

# **Rwanda Training M&E Report 2009**

## **Introduction**

The surveys were administered in electronic format directly after the Africa '09 training. The responses were quite standard and there are no major surprises. As in every country, feedback was only collected from a fraction of the trainees. While this is unlikely to have compromised the findings, it will be useful to get a wider selection of respondents in 2010. The data collected by the Rwanda team seems to have been quite representative, and overall the training seems to have very been successful.

## **Section One- All respondents**

### **1. Trainee Profiles**

Total number of respondents	22
Male	13 (59.1%)
Female	9 (40.9%)
Number of teacher respondents	19 (86.4%)
Number of school administrator respondents	2 (9.1%)
Number of headmaster/ headmistress respondents	1 (4.5%)
Number of respondents with no school function	0

The demographic of respondents from the training is very positive. Firstly, the gender balance is quite close. While there is room for improvement, the discrepancy is small enough to be able to rectify relatively easily. Even more importantly, all of the respondents had a relevant school function, which is fundamental to the efficiency of the Camara model. Unfortunately there is no data as to whether the trainees were from Camara schools, which is a major shortfall.

In terms of age the vast majority of respondents were between 18 and 40. This is probably to be expected but it is welcoming to note that there was significant participation from groups outside of this range.

Age Group	Number of Participants
Less than 18	1 (4.5%)
18-30	11 (50%)
30-40	7 (31.8%)
40-50	1 (4.5%)
50-60	2 (9.1%)

## 2. Training Modules

Skillbuilder	15 (68.2%)
Pedagogy of ICT/ Training of Trainers	7 (31.8%)

The data is very limited in terms of what training courses were attended. The trainees clearly completed the surveys directly after two training sessions, and there is no evidence as to what other training was conducted during the month. Furthermore there is no information as to what level of Skillbuilder was attended, though one would assume it was basic. There is a patent shortfall in this regard and it is very important that volunteers document who was trained in what modules for 2010.

## 3. Distances travelled for training

Less than 5km	17 (77.3%)
5-10km	2 (9.1%)
10-20km	1 (4.5%)
20-40km	2 (9.1%)
Over 40km	0

An overwhelming majority of the respondents were from the immediate locality of the Hub. Given that they were all from educational institutions the trend is perfectly acceptable. It is important to stress that teachers from every recipient school should be trained and the success of the training is entirely dependent on this criterion. If there are sufficient numbers of schools to work with in the local area it is justifiable to show a bias towards them in the establishment phase of the Hub. Camara Rwanda can use this period to develop a foundation of very strong ‘champion’ schools. When it has developed its expertise, capacity, financial resources, and national credibility it can be more equitable in reaching rural schools. It is important that at no point are more remote schools neglected altogether, particularly in Rwanda where accessibility is far less of an issue than in other countries.

#### 4. Trainee Course Timing Preferences

Respondents who want future training to be full-time	14 (63.6%)
Respondents who want future training to be part-time	4 (18.2%)
No preference	4 (18.2%)

Interestingly all respondents claimed to have attended training for at least five days. Either the course went on for longer than expected or this data should be treated with some scepticism. It is interesting that respondents are so keen for training to be full-time in the future. In terms of the longevity of training, respondent preferences break down as follows:

1 Week	7 (31.8%)
2 Weeks	5 (22.7%)
1 Month	4 (18.2%)
3 Months	4 (18.2%)
More than 6 Months	2 (9.1%)

## 5. Cost of Training

The reported training costs charged to trainees were very difficult to explain. 15 trainees claimed that they were given the training for free. Two trainees claimed the training cost \$100, one claimed it cost \$120, and one claimed it was 15,000 Rwandan Francs (approximately €18). There is seemingly no reason for the discrepancies of the charges and it seems highly unusual that four trainees would be charged while the rest were not. Furthermore, all those who said they did pay for the training stated in a subsequent answer that neither they nor their school paid.

Bizarrely while three respondents cited the cost of training as being a major difficulty in attending, only one of these had reported paying a training fee. There is a possibility that these respondents were referring to accommodation or transport charges, though the survey disaggregated quite clearly. It is certainly important for future years to continue monitoring charges and additional costs incurred, and differentiating between them will clearly be essential.

## 6. Subjective Evaluations of the Training

Below are the questions that trainees were asked in order to evaluate the relevance and merits of the training. The questions were left closed so as to facilitate quantification. Without a set syllabus and examination structure it is virtually impossible to get statistics on the objective merits of the training, but subjective feedback on its quality and relevancy is certainly of some use. At the end of the survey trainees were asked how the training could be improved in an open-ended question so as to collect data that would have otherwise remained uncaptured. In this field three respondents cited difficulty in understanding English as being a problem, and one suggested that money should be provided to trainees for food. The answers to the closed questions were as follows:

<b>i) How relevant was the training content to your teaching requirements?</b>	
Very Relevant	11 (50%)
Quite Relevant	9 (40.9%)
Not Very Relevant	0
Not at all Relevant	0
No Answer	2 (9.1%)

<b>ii) How would you rate the training content?</b>	
Very Useful	14 (63.6%)
Quite Useful	5 (22.7%)
Not Very Useful	0
Not At All Useful	0
No Answer	3 (13.6%)

<b>iii) How would you rate the delivery of the training?</b>	
Very Good	12 (54.5%)
Quite Good	6 (27.3%)
Not Very Good	0
Very Poor	0
No Answer	4 (18.2%)

<b>iv) How confident were you in using computers before the training?</b>	
Very Confident	7 (31.8%)
Quite Confident	3 (13.6%)
Not Very Confident	4 (18.2%)
Not at all Confident	5 (22.7%)
No Answer	3 (13.6%)

<b>v) How confident are you in using computers after the training?</b>	
Very Confident	10 (45.5%)
Quite Confident	8 (36.4%)
Not Very Confident	1 (4.5%)
Not at all Confident	0
No Answer	3 (13.6%)

<b>vi) How regularly do you think you will use computers in the classroom?</b>	
Several Times a Week	14 (63.6%)
Once a Week	3 (13.6%)
Several Times a Month	1 (4.5%)
Once a Month	0
Several Times a Year	1 (4.5%)
Once a Year	0
No Answer	3 (13.6%)

<b>vii) What were the major difficulties in attending the training?</b>	
Cost of the Training	3 (13.6%)
Distance Travelled to Attend the Training	0
Costs of Accommodation and Food	2 (9.1%)
Getting Time off Work	2 (9.1%)
Leaving Family for the Duration of the Training	3 (13.6%)
Other Difficulties not Listed	2 (9.1%)
No Real Difficulties Attending	7 (31.8%)
No Answer	3 (13.6%)

<b>viii) Would you agree that the course was worth the time and cost?</b>	
Definitely Worth the Time and Cost	14 (63.6%)
Probably Worth the Time and Cost	3 (13.6%)
Probably Not Worth the Time and Cost	1 (4.5%)
Definitely Not Worth the Time and Cost	0
No Answer	4 (18.2%)

January 2010