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# Introduction

In this section you will need to describe:

* Who the workshop was funded by
* The aim of the workshop (e.g. ‘It aimed to provide theoretical understanding and practical experience in four different TB diagnostic techniques’)
* Who the session leads were, where they were from and which sessions they lead (this can be formed into a table, as below)
* A summary of how many attendees and where they were from (e.g. There were 19 attendees from 10 African countries and representing CANTAM, EACCR2, TESA, PANDORA and PanACEA). This can also be formed into a table, see below.
* A summary of the previous experience of the attendees (e.g. The attendees had a wide range of experiences, from experienced laboratory managers to those with little to no previous experience in the workshop techniques).
* Who organised the workshop (e.g. lead and administrative assistants from the organising institutions)
* How the workshop was run (e.g. theoretical, practical, discussion and recap sessions, (i.e. interpretation of results, quizzes on methods and a chance to ask the instructors specific questions about techniques).
* Brief summary of the evaluation form results (e.g. Student engagement and participation throughout was good. Evaluation forms were filled in by all of the students and participation certificates were awarded at the end of the workshop).
* Any extra information:
* Was there a group meal was organised to encourage networking?
* Did you share delegate, protocol and presentation information to encourage networking in the future?
* Were photos/videos taken for social media/other purposes. If so, mention if this increased followers etc.

# Agenda

Provide an outline of your agenda, as in the example below:

**Day 1: date – main topic of the day**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Title** | **Instructor** |
| 09:00 – 11:00 | Welcome and introduction, overview of laboratory methods  Discussion – expectations and questions | All |
| 11:00 – 11:30 | Tea break | All |
| 11:30 – 12:30 | Theory session 1 | Instructor 1 |
| 12:30 – 14:00 | Lunch break | All |
| 14:00 – 17:00 | Theory session 2 | Instructor 1 |

**Day 2: date – main topic of the day**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Title** | **Instructor** |
| 09:00 – 10:30 | Practical session 1 | Instructor 2 |
| 10:30 – 11:00 | Tea break | All |
| 11:00 – 12:30 | Practical session 2 | Instructor 2 |
| 12:30 – 14:00 | Lunch break | All |
| 14:00 – 15:00 | Theory session 1 | Instructor 3 |
| 15:00 – 17:00 | Practical session 3 | Instructor 1 |

**Day 3: date – main topic of the day**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Title** | **Instructor** |
| 09:00 – 11:00 | Theory session 1 | Instructor 4 |
| 11:00 – 13:30 | Tea break | All |
| 11:30 – 12:30 | Practical session 2 and 3 | Instructor 3 and 4 |
| 12:30 – 14:00 | Lunch break | All |
| 14:00 – 15:00 | Discussion and recap session | Instructor 2 |
| 15:00 – 16:00 | Wrap up session | All |

# Instructors

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Institution and country** | **Session** |
| Instructor 1 | e.g. University College London, United Kingdom | e.g. Theory 1 and 2, practical 3 |
| Instructor 2 |  |  |
| Instructor 3 |  |  |
| Instructor 4 |  |  |
| Instructor 5 |  |  |

Table 1. Instructors and their sessions

# Attendees

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Institution** | **Country** | **NoE** |
| Person 1 | e.g. FCRM | Republic of Congo | e.g. PANDORA |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 2. List of attendees, their institutions, countries and NoE affiliation

# Results of evaluation form

You will need to analyse the results of the evaluation forms and provide the scores etc. below. This will help you identify things like:

* Which topic/technique the participants were already most familiar with
* Which topic was least known before the workshop
* Which topic people found most interesting
* What general things about the workshop people liked and what they thought could be improved

This information can be summarised in a few paragraphs and also using tables. The use of charts is encouraged, as the information is clearer to visualise and interpret.

You will need to consider what information you want from your participants before you create the evaluation score e.g. how much they felt they improved (Q1. Rate your knowledge of X before the workshop and Q2 Rate your knowledge on X after the workshop).

Attendees were asked to fill out an evaluation form by rating questions with a score of 1-5, with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 being ‘strongly agree’. The average score for each question is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Average score for each question

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Session** | **Previous experience score** | **Post session score** | **% improvement** |
| **Session 1** |  |  |  |
| **Session 2** |  |  |  |
| **Session 3** |  |  |  |
| **Session 4** |  |  |  |
| **Session 5** |  |  |  |

Table 4. Average scores and percentage increase in perceived knowledge for each session