, TCTP in 2007 was of 5 weeks duration. During these 4-6 weeks, trainees were given an intensive course in the disciplines of their choice.

During the period of 5 years, 54 participants from 12 Countries followed the TCTP training as shown in the table below.

Country	Number of participants
Tanzania	04
Kenya	09
Pakistan	01
Vietnam	06
Cambodia	04
Laos	05
Bhutan	03
Myanmar	05
Nepal	06
Uganda	02
Maldives	04
Bangladesh	05
Total	54

Table 3.2: Participating Countries and Number of participants

There were 14-17 training courses offered by the FDS to cater to the needs of the participants in a year. The table below shows the number of participants trained in the individual courses during the period of 5 years. Although the number of courses offered by the TCTP rose to 17 in 2007, a maximum of 14 courses only were chosen by trainees due to limitation in the number of trainees to 12. Thus some courses were not chosen in some years.

Course	Year of TCTP					Total No of trainees
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
Introduction to Fixed Appliances	02	02	02	02	02	10
Restorative Management in Paedodontics	-	-	01	02	01	04
Diagnosis and Management of Periodontal Diseases	01	01	02	-	01	05
Introduction to Basic Endodontics	03	01	02	-	01	07
Hands on Course in the construction of Cobalt Chromium Partial Dentures	01	01	-	02	01	05
Diagnostic Oral & Maxillofacial Pathology	01	01	-	-	01	03
Surgical Management of Cleft Lip and Palate	01	01	01	-	01	04
Minor Oral Surgery/Surgical Removal of Impacted Teeth	-	-	01	01	-	02
Surgical Treatment of Oral Cancer/Excision of tumour and	-	01	-	01	01	03

Reconstruction with Random and Pedicle flaps						
Basic Orthognathic Surgery	-	-	-	-	01	01
Effective Teaching Aids for Oral Health Promotion	-	-	-	-	01	01
Microbiology of Oral Diseases	02	-	-	01	-	03
Effective Teaching in Dental Sciences	-	-	02	-	-	02
Diagnosis and Management of Orofacial Pain and TMJ disorders and Oral Mucosal Diseases	-	02	01	01	-	04

Table 3.3: Details of the courses offered and number of participants in each course

3.4. Achievements in terms of inputs

The breakdown of the costs of the TCTP from 2003 to 2007 is shown in the table below in Sri Lanka rupees (SLR).

Fiscal Year	JICA	FDS,UPSL	Total	Number of participants	Cost per participant
2003	4,321,800.00	450,000.00	4,771,800.00	11	433,800.00
2004	5,751,500.00	677,500.00	6,429,000.00	10	642,900.00
2005	5,993,000.00	697,500.00	6,690,500.00	12	557,541.67
2006	4,978,000.00	550,000.00	5,528,000.00	10	552,800.00
2007	5,718,000.00	550,000.00	6,268,000.00	11	569,818.18
Total	26,762,300.00	2,925,000.00	29,687,300.00	54	549,764.81
Average	5,352,460.00	585,000.00	5,937,460.00	10.8	549,764.81

Table 3.4: Financial inputs

The input by the JICA amounted to SLR 26,762,300.00, just over 90% of the total budget through the support of air travel expenses, per diem, lodging and health insurance of 54 participants and the provision of consumables necessary to conduct training.

The input by the UPSL, in the form of supporting expenditure and cost of training amounted to 10%. The instructors contributed their services entirely voluntarily without any remuneration and this aspect has not been taken into consideration in the calculation of costs.

The variation in cost per participant was due to such factors as differences in the cost of long distance air tickets and non-availability of direct flights in the case of some participants. These factors varied each year as the countries and number of participants from different countries varied.

Inputs synthesis

Japanese side:

Experts/ Instructors:	Dr. Toru Nagao
Total Training expenses:	SLR 26,762,300.00 (airfares, per-diem, accommodation, medical insurances, consumables)
Equipment:	n/a

Sri Lankan side

Experts/ Instructors:	65
Local cost:	SLR 2,925,000.00 (administrative and supporting costs)
Remuneration for instructors	None
Equipment:	Free of charge
Land and Facilities:	Free of charge

Chapter 4

Evaluation Results

4.1 Evaluation based on 5 criteria

In order to gather evaluation results (outputs, outcomes and impacts) achieved by the Project, an annual as well as final evaluation scheme were used for guidance, focusing on questions based on 05 criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

4.1.1 Relevance:

The Project was designed and adequately implemented, meeting the needs of participating countries in the different disciplines of dentistry. The existing demands of dental specialized training in countries of South Asia and South East Asia and to a certain extent African countries were previously known and identified by the academics of the FDS through interaction with those countries in meetings and visits of delegates of South Asian Dental Federation, Commonwealth Dental Association meetings and Asia Pacific Dental Congress meetings in addition to JICA sponsored visits by faculty academics to Bangladesh, Cambodia, Nepal and Myanmar. The latter visits were specifically intended for planning relevant training courses.

The participants were offered to choose from 14-17 different courses (variable from year to year) the most relevant course to the participant's and his/her country's needs, thus ensuring relevance of the programme.

It was also possible to evaluate the relevance of the courses through the participants' comments, in relation to objectives. The results of the overall evaluation of relevance of the courses of the five TCTP programmes are as indicated in the following table (Table 4.1):

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very good	82%	75%	67%	90%	90%
Good	18%	25%	17%	10%	10%
Fair	0%	0%	16%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Ref : Annexure II Question 2.4

Table 4.1: Evaluation of the relevance of Course Objectives by participants

The annual feed back of the participants also can be shown to support the fact that the Project is still highly relevant. According to the Annual Evaluation (Annexure II), 100% of the participants stated that there is no topic in their individual programme that needs elimination (Q5, 8). In addition, more than 90% of the participants also confirmed that their expectation of the programme was mostly met or fully met (Q13).

The terminal questionnaire questioned them *inter alia* whether the same structure and organization of the programme could be adopted to their country (Annexure VI, Q15). 55% stated the same structure and organization of the programme without any modifications can be implemented in their country although 32% and 13% stated that these aspects of the programme need modifications or have to be totally different respectively. The fact that 55% stated that the structure and organization of the programme can be adopted without modifications to their country can be interpreted as evidence for the relevance of the courses in the opinion of majority of participants.

In terms of the relationship with JICA cooperation strategy, health sector has been one of the important areas of JICA cooperation. In addition, this TCTP was conducted based on the achievements made by the JICA technical cooperation project and implemented by fully utilizing the resources generated by the JICA project and Japanese grant aid project. Thus, this program can be considered as relevant cooperation to disseminate the outputs accumulated through the long term cooperation between JICA and the FDS to other countries which have similar needs.

4.1.2. Effectiveness

Project purpose

The knowledge and skills of the dental practitioners who were trained are improved through the various TCTP courses.

The project objective was achieved in a satisfactory way and it is considered effective throughout the five years of TCTP programmes.

54 dentists were successfully trained in five successive TCTP programmes on various disciplines of dentistry; they had acquired new technologies, experience new practices and improved their technical knowledge; the participants brought this knowledge to the working environment of their home institutions.

With regard to the questionnaire to instructors as well as interviews of other resource personnel it can be confirmed that 85% showed high learning capacity and at the same time presented final reports in very good technical quality on the subject of their training. Table 4.2 shows participants' achievements.

Excellent (more than 80%)	85%
Good (more than 60%)	15%
Average (more than 50%)	0%
Poor (less than 50%)	0%

Table 4.2 : Evaluation by trainers of participants' learning capacity

The evidence for completion of training is the certificate, and all participants received it. This has considerable impact for their sense of achievement. Although the certificate does not reflect the level of achievement, the Evaluation Team considers that the participants returned home with a great amount of new knowledge and experience which can be expected to cause significant impact on their institutions and contribute to the improvement of oral health in their countries.

Thus, it can be evaluated that the project purpose was achieved satisfactory and the TCTP can be considered to have been effective.

The following points can also be mentioned as contributing factors to improve effectiveness of the program;

1. The methodology and strategy adopted by the different departments of the FDS for the development of the TCTP courses: objectives, structure, organization and support;
2. The continuous evaluation of contents, structure and instructors, introducing the recommendations and comments of former participants and instructors; and
3. Quality of the technical material provided to the participants.

As previously mentioned, the participants confirmed the full comprehension of the contents. Most are making use of the knowledge acquired in their countries of origin. Thus, it can be concluded that the various courses of the TCTP have been effective in achieving the project objectives.

1.1.3. Efficiency

The three outputs generated were technically adequate, conducted in time and at reasonable costs for the achievement of the project objectives.

The efficiency in implementing the project is considered highly satisfactory in terms of significant efforts implemented by the Project Coordination Team in order to carry out activities with the agreed schedule and allocated resources.

In relation to the adequate timing of inputs, the various steps in the process of recruitment, travel arrangements, lodging reservations, per-diem allocation, daily transport from accommodation, conducting the different courses as per pre planned schedule, the distribution of teaching material, organization of study tours etc., were carried out flawlessly throughout the five years. This is evident from the feed back of the trainees who confirmed this fact.

The group of instructors did not have to be replaced for any reason during the five consecutive year of the TCTP.

In the five TCTP programmes, 54 dentists from 12 countries were trained for an average of 4.6 weeks with the total cost of SLR 29,687,300.00 (approximately US\$ 269,885). The average cost per person trained was SLR 549,764.81 (approximately US\$ 5,000).

It should also be evaluated that out of this average value, around 75% are cost of air travel, lodging, per-diem and health insurance for the foreign participants.

If the courses were carried out in Japan, the above cost would be significantly higher in all aspects of the course.

Through a cost- benefit analysis of this type of training in Sri Lanka, it is possible to conclude that the benefit is highly positive when results and short term outcomes achieved by the project are evaluated.

This cost benefit evaluation would be a lot more positive if we look at future oral health impact in medium term outcomes related to participants' contribution for the establishment of high levels of oral health care in the respective countries.

The efficiency displayed by the TCTP team of the FDS in the spheres of formulation of the Program Structure and the provision of Organizational support can be measured by the responses of the participants in the annual evaluations as shown in the following tables(Tables 4.2 & 4.3):

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very good	80%	62%	58%	50%	80%
Good	15%	20%	25%	50%	20%

Fair	05%	18%	17%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Ref : Annxure II Question 2.5

Table 4.2 Evaluation of the Program structure by participants

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very good	60%	52%	42%	50%	90%
Good	40%	48%	41%	50%	10%
Fair	0%	0%	17%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Ref: Annexure II Question 12

Table 4.3 : Evaluation of Organization and support participants received

The average costs for the execution of the project activities are in conformity with the cost of academic programme prevailing in Sri Lanka.

The Evaluation Team considered the project efficiency as very satisfactory on what concerns the significant efforts made by the FDS in order to improve its profile in the national and international scene.

4.1.4. Impact

Impact of the Project is considered to be achieved when the following statement is true: Knowledge and technologies related to the different disciplines of dentistry are applied and disseminated by participants in South and South East Asia and Africa.

The following indicators were observed in the TCTP Project from 2003 to 2007 :

1. Almost all the trainees have successfully concluded the training except one trainee who had to leave due to personal circumstances.
2. The trainees are qualified due to the fact that they reached satisfactory level of learning through self evaluation and evaluation of instructors at the time of training conclusion.

3. The trainees make use of their acquired knowledge and skills learned during the training at their work environment in their home countries.

The results and short term outcomes of the project were achieved throughout the five TCTP programmes and contributed to achieving the overall objectives. The participants returned home with a great amount of new knowledge and experience which can be expected to cause significant impact on their institutions and contribute to the improvement of oral health in their countries. The knowledge can be reproduced and contribute to the increase of quality of oral health in the public enterprises of the participant countries.

Through the analysis of the questionnaire, it can be stated that almost all participants are using the knowledge and skills acquired in the courses in their day to day work and are disseminating this knowledge to the other practitioners in their home countries. However, many of them face difficulties in completely incorporating the knowledge in their daily activities at work due to a lack of trained personnel and equipment, laboratory facilities and restriction of financial resources. Developing countries or least developed countries in particular face this situation. This is especially so in the state sector. Unfortunately the FDS does not have enough financial and technical resources to continue with the monitoring of the implementation of the project in the home countries of the participants.

However, the TCTP provided opportunity for the exchange of information among those involved such as: FDS academics and participants from 14 countries as well as the establishment of a horizontal collaboration between these institutions through email network. Furthermore, another important move is the beginning of activities of mutual cooperation between the FDS and countries participating in the courses such as the mutual cooperation agreement between a University in Pakistan and FDS.

Thus, although there may be difficulties in achieving the expected overall goals to the maximum, it is possible to expect that ex-participants could utilize and disseminate

their knowledge or skills gained in the TCTP with some support from the network of FDS academics and other participants.

In addition, 100% of the instructors stated that the TCTP project conduction produced very positive impacts for the capacity of the FDS on conducting such courses and also has tremendously improved the experience of the staff of the FDS in implementing new training projects. Although this was not clearly stated as the objective of the TCTP, the Evaluation Team considers that this is also one of the major impacts of the TCTP project.

4.1.5. Sustainability

The TCTP project could continue even after its conclusion as an effective method for the dissemination of knowledge and skills in different disciplines of dentistry by the FDS in order to promote oral health care in the participants' home countries.

The Project's sustainability was highly ensured during its execution due to: excellent management capacity; academic and other human, financial and technical resources, installations and equipments and scientific quality of the Training courses.

The capacity of the FDS to conduct courses was enhanced with the execution of the Project; it has also enhanced its profile internationally leading to increased demand from other countries for cooperation in the field of postgraduate education. As example for the latter, the request for opportunity to pursue postgraduate dental education at the FDS by dentists in countries visited by the Dean of the FDS, such as Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia and Pakistan. The recent mutual agreement signed between a dental school in Pakistan and the FDS by which postgraduate students of the former will spend part of their academic programme at the FDS can be cited as a further example.

The Evaluation Team believes that technical sustainability of the Project could be ensured in the coming years, since:

1. Introduction of some new courses and deepening the contents of the TCTP courses have been done;
2. The FDS has systematically carried out annual courses for the training of local dentists and allied personnel in the public and private sector in disciplines of dentistry such as basic sciences, oral and maxillofacial surgery, oral medicine, endodontics, paedodontics, periodontics, oral pathology, orthodontics, implantology, fixed prosthodontics etc.
3. The FDS has been taking part in the University Grants Commission (UGC) sponsored Quality Control Program through submitting to assessment by UGC's Subject Evaluation Teams.
4. The FDS has invested on capacity-building of its own human resources; keeps an action strategy for research projects and has introduced Teacher evaluation schemes.
5. The academics of the FDS are interacting with national and international networks of relevant institutions in medical and dental fields.
6. The FDS has good installations for the conduction of training courses, well trained resource personnel, very good experience in organizing the trainings, a financial and administrative support team and is considered a Centre of Excellence in dental education.

The basic organizational structure is stable. This structure has been characterized by adaptability to new course demands, research outcomes and social needs. The introduction of a 4 year Master of Surgery postgraduate programme in Restorative Dentistry and the Diploma in General Dental Practice course as a distance education programme through the Postgraduate Institute of Medicine, the establishment of the Dental Auxiliary Training School, the Unit for the Development of Dental Education, Computer Aided Learning Unit, Tobacco Cessation Unit etc are evidence of this adaptability. Furthermore, access to the internet has been vastly expanded and is now available freely to all the staff and students alike.

The University system is very stable. Thus institutional stability of the FDS can be assured almost indefinitely thus ensuring sustainability of any Project undertaken by the FDS.

In the financial aspect, the budget of the TCTP Project has remained stable except for variability due to external factors.

The organizational and institutional sustainability of the FDS is very satisfactory because it is nationally and internationally recognized for its capacity. The following table shows the institutional factors that have enabled, in the five years of the TCTP project, the realization of results and immediate outcomes of the Project:

Institutional factors	Level
Support of the high level of management of the UPSL	High
Legal structure and regulations	High
Organizational capacity	High
Capacity within the organization	High
Inter-organizational capacity	High
Availability of financial resources	High
Sufficient technical equipment	Moderately high
Resources for the acquisition of equipment	Insufficient to medium high
Resources for acquisition of consumable products	High
Support to Project beneficiaries	High
Support from National, Provincial and Municipal governments	High

Table 4.6 : Institutional factors that contributed to outcome

However, sustainability of a TCTP like Project is also dependent on:

1. Ensuring external funding, as the annual financial allocation from the governmental budget does not cover such projects.
2. The updating of some of the ageing equipment obtained through Japanese Grant Aid Project.

Thus, the Evaluation Team concludes that the sustainability of TCTP like projects is assured if external financial resources would be available together with support to update aging equipment.

4.2- Promoting and Inhibitory Factors of Project Outcomes

4.2.1. Factors related to the promotion of Project Outcomes

4.2.1.1. Factors related to the Project design plan

The TCTP project followed the Japanese Grant Aid Project to improve the Dental education of the FDS by improving the infrastructure, equipment and other related facilities and the Technical Cooperation Project that lasted for five years after the completion of the Grant Aid Project. The TCTP Project therefore, was based on very high level of resources in the form of equipment and manpower.

The Technical Cooperation Project had laid the foundation for successful outcomes of the TCTP Project, by augmenting the standard of infrastructure including equipment and human resources. The Technical Cooperation Project entailed training in Japan for FDS Academics, Technical and supportive staff.

4.2.1.2. Factors related to implementation

During the TCTP project implementation the following factors contributed to the promotion of outcomes.

- i. Effective management of the FDS in all the steps of implementation by providing Academic, Technical and Financial Management inputs.
- ii. Political support from the Sri Lanka Government establishments and the UPSL Administration for the effective implementation of the Project.
- iii. Excellent collaboration and cooperation between the resource personnel and the TCTP administration.

4.2.2. Inhibitory Factors of the Project Outcomes

4.2.2.1. Factors related to design and planning of the Project

There were no impeding factors related to design and planning.

4.2.2.2. Factors related to implementation

The need to adhere to the UPSL Financial Regulations during the early stages of the Project impeded efficient implementation of the Project. However, this requirement was relaxed towards the latter part of the Project and such impediments were largely overcome.

Chapter 5

Conclusions

5.1- Lessons learned:

5.1.1. Lessons learned related to the country situation and Project management.

The main lessons learned were the following:

1. In order to ensure more successful outcomes, lengthening of the period of the courses is needed. This was also confirmed by the end of course evaluation by trainees most of whom emphasized the short duration of the course.

2. Although our admission requirements insist on good ability in written and spoken English, on occasions some applicants have failed to meet this standard. This arose because we did not have an effective mechanism to evaluate this aspect of the candidates' ability. Such a mechanism has to be incorporated in the selection process. However it must be taken into consideration that some countries in the South East Asia conduct their Dental Education in languages other than English.

3. The comfort of the participants could have been improved with increasing per-diem commensurate with the annual inflation of Sri Lanka. Alternatively "half board" (including breakfast and dinner) arrangements in accommodation for the participants would have contributed to their happy stay in the country.

5.2. Recommendations

5.2.1. Recommendations to the FDS and UPSL (Sri Lankan counterpart)

1. The TCTP Project has to be implemented in a tight frame of time and the purchase of required consumables and related items has to be completed within this time frame. Therefore, the UPSL financial regulations, adherence to which causes lengthy delays can impede the effective implementation of the project. Although the UPSL relaxed

on these matters towards the latter part of the Project, some impediments still remained and this has to be addressed.

2. The FDS should introduce a mechanism in the selection process to effectively evaluate the ability in spoken and written English of the applicant by insisting on a recognized level of qualification such as IELTS or TOEFL or their equivalent.

5.2.2. Recommendations to JICA

The equipment which support the TCTP Project are ageing and have become non functional in some departments of the FDS. JICA has to relent on its prohibition of purchase of equipment from its budget, and effectively support the improvement of infrastructure equipment for efficient implementation of TCTP.

1. It is recommended that the duration of training and the number of participants are increased in order to meet the existing demand for places of training and to achieve a higher level of outcomes.
2. Provided that adequate financial, technical and infrastructure facilities are available, the resource personnel from the FDS can conduct courses in the participating countries themselves.
3. “Lesson learned 3” listed above under 5.1.1 should be taken into consideration.

5.3. Conclusion

The TCTP Project is in accordance with JICA policy that recipients of JICA Grant Aid and Technical Cooperation Aid should contribute to dissemination of knowledge and transfer of technology to neighboring and less developed countries of the world. Although this TCTP was not exclusively designed for African countries, the program was in conjunction with the recent Japanese ODA strategy to transfer knowledge from Asia to Africa since participants from African countries are included every year.

The Project relevance is considered as satisfactory and it can be concluded that the effectiveness of the different courses of the TCTP has also been high in achieving the project objectives.

The short term impact and immediate outcome achieved by the Project were evaluated as highly satisfactory, following the training of Dentists from South Asia, South East Asia and Africa. These professionals are using the knowledge and technologies improved by the courses, when financial, technical and infrastructure conditions in their home countries are favourable.

The outputs achieved by the Project were as best as can be expected, and were achieved within the planned time frame considering that TCTP in the dental field is unique.

The technical administrative and budgetary allocation of the UPSL/FDS was considered highly satisfactory. Similarly JICA's cooperation and assistance is highly valued.

The TCTP Project spanning from 2003 to 2007 has implemented 14 courses out of 17 courses offered in which 54 foreign and 22 local trainees were trained in various disciplines of dentistry. This high number of courses offered has to be considered as a major achievement in the field of international cooperation.

The Project purpose was quantified on what concerns of the subject trained in and the personnel trained and it was possible to identify an increase in the use of new knowledge and skills at their work places in their home countries. On the other hand, it is also noticed that there exists a greater demand for participation in the courses organized by the TCTP than the 10 - 12 vacancies offered annually, representing a high potential for the Project's continuation in the future.

Through the questionnaires, it was possible to identify new areas of interest of the alumni in participating in the TCTP courses. It was noticed that there were several applicants for the same course from some countries thus showing a very high demand for the courses. Hence there is a case to consider an increase in the number of trainees admitted for the TCTP Programme.

Finally, the Evaluation Team considers the TCTP Project as highly successful with high achievement in terms of output, activities and inputs. The outputs, project purpose and overall objective of the TCTP Project were achieved in a highly satisfactory way, as a result of the quality of training courses offered and effective implementation of the Project.

THIRD COUNTRY TRAINING PROGRAMME

Faculty of Dental Sciences - University of Peradeniya

Annual Evaluation Form for the Participant

(A) Training Programme (B) General Matters, (C) Others

Please mark ✓ on the number you have selected.

Write down your comments on the blank lines.

(A) TRAINING PROGRAMME

1. Did you receive information on the objectives and contents of our training/ study programme before coming to Sri Lanka? [1] Yes [2] No

If the answer is “ yes “, was the information sufficient?

[1] Sufficient [2] Insufficient

If the answer is “ insufficient” , what kind of information did you expect?

.....

2. How do you evaluate your training /study program on each of the following items?

2.1 Coverage of subject

[1] too broad [2] sufficient [3] too narrow

2.2 Depth

[1] too deep [2] sufficient [3] not deep enough

2.3 Logical order of topics

[1] very good [2] good [3] fair [4] poor

2.4 Relationship of each topic to the objectives of your training/study program

[1] very good [2] good [3] fair [4] poor

2.5 Time allocation for lectures, discussions, exercises, and observations, within the course

[1] very good [2] good [3] fair [4] poor

If your answer for the (5) question is **fair** or **poor**, indicate your opinion on each item separately?

Too much Sufficient Insufficient

Lectures	[1]	[2]	[3]
Clinical	[1]	[2]	[3]
Practical	[1]	[2]	[3]
Discussions	[1]	[2]	[3]
Observations	[1]	[2]	[3]
Others	[1]	[2]	[3]

3. What was the most beneficial and useful topic in the program?

4. If any topics were to be added to the program, what should they be?

5. If any topics were to be eliminated from the program, what should they be?

6. How do you evaluate the standard of the presentations of the lecturers in the training programme / study programme?

[1] all of them were good [2] many of them were good [3] fair [4] many of them were poor [5] all of them were poor

If your answer is [4] or [5], please specify the reason(s) and give an example.

7. How do you evaluate the guidance and directions given by lecturers on each of the following occasions?

	All of them were good	many of them were good	fair	many of them were poor	all of them were poor
Clinical	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Practical	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Discussions	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Observations	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Others	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

If your answer is [4] or [5], please specify the reason(s) and give an example.

8. Regarding the common lecture series

How do you assess the lecture series

[1] all of them were good [2] many of them were good [3] fair [4] many of them were poor [5] all of them were poor

Do the topics cover wide area

[1] too broad

[2] sufficient

[3] too narrow

Your comments on common lecture series

.....
If any topic/s are to be added to the common programme what should they be?

.....
If any topic/s are to be eliminated from the common programme what should they be?

9. How do you evaluate the following items?

Very good good fair poor very poor

9.1 Printed material [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
Write your comments

9.2 Equipments [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
Write your comments

9.3 Clinical Sessions [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
Write your comments

9.4 Lecture Discussions [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
Write your comments

9.5 Consumables [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
Write your comments

9.6 Field Work [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
Write your comments

10. How do you assess the duration of your training/ study program?

[1]too long [2]sufficient [3]too shot

If your answer is[1] or [3] , please specify the reason(s) and suggest an appropriate duration

.....

11. How do you field about the level of intensity of your training/study program?

[1]too leisurely [2] fair [3]too hard

12. How do you evaluate the general administration and management of your training / study Programme ?

[1]very good [2]good [3]fair [4]poor [5]very poor

13. Were your expectations of this program met?

[1]fully met [2]mostly met [3]somewhat [4]not met

14. How do you assess the applicability of the techniques and knowledge you have obtained through this Training/study program in your country?

[1]very good [2]good [3]fair [4]poor [5]very poor

If your answer is[1] or [2], please describe how or what would you like to apply

.....

If your answer is[4] or [5] , please specify the reason(s)

.....

(B) GENERAL MATTERS

1 Before you left your country, did you receive sufficient information on your flight arrangements,

visa application, orientation for arrival at an airport in Sri Lanka, etc.?

[1]yes [2]No

If your answer is no what kind of information did you need?

.....

2 (1) How do you evaluate the hotel accommodation?
[1]very good [2]good [3]fair [4]poor [5]very poor

(2) What do you think about the geographical location of the hotel
[1]satisfactory [2]fair [3]average [4]poor [5]very poor

any comments regarding hotel accommodation
.....

(3) What do you think about the transport provided between the hotel and the faculty?
[1]satisfactory [2]fair [3]average [4]poor [5]very poor

any comments regarding transport
.....

3 (1) Did you any receive medical treatment during your stay?
[1]Yes [2] No

(2) How do you evaluate the medical services made accessible to you ?
[1]very good [2]good [3]fair [4]poor [5]very poor

If your answer is poor or very poor, please specify the reason(s).
.....

4 How often did you have a face the language problem in communicating with Sri Lankan people outside your training/study program?
[1]often [2]sometimes [3]rarely

5 Do you think the amount of allowances paid by JICA was sufficient?
[1]completely sufficient [2]reasonable [3]insufficient

6 Do you think briefing on allowances, accommodations, medical services, etc. was appropriate?
[1] appropriate [2]inappropriate

If your answer is inappropriate, please specify the reason(s)
.....

7. About the meals- Lunch and Dinner

1. Did you have problems about Lunch? [1] yes [2] no
if yes please specify
.....

2. Did you have problems about Dinner? [1] yes [2] no
if yes please specify
.....

8 Did you participate in the general orientation, before started the program?

- [1]Yes [2]No

If your answer is yes,
(1)How do you evaluate it?

- [1]very good [2]good [3]fair [4]poor [5]very poor

If your answer is **poor** or **very poor**, please specify the reason(s).

.....

9 Did you participate in any of the social programs such as Sri Lankan traditional culture programs, and / or sightseeing's etc.?

- [1]Yes [2] No

If your answer is yes , were they interesting?

[1]All of them were interesting.[2]Some of them were interesting. [3]None of them was interesting

What was the most interesting program for you?

.....

(C) OTHERS

Please feel free to answer the questions below on a voluntary basis. Your answers would by referred to in organizing some activities to deepen peoples' understanding on international cooperation, inter- cultural communication, etc.

1 How much your understanding about Sri Lanka was deepened?

- [1]very much [2]to some degree [3]a little [4]unchanged

2 (1) What kind of overall impression for Sri Lanka did you get from your stay here?

- [1]very favorable [2] favorable [3]fair [4] unfavorable [5]very unfavorable

if your answer is very favorable or favorable please explain

.....

if your answer is very unfavorable or unfavorable please explain

.....

(2) What kind of overall impression for Japan did you get from your stay here?

- [1]very favorable [2] favorable [3]fair [4] unfavorable [5]very unfavorable

if your answer is very favorable or favorable please explain

if your answer is very unfavorable or unfavorable please explain

.....

3 In one word, how would you describe your impression on Sri Lanka?

.....

4 What is the biggest pleasant memory of your stay in Sri Lanka?

.....

5 What gave you the biggest trouble during your stay in Sri Lanka?

.....

6. What would you fetch as souvenirs of Sri Lanka to your family and friends?

.....

7. In your view , what kind of further international cooperation does your country(or community)need? (Please focus on human resource development) .

.....

8. How do you understand the selection procedure, which selects you out of other applicants of your own country for this programme?

[1] Priority of the subject area

[2] Seniority/position of the candidates

[3] Priority decided upon the date of your application for overseas training

[4] Candidates were recommended by some senior persons

[5] Your achievements in the subject area

[6] Decision of the Government

[7] Unknown procedure

[8] Other

please write your comments if any regarding the selection procedure

.....

8. Any other comments.

.....

THIRD COUNTRY TRAINING PROGRAMME

Faculty of Dental Sciences - University of Peradeniya

Summary of the Results of Annual Evaluation Form for the Participant (2003-2007)

- (A) Training Programme
- (B) General Matters
- (C) Others

(A) TRAINING PROGRAMME

1. Did you receive information on the objectives, content and schedule of your training/ study program before coming to Sri Lanka?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Yes	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
No	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

If your answer yes, was the information sufficient?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Sufficient	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Insufficient	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Comments					

If your answer is insufficient, what kind of information did you need?

2. How do you evaluate your training /study program on each of the following items?

2.1 Coverage of subject

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Too broad	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sufficient	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Too Narrow	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

2.2 Depth

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Too depth	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sufficient	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Not deep enough	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Logical order of topics

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very Good	75%	65%	70%	70%	80%
Good	20%	25%	30%	25%	20%
Fair	05%	10%	0%	5%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Relationship of each topic to the objectives of your training/study program

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very Good	82%	75%	67%	90%	90%
Good	18%	25%	17%	10%	10%
Fair	0%	0%	16%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Time allocation among lectures, discussions, exercises, and observations, within the course

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very Good	80%	62%	58%	50%	80%
Good	15%	20%	25%	50%	20%
Fair	05%	18%	17%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

If your answer to the last item (5) is **fair** or **poor**, how did you find the amount of time allocated to each of the following items?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Lectures	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient
Clinicals	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient
Practical	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient
Discussions	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient
Observations	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient
Others	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient	sufficient

3. What was the most beneficial and useful topic in the program?

Different answers which cannot be categorized

4. If any topics were to be added to the program, what should they be?

The answers are different which cannot be categorized.

5. If any topics were to be eliminated from the program, what should they be?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Topics that need elimination	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
None	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

6. How do you evaluate the standard of the presentations of the lecturers in your training /study program?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
all of them were good	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Many of them were good	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Many of them were poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
all of them were poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

7. How do you evaluate guidance and directions given by lecturers on each of the following Occasions?

Clinical:

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
all of them were good	100%	95%	100%	90%	100%
Many of them were good	0%	5%	0%	10%	0%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Many of them were poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
all of them were poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Practical

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
all of them were good	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Many of them were good	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Many of them were poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
all of them were poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Discussions

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
all of them were good	100%	100%	90%	100%	100%
Many of them were good	0%	0%	10%	0%	0%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Many of them were poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
all of them were poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Observations

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
all of them were good	100%	80%	100%	90%	100%
Many of them were good	0%	20%	0%	10%	0%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Many of them were poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
all of them were poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Others

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
all of them were good	100%	100%	90%	80%	100%
Many of them were good	0%	0%	10%	20%	0%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Many of them were poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
all of them were poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

8. Regarding the common lecture series

How did you assess the lecture series

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
all of them were good	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%
Many of them were good	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Many of them were poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
all of them were poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Do the topics cover wide area

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Too broad	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
sufficient	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Too narrow	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Your comments on common lecture series

There are different comments which cannot be categorized but most of them were positive.

If any topic/s were to be added to the common programme what should they be?

Different answers which cannot be categorized.

If any topic/s were to be eliminated from the common programme what should they be?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Topics that need elimination	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
None	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

9. How do you evaluate the following items?

9.1 Printed material - Write your comments

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very good	75%	80%	65%	60%	70%
Good	25%	20%	35%	40%	30%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

9.2 Equipments -Write your comments

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very good		70%	75%	60%	
Good	100%	30%	25%	40%	100%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

9.3 Clinical Sessions - Write your comments

Most of them have commented the clinical sessions were very interesting.

9.4 Lecture Discussions – Write your comments

Most of the trainees wrote positive comments.

9.5 Consumables - Write your comments

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Adequate	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
inadequate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

9.6 Field Work - Write your comments

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very good	95%	90%	75%	30%	80%
Good	5%	10%	25%	70%	20%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

10. How do you assess the duration of your training/ study program?

If your answer is [1] or [3] , please specify the reason(s) and suggest an appropriate duration

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Too long	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sufficient	25%	20%	35%	40%	30%
Too Short	75%	60%	65%	60%	70%

11. How did you feel about the level of intensity of your training/study program?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Too leisurely	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Fair	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Too hard	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

12. How do you evaluate the general administration and management of your training/study Program?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very good	60%	52%	42%	50%	90%
Good	40%	48%	41%	50%	10%
Fair	0%	0%	17%	0%	0%
poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

13. Were your expectations of this program met?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Fully met	20	0%	0%	0%	05%
Mostly met	80	95%	90%	85%	95%
Somewhat	0%	5%	10%	15%	0%
Not met	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

14. How do you assess the applicability of the techniques and knowledge you have obtained through this Training/study program in your country?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very good	100%	90%	95%	90%	100%
Good	0%	10%	5%	10%	0%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

(B) GENERAL MATTERS

1 Before you left your country, did you receive sufficient information on your flight arrangements?

Visa application, orientation for arrival at an airport in Sri Lanka, etc.?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Yes	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
No	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

2 (2.1) How do you evaluate the hotel accommodation?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very good	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Good	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

(2.2) What do you think about the geographical location of the hotel?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Satisfactory	60%	75%	80%	70%	90%
Fair	40%	25%	20%	30%	10%
Average	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Any comments regarding hotel accommodation

Comments vary and cannot be categorized. Most have stated positive comments and few have mentioned that the food at the hotel is expensive.

(3) What do you think about the transport provided between the hotel and the Faculty?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Satisfactory	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Average	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Any comments regarding transport?

NONE in all the years

3 (3.1) Did you receive medical treatment during your stay?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
yes	None	01 trainee	01 trainee	None	None
no					

(3.2) How do you evaluate the medical services made accessible to you?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very good	95%	90%	70%	85%	60%
Good	05%	10%	30%	15%	40%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

4 How often did you have to face the language problem in communicating with Sri Lankan people outside your training/study program?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Often	5%	0%	5%	0%	0%
Sometimes	90%	100%	95%	100%	100%
Rarely	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%

5 Do you think the amount of allowances paid by JICA was sufficient?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Completely sufficient	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Reasonable	50%	55%	45%	45%	40%
Insufficient	50%	45%	55%	55%	60%

6 Do you think briefing on allowances, accommodations, medical services, etc. was appropriate?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Appropriate	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Inappropriate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

If your answer is inappropriate, please specify the reason(s)

7. About the meals- Lunch and Dinner

7.1. Did you have problems about Lunch? If yes please specify

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Yes	75%	85%	80%	70%	60%
No	25%	15%	20%	30%	40%

7.2. Did you have problems about Dinner? If yes please specify

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
yes	90%	95%	85%	85%	80%
No	10%	05%	15%	15%	20%

8 Did you participate in the general orientation, before started the program?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
yes	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
No	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

If your answer is yes, (1)How do you evaluate it?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very good	75%	50%	65%	55%	75%
Good	25%	50%	35%	45%	25%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

9 Did you participate in any of the social programs such as Sri Lankan traditional culture program, or Sightseeing's etc.?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
yes	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
No	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

If your answer is yes, were they interesting?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
All of them	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Some of them	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
None of them	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

What was the most interesting program for you?

Different replies which cannot be categorized.

(C) OTHERS

1 How much was your understanding of Sri Lanka deepened?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very much	100%	95%	100%	100%	95%
To some degree	0%	5%	0%	0%	5%
A little	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
unchanged	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

2 (2.1) What kind of overall impression for Sri Lanka did you get from your stay here?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very favourable	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Favourable	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
unfavourable	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

if your answer is very favorable or favorable please explain

There are different comments which cannot be categorized but most of them were positive.

(2.2) What kind of overall impression for Japan did you get from your stay here?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very favourable	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Favourable	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
unfavourable	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

if your answer is very favorable or favorable please explain

There are different comments which cannot be categorized but most of them were positive.

3 In one word, how would you describe your impression of Sri Lanka?

There are different comments which cannot be categorized but most of them were positive.

4 What is the biggest pleasant memory of your stay in Sri Lanka?

There are different comments which cannot be categorized but most of them were positive.

5 What gave you the biggest trouble during your stay in Sri Lanka?

Most of the participants commented on food.

6. What are you going to take to your family and friends as souvenirs of Sri Lanka?

THIRD COUNTRY TRAINING PROGRAMME

Faculty of Dental Sciences - University of Peradeniya

Annual Evaluation Form for the Trainers

(A) Training Pogramme (B) General Matters

Please mark ✓ on the number you have selected

Write down your comments on the blank lines

(A) TRAINING PROGRAMME

1. How do you evaluate your training /study program on each of the following items?

Coverage of subject

[1] too broad [2] Sufficient [3] too narrow

Depth

[1] too depth [2] Sufficient [3] not deep enough

Logical order of topics

[1] very good [2] fair [3] poor

Relationship of each topic to the objectives of your training/study program

[1] very good [2] fair [3] poor

Balance of time allocation among lectures, discussions, exercises, and observations

[1] good [2] fair [3] poor

If your answer to the last item (5) is **fair** or **poor** , how did you find the amount of time allocated to each of the following items?\

Too much Sufficient too little

Lectures	[1]	[2]	[3]
Clinicals	[1]	[2]	[3]
Practicals	[1]	[2]	[3]
Discussions	[1]	[2]	[3]
Observations	[1]	[2]	[3]
Others	[1]	[2]	[3]

3. If any topics are to be added to the programme, what should they be?

.....

4. If any topics are to be eliminated from the program, what should they be?

.....

5. How do you evaluate the following items?

	Very good	good	fair	poor	very poor	
5.1 Printed material	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	
Write		your				comments

.....

5.2 Training /equipments	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	
(Write your comments)						

.....

5.3 Clinical Sessions	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	
(Write		your				comments)

.....

5.4 Lecture Discussions	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	
(Write		your				comments)

.....

5.5 Consumables	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	
(Write		your				comments)

.....

5.6 Field Work	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	
(Write		your				comments)

.....

6. How do you assess the duration of your training/ study program?

[1]too long [2] Sufficient [3]too shot

If your answer is[1] or [3] , please specify the reason(s) and suggest an appropriate duration

.....

7. How did you find the level of Intensity of your training/study program?

[1] too leisurely [2] Sufficient [3] Too hard

8. How do you evaluate the general administration and management of your training/study Program ?

[1] very good [2] good [3] fair [4] poor [5] very poor

(B) GENERAL MATTERS

1. How did you find the knowledge of English among the participants?

- [1] completely sufficient [2] reasonable [3] insufficient

2. How did you find the knowledge of subject matter among the participants ?

- [1] completely sufficient [2] reasonable [3] insufficient

How do you rate the learning capacity of your trainees?

- [1] excellent (>80%) [2] good (>60%) [3] average(>50%) [4] poor(<50%)

4. How did you find the general behaviour of participants ?

- [1] very good [2] good [3] fair [4] poor [5] very poor

5. Did you participate in any of the social programmes with participants ?

- [1] yes [2] no

If your answer is yes, were they interesting ?

- [1] All of them were interesting [2] Some of them were interesting [3] None of them was interesting

What was the most interesting programme for you ?

.....
6. Did the commitment for this training programme affect your daily routine work load ?

- [1] heavily affected [2] moderately affected [3] did not affect

7. About how many times a year would you be happy to carry out such a training programme?

.....
8. What is / are the most suitable period/s year for your division to carry out such a programme ?

9. How should we select the participants next year?

.....
10. Do you have any opinion about the TCTP programme management?

.....
11. If you have any ideas to improve the 1) programme 2) course next year, please write them.

.....
12. Any other comments?

THIRD COUNTRY TRAINING PROGRAMME

Faculty of Dental Sciences - University of Peradeniya

Summary of the Results of Annual Evaluation Form for the Trainers (2003 – 2007)

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TRAINERS

(A) Training Programme, (B) General matters

Please mark ✓ on the number you have selected

Write down your comments on the blank lines

TRAINING PROGRAMME

1. How do you evaluate your training /study program conducted by you on each of the following items?

1.1 Coverage of subject

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Too broad	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sufficient	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Too Narrow	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

1.2 Depth

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Too broad	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sufficient	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Too Narrow	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Logical order of topics

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very Good	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Relationship of each topic to the objectives of your training/study program

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very Good	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Balance of time allocation among lectures, discussions, exercises, and observations

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Good	85%	80%	85%	80%	90%
Fair	15%	20%	15%	20%	10%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

If your answer to the last item (5) is **fair** or **poor**, how did you find the amount of time allocated to each of the following items?

Lectures

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Too much	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sufficient	85%	90%	95%	90%	90%
Too little	15%	10%	05%	10%	10%

Clinicals

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Too much	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sufficient	80%	85%	90%	95%	90%
Too little	15%	15%	10%	05%	10%

Practicals

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Too much	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sufficient	95%	90%	95%	90%	95%
Too little	05%	10%	05%	10%	05%

Discussions

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Too much	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sufficient	100%	95%	90%	95%	100%
Too little	0%	05%	10%	05%	0%

Observations

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Too much	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sufficient	85%	90%	95%	90%	90%
Too little	15%	10%	05%	10%	10%

Others

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Too much	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sufficient	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Too little	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

If any topics were to be added to the program, what should they be?

Nothing to be added

4. If any topics were to be eliminated from the program, what should they be?

Nothing to be eliminated.

5. How do you evaluate the following items?

5.1 Printed material - Write your comments

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very Good	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Good	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

5.2 Training /equipment

Write your comments

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very Good	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Good	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

5.3 Clinical Sessions

Write your comments

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very Good	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Good	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

5.4 Lecture Discussions -Write your comments

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very Good	50%	60%	70%	45%	80%
Good	50%	40%	30%	55%	20%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

5.5 Consumables

Write your comments

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very Good	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Good	90%	90%	80%	70%	80%
Fair	10%	10%	20%	30%	20%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

5.6 Field Work

Write your comments

A very few academic members participate at the field work.

6. How do you assess the duration of your training/study program?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Too long	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sufficient	90%	90%	85%	90%	90%
Too short	10%	10%	15%	10%	10%

If your answer is[1] or [3] , please specify the reason(s) and suggest an appropriate duration

*Suggestions were :
three months
two months*

7. How did you find the level of intensity your training/study program?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Too leisurely	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sufficient	99%	98%	100%	99%	99.5%
Too hard	1%	2%	0%	1%	0.5%

8. How do you evaluate the general administration and management of your training/study program?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very good	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Good	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

(B) GENERAL MATTERS

1 How did you find the knowledge of English language among the participants?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Completely sufficient	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Reasonable	90%	90%	90%	95%	95%
Insufficient	10%	10%	10%	5%	5%

2 How did you find the knowledge of Subject matter among the participants?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Completely sufficient	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Reasonable	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Insufficient	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

How do you rate the learning capacity of your trainees?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Excellent >80%	90%	80%	75%	90%	90%
Good >60%	10%	20%	25%	10%	10%
Average >50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor <50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

How did you find the general behavior of participants?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Very good	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Good	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Fair	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

5. Did you participate in any of the social programs with participants?

Some have participated and some have not.

If your answer is yes, were they interesting?

Those participated have commented all of them were good

Did your commitment for this training programme affected your daily routine workload?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Heavily affected	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Moderately affected	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Did not affect	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

7. About how many times a year would you be happy to carry out such a training program?

Only once a year

8. What is/are the most suitable period/s for your division to carry out such a Programme?

End of the year (September – November)

How should we select the participant next year?

*By short listing according to how they will utilize this training back in their country. By evaluating their understanding in – English , This will be essential
From OMF Consultants/SR who like to learn detailed management of Cleft lip/Cleft Palate*

Do you have any opinion about the TCTP programme management?

It will be more appropriate to select at least two trainees for each course

If you have any ideas to improve the 1) programme 2) course next year, please write them.

There is no pre and post programme communication with trainee/Trainers. If you can establish contact(.Teleconference with them before hand, a facility which we are technically capable & Practiced) a trainee will get much benefit than now

12. Any other comments.

**Terminal Evaluation Form - Third Country Training
Programmes (TCTP) (From 2003 to 2007)**

Faculty of Dental Sciences, Sri Lanka and JICA Sri Lanka are planning to revise the prospective Third Country Training Programmes based on the experience gained from programmes conducted in the past. Help us to make the improvements by completing this questionnaire.

Name of the participant: ----- Address: -----

Institute: ----- Country: -----

Tel/Fax-----

The name of the course followed: -----

Relevance of it for your day to day practice: -----

On which basis were you selected for the TCTP programme?

Are you engaged in (Please tick in appropriate box):

(a) Teaching: Yes No

(b) Clinical practice: Yes No

Private:

Government:

Both:

(c) Teaching /Clinical practice: Yes No

1. Do you think that your knowledge was improved after following the course?

Yes

No

5.1. If the answer is “YES” to question 5, please indicate in which of the following areas?

- (a) Theory (b) Practical (c) Both

5.2. If answer is “NO” please give reasons briefly:

What is your opinion on the duration of the programme?

- (a) Too long
(b) Too Short
(c) Optimum in length

2. Do you have the necessary facilities in your institute or country to practice what you have studied during the course?

- (a) Financial (b) Infrastructure (c) Equipments (d) Material

3. At what level, were you able to deliver the benefits of your training to your fellow professional/people of your country?

- (a) Maximum (c) Minimum
(b) Average (d) Not at all

4. Was there encouragement from your institute/administration to practice what you have studied from the course? Yes No

5. Indicate problems and barriers that you faced in delivering your knowledge and skills after the training programme:

6. Do you think the knowledge you have gained is

- (a) Inadequate (b) Sufficient (c) Excellent

7. Do you consider it would be more beneficial if a similar programme is conducted in your own country by using foreign expertise rather than sending one person abroad for training?

- Yes No

Based on the answer in question 12 please add your comments if any:

8. Are there the following facilities in you own institute to conduct a similar programme?

(a) Equipment

(c) Expertise

(b) Infrastructure

(d) Financial

9. Is it possible to conduct a similar programme in your institute/country if resource personal is provided Yes No

13.1. If answer to is “YES” to question 13, where do you proposed to conduct the programme (In your own institute or institute located in a central place of your country with suitable facilities)?

My own institute

Any other institute

Both

(in my country)

If the answer is NO to question 13, please give your suggestions as how to provide a similar training programme for dental surgeons in your country: -----

10. What are the anticipated problems and barriers, if a similar programme is planned to be conducted in you own country with foreign expertise?

11. If the training programme could be conducted in your country how should it be organized/structured ?

(a) Similar

(b) Need modifications

(c) Totally different

17. Depending on the needs of your country what would be the most appropriate field to be selected for a training programme? -----

18. Are there any difficulties in conducting such a programme in English?

Yes

No

If the answer is “YES” to question number 21, Please give your comments:

Head of the institute who nominated the candidate

1. Do you think the training of Dr/Mr./Mrs. was useful to your institute /people of your country?

2. Are you happy about the performance of the candidate after the training?

Yes No

3. Are trainees entitled for study leave for a programmes of this nature

Yes No

4. Depending on the needs of your country what field of study (in dentistry) do you suggest for training? -----

5. Do you consider it would be more beneficial if a similar programme is conducted in your own country by using foreign expertise rather than sending one person abroad for training.

Yes No

Based on the answer, please add your comments if any: -----

6. Do you think that there is a need of a feasibility study before conducting such a programme in your own country? Yes No

7. Are there the following facilities in you own institute to conduct a similar programme?

(a) Equipment (c) Material

(b) Infrastructure (d) Financial

8. Is it possible to conduct a similar programme in your institute/country if resource personal is provided Yes No

9. If answer to is “YES” to question 14, where do you proposed to conduct the programme

(In your own institute or institute located in a central place of you country with suitable facilities)

My own institute

Any other institute
(in my country)

If the answer is NO to question 14, please give your suggestions as how to provide a similar training programme for dental surgeons in your country.-----

10. What are the anticipated problems and barriers, if a similar programme is planned to be conducted in you own country with foreign expertise? -----

Name of the Head -----

Designation -----

Address -----

Country -----

Telephone/Fax -----

Results of the Terminal Evaluation Form

**Third Country Training Programmes (TCTP)
(From 2003 to 2007)**

**Please note that the total number of respondents is 22 but answer was not given to some questions, so the total number for each question does not necessarily become 22.*

Name of the participant: ----- Address: -----
 InSTITUTE: ----- Country: -----
 Tel/Fax-----

The name of the course followed: -----
 Relevance of it for your day to day practice: -----

On which basis were you selected for the TCTP programme?

Are you engaged in (Please tick in appropriate box):

- (a) Teaching: Yes **21** No **01**
- (b) Clinical practice: Yes **22** No
- Private: **02**
- Government: **12**
- Both: **08**
- (c) Teaching /Clinical practice: Yes No

Do you think that your knowledge was improved after following the course?
 Yes **22**

- 5.2. If the answer is “YES” to question 5, please indicate in which of the following areas?
- (a) Theory **2** (b) Practical **3** (c) Both **17**

5.2. If answer is “NO” please give reasons briefly:

What is your opinion on the duration of the programme?

(a) Too long **01**

(b) Too Short **11**

(c) Optimum in length **10**

Do you have the necessary facilities in your institute or country to practice what you have studied during the course?

(a) Financial **5** (b) Infrastructure **12** (c) Equipments **12** (d) Material **10**

At what level, were you able to deliver the benefits of your training to your fellow professional/people of your country?

(a) Maximum **4** (c) Minimum

(b) Average **15** (d) Not at all

Was there encouragement from your institute/administration to practice what you have studies from the course? Yes **14** No **3**

Indicate problems and barriers that you faced in delivering your knowledge and skills after the training programme:

***Most of them do not have equipment, material, infrastructure, finances.
Some do not have laboratories, human resources***

Do you think the knowledge you have gained is

(a) Inadequate **7** (b) Sufficient **9** (c) Excellent **5**

Do you consider it would be more beneficial if a similar programme is conducted in your own country by using foreign expertise rather than sending one person abroad for training?

Yes **17** No **05**

Based on the answer in question 12 please add your comments if any:

Some says that more people can participate. Among these, most of them says that it is impossible as they do not have facilities. Some says that it is impossible.

Are there the following facilities in you own institute to conduct a similar programme?

Head of the institute who nominated the candidate

Do you think the training of Dr/Mr./Mrs.was useful to your institute /people of your country?

Are you happy about the performance of the candidate after the training?

Yes No

Are trainees entitled for study leave for a programmes of this nature

Yes No

Depending on the needs of your country what field of study (in dentistry) do you suggest for training? -----

Do you consider it would be more beneficial if a similar programme is conducted in your own country by using foreign expertise rather than sending one person abroad for training.

Yes No

Based on the answer, please add your comments if any: -----

Do you think that there is a need of a feasibility study before conducting such a programme in your own country? Yes No

Are there the following facilities in you own institute to conduct a similar programme?

(a) Equipment (c) Material

(b) Infrastructure (d) Financial

Is it possible to conduct a similar programme in your institute/country if resource personal is provided Yes No

If answer to is “YES” to question 14, where do you proposed to conduct the programme (In your own institute or institute located in a central place of you country with suitable facilities)

My own institute Any other institute (in my country)

If the answer is NO to question 14, please give your suggestions as how to provide a similar training programme for dental surgeons in your country.-----

What are the anticipated problems and barriers, if a similar programme is planned to

be conducted in you own country with foreign expertise? -----

Name of the Head -----

Designation -----

Address -----

Country -----

Telephone/Fax -----

Only few heads have responded and they are very happy about the training of their staff. They are willing to have the training programme in their own institutions as more can participate. However, most have stated that due to lack of facilities this may be difficult. Lack of finances and lack of laboratories are some of the other difficulties.