

## **Postabortion Care Technical Meeting**

### **Moving Forward with Postabortion Care—Emerging Models from Five Countries**

**March 18-19, 2008**

#### **FRONTIERS/ACQUIRE/USAID**

##### **Evaluation Form Results**

**N=11**

Attendees of this two-day program were asked to evaluate the sessions, provide comments, and offer recommendations. Eleven forms were returned with two reflecting attendance for only one of the two days. Since the forms did not fully accommodate rating of all the sessions, it was not possible to show meaningful percentages of responses therefore synthesis of responses are captured below.

##### **Day One**

The overwhelming majority of respondents agreed/agreed strongly that the sessions were satisfactory; had adequate time, provided new knowledge, and offered interaction:

- Introduction & Opening Remarks, G. Steele
- PAC overview & Strategy, C. Curtis
- Decentralization: Tanzania, J. Pile
- Structured OJT, E. Lu

While the session on Decentralization: Senegal, S. Ramarao was rated highly for new knowledge, respondents felt that the time was not adequate for the depth of content and was consequently minimally interactive.

The afternoon session, “Update on USG Compliance” was found to very interactive by respondents, several noted that they had been “trained too many times” and the that the session was “too long”.

##### **Day Two**

Higher numbers than Day One were reflected in Day Two sessions. Again, the overwhelming majority of respondents agreed/agreed strongly that the sessions were satisfactory; had adequate time, provided new knowledge, and offered interaction:

- Overview of Community Action Cycle, C. Tran
- Community Mobilization Panel, Curtis, Dinev, Ottolenghi
- COMMPAC/Kenya, N. Russell

Respondents made a point of sharing that more time for information presented by C. Curtis and E. Ottolenghi would have been appreciated; an opportunity for question and answer

following N. Russell's presentation was desired. E. Ottolenghi was noted to have presented "excellent, concrete recommendations". One respondent felt that the "COMMPAC/Kenya" should have been included in the panel and the "Overview of Community Action Cycle" should have followed the panel.

Although the numbers was not as high as for the community presentations, "What is the value of a PAC Second Visit?" respondents agreed or strongly agreed in each of the four categories of assessment.

Few respondents evaluated the concurrent sessions since the forms did not accommodate these sessions, however, for those who wrote in these session, ALLOCATE and Structured OJT feature positively, followed by Community Mobilization. The Donor session was only acknowledged by 2 respondents (neutral).

### **General Comments**

- ✓ Informative!
- ✓ Good meeting! Very well-organized; very relevant topics; good resources provided. Leaving with new ideas for what my organization can do in PAC.
- ✓ Let us network during lunch; did not schedule a speaker with such a short meeting.
- ✓ How about more fruit in continental breakfast and afternoon; and/or as dessert instead of high "carbs", calories, sweets. Nice food overall, though!
- ✓ Good, interesting meeting.
- ✓ Good meeting with some new information on PAC. This would be helpful for our program. Thanks for organizing this.