Evaluation Report

Pilot Lebanon 2018

Introduction to the project:

The Community Mobilization in Crisis (CMIC), risen from the collaboration between the University of Ottawa and the American University of Beirut, is a multidisciplinary project that seeks to enhance the resilience and strength of refugee and host communities in Lebanon, as well as marginalized communities elsewhere, through education and mobilization.

With this purpose, since 2014, the project has developed an open-education resource, as well as in-person trainings, to enhance knowledge, skills and abilities of leaders on community mobilization, valuing participatory and sustained initiatives where community members plan, carry out, and evaluate projects collectively to meet their needs and improve their own wellbeing.

In August 2018, Community Mobilization in Crisis (CMIC) implemented its pilot course on Community Mobilization with the American University of Beirut and the local community in the Bekaa Valey. The four-week pilot course took place from () to () and included in-class sessions and online sessions. The course was piloted among 14 participants (initially 15 but one dropped out); among seven females and seven males between the age group of 18-49. Eleven out of Fifteen were university graduates, two from vocational training and one from school. The majority of the participants work either in NGOs or international organization. Initially, the group of participants was supposed to include an equal representation of Lebanese and Syrians but ended up with four Lebanese, eight Syrians, one PRS, and one PRL.

Purpose of the Evaluation and Methodology:

Prior to this four-week pilot, CMIC had a one-day workshop in Ottawa to pilot the platform and material; however, as the first in-depth pilot, this is vital for producing learning and supporting future projects. The purpose of the evaluation is to examine the effectiveness of the course curriculum and the implementation of the pilot program in order to inform future programming decisions and identify areas for improvement. The participatory nature of this pilot course ensures that diverse viewpoints are considered, and that input is sought from all of those involved in the pilot program, such as the students (participants), program facilitators (trainers) and co-directors. The mixed-method evaluation plan utilizes participatory based qualitative and quantitative research methods; input from two participant focus groups, program reports, and de-briefings, as well as weekly pilot questionnaires.

Evaluation Highlights:

- It is recommended that the course content emphasize theoretical material on community mobilization and provide a unit on what community mobilization is and how it differentiates from other forms of community work (example NGO and service provision).

- In terms of modules/units, participants stated they benefited the most from the unit on *What is a Community*, the unit on *Leadership*, the unit on *Evaluation*, and the unit on *Burnout*.
- During the focus groups, participants acknowledged that the case studies were helpful in illustrating community mobilization – but that the approaches and the contexts were sometimes contradictory, more service provision (NGO work) or almost impossible to undertake in Lebanon.
- The content lacked an emphasis on community mobilization in crisis, and how to overcome challenges and barriers (support and funding) in the context and lived reality of the participants "state of crisis."
- During the focus groups participants noted that content was sometimes confusing and unclear – this is owing to the language and the fact that the content was translated from English to Arabic.
- This is the first time many of the participants have encountered some of the terms and concepts; therefore, many felt that the modules could have been more detailed and informative, especially in terms of providing definitions --- extra resources.
- Participants noted that there should be a better balance between the videos and readings and that it was necessary to add more background readings to some of the videos. On the other hand, there were some comments that with the limited amount of time that the participants were provided with, the readings were sometimes too long and that instead they should have been condensed and supplemented with optional readings.
- Participants recommended that the course have a syllabus that contains summaries of the modules and the purpose of the session and the main learning points. Since many are used to the university style structure, this would have helped in terms of referring back to the content for clarity and organization. In addition, some participants recommended hard copies of the readings because reading online was new to them and they do not always have access to their tablets.
- Participants did not feel that they would have been able to benefit from the pilot if it was an online-only course. Many felt that the online portions on their own would cause confusion and misunderstanding and that the in-class discussions were vital as they helped clarify confusion, concepts, and allowed the exchange of skills, experiences, and points of views.
- The program facilitators acknowledged that the material should have been completed before the course began because giving a session one day and working on the next day's module was stressful for the facilitators and time limiting for the students.
- The questionnaires revealed that participants felt that the time to study the material on their own was largely insufficient.
- During the focus groups, many of the participants acknowledged that the pilot was too short and that they did not have sufficient time to complete the online activities and to properly study. The online portion and online tasks required a quick turnover (the time between having access to the material and the time to complete them) that was difficult because the modules took hours to complete and correctly understand.
- The program facilitators acknowledged that the material should have been completed before the course began because giving a session one day and working on the next day's module was stressful for the facilitators and time limiting for the students. The questionnaires

revealed that participants felt that the time to study the material on their own was both insufficient and somewhat insufficient.

- The online portion and online tasks required a quick turnover (the time between having access to the material and the time to complete them) that was difficult because the modules took hours to complete and correctly understand.
- During the focus groups, participants emphasized that the in-class lectures/discussions did not provide sufficient time to cover all the information and points adequately. Some participants suggested a lecture style overview that should be followed by an open discussion with more time allocated to both.
- Although the plan was that program facilitators would read student e-portfolios ahead of time and incorporate student ideas in during face-to-face discussions, this did not take place. Moreover, some of the facilitators noted that the students handed in responses that lacked depth and thoughtful effort and that they did not have time to go over all the student responses in time for the next in-class session. During the focus groups, participants raised the concern around the lack of feedback on their e-portfolios and how they felt unsure of whether they were adequately answering the questions or on the right or wrong track.
- According to the program facilitators; The e-portfolio, google forms, and tablets were not tested ahead of time, and they were difficult to manage by students and created some mishaps along the way. The e-portfolio was not user-friendly for the participants, and the forms and submission process was confusing at the beginning. Due to internet connection problems and tablet issues, sometimes the students were unable to submit their work on time (the night before the in-class sessions) or had to repeat their work halfway through because of loading issues.
- Regarding the quality of the technology, the participants raised the fact that the volume in the videos was sometimes not clear and the translations were too fast to follow along with – in which participants suggested providing transcribed documents.
- All of the participants suggested that the material and database should be accessible offline without the need for the internet and that they connect online once they have saved their work and need to submit assignments.

Detailed Evaluation findings:

Questionnaire results:

Quantitative data was collected through weekly questionnaires (three in total throughout the pilot) to measure content, accessibility, support, and structure. The majority of participants filled out these questionnaires at the end of each week. (Please find the questionnaire results attached).

Focus groups results:

Qualitative data was collected through focus groups –the purpose of which was to gather in-depth information on participants experience and their opinion on the course content and structure, as well as the knowledge and skills they gained or enhanced from participation in the

pilot. Additionally, the qualitative data will support the quantitative data collected from the weekly questionnaires. The project evaluator, Norma Roumie, facilitated the focus groups in which the participants were split as evenly as possible into two groups; the first with six participants and the second with seven participants (one participant was missing). The groups were split based on personality types and inner groups dynamics in order to ensure an open environment where everyone can engage. Additionally, the facilitator ensured that participants had the opportunity to provide input and comments and that the environment was comfortable and responsive. The first five minutes were spent introducing the purpose of the focus group as well as the rules. Additionally, the focus groups began with warm-up exercises in which participants introduced themselves with a few adjectives to describes themselves as community mobilizers. Pre-determined questions were used to facilitate the discussion while allowing participants also to lead the discussions. Observational reports by the program facilitators supplement the data from the focus groups.

The following questions were used to facilitate group discussions and gather insights from participants.

Content - knowledge/skills:
1.   Did the organizers make the concept of community mobilization clear? Has your definition of this changed? How different is it from NGO/service? Would you have liked a session on what community mobilization is?
2.   What module did you like the most and why?
3.   What new skills did you gain during this pilot? How did this pilot help you?
4.   How did you feel about the case studies and videos from the region? Did they change your perspective and expectations about what is possible in the Lebanese context?

Almost all of the participants have varying degrees of NGO experience that facilitators felt strongly influenced them – this was evident by the "we will do it for them" NGO mentality of providing communities with services. Despite this, the program facilitators felt that they were able to shift this mentality among some of the participants by emphasizing that mobilization needs to be done within and with the communities in order to empower the communities and facilitate change. Communal ownership of initiatives was a major focus throughout the discussions with the participants as they designed and developed their initiatives. It is important to note that the program facilitators also felt that they should have spent more time at the beginning of the pilot discussing the meaning of community mobilization, especially in juxtaposition to service delivery and how they differ in terms of capacity, empowerment, and mobilization. As a result, the facilitators felt that "What is Community Mobilization" should be developed as an introductory module in the online curriculum.

During the focus groups, participants elaborated that the concept of community mobilization was not that clear at the very beginning, however, many noted that progressively the concepts and terms became clearer (especially in the second week) through the class discussions and the online portal. Although they admitted that community mobilization has to be gradually

understood through discussions and examples, an introductory background would have been helpful. In line with this, participants felt that by the end of the pilot they were able to differentiate between community mobilization and NGO work, and because of their NGO background they gained not just theory but practical difference and information that has enhanced the way they think of mobilization. It is evident that participants view on their role within the community has changed and they now view mobilization as engagement and activism within the community. An example, according to one of the participants "I used to think that I have nothing to do with it/ not my responsibility, now I know how people used to work on social issues and support each other." Another participant "At first I had a different idea as a person who works in community mobilization at the NGO, organizing and mobilizing are different than service, they might have same goals but the methods and processes differentiate, there are similarities but community organizing, engagement and empowering people to differ." Nonetheless, for future implementation it is recommended that the certificate program provides participants with theoretical material on community mobilization and its core principles in a way that differentiates it from other forms of community work (which may include NGO work).

In terms of modules/units, participants stated they benefited the most from the unit on *What is a Community*, the unit on *Leadership*, the unit on *Evaluation*, and the unit on *Burnout.* Participants agreed that the unit on *What is a Community* changed their views towards their community, one participant stated that they "started viewing the community in a different way, I started thinking about the needs, partnerships and engaging members, before I used to develop a project and deliver it to the community now I started thinking of ways to engage them" and another participant stated that "we changed some projects so we could tackle the community's needs, now we know that a community is not a bunch of individuals located in the same place, it is more than that." In regards to the unit on *Burnout*, participants felt that it taught them how to pause, question and adjust - one participant admitted that it changed his life "it taught me when I need to stop and start again, I make mistakes but my eyes open to new ideas/things." The unit on *Group Processes on Evaluation taught participants the importance of evaluation, one participant* acknowledged that "any project needs evaluation, also throughout the project to assess whether or not I achieved my goals, it gives me the green light to proceed or change and adjust to make the project successful." Others felt that leadership helped them link the course to their work, especially in terms of the types of leadership they come across and engage with. According to the participants, the pilot built on previously superficial skills – it improved their skills and enhanced their knowledge as well as added value to the kind of work they can now do – it opened up their trajectory of initiatives and future community work. Moreover, this is evident in the weekly questionnaires in which 90% of the participants felt that they very often or always gained ideas that they expect to use in their work.

Additionally, the final debriefing questionnaire revealed that 93.3% of participants felt that the materials use of case studies and scenarios really helped them gain a clearer understanding of the content. Moreover, the questionnaire revealed that the majority of participants felt that the material very often or always provided with different examples and different perspectives. During the focus groups, participants acknowledged that the case studies were helpful in

illustrating community mobilization – but that the approaches and the contexts were sometimes contradictory, more service provision (NGO work) or almost impossible to undertake in Lebanon. Many of the case study examples are from Palestine and participants felt that they were empowering but not applicable or possible to mobilize that way in Lebanon, the exception being the Naameh landfill. All of the participates agreed that the pilot did offer steps on how to mobilize a community and where to start, but that the content lacked an emphasis on community mobilization in crisis, and how to overcome challenges and barriers (support and funding) in the context and lived reality of the participants "state of crisis." It is important to note that the Syrian participants felt that the state of their country and their "Syrian community in crisis" meant that they are facing very difficult challenges and problems without a core of support, community bonds, or trust. In addition, many of them noted that their status in Lebanon prevented them from doing many things and that they faced internal and external barriers and are limited in terms of support (Lebanese support), politics, rules, and municipalities, mobilizing funding, and even networking. The participants stated that the context of the Palestinian mobilizers in Palestine showcased in the materials were not the same as the reality that they, as Syrian refugees, are living through in Lebanon. Therefore they found difficulties in relating their context and possibilities of designing initiatives to that of the Palestinians'. The participants who are living in a refugee context requested more examples from their own communities and realities. It should also be noted that the Lebanese participants felt that community mobilization is generally difficult due to the country's structure problems, policies, funding scene, and the state of affairs.

Structure:
1.   Suggestions on how to convey the material; how could the advisors convey the material differently?
2.   Did you feel that the online content was aligned with the class content?
3.   what did you think about the video-heavy modules? What about the text-heavy modules? Comments?

The questionnaires show that participants felt that the concepts started to become clearer in the second week –in the first week, 46% of participants believed that the concepts were either sometimes clear or just clear enough and 53.9% felt that the concepts were very often or always clear. In the second week, 27.3% of participants felt that the concepts were clear enough and 72.8% felt the concepts were very often or always clear. There was an evident increase from week one to week two, in which participants felt better equipped with the knowledge to understand the concepts. However, during the focus groups participants noted that content was sometimes confusing and unclear – this is owing to the language and the fact that the content was translated from English to Arabic. It was felt that some concepts or terminologies are better understood in English than in Arabic and could have been left in both languages. In line with this, participants noted that the question formulations were unclear and that they sometimes struggled to understand the questions or aim of the questions – and often they were also too long. As well, participants stated during discussions that they were expecting to find their answers in the videos and felt unsure and confused when they did not directly find the "right answer". This was discussed during the first session on how the traditional learning system in the region forces

students to recite and reproduce materials without engagement and questioning. Participants shared their own experiences with the school systems growing up in Syria, Lebanon, and in UNRWA schools and critiqued these structures and emphasized the need for change.

Moreover, this is the first time many of the participants have encountered some of the terms and concepts; therefore, many felt that the modules could have been more detailed and informative, especially in terms of providing definitions. For example, concepts like "Aouna" and "Aldamj w Al Moa'rada" were not clear or well explained/defined. Due to this, some participants admitted to having used the internet to acquire additional information that may not have always been accurate, hence for future implementation of the certificate program it is recommended that definitions should be elaborated and reinforced with other resources.

In terms of the video-heavy modules and text-heavy modules, participants enjoyed the videos because they presented the essence (summaries) as well as supported and complemented the readings. Despite this, some noted that there should be a better balance between the videos and readings and that it was necessary to add more background readings to some of the videos. On the other hand, there were some comments that with the limited amount of time that the participants were provided with, the readings were sometimes too long and that instead they should have been condensed and supplemented with optional readings. Based on the questionnaires, 72.8% of participants (initially 84.7% in the first week) felt that the content very often or always reinforced and complemented the lessons learned in the online material (initially 84.7% 92.3% in the first week). The questionnaires reveal that in the second-week participants felt that the concepts were clearer and it is unclear why this was the case. Notedly, 86.7% of participants felt that the content very clearly stated learning goals, participants recommended that the course have a syllabus that contains summaries of the modules and the purpose of the session and the main learning points. Since many are used to the university style structure, this would have helped in terms of referring back to the content for clarity and organization. In addition, some participants recommended hard copies of the readings because they don't always have access to their tablets and reading online was new to them.

The pilot certificate program has an online portion that was supplemented with in-class attendance – with the eventual goal of becoming an online-only course. Notedly, participants did not feel that they would have been able to benefit from the pilot if it was an online-only course. Many felt that the e-portfolio on its own would cause confusion and misunderstanding and that the in-class discussions were vital as they helped clarify confusion, concepts, and allowed the exchange of skills, experiences, and points of views. This allowed for interactive learning and the opportunity to connect the material to reality – this is especially true during the guest speaker presentation in the final week of the pilot, one participant summarized the thoughts of the focus group "…a person came and told us about personal experience, I felt like this he summarized the whole modules, I saw leadership, experience and challenges in that session, we experienced something real, I recommend that each unit would host someone like that, along with the videos it would be complimentary, he was supportive, interactive and we asked as much questions as we wanted."

Support:
4. How did you feel about the workload/study? Was the time enough, time management?
5.   In terms of discussions, what were your expectations, that the instructors would facilitate, lead a lecture, review content? And how was that expectation met or not met? And what did you prefer?
6. Based on the questionnaire, many of you felt that the time was insufficient, why did you feel this way?
7. Did you feel like you could have worked online without the face to face sessions?

The pilot program was on a tight four-week schedule that impacted not only the participants but also the program facilitators. For example, the program facilitators acknowledged that the material should have been completed before the course began because giving a session one day and working on the next day's module was stressful for the facilitators and time limiting for the students. The questionnaires revealed that participants felt that the time to study the material on their own was insufficient. During the focus groups, many of the participants acknowledged that the pilot was too short and that they did not have sufficient time to complete the online activities and to properly study. The online portion and online tasks required a quick turnover (the time between having access to the material and the time to complete them) that was difficult because the modules took hours to complete and correctly understand. Participants felt that this became tiring because they were taking a lot of work home and that this meant they also needed to take work leave in order to complete their assignments/readings. This is supported by the midterm questionnaire that revealed that 54.6% of the participates felt that the timing of the course to their learning was not very suitable or suitable enough. Even in terms of the long readings – the major complaint was in regards to having insufficient time to properly read and not the content or actual length of the readings. Moreover, the questionnaire revealed that participants felt that the time allocated for discussions was either somewhat sufficient or adequate (and more somewhat sufficient than adequate in the second week). During the focus groups, participants emphasized that the in-class lectures/discussions did not provide sufficient time to cover all the information and points adequately. Some participants suggested a lecture style overview that should be followed by an open discussion with more time allocated to both. The program facilitators did notice a decrease in the excitement following the first week, and it should be noted that many of the participants said that their enthusiasm did not decrease, however, their energy may have due to the workload and time constraints.

It should be noted that the program facilitators created a participatory teaching environment in which the participants lead the discussions and learning activities. Based on the questionnaire results, the participants and trainers, as well as the participants among each other, had a good relationship that improved significantly throughout the pilot. The participants commented that the despite the lack of time to sometimes cover all the material, the facilitators tried both inside and outside the classroom to be readily available to answer any questions or assist with their learning. In order to answer questions and address concerns, the facilitators shared their numbers with the participants to contact on Whatsapp or via a direct phone call. The initial time to contact

the facilitator providing support was set from morning till 5 PM, however since the majority of the participants were only able to work on the online materials after their work day ended, questions were sent at late hours. Although the plan was that program facilitators would read student e-portfolios ahead of time and incorporate student ideas in during face-to-face discussions, this did not take place. The deadline to submit the e-portfolio was set at 5 PM the evening before the in-person session was set to happen, however, due to time constraints, work, and home responsibilities, some participants submitted late at night or during the day of the session. Moreover, some of the facilitators noted that the students handed in responses that lacked depth and thoughtful effort and that they did not have time to go over all the student responses in time for the next in-class session. During the focus groups, participants raised the concern around the lack of feedback on their e-portfolios and how they felt unsure of whether they were adequately answering the questions or on the right or wrong track. This could have been rectified on the end of the program facilitators, in terms of providing instant feedback and support to the students. On the other hand, the program facilitators acknowledged that communication was an issue during class, that participants with stronger personalities dominated the discussions and despite the facilitators best efforts to thwart this it remained a pattern throughout the pilot. Despite some participants comments in the questionnaire that some participants dominated the discussions, 90% of the participants felt that they very often or always had the opportunity to share their perspectives. Moreover, participants supported each other outside of the classroom by maintaining contact through a WhatsApp group and helping each other with the content and learning process. This formed a strong bond between the participants and created a supportive environment.

Technical issues;

According to the program facilitators; The e-portfolio, google forms, and tablets were not tested ahead of time, and were not equipped with Acrobat Reader and had their software updated, and they were difficult to manage by students and created some mishaps along the way. The e-portfolio was not user-friendly for the participants, and the forms and submission process were confusing at the beginning; however, this was rectified after the first week. Due to internet connection problems and tablet issues, sometimes the students were unable to submit their work on time (the night before the in-class sessions) or had to repeat their work halfway through because of loading issues. Regarding the quality of the technology, the participants raised the fact that the volume in the videos was sometimes unclear and the transcriptions were too fast to follow along with – in which participants suggested providing transcribed documents. Moreover, all of the participants suggested that the material and database should be accessible offline without the need for the internet and that they connect online once they have saved their work and need to submit assignments.

1 = Never 2 = Sometimes 3 = enough 4 = very often 5 = always

Weekly Module Survey (1st)
Content
General Questions

Analysis	QUESTIONS	RATE
Participants felt that the concepts started to become clearer in the second week –in the first week, 46% of participants felt that the concepts were either sometimes clear or just clear enough and 53.9% felt that the concepts were very often or always clear. In the second week, 27.3% of participants felt that the concepts were clear enough and 72.8% felt the concepts were very often or always clear. There was an evident increase from week one to week two, and participants felt better equipped with the knowledge to understand the concepts.	Were the concepts of this unit clear?	Week 1: Sometimes – 23.1% Enough – 23.1% Very often – 38.5% Always – 15.4 % Week 2: Enough – 27.3% Very often – 36.4% Always – 36.4%
In the first week, 23% of participants felt that the content very often or always provided them with critical ideas. In the second week this number drastically increased to 63.7% of participants feeling that the content provided them with critical ideas.	How often did the content provide you with critical ideas?	Week 1: Never – 7.7% Sometimes – 23.1% Enough – 46.2% Very often – 15.4% Always – 7.7% Week 2: Sometimes - 27.3% Enough – 9.1% Very often – 45.5% Always – 18.2%
In the first week, 53.9% of participants felt the material very often or always provided them with different examples. In the second week this number increased to 72.7% of participants feeling that the material provided them with different examples.	How often did the material provide you with different examples?	Week 1: Sometimes – 7.7% Enough – 38.5% Very often – 46.2% Always – 7.7% Week 2: Sometimes – 9.1% Enough – 18.2% Very often – 54.5% Always – 18.2%

In the first week, 61.6% of participants felt that the units very often or always provided them with different perspectives. In the second week, this number increased to 91% of participants feeling that the units very often or always provided them with different perspectives.	How often did the unit provide you with different perspectives?	Week 1: Sometimes - 15.4% Enough – 23.1% Very often – 38.5% Always – 23.1% Week 2: Enough – 9.1% Very often – 45.5% Always – 45.5%
From the first week participants felt they had the opportunity to share their perspectives (84.6% felt that they very often or always felt this way). In the second week this increased to 90.9% and remained relatively high.	How often did you feel that you had the opportunity to share your perspective?	Week 1: Sometimes – 7.7% Enough - 7.7% Very often – 53.8% Always – 30.8% Week 2: Sometimes – 9.1 Very often – 27.3 Always – 63.6%

Specific questions
1st Module - 1st Week - Objective: *Thinking and working with community*

Analysis	QUESTIONS	RATE
In the first week, 84.6% of participants felt that the activities and learning materials very often or always helped them get more of a sense of themselves as community mobilizers. In the second week, this number decreased to 72.6% and it is unclear why.	How much did the activities and e-learning materials help you to get more sense of yourself as a community mobilizer?	Week 1: Sometimes – 7.7% Enough – 7.7% Very often – 53.8% Always – 30.8% Week 2: Sometimes – 27.3% Very often – 54.4% Always – 18.2
84.7% of participants felt that the activities very often or always helped them get a better sense of others when working as community mobilizers. This number increased to 90.9% in the second week.	How much did the activities help you to get a better sense of others when working as community mobilizers?	Week 1: Enough – 15.4% Very often – 46.2% Always – 38.5% Week 2: Enough – 9.1% Very often – 63.6% Always – 27.3%

53.9% of participants felt that the activities very often or always helped them find ways of working better in groups. This number remained relatively stagnant into the second week of the pilot.	How much did the activities help you to find ways of working better in groups?	Week 1: Enough – 46.2% Very often – 23.1% Always – 30.8% Week 2: Enough – 45.5% Very often – 27.3% Always – 27.3%
84.7% of participants felt that they very often or always gained ideas that they expect to use in their work. This number increased to 90% in the second week.	How much did you gain ideas that you expect to use in your work?	Week 1: Enough – 15.4% Very often – 46.2% Always – 38.5% Week 2: Sometimes – 9.1% Enough – 54.5% Very often – 36.4%

- Structure of the activities

VARIABLES	QUESTION	CHECK IN QUESTION
Week 1: Enough – 15.4% Very often – 46.2% Always – 38.5% Week 2: Sometimes – 9.1% Enough – 18.2% Very often – 27.3% Always – 45.5%	Did the content…	Reinforced the lessons learned in the online material? 84.7% of participants felt that the content very often or always reinforced the lessons learned in the online material. In the second week, this number decreased to 72.8%.
Week 1: Enough – 7.7% Very often – 53.8% Always - 38.5% Week 2: Sometimes - 9.1% Enough - 18.2% Very often – 27.3% Always – 45.5%		Complemented the content of the online material? 92.3% of participants felt that the content complemented the online material. However, this decreased significantly in the second week, to 72.8%.

Week 1: Sometimes – 7.7% Enough – 15.4% Very often – 46.2% Always – 30.8% Week 2: Enough – 18.2% Very often – 45.5% Always – 36.4%		Promote skills discussed in the online material? 77% of participants felt that the contented promoted skills discussed in the online material. This number increased to 81.9%.
Week 1: Sometimes - 7.7% Enough - 15.4% Very often – 38.5% Always – 38.5% Week 2: Enough – 27.3% Very often – 18.2 Always – 54.5%		There is no clear relationship between online materials and in-person activities 77% of participants felt that there was very often or always no clear relationship between online materials and in person activities. This number decreased to 72.7%. in the second week.
Week 1: Sometimes - 15.4% Enough - 38.5% Very often – 30.8% Always – 15.4% Week 2: Sometimes – 9.1% Enough – 27.3% Very often – 36.4% Always – 27.3%		How much did the sequence of the activities in this module help you to understand the content? Almost more than half of the participants felt that the sequence of activities in the first week of modules sometimes helped or helped enough in understanding the content. In the second week, more than half of the participants felt that the sequence of activities in the modules very often or always helped them understand the content.

1 = insufficient
2 = somewhat insufficient
3 = adequate
4 = somewhat excessive
5 = excessive
6 = no opinion

VARIABLES   QUESTION   RATE

How adequate was each aspect below with respect to quantity or intensity?

Between the first and second week, participants felt that the time allocated for discussions was either somewhat sufficient or adequate, however, in the second week it seemed that participants felt that the time was more somewhat sufficient than adequate.

In the first week, 76.9% of participants felt that the interaction between participants and trainers was adequate, and 23.1% felt it was somewhat excessive or excessive. In the second week, the number of participants that felt it was somewhat excessive or excessive increased to 45.5%.

In the first week, a majority of participants (69.2%) felt that the interaction among participants was adequate and 23.1% felt that it was either excessive or somewhat excessive. In the second week, participants felt better about their interactions with each other, 54.5% felt it was adequate and 45.5% felt it was either excessive or somewhat excessive.

In the first week, 15.4% of participants felt that the time to study the material on their own was insufficient, 53.8% felt it was somewhat insufficient and 30.8% felt it was adequate or excessive. In the second week, 18.2% of participants felt it was insufficient, 45.5% felt it was somewhat insufficient and 36.4% felt it was adequate. Over the two weeks, it is clear that most participants felt that the time was both insufficient and somewhat insufficient.

Between the first and second week, it is clear that a majority of participants felt that the amount of work to do in the in-person sessions was good, in the second week this satisfaction decreased and more participants felt it was adequate.

a) Time allocated for discussions
b) Interaction between participants and trainers
c) Interaction among participants
d) Time available to study the materials on your own during the activity
e) Amount of work to do between in-person sessions

a) Week 1:
Insufficient – 7.7%
Somewhat sufficient – 38.5 %
Adequate – 38.5%
Somewhat excessive – 15.4 %

Week 2:
Somewhat sufficient – 63.6%
Adequate – 36.4%

b) Week 1:
Adequate – 76.9%
Somewhat excessive – 7.7%
Excessive – 15.4%

Week 2:
Adequate – 54.5%
Somewhat excessive – 9.1%
Excessive – 36.4%

c) Week 1:
Somewhat insufficient – 7.7
Adequate – 69.2%
Somewhat excessive – 15.4%
Excessive – 7.7%

Week 2:
Adequate – 54.5%
Somewhat excessive – 27.3%
Excessive – 18.2%

d) Week 1:
Insufficient – 15.4%
Somewhat insufficient – 53.8%
Adequate – 23.1%
Excessive – 7.7%

Week 2:
Insufficient – 18.2%
Somewhat sufficient – 45.5%
Adequate – 36.4%

e) Week 1:
Insufficient – 7.7%
Somewhat insufficient – 7.7%
Adequate – 15.4%
Somewhat excessive – 53.8%
Excessive – 15.4%

Week 2:
Insufficient – 9.1%
Somewhat sufficient – 9.1%
Adequate - 46.4%
Somewhat excessive - 36.4%
Excessive – 9.1%

Midterm evaluation (week 2):

Variable	Question	Rating
Logistics – environment	How adequate is the location for the activities? Participants were split up in regards to whether the location for the activities was adequate, some felt it was not at all or not very adequate, others felt it was adequate enough, and others felt it was quite or very much adequate.	1 = Not at all 2 = Not very 3 = enough 4 = quite 5 = very much Not at all – 9.1% Not very – 18.2% Enough – 36.4% Quite – 9.1% Very much – 27.3%
Transportation	How easy to reach is the meeting place of the bus? Half the participants felt that it was easy enough to reach the meeting place of the bus. Some felt it was very easy and a small minority felt it was not very easy.	Not very – 9.1% Enough – 54.5% Very much – 36.4%
Schedule (days of the week)	How suitable is the schedule of the course? A majority of participants (70%) felt that the course schedule was quite or very much suitable.	Not very- 10% Enough – 20% Quite – 30% Very much – 40%
Timing	How suitable is the timing of the course to your learning? 54.6% of the participates felt that the timing of the course to their learning was not very suitable or suitable enough.	Not very - 18.2% Enough – 36.4% Quite – 18.2% Very much – 27.3%
Food	How suitable are the meal arrangements? More than half of the participants felt that the meal arrangements were quite or very much suitable.	Not very - 18.2% Enough – 9.1% Quite – 27.3% Very much – 45.5%
Wifi	How stable is the access to wifi on campus? The majority of the participants felt that the access to the wifi on site was quite or very much stable.	Not very - 9.1% Enough - 18.2% Quite - 27.3% Very much - 45.5%
Access to electronic devices	How satisfied are you with the access to electronic devices for the online sessions? 81.9% of participants felt quite satisfied or very much satisfied with the access to electronic devices for the online sessions.	Enough – 18.2% Quite – 36.4% Very much – 45.5%

+ Do you have any additional feedback on logistics?

Comments

The course is very important but it takes longer because all the information and articles are very important and we need a detailed discussion to enable and reinforce ideas

The workshops were very good and I gained a lot of knowledge and expanded my horizons in front of any future work

We thank the efforts made

Prefer to increase training time in general, God reward you the best reward

It is preferable to give a longer period of time to read and read the articles and topics of the olean enough

Final De-briefing:
Content

Variable	Questions	Rate
Content	How clearly did the content state learning goals? 86.7% of participants felt that the content quite or very much clearly stated learning goals.	1 = Not at all 2 = Not very 3 = enough 4 = quite 5 = very much Enough – 13.3% Quite – 60% Very much – 26.7%
	Did the material's use of case studies and scenarios help you gain a clearer understanding of the content? 93.3% of participants felt that the material's use of case studies and scenarios quite or always helped them gain a clearer understanding of the content.	Enough – 6.7% Quite – 40% Always – 53.3%
	Did the mobilization form help you gain a clearer understanding of the content? V 40% of participants felt that the mobilization form did not really provide enough of an understanding of the content. On the other hand, 56.3% felt that the mobilization form did help clear up the content.	Not very – 20% Enough – 20% Quite -33.3% Very much – 26.7%
	Did the material clarify some experiences/ knowledge that you have already used before in group activities or mobilizations? The majority of participants (92.8) felt that the material really clarified some experiences/knowledge that they already used before in group activities or mobilization.	Enough – 7.1% Quite – 71.4% Very much – 21.4%

	Did you feel better equipped to implement your mobilization activity? All participants felt better equipped to implement their mobilization activities, in which a large majority (73%) felt quite or very equipped to implement their mobilization activities.	Enough – 26.7% Quite– 40% Very much – 33.3%

Accessibility - content, learning moduls, interaction

Question	Rate	Obs
Initial Statements - I can manage my "study time" effectively and easily complete assignments on time by the online platform. - I enjoy attending to the online sessions overall	1 = Not at all 2 = Not very 3 = enough 4 = quite 5 = very much Participants were divided in terms of managing their study time effectively and easily in order to complete assignments on time by the online platform. 33% of participants felt they could not manage their time well, 33.3% felt they could manage their time enough, and 33.3% felt they could manage their time quite well.	Not very - 33.3% Enough – 33.3% Quite – 33.3%
How easy was the online material to navigate?	1 = Not at all 2 = Not very 3 = enough 4 = quite 5 = very much Only a small number of participants felt that the online material was not very easy to navigate. 40% of the participants felt it was easy enough, and 53.4% felt that it was quite or very easy to navigate.	Not very – 6.7% Enough – 40% Quite – 26.7% Very much – 26.7%
How visually attractive did you find the material?	Participants were divided in terms of the visual attractiveness of the material; but a majority felt that it was quite or very much visually attractive.	Enough – 33.3% Quite – 33.3% Very much – 33.3%

How interactive was the platform?	6.7% of participants felt that the platform was not very interactive, 53.3% felt that the platform was interactive enough and 40% felt it was quite or very much interactive.	Not very– 6.7% Enough – 53.3% Quite – 20% Very much – 20%
How clear are the program guidelines and directions?	40% of the participants felt that the program guidelines and directions are not very clear or clear enough, and 60% felt they were quite clear or very clear.	Not very – 6.7% Enough – 33.3% Quite – 40% Very much – 20%
Did you encounter any technical or accessibility barriers to the online resources?	Open Question	No Yes, I have often encountered problems on the Internet, which made me take longer and return content more than once because of Internet problems Both A, but the problem is the weakness of the net. No Delete answers from the wallet There is no permanent data retention feature until the wallet is full Technical problems in some videos and translations were not at the required level, and the formulation of questions was often not clear No The weakness of the Internet has led to the difficulty of downloading videos No Suggest to activate video upload feature

Support

Variable	Technical Support	Rate
21.4% of participants felt they received enough technical support and 78.6% felt they received quite or very much technical support.	How much technical support did you receive through the online platform?	1 = Not at all 2 = Not very 3 = enough 4 = quite 5 = very much Enough – 21.4% Quite – 35.7% Very much – 42.9%
	Have you had any technical problem or barrier that impeded you in completing the activities/ course?	Yes – 13.3% Both – 86.7%
A majority of participants felt it was quite easy and very easy to request technical support.	If yes, how easy was it to request technical support? (either online or in person)	Not very – 6.7% Enough – 6.7% Quite - 40% Very much – 46.7%
	How quickly have you received the support that you needed? (either online or in person)	Not very – 7.1% Enough – 14.3% Quite -50% Very much– 28.6%
	Instructors	
93.4% of participants felt that the instructors were quite or very much available during the course.	How available was the instructor during the course?	1 = Not at all 2 = Not very 3 = enough 4 = quite 5 = very much Enough - 6.7% Quite – 26.7% Very much – 66.7%
The majority of participants felt that the instructors were quite or very friendly.	How friendly were the instructor's attitudes to learners?	Enough – 6.7% Quite – 33.3% Very much – 60%
The majority of participants felt that the instructors explanations and guidance were very clear.	How clear were the instructors' explanations and directions towards the learning process?	Enough – 13.3% Quite – 53.3% Very much - 33.3%
The majority of participants felt that the instructors encouraged lots of interactions between students.	How often did the instructor encourage interaction between students?	Enough – 13.3% Quite – 40% Very much – 46.7%
The majority of participants felt that the instructors helped a lot in developing the group's e-portfolios.	How much has the instructors' following up helped your group to develop the e-portfolio?	Enough – 13.3% Quite – 26.7% Very much – 60%

Comments

You are delighted to be here and receive this wonderful training which has had a great impact on my practical experience in dealing with the community
Please follow up with such courses for its effectiveness and if you can provide us with any new special to this course

We thank the efforts of the trainers on valuable information during this session and raise new issues that address the needs of the society in which we live

We thank all those who contributed to the completion of this course to give us an opportunity to benefit from all the important information that the course and we thank all the coaches for the support and follow-up and attention

Opinion Projects need a broader discussion with trainers

In general, the course was rich in subjects and the axes that worked on them were very important and useful to us. The mechanism of subtraction and discussion was clear and understandable, but sometimes there are some points that are not understood and are not clarified in the form and level required

Thank you very much

The session is very useful. Thank you very much for this opportunity. I have a small note: Some trainees take up most of the posts, questions and discussions on a permanent basis. It is useful to organize this to allow others to participate and express their opinions and participations