



WEST AFRICA CIVIL SOCIETY INSTITUTE



POST-TRAINING EVALUATION REPORT

REPORT WRITING TRAINING FOR KAIPTC PROGRAMMES STAFF

June 18 – 19, 2012,

Venue: Airport View Hotel, Accra-Ghana

INTRODUCTION

WACSI organised a 2-day Report Writing training course for 33 KAIPTC Programmes staff. At the end of the training evaluation forms were distributed to KAIPTC programmes staff to gauge their overall impression about the training. The forms were also intended to determine how the training impacted the participants, improved their knowledge and added value to their skills.

This report highlights three aspects, impressions about: Overall Training Delivery, Training content and Training Duration. Out of 33 participants, 27 answered the questionnaires representing 82% of the total number of participants who attended the training.

A. OVERALL COURSE DELIVERY

The table below highlights on the level of satisfaction as expressed by KAIPTC programmes staff on the overall course delivery:

Areas of Assessment		Percentage Ratings of Outcomes of Participants		
		Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Not Satisfied
1. What is your overall impression of the course?		37%	59%	4%
2. Were your objectives for this course met?		37%	63%	-
3. Rate your satisfaction with the course training materials.		22%	78%	-
4. Taking into account your knowledge on Report Writing before the course, did the course help to build your knowledge and skills in this area?		30%	70%	-
5. How effective was the methodology used in the course?	The Discussions	59%	37%	4%
	The Practical Sessions	56%	41%	3%

B. EXPLANATION TO RESPONSES

The following texts are comments documented by KAIPTC programmes staff in expressing their impression on the training delivery.

1. Overall Impression

KAIPTC programmes staff expressed their general view on the training as follows:

- The training met my expectations;
- Excellent instructor;
- Simple, participatory and informative;
- Useful;
- The course is very relevant;
- It helped me revise my report writing skills and added to what I knew;
- Very useful;
- Lessons went well, class was interactive;
- Timely and relevant but struggled to follow on day 1;
- It was an excellent delivery;
- Basically covered the essential;
- Knowledgeable, sent us back to the basics and it enhanced my knowledge;
- Nothing new but the various inputs made it worthwhile;
- It met my expectations;
- Helpful, repetition of report writing – good facilitation;
- It looked as if we knew some of the presentations before attending the course and the whole session was a recap. It may be important to test participants gaps before designing the training, that way gaps will be easily bridged;
- It was good and generally well delivered;
- Ok, could be better, should be tailored to individual needs of the group as some things were not too useful;
- Generally it was ok, but I just felt some new dimensions could have been added;
- Content and the teaching method were excellent; and
- It was good and new methods of report writing were learnt.

2. Training objectives

In an attempt to state whether their objectives were met, KAIPTC programmes staff responded:

- Covered all my objectives for the course;
- To a large extent;
- My objectives were not met;
- It helped me remember what I knew about report writing;
- Not entirely, I expected more examples given the participants experience in report writing;
- Yes, my objectives were quite met;

- Excellent;
- Yes, the expectation and objectives were met (4);
- Certainly;
- Partly;
- In general, good information/slides, but group work (questions/tasks) can be improved;
- Yes, but there is room for improvement;
- Yes, because as a researcher, these skills will help me in writing quality reports and papers;
- I didn't really have objectives before I started so it is hard to tell if they were met or not;
- I expected something new because generally most, if not everything, presented were already known;
- My objectives were met; but expected more practical examples;
- Yes, I now understand the key components of a good report;
- Not entirely but overall everything was fine.

3. Training materials

Participants' appreciation on the usefulness of the training materials is:

- Could have been better;
- The training materials were quite few;
- Satisfied/adequate;
- More materials should have been given;
- I liked the examples, very practical;
- Not adequate, the power point was not easy to read. Should have provided background reading materials;
- Only flip chart and projector were used;
- The slide were self-explanatory;
- Training materials yet to be shared but presentations were good and case studies equally relevant;
- Even though we are yet to receive some of the materials, I think WACSI's sample reports were very helpful;
- Good;
- They were good except that we don't have all the materials, yet so difficult to be satisfied;
- Materials should have been more;
- There were no handouts even after the course ended, it will be useful to have some hard copies;
- Good and helpful, expect CD-ROM at the end of the course;
- Satisfied, there is room for improvement and need to use more innovative materials in future (case studies, etc);
- Good and well-structured;
- Ok, seemed quite standard, nothing really stood out to me as something new;

- It is good that examples were provided to help participants have an idea on what was being taught in theory;
- It was ok;
- Reading materials should be given earlier.

4. Knowledge and skills acquisition

Explanations on whether the course contributed to increasing knowledge and skills:

- It was revealing;
- Yes, it added knowledge in certain areas;
- To an extent;
- Yes (3);
- Some areas as Introduction to Report Writing and Planning for the Report did increase my knowledge;
- Certainly, I have learnt something new about report writing, however the presentation was more on what I know already, could have spent more time on writing reports to donors;
- More of a revision;
- Yes, I had little knowledge in report writing;
- My stock of grammar needs to improve;
- Yes, my knowledge about report writing has been enhanced;
- Yes it has helped, for instance, to see the difference between proofreading and editing;
- Yes, I learnt about the different types of report writing and the difference between editing and proofreading;
- Certainly;
- Yes, this will help me get more confidence in writing;
- Partly;
- The course did help build my knowledge and skills;
- A little – some things were interesting/new, i.e. language, tone, etc. I feel the facilitator could deal with more complex issues;
- The course seemed more of a refresher course than really adding any new skills;
- Certainly, I have gained a lot of knowledge to help me build and produce a good report;
- Yes, it helped me building new knowledge and skills in this area.

5. Methodology:

In the subsequent paragraphs, KAIPTC programmes staff members assess the effectiveness of the methodology used:

- Discussion

Participants commented that the training:

- Elaborative;
- Slow at first, but gradually built up;
- Approaches very useful;

- The method used was very interactive;
- Enjoyed the different views shared;
- The methodology was good;
- Encouraged discussion among participants;
- Very effective (2);
- Good (2);
- Very interactive;
- It was participatory and people brought their thoughts and explanations to bear;
- The interaction was intense;
- Active style of facilitator helped facilitate understanding;
- The facilitator should have shown the group the best-practices instead of always saying it depends on the situation;
- Very interactive;
- Quite good;
- Could have been more interactive/engaging.

- **Practical session**

Participants provided their impression about the practical session:

- Very interactive;
- Great;
- Enjoyed the different views shared;
- The group practical exercises were helpful but not very challenging;
- Made class lively and interactive;
- Very effective;
- Good (2);
- Use of sample reports was very good;
- Delivery was simple;
- There were group work and exercises;
- More could be done on this part;
- Personally enjoyed the discussions and brainstorming processes;
- Questions/tasks for the group work can be improved (more clear and challenging questions/tasks);
- There were practical examples, very useful;
- Gave every participant the opportunity to contribute;
- Quite good;
- Just about ok. Could have been more of such sessions. We could have been tasked to write a one page report on something to see if the course had been understood; and
- More interactive.

C. TRAINING COURSE CONTENT

Participants' rating to the training content is summarized in the table below.

Report Writing Training		Rating		
		Very useful	may be useful	may not be useful
1.	Introduction to Report Writing	77%	19%	4%
2.	Planning and Resources for your Report	73%	27%	-
3.	Organising your Report	77%	23%	-
4.	Presentation of the Report	65%	35%	-
5.	Final Review and submission	65%	35%	-

D. PARTICIPANTS' EXPERIENCE ACQUIRED

KAIPTC programmes staff described the gains obtained from the training:

- Good review and confirmation of what I know;
- Expressing my thoughts with the right words;
- Key features of report are often ignored or missed, re-learning about it was refreshing;
- The need to focus on relevant issues of interest to audience;
- I learned a lot about editing and what should go into report writing;
- In editing you are allowed to include your views and somewhat change the content. Proofreading is more correction of grammar;
- I find the session on tone of report writing very useful;
- Need to set and agree objectives and to have discussion to know what is expected in report;
- Features of a good report will forever be remembered;
- Report writing should be accurate and concise;
- The correct use of words is key to draft a good report and ease the editing process;
- I have learnt to improve upon my report writing skills;
- The course has increased my knowledge in introduction to report writing, its features, setting agenda, planning and others. It was very useful with a lot of information;
- Features of a good report have been clearly understood. I also understood the style, structure and the editing processes which are important prerequisite of a good report;
- To be practical using simple language – identify what the person reading the report needs or wants to see is important;
- I learnt there are different types of reports and approaches, but in all one must ensure to communicate effectively;
- Report writing style is very purpose related.

- The principles and components of report writing;
- Useful in reinforcing what I already know about report writing;
- It was good to always repeat all important issues of a good report;
- The right language to use in writing the different types of reports;
- It's hard for me to recall since I do not have any of the materials at hand. Although I know I learnt something but expected more. Much of the content was basic at times;
- The importance of being brief and comprehensive when writing reports, and that of editing as well;
- I learned the ingredients of a good report and the planning processes involved in report writing. I also learned very key points to be noted when editing and proofreading a report;
- I learned that a good report should be concise, use of simple language, coherent and reader focused;
- The practical exercises helped in providing a better understanding of what was lectured on.

E. PARTICIPANTS' ADVICE TO THE TRAINER

- Stamp more authority on his ability;
- Well done;
- Way of adapting and delivery was impressive. Keep it up!
- Need for more examples that relate to what participant/trainee does (area of work);
- More materials should be given before the beginning of the lectures;
- With a group like us that do a lot of report writing, more examples and exercises is needed;
- The trainer should tailor the delivery to the need of the trainees, should provide better reading materials to participants;
- Tailor course to specific needs of target group through a needs assessment process ahead of the course;
- Good, keep it up!
- Very good;
- Use materials that relate to the particular work environment of trainees. This is more crucial when trainees are from one institution;
- Keep the current delivery methodology up;
- Keep-up the style of involving participants in the delivery process;
- Include an exercise on writing a short report (case study);
- The groups should not be too large in the future. The group questions/exercises should be well thought through;
- I think various reports templates should be shared and discussed;
- The facilitator should be more practical and provide more materials;
- A bit more emphasis on actual case studies pertaining to group area of interest;
- Find better exercise for the group work;

- A needs assessment would help structure the training better in the future. That way specific needs of participants would be met (3);
- Ask participants' expectations for the training the first day so as to help you structure your presentation to meet those needs;
- Keep it up, however, include more practical steps in writing a report;
- The content could be enhanced;
- Produce training materials for participants to read ahead of time.

F. ASSESSMENT OF FACILITATORS

- Excellent, very interactive;
- Outstanding delivery;
- Use of space, facilitation and discussions were good;
- Good (3);
- The facilitator's approach was very participatory, made the lecture more interesting through practical examples;
- The facilitator was very engaging;
- Very interactive. The facilitator kept a good eye contact and engaged the participants;
- On point!
- Very knowledgeable;
- Great!
- Very well organised, ready to know new things;
- The participatory approach has been really good and interesting;
- The facilitator was good and simple;
- It was excellent. The facilitator kept participants engaged with work and exercises particularly after lunch;
- The facilitator's delivery was good;
- The overall course was just good and very useful;
- Delivery and engagement were great;
- Very active and good facilitator. Thank you!
- Excellent (2);
- Good, the facilitator was friendly, listened, engaged well with groups;
- This was good and there was great interactions between the facilitator and participants;
- Excellent, the facilitator used a participatory approach and he respected every trainee, which is good;
- Satisfactory, but there is still room for improvement.

G. COURSE DURATION

Below is recapitulated the participants' appreciation on how long was the training with respect to its content.

Percentage Ratings		
Too long	Too short	About right
-	-	100%