**LEGS TOT: Summary of Evaluation Responses**

**[Hanoi, Vietnam 18th – 23rd November 2014]**

1. **Course objectives and relevance**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.1 Do you think the following objectives of the training have been met? | Not met | Partly met | Mostly met | Fully met |
| Describe and apply the LEGS approach |  | 1 | 8 | 7 |
| Identify appropriate livelihood-based livestock interventions in emergency response |  | 1 | 3 | 12 |
| Design and implement response interventions according to LEGS standards and guidelines |  | 1 | 2 | 13 |

Was the course relevant for your work?

Yes: 13 No comments x 2 and not really x 1

Why?

* Provided all needed information
* Working on DRR and support DRR project in Asia Pacific
* As a professor of a national university it is our responsibility to educate and train people on matters that are of utmost concern. And as vets it is our responsibility to ensure food security and sustainability of livestock based livelihoods
* Because this is my daily work to manage and care for the livestock in the district and disasters occur very often, the training is really helpful for us: 10
* Because when disasters happen only human is taken into account in the plan

**2. Workshop design**

2.1 What did you like about the overall design and structure of the course?

* Very interactive, participatory
* The course has been provided systematically, well organised by professional trainers
* Well structured, participatory approach. I also liked the practise sessions with feedback
* Chapter 2, Preliminary Assessment and Interventions: 2
* PRIM: 1
* Identification of technical interventions : 5
* SMART x 2
* Everything x 1

2.2 How do you think the design and structure of the training course can be improved?

* More disaster case scenarios
* Case studies more relevant to local context x 4
* Training divided into phases to make it easier for trainees to afford the time for learning and work x 1
* Better if field work is included x 3
* Trainees need time to study the handbook x 1
* The handbook needs revising x 1
* The translation of the handbook sometimes makes it difficult for readers. Some terms are not consistent between slides and handbook, and the number of pages mentioned in the slides do not match with the handbook x 1

**3. Presentation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3.1 The presentation and facilitation of the workshop was: | Poor |  | Adequate |  | Good | 5 | Very good | 11 |

What are your comments on [Emma]:

* Very patient, interacts well with all participants, provided needed help – thank you
* Impressive training skills, well organised, good mentor – thank you!
* Strong, determined x 1
* Very good x 5
* Friendly, easy to understand, specific, clear x 2
* Cheerful, skilful and experienced in training x 2
* Fascinating, and pratical x 1

What are your comments on [David]:

* Very patient, guided everyone very well – thank you
* Very encouraging, supportive, good mentor – thank you!
* Impressive presentation x 2
* Very good, very impressive x 4
* Friendly, presentations easy to understand, specific, clear x 2
* Humorous, experienced in training with participatory approach x 3

3.2 Do you have any suggestions for alternative ways of facilitating the training?

* Keep up the good work!
* It’s better to organize the training at the beginning of the year or middle of the year x 4
* Training venue at famous tourist attraction x 1
* Classroom training combined with field trip at local level x 2
* This training should be lengthened and should be for 10 days x 1

**4. Content**

4.1 Which session or topic did you find most useful, and why?

As shown below, people varied greatly in their preference/interest for the topic(s). However, the topics mentioned in their answers include Session 4, PRIM, Preliminary assessment. None of them stated why they liked the topic(s).

* Analysis of interventions and technical options x 2
* Chapter 4 because it refers to minimum standard to destocking:
* PRIM because it helps plan makers x 3
* Assessment and intervention : 1
* M&E to be done from the beginning to the end x 1
* LEGS approach
* M&E as it allows for the optimal options, most effective for the responses x 3
* All: 2

4.2 Which session or topic did you find least useful, and why?

* All sessions were useful!
* Chapter 6: Minimum standards for temporary shelters x 1
* No section is found least useful x 4
* Introduction about LEGS – needs shortening x 1
* Introduction x 2

4.3 Was there anything not included in the workshop that needs to be? If so, what is it?

* All sessions were covered x 10

**5. Satisfaction**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5.1 Overall, how would you rate this course? | Poor |  | Adequate |  | Good | 4 | Very good | 12 |

5.2 Any further comments

* More group based planning workshop
* Include report handling and preparation e.g. Project Terminal Report
* More training on training skills for participants is needed x 2
* Should combine theory with local practice. Building training needs more relevant to Vietnam context x 2
* Training is very useful, trainers are very friendly, enthusiastic and considerate x 1

5.3 Tell us in one word how you would describe this training:

* Amazing experience
* Excellent
* Empowering
* Satisfied
* The training helps me greatly, it provides me with training skills and group work skills in addition to lots of information re LEGS
* Very good
* Excellent
* Very useful and very happy with the results
* Very useful, practical, highly effective. Very useful knowledge for our work in the future:3
* Very pleased and thank for everything you have provided us at the training.
* Only with 3 days training but I have understood LEGS much better.
* The training is excellent. I myself have gained a lot of knowledge and skills