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Executive Summary

The Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences at the American University in Beirut, through its Environmental and Sustainable Development Unit (ESDU) is acting as an implementing agency for a Regional Training Course on Urban Agriculture (UA) for the Middle East/North Africa region (MENA). UA is a relatively new area of knowledge and IDRC-CFP has been an innovator in supporting both research and learning on it, starting the 1980’s.

The course that was held in September (5-24) 2005, primarily in Beirut, Lebanon with shorter period in Damascus, Syria and especially in Amman, Jordan brought together 23 participants from 7 countries.

The overall aim of the course was to contribute to strengthening and institutionalizing UA in local and national urban development in the MENA region. Its general objectives are:

a. to build up a body of knowledge that exists on UA in the MENA region.

b. To train actors who are engaged formally and informally in UA on how to use it as a tool to strengthen food security, alleviate poverty, promote sustainable livelihoods and ameliorate the living environment, so as to foster their competence and their capacity to influence institutional change favoring the development of UA, including within their own organization;

c. To establish and empower teams of strongly interested, well-informed, strategically placed and highly networked individuals who are interested in and able to respond to the UA needs; and

d. To enable the improvement of the planning, management and policy making for UA, and the enhancement of access to resources for it, within the selected cities, and within MENA more broadly.

The course differs from other courses that have been organized in Anglophone and Francophone Africa and that of Latin America. Participants come with a varied experience; some have had a considerable exposure to the issues of UA while others are totally new to the subject. Moreover, city teams were not asked to come with a ready made proposal that will be looked at during the course then evaluated for possible funding. The city teams were asked to work together based on the information that was gathered as we went along the course, and then start building up their approach that will be developed once they are back home into a viable project proposal.

Two preparatory meetings were held prior to the course. The first was held in February 9-11, 2005, while the second was held on July 20-23, 2005 at the American University of Beirut. Meanwhile, ESDU and the Course Coordinator (CC) followed up pressing issues with both the city teams and the moderators.

As with earlier courses undertaken by IDRC-CFP, evaluation was an intrinsic to the pedagogical approach of the MENA course. The evaluator, an external consultant, intervened in the process of course design and
development, providing an independent voice and commentary at key moments, as well as a post-course summary evaluation document. The evaluator was brought in at the second preparatory meeting in July 2005 when most of the plans were already developed. He then, attended the meeting as well as the course in full. The evaluator issued a report following the second meeting, then a short brief at the end of the course. This present document is a general wrap-up of the proceeds of the overall process of setting the course.

It is important to note that the course ended on a decision that a proposal format would be designed by the course organizers. This will be sent to all city teams to be filled, completed and then sent back for evaluation. Based on the results of the evaluation, seed funds will be made available by IDRC to finance projects on UA in the respective cities. This was done in December 2005, and projects were reviewed, approved and started in March 2006. As the city teams begin to utilize the funds available, it would have been much more beneficial if the evaluation process could assess to what extent the course material is being actively incorporated in the initiative of participants and their interventions in their cities.

The key evaluation issues in this document cover both the content of the course as well as its design. It focuses also on the interaction of the various stakeholders and gives some basic indicators on the process and the outcome of the course.

The general impressions were that the course was very helpful in highlighting the importance of UA. The methodology relied on a participatory approach which has allowed a very fruitful interaction among participants.

**Background information**

The MENA course was the fourth regional training course on urban agriculture (UA) to be supported by the International Development and Research Center (IDRC). The previous three were for Francophone Africa held in Dakkar 1998, Latin America held in Ecuador 2001 and, Anglophone Africa held in Nairobi 2004.

The main directives of this report abide by the Terms of Reference (TOR) of the evaluator that are attached to the document (Appendix 1).

The technical committee (TC) that guided the design and management of the course consisted of a number of experts in the field of UA (Appendix 2).

The course was supported in funds and in-kind by the International Development and Research Center (IDRC). It builds upon earlier experience of regional courses supported by Cities Feeding People Initiatives of IDRC.

**Objectives of the course**

The general objectives of the course are:
1- to build up a body of knowledge that exists on UA in the MENA region,
2- to establish teams of strongly interested, well-informed, and strategically placed individuals,
3- to enable the improvement of the planning and management of UA within the selected cities and within MENA more broadly.
4- Ultimately, the course seeks to contribute to strengthening and institutionalizing UA in local and national urban development.

"..The course met the expectations of participants and provided a framework for the design of future projects in UA."

"The course was very intense. I do suggest to reduce the number of days."

"The academic objectives of course were met, however other objectives were not clearly identified namely building up a future training plan in UA as well as the formation of a network for UA in the region."

**Preparatory Process**

The First preparatory workshop was held on February 9-11, 2005. The objectives of the workshop focused on:
- Setting learning objectives and pedagogical strategy for the course.
- Presentation, discussion and confirmation of training materials to be developed, including consideration of how to make them usable for distance-learning and other purposes.
- Discussion and confirmation of case studies, field trips and special sessions.
- Criteria for the selection of city teams

The Second preparatory workshop was held at the American University of Beirut on Wednesday July 20, 2005 at the Faculty of Agriculture and Food Sciences. The objectives of the workshop were:
- Ensuring learning objectives are met and match pedagogical strategy through approach taken so far.
- Presentation, discussion and confirmation of modules, including the accompanying training materials
- Discussion and confirmation of themes and purposes of special sessions
- Discussion and confirmation of case studies and the way they will be used
- Discussion and confirmation of field visits and the way to tie them to the modules
- Discussion of city teams, including what will be asked of them
- Finalizing day by day structure of the course
- Identification of alternative plans, including possible adjustments in the course structure, in response to potential problems
• Discussion of the role of gender and social equity expert
• Discussion of the use of the evaluator, including the process of integrating his role in the course
• Consideration of broader activities, including how to capture the interest of those not participating in the course.

Risks and assumptions:

I came to the second workshop, as the External Evaluator (EE), with the understanding that the group was going to attend a test run of the course in its final form. This was not very correct.

When I attended the second workshop in July 2005, plans have already been developed. My observations on the preparatory process were drawn from: (a) the briefing of the course facilitator on the general planning steps undertaken during the first preparatory workshop, (b) the minutes of that first workshop and, (c) the e-mail correspondence related to the technical matters related to the selection of city teams, (d) the setting of learning objectives that I received after the end of the second preparatory workshop.

The Evaluation approach: Participatory

During the evaluation design session in the second preparatory workshop, the EE led a session on the course teams’ expectations of the course and what is expected of the evaluation. While the expectations of the course participants were drawn out prior to the course through a detailed questionnaire.

The essential task of the EE was to assist in gearing the course towards meeting the expectations of both the participants and the course organizers.

Participants were encouraged to set their goals, establish priorities and connect training processes to desired expectations and outcomes. The Course facilitator (CF) and the External Evaluator (EE) initiated the participants to work together on the looking at the process and the outcomes to support the inquiry in a collective manner.

Once the course started, the EE introduced evaluation as a daily process to support receptivity to the training material and therefore the learning.

The IDRC evaluation guidelines require that the approach to the evaluation be useful (i.e. serve the information needs of the technical committee); be realistic (i.e. recommendations should be feasible in other similar courses); be ethical; and be accurate (convey technically correct information). The evaluation process and this report attempted to comply with all of these requirements.

a. Methods:

Baseline questionnaire
During the evaluation design session in the second preparatory workshop, the evaluator led a brainstorming session on the course team's expectations of the course training and evaluation processes.

It was decided that a baseline questionnaire (Appendix 3) be sent to all participants. This questionnaire looked at the basic knowledge of participants to the concept of UA and the various interrelated fields as well as their expectations of the course.

Though the basic principle laying behind the evaluation focused primarily on participation based on the following principles:

- Participants in the evaluation process set evaluation goals, establish priorities, and connect training processes to desired outcomes.
- Participants focus the evaluation on process and outcomes they consider important and to which they are committed.
- Participants work together with each other and the evaluation facilitator to support inquiry in a collective manner.
- Self-accountability i.e. participants accountability to themselves and their community/ institution is highly valued (this implies that participants monitor their own progress as much as possible).

By the second preparatory workshop, the selection of city teams was completed based on the criteria that were set previously. Though the selection was not very clear, at least to me and some others present, the group did not discuss the issue at length.

The city teams were selected and the course was bound to start within few weeks. The baseline questionnaire had to reach everyone concerned before the beginning of the course. The timing of the baseline questionnaire was late and thus should have been completed at an earlier stage of the course preparation. It was sent out by ESDU to all participants. The responses that came back were general, late and had no major influence on the design of the various modules. The EE thought that these responses would help set a number of indicators that could be of relevance in the evaluation of the course.

a. Defining UA: The baseline questionnaire revealed a very preliminary knowledge and understanding of the concept of UA within city teams that have had a limited exposure to the subject. On an opposite side, the teams that have worked in the field showed a very elaborate interdisciplinary approach to UA.

It was interesting to see, though, that at the end of the course, every participant was appreciative on how much he was able to learn. Moreover, it was evident through the answers to the final questionnaire how much their understanding to UA had changed.

The interactive sessions that took place later during the course attracted the attention and helped participants become more focused on the content of the course. It was also important to note that through out the discussion, few concerns that emerged earlier in the baseline questionnaire became clearer to participants.
Participatory observations

I was required by the terms of my contract to be in full time attendance at the course. This allowed me to play a “participant observer” role in the training process which had both benefits and challenges. The observations made by the participants in the daily “end of the day” evaluation sessions were shared with the course team and the moderators in an attempt to respond to concerns as quickly as possible.

The full time presence of the EE allowed him to become a familiar face that shares the concerns of participants and has his own views of the process. However, this had a disadvantage that prevented the EE to step back to allow for thinking through his impressions and observations, as well as those of participants, in a structured way to enhance feedback into the course.

I believe that with all the stress that goes along with this process of “participant observer”, yet it had allowed the evaluator to have a global look at the overall process and be in the seat of the participants.

The course participants expectations were drawn out before, during and after the course and were couched by the evaluator and participants in terms of learning objectives and the desire to see the evaluation process supportive.

Plenary feedback sessions

This was done at the end of each module. However, a daily evaluation session was done at the closure of every day (comments on the flow of the course, the course material, the performance of the moderator and, the overall logistics). Unfortunately, the long working days affected the daily evaluation sessions. Still the feedback of participants was helpful.

At the end of each module, an evaluation sheet looked at the technical aspects of the module and the methods used by the moderators. These sheets were analyzed and the outputs were conveyed by the EE to each concerned moderator.

At the end of the course, an “exit” evaluation form looked at the whole course. It consisted of a series of questions that looked at the achieved objectives, expectations met in comparison with what was mentioned in the Ex-ante form submitted prior to the course.

As a general note, we need to allocate more time for evaluation in the schedule of events. It is true that my role as evaluator became more that of a participant. I was able to build on the trust of participants to convey the concerns of participants to the course team.

Feedback to moderators

This was mainly done during the process of delivery of the module. Feedback to the moderators on the reaction of participants to the delivery of their training material was shared during the module presentations at the end of every day to steer the delivery. Observations on “reaction” included more
than like/dislike but also commented on the "absorptive capacity" indicated by interest and understanding (this was done through the evaluator’s own assessment as well as by looking around the class and talking informally to participants during coffee breaks).

Besides these observations offered by the evaluator on daily basis, the only structured time for feedback to the moderators was after the end of their modules and once the evaluation forms for the respective module have been completed and analyzed. The final evaluation session came at the end of the course just before the certificate ceremony so no time was available to provide feedback to the moderators from the evaluation session.

Course material and handouts

There was a general consensus among participants that the course material should have been distributed to participants prior to the course. This could have helped participants have a look at the material and start up discussion during the course. The organizers, on their side, felt that the material for every module will be distributed during the course, this way participants will be encouraged to focus on the moderator to understand what he is talking about. This also could be correct. What happened in fact was that the material was late in getting to participants and that was not done in a convenient way. One could have expected to get a complete folder where lectures could have been filed easily. That was not the case. It seems that somebody was late in completing his homework for that.

This component needs to be looked at carefully in future courses.

Methodology:

The participation in the training was helpful in that it had allowed the evaluator to be available at all times during the course and had put the evaluator in the seats of participants to see the view from a different angle thus, open a way for a more deliberate discussions with them later. This had encouraged the trust of participants. On the other hand, that gave way to take up with the moderators general impressions before these are conveyed by participants later at the end of the day. Observations made by the participants in the evaluation session at the end of every day were presented to the course team in a separate session and the moderators attempted to respond to the concerns whenever possible. The reactions of participants as well as those of the evaluator were shared with individual moderators through the course process.

This full time attendance had some disadvantages. The first is the time commitment which could stretch on some days to 10 hours days and more. This meant that there was little time available for the reflection of the evaluator and the course team on the proceedings of the course in a structured manner outside of the course process. If set aside during the course duration, this time would have allowed the analysis of the impressions and the observations in a structured way and encouraged feedback into the course. This ought to be looked at carefully (full time attendance / sample evaluation and attendance).
A quick evaluation session was scheduled at the end of every day to test how
participants reacted to the relevance of each module compared to their own
learning objectives. The evaluator then briefed the moderator on the
proceedings of that particular day. At the end of each module, a general
session was scheduled, and participants were asked to fill in a special form
that would look at their feedback on module delivery.

More detailed analysis is provided on each module (Appendix 4). This
appendix shows a translation of the original form that was filled at the end
of each module, as well as a detailed description of the analysis that was
drawn for each one of the modules. The results of each of the evaluation
forms was conveyed to the concerned moderator.

The module evaluation form looked at the following points: a- Quality of
training in the module b- level of knowledge of the suggested topics in the
module ( Extent if information, usefulness, focus on what is needed,
mapping objectives, complexity, case studies) c- pedagogy of the module d-
suggestions for application and improvements.

The end of the course evaluation session (Appendix 5) was for feedback on:
- Changes in individual attitudes towards UA issues
- Understanding technical and interrelated themes within UA activities
  and
- Learning how to move ahead in future planned activities.

The evaluation process should have been scheduled earlier in the
preparation of the course. This would have given the evaluator a better
chance to work closely with the moderators of the different modules. That
would have given both parties the opportunity to set benchmarks that
would help get the pulse of participants on the module at the end of each
day, the evaluator could have played a more active role in facilitating the
modification of the process if needed.

Evaluation was not introduced properly into the schedule of the course and
it was very obvious that there was not an adequate opportunity that was
made available for that. Evaluation sessions were always scheduled at the
end of the day when everybody was drained and eager to leave, yet still
efforts were made. These could have been much more beneficial given more
time.

b. Evaluation findings:

The course in general was a success in that
- Understanding UA concepts, strategies and UA related
  interventions were developed.

“The course has contributed to the initiation of new
understanding and dimensions to UA, and what we
were able to achieve in the course out-passed all what
we expected”

- Gender awareness was initiated. Gender mainstreaming was
  integrated by participants in their design of UA initiatives.
The course was able to meet a number of objectives that I did not expect (the situation of UA in the cities represented and the problems that are faced), however, some of the topics were discussed very briefly.

Increased networking and possibilities for sustained partnership among a variety of UA stakeholders was facilitated. This has, in fact, led to the creation of a network in the region. It was apparent, since the start of the course, that this was a major concern to some of the participants.

At the same time there were observations from the moderators on course preparation and coordination and from participants on logistics, content and pedagogy and their expectations of the course which provide important feedback on how in future such courses can be enhanced. The proceedings of the course as well as the evaluation findings shows that the contributions of the course towards the creation of a region-specific knowledge and practice through the creation of a network for UA in the MENA region are of great value. Observations on pedagogy comment how this could reinforce participants learning especially with regard to applying what they learn, in their own city contexts.

Since the understanding of UA that can only be assessed after few months. The course was enjoyable and enriching but the process could have been benefited from greater coordination and focus (mainly in looking at the practicality and efficiency of the fields visits)

b.1. Selection of moderators: As it was expected in the 2nd preparatory workshop, the moderators selected by the Course Coordinator were expected to have almost completed the preparation of their modules. It was noticed, however, that although the importance of participatory methods was emphasized in the first preparatory workshop, the capacity of the moderators to do this and to do it well varied depending on their own training and experience in this. That is why it was not clear at all how these moderators have been selected. I have asked the Course Coordinator to provide me with the criteria that were set for the selection of the moderators, but unfortunately this was not done.

It was expected to see, similar to previous courses, that the selection of the moderators be based on the following criteria:

- Practical and theoretical knowledge on the specific topic to be treated in their module.
- Knowledge of and experience in regional programs on UA (to be able to identify with the problems of the various participants).
• Interactive capacities and experience in developing participatory training programs for adults.

“**The content of the course was very rich in introducing practical know-how, however some moderators were too academic in their ways of presenting their material**”

It was apparent at the end of the 2nd workshop that the concerns raised by the Course Manager about the selection of some moderators, were relevant and need to be looked at carefully.

**b.2. Learning objectives:** These were set in the first preparatory workshop and included:

(a) improved skills for the participants to analyze the production and farming systems in UA and its contribution to the urban food system

(b) awareness by the participants of the environmental and health impacts of UA, and acquisition of basic know-how for addressing issues at the policy level

(c) Ability of participants to place UA within the context of household strategies for sustainable livelihoods, and to better respond to the challenges that hinder it

(d) Enhanced means for the participants to advocate and lobby for the implementation of UA policies and practices within the public sector and the civil society at large

(e) Acquisition of practical tools for the optimization of the use of resources through linking UA to water resource management

(f) Possession of basic understanding of how property systems, land-tenure patterns and land-use planning all impinge on and enable UA to flourish or not.

Though it was expected that particular learning objectives will be specified for each of the training modules that make up the course, some of these learning objectives were not clearly reflected in some of the modules that we have seen in the 2nd preparatory workshop.

The Course Coordinator was expected to dwell on the matter for these constitute an integral part of a comprehensive framework for monitoring and evaluation of the process of both giving the course as well as the looking at its output. In fact, these were well developed during the course itself. The moderators apparently did a considerable effort, with the help of the coordinator, to focus their effort to meet these objectives.

**b.3. Design of field visits:** The planning for the field visits was introduced during the 2nd preparatory workshop.

The following was decided (minutes of first preparatory workshop): “Field visits have to be structured in the same way than the modules. Dr. Salwa Tawk would be responsible for producing 6 plans for these visits and circulate them to the EC by the second week of March”.

It was not clear, in the second preparatory workshop who is in charge and what is the purpose of each one of those visits. Everybody had the impression, during that workshop, that we were supposed to witness a test run for the practical side of the course which we did not. It was decided that the methodology for conducting these field visits ought to be looked at carefully.
As a result, the evaluation of participants for the field visits was controversial. Some viewed those as beneficial, while others felt that these were practically a loss of time and that these visits ought to be well prepared.

“The course content was very comprehensive, however we found out that some of the field visits were insignificant.”

The course Coordinator felt on his side, that the field visits, as they were, served the purpose of showing issues of UA in the MENA region. It was meant to have these as a combination of technical visits and tourism, which seems to have worked. The impact of these visits was beneficial in that some participants referred to some of those visits in Lebanon and Jordan, thus the importance of the roaming course. The negative feedback of some participants, the CC believes, is probably due to the timing of these visits and the over-loaded schedule of the course.

I personally felt that these field visits should have been structured pedagogically. Participants should be given a brief of the project to be visited including the main objectives of the visit and the technical aspects of relevance to UA that need to be looked at. These findings would be looked at more in depth during the module.

b.4. Issues of communication and guidance: Issues of communication and guidance between module team members and the Course Coordinator and the Course Manager was of concern. Some moderators, during the preparation of the courses alluded to “mixed messages” from the Course Coordinator on the amount or the format of the material to be included in the module.

This could have been avoided through explicit understanding of roles and adequate networking and follow up between all concerned in the preparation of the course.

As an attempt to resolve this mis-understanding, some specific technical points related to supervision and follow up came out in the session of the Executive Committee that I attended at the end of the Second preparatory workshop. Unfortunately, the general feeling of both the CC and CF was that these points were not well respected.

b.5. Appropriateness of the training material for the selected teams: The problem emerged upon the test runs of the modules M1 : UA Systems and M2 : Access to water, where the moderators demonstrated through giving their representative blocks a knowledge that was purely theoretical and drifted away from any participatory modalities of knowledge transfer.

The interactive capacities were kept to its minimal. Moreover, it was felt that the group of moderators was not able to connect as a whole in packaging the material to enhance continuity between modules, so how about connecting with the participants.
The TC, CC, CD agreed, at the end of the 2nd workshop, that the participants should get the feel that the moderators have practiced what they have been talking about.

The moderators should demonstrate an experience in adult participatory learning techniques. Participants are not there to attend lectures. It was made very clear during the first preparatory workshop that the approach was to encourage moderators to develop tailor-made participatory learning modules, and it was expected that the moderators will be coached by the Course Coordinator. The initiation of training on participatory techniques after workshop 2 is a late process with a high risk of failure. As a matter of fact, this seems to have been a point to be followed up as a result of the first preparatory workshop but was not done.

It is only fair to say, at this point, that all moderators particularly in M1 and M2, previously mentioned, did a remarkable effort to use the participatory approach as needed. It is true, though, that at some instances this appeared to be a “cut and paste” approach that the moderator needed to mold it into his module.

The Course Coordinator admits, at the end of the course, that he did not push the moderators enough, at the 2nd preparatory workshop, to move along the two lines of academicians and trainers. They were all very late. But since then, they all responded to the crisis situation and their module material started coming up in abundance. After that it was moved to the facilitator and ESDU which was supposed to perform lot of tasks but did not, according to the CC.

One can say, that in view of the above-mentioned remarks, the moderators came with workable modules that picked up on most of the comments that were made in the 2nd workshop. Luckily, we did not witness any dramatic events during the delivery of the course.

The specificity of the training material is a critical point in looking at the learning objectives of every module. It was noted that, although the first preparatory workshop proposed to “build theory on practice by illustrating and anchoring concepts and methods in real-world case studies”. This did not materialize during the 2nd preparatory workshop where the moderators were supposed to give a test run of their modules. The lecturing component was supposed to be kept to a minimum; however this was basically the dominant feature in the first two modules (UA systems and access to water). The third module picked up correctly on the results of the discussion and the moderator was quite capable of altering his presentation to meet the required goal. While the fourth and the fifth modules dealt with their respective subject in a participatory and comprehensive way.

The task of matching the content of the module within an appropriate and participatory way ought to be dealt with by the course coordinator who was expected to review the material by the second preparatory workshop to avoid these alterations.

The evaluation questionnaires at the end of each module showed that some modules have missed the participatory approach by far. This has raised a number of concerns among participants about the overall objective of the
course; was it a teaching course or an initiation of trainers in UA? In fact, among moderators and participants, there were people who felt that this course ought to be designed as a training of trainers (TOT) program. The feeling behind it is that UA capacity in MENA are scarce and this could be a very powerful catalyst towards the launch of the regional network on UA expected to be formed during or towards the end of the course. This was not an objective of the course. I also sensed some tension related to that issue that linked directly to the capacities of some moderators to convey their module in a participatory way. Participants felt that some moderators had to pull their material and find their way by experimentation, and this could have been done easily through a TOT.

**b.6. Contribution of the course design to the participant learning:** The learning material presented by the various moderators seem to offer a substantive introduction to the field of UA. The theoretical component consists of introductory notes as well as methods for applications.

Though the learning objectives and pedagogical strategy were discussed in the first preparatory workshop and recommendations were formulated, it was surprising, at the 2nd workshop that there had been still a lack in the proper follow up and implementation, in some modules, on what was agreed upon in the 1st workshop namely:

1. Conducting the modules in a participatory way involves a lot of flexibility from the moderators, both in the conceptual design and the delivery of the respective modules.
2. The block should contain no more than 20-30 minutes of lectures.
3. Moderators should provide in their blocks not only concepts but also tools and institutional and policy frameworks.
4. Modules should be conducted in an innovative and participatory manner, allowing the participants to share their knowledge and experience.
5. Moderators should avoid the excessive use of power point presentations and focus more on innovative and manual tools.

It was agreed, during the 2nd preparatory workshop, that the participants shall be encouraged to get involved in sharing and exchanging information. This could be through case studies that somehow respond to the demands of the participants. That is why it is expected that the modules shall include a good load of material on UA from the region and beyond.

These recommendations were not respected during the course delivery. Some modules exaggerated in the involvement of participants to the degree of losing the focus of the module and the discussion in question, while some others went into an academic approach that tried to touch on participation with difficulty.

**b.7. Gender and diversity considerations in the course content:**

The issue of gender and social equity was introduced in at the second preparatory workshop. The approach to gender in the course is to make an analysis of what both men and women do and then address inequalities and stereotyped concepts in the introduction of learning modules and the formulation of projects at a later stage. It is expected to see that specific
attention to gender awareness and gender mainstreaming be considered, where needed, in every module. I think this came a bit late. Some of the moderators are not quite accustomed to the concept of Gender and the basic element of gender mainstreaming. Therefore, the introduction of methodologies for gender analysis, at this point in time, was very critical and needed to be dealt with tactfully. The presence of a gender expert facilitated the task.

A positive aspect remains though, is that moderators took a quick feedback during that second workshop, but there was, however, a continuous participatory learning going on.

The gender dimension was well taken during the course. The gender expert met the group early at the course to introduce practical tools to be used for gender analysis in the suggested projects, and to initiate a discussion on the subject at all levels. It was evident that the presence of active female participants supported the process, and it was very rewarding to see that the perspective was fully respected and adopted in discussions as well as project formulation. As to the moderators, I reiterate again that the subject should have been looked at more in depth during module preparation. However, in an attempt to make up for the lost time, some moderators introduced the concept of gender in a ‘cut and paste’ format. That was very obvious and need to be avoided in future courses.

**Main problems**

- Large number of actors in the course preparation
- Overlaps and some confusion between roles and responsibilities of concerned
- Cohesiveness of modules and modules preparation

**Elements**

- Appropriateness of the training material for the selected team and institutions. Material appreciated but there was too much of it. That means that there was not enough time set aside for reflection on the material that was presented. There was technical detail and complexity in some modular blocks which could have been better understood if presented differently.

- The focus of the modules focused on problem definition, methods and policy formulation. The learning process could have moved further in adapting the knowledge and techniques to practical situations which would enhance the abilities of participants to choose and apply options.

- Gender as a cross cutting theme could have been more fully but more simply elaborated. The gender analysis and the introduction of gender dimensions would have been placed better at the beginning of each module and in a more integrated way.
• Capacity building in undertaking UA related research: This component seemed to be lacking. There was not much done to enhance the participants knowledge about UA and awareness of the many techniques available for interventions. Training on UA was limited to the exposure to the different modules and a quick catch up of proposal writing at the end of the course. That leaves you wondering about the needed follow up of participants?

• The replicability of the course as a training modality: the course design is for the large measure replicable but with recommendations: 1- Schedule and conduct of the preparatory workshops such that they can allow ample time for preparation and vetting of course material and training of moderators in facilitation and gender skills. 2- Recognize that close coordination of module preparation is key to successful course delivery. 3- Clarify and define the roles of the various players so that overlaps and ambiguity are avoided. 4- Regional partnership in course management and delivery.

• Once the proposals are submitted, the city will then start utilizing the funds made available. The evaluation process will then assess to what extent the course material is being actively incorporated in participants initiatives and interventions in their cities.

A main question relates to the objectives of this course: was the course an introduction to UA and related concepts or was it an initiation to a development tool to be used by city teams?

c. Conclusions and recommendations:

1. It is very important to engage the participants in the discussion of the modules, the case studies and the field visits. To be able to do that and to draw of examples that could be identified by the participants, it was suggested that moderators would get some background information on the most important features of the countries of the participants which are of relevance to the topic and try as much as possible to use these while giving pertinent example during the flow of the course.

"It would have been much more helpful if the course material was forwarded to participants prior to the course"

2. There exists a need to establish the conceptual coherence between the different modules, and show the broad dimension of UA. Participants should be able to see the whole course as one comprehensive unit that would serve the objectives set by the moderators, and at the same time would allow them to feel that the concept of UA is not alien to their field of work. That is why ESDU suggested that framing the course within the concept of sustainable livelihood could help that integration. Moreover, it is essential for every moderator to keep visible the logical progress in his module and at the same time establish this link with previous as well as
coming modules so that the course could be looked at, as mentioned previously, as one comprehensive unit.

3. Moderators know a lot but we need to make that knowledge accessible to participants. The use of participatory techniques should be emphasized and monitored closely during the course. Moderators shall be ready to change and adjust to the needs of participants or comments of the organizers, if need be.

4. Moderators need to keep a view on the objectives of the module so that it is clear to establish a link between the various blocks as well as with other modules. This would help the moderator monitor the flow of the course and make sure to meet the expectations of the different stakeholders. Most importantly, it would make clear to everybody concerned what kind of knowledge and techniques would you like the participants to get at the end of the session.

5. The introduction of a new approach for working with communities would entail giving an idea of the cost. It is important at this point to introduce in the various modules a cost benefit analysis of a specific intervention of relevance. This could be introduced as a practical example or examples to be performed by each city team. This way local conditions and variables would be accounted for, and the perception of the concerned modules would be acknowledged.

6. Unlike the courses that have been organized previously, the participants in the MENA course were not asked to submit a proposal for a project to be implemented at a later stage. I believe this is a critical issue that has to be well looked at during the course. Participants should be put on track, be initiated to start this exercise and even build the basics of it before they leave.

City teams, at least most of them, do lack the capacities and the skills for proposal writing. This training component could be integrated in future courses. Participants will be exposed to the techniques and will be introduced to the main criteria of relevance in the evaluation and selection of proposals.
Participants and moderators discussed this issue and valued its importance. The group suggested even that organizers could announce that there will be some seed funding available for good project proposals as an incentive.

I think that this is a good start up for a practical exercise that could kick off in the second week of the course where city teams will be guided in an exercise to draft down a preliminary project proposal that would take into account the objectives of the course based on the various elements highlighted by the moderators in the different modules.
These will be put in the appropriate framework of every city team. A mechanism for follow up on the development of the proposal, its implementation and evaluation will be agreed upon during the workshop. A deadline could be set for the submission of the proposals (30 days after the end of the course). An appraisal committee (EC, TC) would evaluate the proposals and award the grants for application.
In retrospect, evaluation should have been introduced since the first preparatory workshop. This could have helped us assess the baseline knowledge of participants in UA and their expectations of the course. Evaluation should have been looked at as an integral part of module preparation. It would have been more helpful and participatory if the evaluator had introduced, as any other moderator, his approach to the participatory evaluation process that he would follow.

Ex-post evaluation

Unlike previous courses in UA, the city teams in the course for the MENA region were asked to submit their proposals to start up an UA activity in their city bearing in mind the basic principles they have acquired in the course. It is important to note that the initiative was started, during the course, as part of the practical initiation and training on practical know-how.

A request for proposal was designed and sent to the teams. A draft proposal was submitted by each team at first, then these were adjusted jointly by the team and the technical committee that advised on some issues.

I tried to outline here-below the major features of the proposals as submitted by the city teams:

1.1 **Amman - Jordan:**

*Production of medical, succulent & fragrant plants to develop home gardens in poor districts of Amman.*

Project implemented jointly by the municipality of Amman and a NGO. An integrated approach is used to link the project with the livelihoods dimension. Gender perspective is well looked at. The project builds on previous pilot experiments in the region to initiate the community dynamics of the project.

1.2 **Baalbeck - Lebanon:**

*Organic medicinal and aromatic plants production in urban home gardens of Baalbeck.*

This project is implemented jointly with the municipality. Once again, we see the initiative moving towards institutionalizing the intervention in UA in a formal structure in the community which would allow for better sustainability in the future. In this city, the team established the link between UA and environment and aimed at an economic dimension through job creation and tourism as Baalbeck happens to be the most visited touristic site in Lebanon.

1.3 **Gaza - Palestine:**

*Towards the Institutionalization of Gaza UA Committee* (a multi-stakeholders committee that was set back in 1999 and which will be re-activated and empowered through this pilot project)

This is probably the most exposed group to the subject of UA. The team has reached a well advanced stage in the perception of UA and the different useful approaches that could be adopted in this field. They have moved in their approach in the project towards establishing a long lasting structure.
that would incorporate UA in future planning in the city. Gender mainstreaming is highly valued in the approach as well as looking at the different elements needed for the project (location, resources, capacity building and advocacy at the level of the stakeholders and authorities.

1.4 Jericho - Palestine:

Campaign to raise awareness of citizens and farmers in Jericho of UA, the importance of developing it, and the creation of a center specialized in UA, the first in Palestine

The project is a vivid example of networking between the different agencies that could be involved in UA. This, in fact, adds up also to a new dimension for the sustainability of any project related to UA. In this way, I see that the various stakeholders can build on a strategy to attract and mobilize resources and prevent further duplication of efforts in the work for UA.

1.5 Setif - Algeria:

The valley of Oued Boussellam: Fostering a symbiotic relationship between urbanization and agriculture

A very well formulated project that looks at a pilot experimentation in a well-delineated area and considers the introduction of UA in a planned way to be able to improve productivity and at the same time ensure proper planning and zoning of the region.

The project tackles economic problems through job creation and introducing a different mode of life that could be beneficial to all groups within that particular community. The implementation looks at involving academicians which will open way for more elaborate studies and analysis of the experiment. A integrated approach to UA well put.

1.6 Tunis - Tunisia:

Collection, stocking and reuse of rainwater for UA through rooftop water systems in Tunis the capital

This project aims at creating public awareness on the issue of UA through activities that targets the general audience. In addition, and to be able to create a vivid example on the subject of UA, the NGO decided to work closely with a school that has shown a good record of work with students on agricultural matters in the city and showed its willingness to assist in the spread of ideas on UA among youngsters. Working with youth could be one of the best means to ensure the sustainability of the approach to UA.

Remarks

In looking at the proposals above-mentioned and that were submitted by the city teams, one can draw a number of interesting remarks:

- The proposals do constitute a convenient tool to evaluate the level of learning that the participants have acquired during the course. In fact, it does not really matter if we try to compare their answers to the baseline questionnaire with the ones they had in the exit end-of course questionnaire as much as what we get when they try to formulate what they have learnt into practical work.
- The concept of UA was well reflected in all the proposals. This was also taken to the dimension of linking it to sustainable livelihoods,
income generation and others. A well understood concept of integration.

- All proposals considered carefully gender mainstreaming.
- All proposals looked as well to the issue of sustainability. It was even taken to the higher level of institutionalization at the city level and at a national level in some other places.
- Ultimately, these proposals would have a strategic direction and that is to influence policies and decision making processes.
- The different projects would constitute a series of diversified lessons learnt that could be exchanged between members of the UA network initiated during the course.
- Technically, we can see in the formulation of the different proposals that the various modules have been reflected carefully in the practical implementation of projects.
- At the level of design and implementation, all the proposals looked carefully at the various steps of project cycles and how to undertake those.
- Moreover, they all looked carefully at the process of monitoring and evaluation of activities by setting baseline information as a start and then milestones to measure progress and finally the targets that need to be achieved.

In conclusion, one can say that by looking at the different proposals, the course was able to achieve the basic objectives it was set for. The city teams do enjoy the knowledge required as well as the basic corner stones for future more elaborate interventions in the field of UA.

**Roaming course**

The reaction of the participants, as reflected in the evaluation form, revealed that they were positive about the idea of the roaming course. They all felt that this added knowledge and experience in the different settings. Some of them went even to the extent of asking for a more elaborate participation from other cities to enrich the knowledge acquired in the course. These observations were supported further by the urge of all participants to work, since the early start of the course, on initiating the formation of a regional network on UA.

This enthusiasm for the idea of roaming had also its drawbacks. Some of the participants called for more focus in the design of both the material of the modules as well as the field visits. They even thought that the focus could start by the geography of the course. However, one wonders whether this idea resulted from being tired to move around. In fact, some complained even that the course was lengthy and it could be made more concise in the future.

**Accommodation and logistics**

The general comments of all participants was that the accommodation in Beirut was very good. A better arrangement was needed in Damascus. A number of participants felt that the trip to Jordan could have been easier if the group stopped at Damascus in addition to the fact that they felt that the Syrian experience in UA was missing. More time could have been scheduled
in Damascus. Finally, most participants commented on the accommodation arrangements in Jordan. The organizers did their best to meet the expectations and the convenience of the participants but that had its problems.

It was interesting to see the sudden changes in schedule and arrangements. I acknowledge the fact that we need in lot of instances to show a certain degree of flexibility, however when this exceeds its limits it falls within the risk of disorder. This will undermine the whole pedagogy of the course and jeopardize the trust of the participants. This point takes us back to the issue of communication between the different key players in the course.
Appendix 1
Regional Training and Knowledge Sharing in Urban Agriculture
for the Middle East and North Africa – 2005-2006

Terms of Reference, Evaluation Consultant.

Background to the course

The American University of Beirut’s Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, through its Environment and Sustainable Development Unit (ESDU), is acting as the implementing agency for a Regional Training Course on Urban Agriculture (UA) for the Middle East-North Africa (MENA) region. The course will build upon earlier experience of regional courses supported by the Cities Feeding People Initiative of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC-CFP), in Francophone Africa, Latin America and Anglophone Africa, in 1998, 2001 and 2004 respectively. UA is a relatively new area of knowledge and IDRC-CFP has been an innovator in supporting both research and learning on it, starting in the 1980s. It works with a variety of institutional partners to develop knowledge, exploring the various dimensions of UA and promoting awareness of and action on it at international, regional, and municipal levels.

The course will be held in September 2005, primarily in Beirut, Lebanon, with shorter periods in Damascus, Syria and especially Amman, Jordan. Two preparatory meetings would be held in the same year, one in February and one in June. The ESDU team that will manage the preparations of the course and related activities includes a project manager, course coordinator, course facilitator, administrative assistant, backed by a technical advisor, an advisory committee and a project evaluator. Moderators will prepare six modules and some additional training sessions and field visits.

The general objectives of the course are to build up the body of knowledge that exists on UA in the MENA region, to establish teams of strongly interested, well-informed, and strategically placed individuals, to enable the improvement of the planning and management of UA within the selected cities, and within MENA more broadly. Ultimately, the course seeks to contribute to strengthening and institutionalising UA in local and national urban development.

Main responsibilities

As with the earlier courses, evaluation will be intrinsic to the pedagogical approach of the MENA Course. A professional evaluator will be contracted to work with the course team during the planning and preparatory process and with them and the participants during the course itself.

The consultant will intervene strategically in the process of course design and development, providing an independent voice and commentary at key moments, as well as a post-course summary evaluation document. The consultant will use the IDRC guidelines for evaluation reports, no. 3 on
formatting of reports and number 4 on quality of assessment. The evaluation is expected to:

- Serve the information needs of intended users and be owned by the stakeholders, in this case represented by the Technical Committee (i.e. useful).
- Be realistic, prudent, diplomatic and frugal (i.e. feasible to act upon in follow-up activities including other courses)
- Be conducted legally, ethically and with due regard to the welfare of all involved (i.e. propriety)
- Reveal and convey technically adequate information about the features that determine worth or merit of the course (i.e. accurate)

The main sources of information are the project documents and the course participants themselves, and information should be gathered from them before, during and after the course as follows:

Ex-ante evaluation:
- Profile of individual knowledge of participants
- Interest in the course (what do they want to learn)
- Project profiles

Evaluation during and at the end of the course:
- Chances in individual knowledge of participants (refer to learning objectives that indicate what the people that will be trained are expected to be able to do (better, different) after the training course)
- Degree of reaching identified learning objectives
- Evaluation of changes in city project proposals
- Evaluation of course set up and used pedagogical modalities
- Evaluation of content of modules
- Evaluation of performance of and interaction between moderators
- Evaluation of course accommodation and logistics

Ex-post evaluation:
- Evaluation of uptake of course results six months after the course

The stated goals of the project document provide the guide to the evaluation, while the overall goals of the CFP programme give the broader context (see both above). The evaluator should be aware of the current state of knowledge of urban agriculture – that it is a new area that is being explored. The evaluation should reflect the fact that the course itself is a part of that exploration, which attempts to develop UPA knowledge collectively, and in a manner that promotes useful learning materials that can be shared subsequently.

**Method and outputs**

The consultant is expected to provide 40 working days for the execution of the task, including full time attendance at the second planning workshop.
during June 2005 in Beirut and the course itself for three weeks during September 2005, in Beirut, Damascus and Amman.

Preliminary findings will be presented to the Planning Committee at the second planning workshop in June 2004, where it will be an item on the agenda for discussion. The preliminary findings will also be provided to the Planning Committee in the form of a report of approximately ten pages. This and the final report will be structured as specified above. Annexes to this report will address each of the learning modules separately.

During the course itself, the evaluation consultant will intervene strategically, providing commentary during structured feedback sessions. This will facilitate structured self-evaluation of the course by the Course Coordinator, Course Facilitator and the Module Team Leaders. The consultant will also attend the final evaluation workshop of the course which will be held immediately following the completion of the course.

Following the course, the evaluator will ascertain, through e-mail contact, the extent to which planned impacts at city level are starting to be felt, through follow-up actions identified in the course. The final evaluation report, to be submitted to the Course Coordinator, the Technical Committee and IDRC within seven months of the completion of the course should be structured as follows:

1. Executive Summary
2. Background to the study
3. Methodology employed
4. Contribution of the course to meeting IDRC’s overall programme evaluation goals
5. Overall performance of the course in defining and developing useful knowledge on UPA, summarizing performance of each learning module as contained in separate annexes.
6. Overall performance of the course in developing a practical approach to pedagogy on UPA, summarizing performance of each learning module as contained in separate annexes.
7. Recommendations for improvements in future courses with respect to course content.
8. Recommendations for improvements in future courses with respect to pedagogy.
10. Annexes on learning modules.
11. Annexes as per IDRC Evaluation Guideline No. 3.

**Contractual aspects**

The evaluator will be identified by the Executive Committee of the project, yet her/his contractual arrangements will be concluded directly with IDRC. The consultant will be paid a total of US$ 15,000 for the work detailed above, which is assumed to take 40 days at the corresponding AUB rate of $375/day. All travel, board and lodging are provided to the evaluator according to the same arrangements provided to the course participants and staff.

Payment will be according to the following schedule:
• $7,500 on submission of the preliminary report, before 30\textsuperscript{th} October 2005.
• $7,500 on submission of the final report, before 30\textsuperscript{th} April 2006.

The evaluator can tap the resources of ESDU for the production of adequate copies of the preliminary and final reports for the members of the Executive Committee and the Module Team leaders, and any audio-visual materials used in the presentation of the evaluation.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Postal Address</th>
<th>E-mail Address</th>
<th>Main Phone Number</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>33 1 39 24 62 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Rue Marechal Joffre, 78000 Versailles France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tél. 33 1 39 24 62 73 Fax 33 1 39 24 62 74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsi</td>
<td>UNDP P.O.Box 11-3216 Beirut Lebanon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Elie.kodsi@undp.org">Elie.kodsi@undp.org</a></td>
<td>961 1 978733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>961 3 247733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodsi</td>
<td>Administrateur Scientifique CIHEAM/IAM Institut Agronomique Méditerranéen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Padilla@iamm.fr">Padilla@iamm.fr</a></td>
<td>33 467046022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3191, route de Mende 34093 MONTPELLIER CEDEX 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel: 33 (0)4 67 04 60 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodsi</td>
<td>P.O.Box 8576 ESCWA-Beirut-Lebanon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tappuni@un.org">tappuni@un.org</a></td>
<td>961 1 978400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>961 3 270056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alasad</td>
<td>P. O. Box 5314, Zahran Post Office, Amman 11183, Jordan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:al-asad@csbe.org">al-asad@csbe.org</a></td>
<td>962 6 461 5297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padilla</td>
<td>American University of Beirut Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences/...</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rzuravk@aub.edu.lb">rzuravk@aub.edu.lb</a></td>
<td>961 1 374374 Ext: 4577/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Hamra, Bliss Street, Beirut, Lebanon P.O.Box: 11-0236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alasad</td>
<td>71 Winchester Str., Ap't 4, Toronto, Ont. M4X 1A8, Canada.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joenasr@compuserve.com">joenasr@compuserve.com</a></td>
<td>961 1 336096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:joenasr@cyberia.net.lb">joenasr@cyberia.net.lb</a></td>
<td>[30] 694-698-7673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jnasr@rverson.ca">jnasr@rverson.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asad</td>
<td>American University of Beirut, Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences ESDU, c/o Dean's Office Hamra, Beirut - LEBANON</td>
<td><a href="mailto:zm13@aub.edu.lb">zm13@aub.edu.lb</a></td>
<td>961 1 374374 Ext: 4503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR 961 3 885512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Regional Training & Knowledge Sharing in Urban Agriculture for the MENA

Baseline questionnaire on basic information and expectations of participants

Dear Participant,

The External Evaluator of the course on Regional Training & Knowledge Sharing in Urban Agriculture for the MENA is in the process of setting a baseline for basic knowledge of participants as well as their expectations of this course. You are therefore kindly urged to answer the questions below and forward this form as soon as possible to ESDU before September 1, 2005. Thank you for your cooperation.

Name: ___________________________
Occupation:______________________
City:_____________________________

1- How did you know about the course?

2- Why did you submit an application to enroll?

3- What is Urban Agriculture?

4- What are your expectations of the course?

5- What are the technical aspects that you would like to see during the course?

6- What is the level of knowledge you posses in each of the following fields:
   - Health/Food Security and UA
   - Environment and UA
   - City planning and UA
   - Water and UA
   - Agricultural systems and UA
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Regional Training and Knowledge Sharing in Urban agriculture
For the Middle East & North Africa

Evaluation Form for the module

You are kindly asked to answer to the questions listed here below. Your candid answer is extremely important to us.

1. What do you think of this module?

Could you please rank the quality of the training in this module on a scale form 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest grade and 5 being the best grade. If for any reason, you feel that the question does not apply to your particular situation or you feel that you do not possess adequate information or opinion on the matter, please indicate that under “no opinion”.

1- How was the quality of training in this module?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5 Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Remarks/Suggestions

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

2- Level of knowledge of the suggested topics in this Module?

Relevance of this Module to your current work or functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5 Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Extent to which you have acquired information that is new to you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5 Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Usefulness for you of the information that you have acquired

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5 Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Focus of this module on what you specifically needed to learn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Extent to which the content of this Module matched the announced objectives
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Highest 5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Overall usefulness of this Module

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Highest 5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Improvement in your appreciation of the complexity of the issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Highest 5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Extent to which you gained ideas that you expect to use in your work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Highest 5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Effectiveness of the module in maintaining your interest during its full duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Highest 5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Usefulness of the cases studies for you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Highest 5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Organization of the case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Highest 5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Information that you gained from that case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Highest 5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Effectiveness of the case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Highest 5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Please rate each item below with respect to quantity or intensity**

Time allocated for discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Excessive</th>
<th>Somewhat Excessive</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Somewhat insufficient</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Interaction between participants and trainers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Excessive</th>
<th>Somewhat Excessive</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Somewhat insufficient</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Depth of treatment of the issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Excessive</th>
<th>Somewhat Excessive</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Somewhat insufficient</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Pace of the delivery of the module

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Excessive</th>
<th>Somewhat Excessive</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Somewhat insufficient</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Variety of the training methods used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Excessive</th>
<th>Somewhat Excessive</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Somewhat insufficient</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What did you find most useful in this module (Please justify your answer)

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

What did you find least useful in this module? (Please justify your answer)

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

How might you apply what you learned in this module?

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

What advice can you give us to improve modules and courses of this kind in the future?

___________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for completing this questionnaire

Appendix 4 (a)
التدريب الإقليمي وتبادل الخبرات في الزراعة الحضرية

في منطقة الشرق الأوسط وشمال إفريقيا

Module 1

استمارة تقييمية حول الفصل الأول: الأنظمة الزراعية

يرجى التفضيل بالاجابة على الأسئلة الواقعة ادناه مما يتيح لنا تحسين ادانتنا في المستقبل. يرجى اعتماد الصراحة والشفافية في اجاباتكم.

- ما رأيك في هذا الفصل؟

يرجى تصنيف نوعية التدريب في هذا الفصل وفق سلم درجات من 1 إلى 5 على أن تكون علامة 1 هي العلامة الأدنى فيما تكون علامة 5 العلامة الأعلى.

- إذا شعرت بأن السؤال لا ينطبق عليك، لا تقم باتباع أي المعلومات الكافية لابداء الرأي، يرجى الإشارة إلى علامة "لا رأي لي".

كيف كانت نوعية تدريب هذا الفصل؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>الآلي 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>الأعلي 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ما هي الملاحظات أو الاقتراحات؟

يرجى إدراج الملاحظات أو الاقتراحات.

- الملاحظة ناجحة

بداية التدريب لم تكن جيدة إما تحسنت لاحقا

- ملاحظات الدقة في اختيار المدربين أصحاب المهارة عالية في تدريب المدربين

- الانتهاك من الاعتماد على أسئلة المحاضرات

- ضعف في إدارة الجلسات ووصف في المشاركة

- نقص إعطاء المعلومات المهمة وربطها بواعظ المدربين المشاركون بالرقام الكامل

- كان الفصل طويل جدا حتى أصبحنا نتمنى أن تكون مرور الكرام

زيادة المشاركة العملية

- زيادة المعرفة في المصطلحات الموجودة في التدريب

- عدم الإلمام الكافي بالموضوعات بدليل التوجه إلى الوثائق بشكل متكرر

- عدم ضبط الأشخاص والتدقيق من المدربين الآخرين أثناء الدروس

- عدم تقليل الملاحظات والتنقل الإيجابية من النقاط والأمور بها بشكل سهل

- إبقاء المدربين في حالة بالاعتماد ولكن حصول بعض الأسئلة

- محاولة أخذ ادوات بيداغوجية أكثر فاعلية

2- مستوى معرفة المواضيع المفترضة في الفصل؟

ارتباط هذا الفصل في عملك الحالي

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>الآلي 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>الأعلي 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

إلى أي حد أكسبت أي معلومات جديدة بالنسبة لديك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>الآلي 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>الأعلي 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

منافع المعلومات التي أكسبت أي بالنسبة لديك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>الآلي 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>الأعلي 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
تركز هذا الفصل على ما ارتبته معرفته بالتحديد؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 1</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

مدى تنباس محتوى هذا الفصل مع أهداف الفصل المعلنة؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 1</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

الفائدة العامة لهذا الفصل؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 1</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

تطوير فهمك/يك للتحديات المحيطة بالموضوع؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 1</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

مقدار اكتساب الأفكار التي تتوقعون/ن استخدامها في عملك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 1</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

فاعلية الفصل في اثارة اهتمامك كام الفتره الزمنية المحددة له؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 1</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

فعالية دراسات الحالة/ CASE STUDIES/ التمرين

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 1</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

تنظيم الزيارة الميدانية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 1</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

العلومات التي اكتسبتها من الزيارة الميدانية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 1</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

فعالية الزيارة الميدانية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 1</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

يرجى تصنيف كل من النقاط الواردة أدناه وفق الكم أو النوعية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>نسبية مبالغ به</td>
<td>نسبية غير كاف</td>
<td>مناسب</td>
<td>غير كاف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

التفاعل بين المشاركين والمدرب

33
ما الذي وجدته الأكثر فائدة في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الإجابة)

- الزيات الميدانية-بمساحة الطرح-السلامة من تشتت الكثمات-المصطلحات الجيدة-محاضرة الضيف السيد
- ديقة
- وقياسات
- ونتائج واسطة
- والثبات وعدد التردد في مراحل وتدابير التدريب بالرغم من أهمية الموضوع- لم تعتمد التدريب نماذج موعرة عن الأنظمة الزراعية- مازال المفاهيم غير واضحة بالنسبة للناطق- لم
- تكن الزيات الميدانية على قدر كاف من الفائدة مع تميز إفارة تعاونيات- لم يبلغ المتدربون الوقت الكافي
- للتدريس- وجدت هذه النماذج خاصة بالنسبة للمبتدئين في عصر فريق بعضه عن بلد- التمرين- مفاهيم
- على مفاهيم مشتركة- لم اجد كل المفاهيم ذات فائدة. التركيز على العرض من دون القدرة على إلحاق المفاهيم-
- طول فترة العرض وعدم ملاءمتها لل котор- تدوير النفايات وإعادة استخدامها- كان هناك خلل بين الزراعه
- الطبية- وعصب
- لطرح
- جمع
- والتعابير والدراستينات التي شرحت
- ممكناً في لينين الأول في بعض القرى البعيدة عن المدن المتواجدة- أفانتي الزيات الميدانية لفاح
- للمشروع الذي أقره- إلى إننا يمكن أن تكون نماذج موعرة عن الاستقلال والمثلى للمؤتمرات المحلية
- المستقلة- إن مكتب المشروع بطريقه سليمة بعد دراسة شاملة لدينداي ومجتمع الذي ساعدنا- تطبيق
- الجهود والمراقبة وتطوير تلك نماذج أو نظام أو نظام زراعي في المنطقة المستهدفة- قد وضع
- ونهاية محمودية الزراعية الصحية للمجالس المحلية في نطاق مشروع أطرف قضايا الزراعية الحضرية
- وإيضاح دورها في خلق فرص عمل ومتعمه من استقلال الموارد الطبيعية وتوهجهما من أجل تنمية مستدامة
- للمجتمعات المحلية.

هل يمكن أن تعملي نصيحة لتطوير هذا الفصل في المستقبل؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>لازم لي</th>
<th>مبلغ به</th>
<th>نسبا مبلغ به</th>
<th>مناسب</th>
<th>نسبا غير كاف</th>
<th>غير كاف</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>عمق معالجة الموضوع</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سرعة إعطاء التدريب</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>التتوع في استخدام الأساليب التدريبية</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- أعطاء منهجية علمية ووثائق بالإضافة إلى ما قدمته المحاضرة. اتخاذ الملاحظات بين الاعتبار. الدقة في اختيار المدربين. اعتماد منهجيات وتدخلات واضحة للتدريب. تطوير أساليب المشاركة. ضرورة التركيز على اقتراح المشاركة في التقييم الموسمي والمنهجي لمنهج الدورة للوصول إلى التثبيك. من الأفضل أن تكون معلومات عن المدن المشاركة مسبقاً وأن يكون هناك دراسة أولية لواقع هذه المدن من قبل فريق ثم يحضر الدورة ممثل عن الفريق وان يكون هناك ورش عمل لوضع دراسة أولية عن المدن المشاركة لاستكمال الدورة حيث تكون أكثر واقعية. التمكين من استخدام الأدوات في عرض الأنشطة وتمارين تعليم المحاضرات. إعطاء معلومات واضحة للمشاركين حول أهداف التمارين وطرق الخروج. منagraphs تحقق الفائدة من التمرين. أن يتم في دول مختلفة لاستكمال خبرات عملية متنوعة في هذا المجال. الدقة في اختيار المصطلحات. التركيز على المفاهيم بالإضافة إلى الجانب التطبيقي. زيادة اللفاءات مع أصحاب الخبرة العملية والمؤسسات ذات العلاقة بالإعلام على الواقع من جميع جوانبه. يمكن أن تشكل الورشة حجر الأساس لبدء عمل أثري لتبادل مفهوم الزراعة الحضرية.

شكرا لاجابتكم/ن.
Module 1: Agricultural Systems and UA

By looking at the complete evaluation form that the participants had filled at the end of module 1, we can draw the following remarks:

- 91% felt that the quality of the training within the module was relatively adequate.
- **Suggestions for future modules:** - Need to be careful in the selection of moderators- The module was boring and long. Some points towards the end of the module were discussed barely- The moderator was not in full control of the material in question. She had to refer frequently to the documents and notes- The need to increase practical examples and related field visits.
- 86% felt that module 1 was related to their actual line of work.
- 68% felt that they have acquired new knowledge.
- 86% acknowledged that the information they have acquired is useful.
- 81% found out that the content of the module matched the objectives set at the start.
- 91% found that the module was generally useful and 94% felt that the module developed their understanding of the complexity of the topic.
- 82% felt that the ideas transferred through the module could be used in their line of work.
- Module 1 was 76% effective in capturing the interest of participants.
- The case studies related to this module were found to be 95% effective.
- Participants felt that the field visits were well organized (90%), knowledgeable (81%) and effective (85%).
- Time for discussion was found to be 72% suitable, while 23% found out that it was exaggerated.
- The interaction among participants and moderators was found to be 82% adequate.
- The speed of the training in the module was found to be 63.6% suitable with an 82% adequate diversification of pedagogical tools.
- **Most useful:** Good terminology- Field visits- Guest lecturer-Exercises and interaction between city teams- What to prepare before writing a proposal for a UA project.
- **Least effective:** Lack of practical examples- Unorganized interventions from organizers and other moderators- Absence of conclusions to exercises- The concept of systems is still unclear- Participants are not given enough time to interact- Not all the information given was useful- Lengthy session that are not suitable for the content of the module-More concentration was put on the presentation rather than on the ability to explain concepts.
- **Application of the module:** Design new strategies for agricultural systems and analyze existing factors within participating city teams- Most of the concepts that have been introduced are not applicable but in few remote areas- Comprehensive assessment of the situation before writing a proposal on UA- Build up a data base before the implementation of a agricultural system in the targeted cities- Create awareness on UA.
- **Advice to improve the module:** Adopt a methodology for the presentation of the content and provide additional documentation to
the module content- Consider seriously the comments made by the 
participants- Develop participatory methods- Adequate selection of 
moderators- Use of sound, clear training techniques- Initiate 
participation within a TOT approach- Provide information on every 
participating city for further development of training- Give a clear 
indication on how to build up a case study or an exercise- Focus on 
concepts besides practical examples.
**Appendix 4 (b)**

**التدريب الإقليمي وتبادل الخبرات في الزراعة الحضرية في منطقة الشرق الأوسط وشمال أفريقيا**

**استمرارية تقريبية حول الفصل الثاني: الإعداد البيئي للزراعة الحضرية 2**

يرجى التفضيل بالإجابة على الأسئلة الواردة أدناه مما يتيح لنا تحسين أدائنا في المستقبل. يرجى اعتماد الصرامة والشفافية في إجاباتك/أنه هذه الإجابات. كانت إجابتك/هي قيمة جيدة بالنسبة البداية.

1- ما رأيك في هذا الفصل؟

يرجى تصنيف نوعية التدريب في هذا الفصل وفق سلم درجات 1 إلى 5 على أن تكون علامة 1 هي العلامة الأدنى فيما تكون علامة 5 العلامة الأعلى.

- إذا شعرت بأن السؤال لا ينطبق عليك أو أنك لا تملك أي المعلومات الكافية لإبداء الرأي، يرجى الإشارة إلى علامة "لا رأي لي".

كيف كانت نوعية تدريب هذا الفصل؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الراي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 5</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأدنى 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ما هي الملاحظات أو الاقتراحات؟

- كان وقت التدريب ناقص قليلاً مما يشعر المتلود وكأنه في امتحان وعليه الالتزام بالوقت. يتميز هذا الفصل بالعموميات. ممتاز - الوقت غير كاف والبرنامج مكلف - امكانية التكرار واعتماد مزيد من الوقت للشرح الإخباري والتدريب العملي - زيادة الخبرات العلمية -أسلوب جيد جداً، واضح ومفهوم وتمارين العملية جيدة وهي تزيد المشاركون خبرة ومعرفة في المد - تردد نسخ من المحاضرات - كان المدرب على مستوى عال من المعرفة - يعتبر هذا الفصل من أهم الفصول من حيث المعلومات وخاصة من حيث المنهجية المتبقية.

2- مستوى معرفة المواضيع المقترحة في الفصل؟

ارتباط هذا الفصل في عمل الحالي

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الراي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 5</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأدنى 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

إلى أي حد أكسبت/ي معلومات جديدة بالنسبة البداية؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الراي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 5</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأدنى 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

مناقش المعلومات التي أكسبت/ي بالنسبة البداية؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الراي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 5</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأدنى 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

تركيز هذا الفصل على ما أردت/ي معرفته بالتحديد؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الراي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 5</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأدنى 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

مدى تناسب محتوى هذا الفصل مع أهداف الفصل المعلنة؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الراي لي</th>
<th>الأعلى 5</th>
<th>الأعلى 4</th>
<th>الأعلى 3</th>
<th>الأعلى 2</th>
<th>الأدنى 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
الفاتحة العامة لهذا الفصل؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأى</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>المتوسط</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

تطوير فهمك/للتعميدات المحيطة بالموضوع؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأى</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>المتوسط</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

مقدار اكتساب الأفكار التي تتوقعون/أن استخدامها في عملك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأى</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>المتوسط</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

فعالية الفصل في أثره اهتمامك كامل الفترة الزمنية المحددة له؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأى</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>المتوسط</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

فعالية دراسات الحالة/التمارين

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأى</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>المتوسط</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

تنظيم الزيارة الميدانية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأى</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>المتوسط</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

المعلومات التي اكتسبتها من الزيارة الميدانية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأى</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>المتوسط</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

فعالية الزيارة الميدانية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأى</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>المتوسط</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

يرجى تصنيف كل من النقاط الواردة أدناه وفق الكم أو النوعية

الوقت المخصص للنقاش

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأى</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>المتوسط</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

التفاعل بين المشاركين والمدرب

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأى</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>المتوسط</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

عمق معالجة الموضوع

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأى</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>المتوسط</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

سرعة اعطاء التدريب
ما الذي وجدته الأكثر فائدة في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الأجاية)


- ما الذي وجدته الأكثر فائدة في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الأجاية)

كلمة مفيد. الزيارات الميدانية لم تزود المعلومات بعداً عملاً وعابياً - التركيز الإداري في طرح الموضوع بحيث لنساناً أصحاب التخصص - التحكم في زمن النصوص - لم تربط الزيارات الميدانية مع الزراعة الحضرية خارج الاطار البيئي - تعميق معي المفاهم المستعملة - مناقشات تحتاج إلى وقت اطول.

كيف يمكن أن أتلقى/ي ما تعلمنا في هذا الفصل؟ (إذا امتلاً إذا امكن)

- تشجيع الاتجاه البياني إلى جانب النباتات في الزراعة الحضرية وذلك بالنسبة إلى السكان المحليين - إيسال المفاهيم البيئية إلى المجتمعات المحلية في مبايعة الزراعة الحضرية - طرح مشكلة البيئة في المشروع المقترح - تحليل عناصر المشروع - ربط خاصية البيئة ببعضها البعض - ضمن منهجية علمية متواضعة - دراسة أي مشروع والدراسات السلبية والأجنبية - في تطبيق الأثر البيئي للمشروع في التخطيط الإضافي الضروري ومطابقة المعلومات العامة في تجديد ألوانها - تبسط المعلومات تم التدرج لتحقيق الأثر. استخدم الطرح المحتمل عند تنفيذ المشروع وتفاهمها للتمييز ومن ثم متابعة التنفيذ على الأرض - من خلال لجان محلية في المناطق تساهم في درس ووقت عمل المشروع - العمل الكومبوستي وترجمة الثروة الحيوانية في ضواحي المدينة.

هل يمكن أن نتعهد نصيحة تطور هذا الفصل في المستقبل؟

- استخدام مريد ووسائل التوضيحية تطور هذه الدورة إلى مستوى دبلوم وموجات أكثر تقدمًا
- استخدام مزيد من المواد تعليمية تطور هذه الدورة إلى مستوى دبلوم وموجات أكثر تقدمًا
- الاستخدام الواعي والدقيق في إضافة المفاهيم الشكلية - طرح الموضوع بشكل جيد. الأساليب الإستهلاك والمهارات المتنورة - استعمال الخبرات الشاملة في المشاريع - فحص نوع من المشاركة الإقليمية - يجب أن يكون الناحية العلمية قرب إلى التطبيق أضاف الوقت الكافي للدفاع عن المشروع المقتريحة من قبل الفرق. طبقة المشاريع القائمة من الفرق وتتابعها ومطابقة المشاريع المعاينة على الفرق.

- معلومات النقل. إن بيكي شادي هو الاستاذ، ولا ينصح نفس الرؤى الجميلة والسلسة في إعطاء المعادلات.
- اقترح بأن يعرض المدراء الفيلم قبل الفصل ثم التصوص في أن يعرض الفيلم لاحقاً للتعليم. ننكر هذا النوع من التدريب ولكن بعض أكثر من الجامعات الإداري والعلي وعابياً من الواقع الفعلي. تنوي التدريب. أن يكون الخطوات التالية بالإضافة إلى كل ما قبل الحاضرة على ما يجب أن يكون هذا التدرب. لا يمكن في النهاية من مشاهدة كافحة نماذج المشاريع وتركز أثناء المناشطات وعدم وجود تفكك في دراسة المشروعات. تتوسع في بعض المصطلحات. تتوسع أكثر كاذبة الزراعة السودانية مشاهدة عابياً وفاضلة وبداعة عدد الحاضرة.

شكرًا لابتكاران.
Module 2: Environment and UA

By looking at the complete evaluation form that the participants had filled at the end of module 2, we can draw the following remarks:

- All participants (100%) felt that the quality of the training within the module was relatively adequate.
- *Suggestions for future modules:* - Timing was short and the content of the module is extensive- This module is characterized by the general information it provides- Increase in practical knowledge- Excellent teaching technique- The moderator was very knowledgeable- This is probably one of the most important module in both content and training technique-
- 95% felt that module 2 was related to their actual line of work.
- 100% felt that they have acquired new knowledge.
- 100% acknowledged that the information they have acquired is useful.
- 100% found out that the content of the module matched the objectives set at the start.
- 100% found that the module was generally useful and 94% felt that the module developed their understanding of the complexity of the topic.
- 100% felt that the ideas transferred through the module could be used in their line of work.
- Module 2 was 100% effective in capturing the interest of participants.
- The case studies related to this module were found to be 100% effective.
- Participants felt that the field visits were well organized (100%), knowledgeable (95%) and effective (95%).
- Time for discussion was found to be 85% suitable.
- The interaction among participants and moderators was found to be 90% adequate.
- The speed of the training in the module was found to be 85% suitable with an 85% adequate diversification of pedagogical tools.
- *Most useful:* Incorporating environment as a key element in the design and implementation of projects- Importance of Organic and animal production in UA- Environmental Impact Assessment- Working in groups- Comprehensive approach- Methodology- Interaction between city teams- Good terminology- Field visits.
- *Least effective:* The field visits did not add much to the theoretical knowledge- The academic approach was a bit exaggerated- The field visits were put in a Lebanese context- Need to deepen the understanding of concepts used in the module- Participants are not given enough time to interact-
- *Application of the module:* Encourage animal production within UA- Convey the concepts of environmental protection to local communities as part of UA- Analysis of the project components- Design of the EIA in a project-
- *Advice to improve the module:* Use educational tools- Adopt a methodology for the presentation of the content and provide additional documentation to the module content based on practical examples from MENA- Deepen the level of training both in academic information and practical know-how- Consider seriously the
comments made by the participants- Provide information on every participating city for further development of training- Give a clear indication on how to build up a case study or an exercise- Focus on concepts besides practical examples- Better organization of field visits.
Appendix 4 (c)

تدريب الإقليمي وتبادل الخبرات في الزراعة الحضرية في منطقة الشرق الأوسط وشمال أفريقيا

Module 3

استمارة تقييمية حول الفصل الثالث: الولوج إلى الأرض في الزراعة الحضرية

يرجى التفضيل بالإجابة على الأسئلة الواردة أدناه مما يؤدي إلى تحديد إداناتي في المستقبل. يرجى اعتماد الصرف والشفافية في إجاباتك/أن.

1 - ما رأيك في هذا الفصل؟
يرجى تصنيف نوعية التدريب في هذا الفصل وفق سلم درجات من 1 إلى 5 على أن تكون علامة 1 هي الدراسة الإدانية فيما تكون علامة 5 الإجابة الإجابة.

- إذا شعرت بأن السؤال لا ينطبق عليك اتركها كما تملك أي المعلومات الكافية لإبداء الرأي، يرجى الإشارة إلى علامة "لا أرى لي".

كيف كانت نوعية تدريب هذا الفصل؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا أرى لي</th>
<th>الإجابة 5</th>
<th>الإجابة 4</th>
<th>الإجابة 3</th>
<th>الإجابة 2</th>
<th>الإجابة 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ما هي الملاحظات أو الاقتراحات؟

- مراجعة المادة العلمية قبل موعدها-الأثراء اللغوي-عرض خيارات مزيد من حالات دول العربية-تعزيز الجانب اللغوي
- تقديم مساعدة في تجربة سريعة تجهيز المقررات وتوزيعها توضيح نظام الإدارة للسلطات التنفيذية في كل مدينة إيجابيا أو سلبًا على موضوع الدورة-الفصل مبكر وشهد تبادلا معرضا بين المشاركين-تفاصيل في تعرف المفاهيم وتلخيصه-كأن يجب اقتصار الفصل والتركيز على المهم كانت الأفضل التطرق إلى هذا الفصل منذ بداية الدورة-غلي بالمعلومات-فصل مكثف جداً-مزيج من المناقشات حول خصوصية كل مدينة-تكو في هذه النشاطات مستقبل بابين إيجاد آلة فصل من التواصل بين العاملين والمهتمين في هذا القطاع. أقترح دقة أكثر في التنظيم.

Module 2

- مستوى معرفة المواضيع المفترضة في الفصل

ارتباط هذا الفصل في عملك الحالي

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا أرى لي</th>
<th>الإجابة 5</th>
<th>الإجابة 4</th>
<th>الإجابة 3</th>
<th>الإجابة 2</th>
<th>الإجابة 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

إلى أي حد أكسبت/ي معلومات جديدة بالنسبة ليك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا أرى لي</th>
<th>الإجابة 5</th>
<th>الإجابة 4</th>
<th>الإجابة 3</th>
<th>الإجابة 2</th>
<th>الإجابة 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

مناقشة المعلومات التي أكسبت/ي بالنسبة ليك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا أرى لي</th>
<th>الإجابة 5</th>
<th>الإجابة 4</th>
<th>الإجابة 3</th>
<th>الإجابة 2</th>
<th>الإجابة 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

تركيز هذا الفصل على ما أردت/ي معرفته بالتحديد؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا أرى لي</th>
<th>الإجابة 5</th>
<th>الإجابة 4</th>
<th>الإجابة 3</th>
<th>الإجابة 2</th>
<th>الإجابة 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

مدى تناسب محتوى هذا الفصل مع أهداف الفصل المعلنة؟

43
الفائدة العامة لهذا الفصل؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي في</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا أرى لي</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

تطوير فهمك/يد للتعميدات المحيطة بالموضوع؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي في</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا أرى لي</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

مقدار اكتساب الأفكار التي تتوقعون استخدامها في عملك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي في</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا أرى لي</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

فاعلية الفصل في إثارة اهتمامك كمافة الفترة الزمنية المحددة له؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي في</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا أرى لي</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

فاعلية دراسات الحالة/التمارين CASE STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي في</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا أرى لي</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

تنظيم الزيارة الميدانية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي في</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا أرى لي</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

المعلومات التي اكتسبتها من الزيارة الميدانية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي في</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا أرى لي</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

فاعلية الزيارة الميدانية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي في</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا أرى لي</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

يرجى تصنيف كل من النقاط الواردة أدناه وفق الكم أو النوعية

الوقت المخصص للنقاش

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي في</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا أرى لي</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

التفاعل بين المشاركين والمدرب

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي في</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا أرى لي</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

عمق معالجة الموضوع

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي في</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا أرى لي</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
سرعة اعطاء التدريب

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا يأتي لي</th>
<th>يطير مناسبة</th>
<th>يطير غير مناسبة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>نسبا مبالغ به</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نسبا مبالغ به</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ما الذي وجده الأقل ف/sp�;دة في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الإجابة)


ما الذي وجده الأقل ف/sp podráً في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الإجابة)


كيف يمكن أن تنطبق/ ما تعلمت في هذا الفصل؟ (أعط مثال إذا امكن)


هل يمكن أن تعطي نصيحة لتطوير هذا الفصل في المستقبل؟


شكرًا لإنجازكم.
Module 3: Access to land and UA

By looking at the complete evaluation form that the participants had filled at the end of module 3, we can draw the following remarks:

- 96% felt that the quality of the training within the module was relatively adequate.
- **Suggestions for future modules:** - The need to review the technical material before the final presentation of the module- More case studies from Arab countries- Need to be careful in the translation of terminologies- Interesting module that witnessed interaction between the participants- Some points could have been summarized- More organization of the module-
- 86% felt that module 3 was related to their actual line of work.
- 95% felt that they have acquired new knowledge.
- 100% acknowledged that the information they have acquired is useful.
- 100% found out that the content of the module matched the objectives set at the start.
- 95% found that the module was generally useful and 100% felt that the module developed their understanding of the complexity of the topic.
- 95% felt that the ideas transferred through the module could be used in their line of work.
- Module 3 was 100% effective in capturing the interest of participants.
- The case studies related to this module were found to be 100% effective.
- Participants felt that the field visits were well organized (90%), knowledgeable (81%) and effective (85%).
- Time for discussion was found to be 81% suitable, while 10% found out that it was exaggerated.
- The interaction among participants and moderators was found to be 95% adequate.
- The speed of the training in the module was found to be 85% suitable with an 77% adequate diversification of pedagogical tools.
- **Most useful:** Lessons learnt from other city teams- Exercises that had allowed comparison between the different city teams- Ways of interaction of UA with city planning-
- **Least effective:** Lack of practical examples- Unorganized interventions from organizers and other moderators- Absence of conclusions to exercises- Participants are not given enough time to interact- Not all the information given was useful- Lengthy session that are not suitable for the content of the module.
- **Application of the module:** Most of the concepts that have been introduced are not applicable- Comprehensive assessment of the situation before writing a proposal on UA- Create awareness on UA- Establish the link between spatial planning and UA- Cooperation between the public and private sectors-
- **Advice to improve the module:** Adopt a methodology for the presentation of the content and provide additional documentation to the module content- Consider seriously the comments made by the participants- develop participatory methods- Use of sound, clear training techniques- Initiate participation of the city teams as
permanent members of an organizing committee- Provide information on every participating city for further development of training.
Appendix 4 (d)

التدريب الاقليمي وتبادل الخبرات في الزراعة الحضرية

MODULE 4

الاستمارة تقييمية حول الفصل: الزراعة الحضرية-الصحة والأمن الغذائي

يرجى التفضل بالاجابة على الأسئلة الواردة أدناه مما يتيح لنا تحسين أداننا في المستقبل. يرجى اعتماد الراية والشفافية في اجابةكم. إن هذه الإجابات، كانت إجابية أم سلبية-هي قيمة جدًا بالنسبة الينا.

1- ما رأيك في هذا الفصل؟

يرجى تصنيف نوعية التدريب في هذا الفصل وفق سم درجات من 1 إلى 5 على أن تكون علامة 1 هي الاعلان الأدنى فيما تكون علامة 5 الاعلان الأعلى.

• إذا شعرت بأن السؤال لا يتطابق على أليك أو أنك لا تملك أي المعلومات الكافية لإبداء الرأي، يرجى الإشارة إلى علامة "لا أرى".

كيف كانت نوعية تدريب هذا الفصل؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الراية</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ما هي الملاحظات أو الاقتراحات؟

- كان هناك نقص في إعطاء مثة عمل أو زيارة ميدانية حيث كانت الزراعة الميدانية بعيدة عن اهداف الفصل.

لم يكن العمل الجماعي متكافئاً، أدى ذلك الفصل إلى اتساق أفكار مزيد من المشاركة والتفاعل بين المشاركين. الامثلة واقعية متنوعة ومتميزة ولكن نقص في تقدمها. كانت نوعية التدريب ممتازة حيث أنها كانت متنوعة وشائعة ومتميزة ولم نحس باي مثل منها. كانت اقتران في النوعية الجيدة لهذا التدريب في هذا الفصل ولارتبط بالصحة أن يكون التوسع في مفهوم المدينة الصحية على مستوى كافة المقابلية واحدة لقائمة

إنها ما نحن عليه- الفصل ذو منهج عمل مفيد جدا مع طريقة عمل مشروفة.

MODULE 2- مستوى معرفة المواضيع المفترضة في الفصل الحالي

العلاقة بين الفصل في عمل الحالي

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الراية</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

إلى ما حد اكتسبت/ي معلومات جديدة بالنسبة للبيك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الراية</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

منافع المعلومات التي اكتسبت/ي بالنسبة للبيك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الراية</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

تركز هذا الفصل على ما اردت/ي معرفته بالتحديد؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الراية</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

مدى تناسب محتوى هذا الفصل مع أهداف الفصل المعلنة؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الراية</th>
<th>الأعلى</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>الأدنى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
لا راي لي | الأعلى 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | الأدنى 1
---|---|---|---|---|---
| | 56% | 44% | | | 
الفائدة العامة لهذا الفصل؟
لا راي لي | الأعلى 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | الأدنى 1
---|---|---|---|---|---
| | 36% | 56% | 8% | | 
تطوير فهمك/ي للتقييدات المحيطة بالموضوع؟
لا راي لي | الأعلى 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | الأدنى 1
---|---|---|---|---|---
| | 40% | 40% | 20% | | 
مقدار اكتساب الأفكار التي توقعون/ين استخدامها في عملك؟
لا راي لي | الأعلى 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | الأدنى 1
---|---|---|---|---|---
| | 40% | 36% | 24% | | 
فاعلية الفصل في اثارة اهتمامك كامل الفترة الزمنية المحددة له؟
لا راي لي | الأعلى 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | الأدنى 1
---|---|---|---|---|---
| | 40% | 36% | 24% | | 
فاعلية دراسات الحالة/ Case Studies/ التمرين
لا راي لي | الأعلى 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | الأدنى 1
---|---|---|---|---|---
| | 40% | 44% | 16% | | 
ملاحظة: أكمل 11 مشارك من إجمالي 25 تعبئة الأسئلة العائدة للزيارة الميدانية فيما اعتبر الباقين أن الزيارة الميدانية لا علاقة لها بالفصل.

Eleven (11) participants out of 25 completed the section related to the field visit in the questionnaire while the others felt that this is irrelevant.

لا راي لي | الأعلى 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | الأدنى 1
---|---|---|---|---|---
| | 44% | 40% | 16% | | 
المعلومات التي اكتسبتها من الزيارة الميدانية
لا راي لي | الأعلى 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | الأدنى 1
---|---|---|---|---|---
| | 18% | 9% | 18% | 18% | 36% 
فاعلية الزيارة الميدانية
لا راي لي | الأعلى 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | الأدنى 1
---|---|---|---|---|---
| | 18% | 18% | 9% | 18% | 36% 
يرجى تصنيف كل من النقاط الواردة أدناه وفق الكم أو النوعية
لا راي لي | الأعلى 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | الأدنى 1
---|---|---|---|---|---
| | 8% | 60% | 10% | | 
الوقت المخصص للنقاش
لا راي لي | الأعلى 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | الأدنى 1
---|---|---|---|---|---
| | 4% | 96% | | | 
التفاعل بين المشاركين والمدرّب
وعق معالجة الموضوع

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>غير كاف</th>
<th>مناسب</th>
<th>غير غير كاف</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

سرعة اعداد التدريب

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>غير كاف</th>
<th>مناسب</th>
<th>غير غير كاف</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

التنوع في اعداد الأساليب التدريبية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا رأي لي</th>
<th>غير كاف</th>
<th>مناسب</th>
<th>غير غير كاف</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ما الذي وجدته الأكثر فائدة في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الإجابة)

1. التعريف بشكل عام عن علاقة الزراعة الحضرية بالأمن الغذائي، وكيفية معرفة الأمن الغذائي والصحة بشكل عام في مجتمع ما. - مفهوم المدن الصحية المضمون والاسلوب، بالإضافة إلى بعض المعايير التي تعتقد بهدف (du simple au complexe- Excellent indicator)
2. تعريف مفهوم الأمن الغذائي واستراتيجيات توجيه المحاضر من البضائع إلى المعدات (ادخل ذاتية المحصلة المهنية عند عملية التخطيط والتنفيذ والمتاحة، والتقنية للمشاريع التنموية، وربط قضايا الزراعة الحضرية بالأمن الغذائي والمكافحة على الإدماج أو الدراسة أو البحث)
3. مكون أساس أساس من البيئة، طريقة المقاومات كبداية وتسليطها وربطها بالملاحظات كنوع من المراعاة العامة، ويمكن تحقيق الأهداف المضمنة في المدى المحدّثة لتدريب الكتيبة كانت واثقة ودالة على مدى تمكين المحاضر من المادة، طريقة تطوير مهاراته لاعداد الدراسات وربط الأمن الغذائي بالصحة والزراعة الحضرية، مفاهم جديدة، واعدة التدخل، والمحتوى في عدة موضوعات تم توحدها توحدة واحدة مشتركة، تعلم الجملة.
4. تطوير مفهوم الأمن الغذائي والزراعة الحضرية وربطه بالصحة العامة، تطوير مفهوم الأمن الغذائي وربطه بالصحة العامة، تطوير مفهوم الأمن الغذائي وربطه بالصحة العامة، تطوير مفهوم الأمن الغذائي وربطه بالصحة العامة، تطوير مفهوم الأمن الغذائي وربطه بالصحة العامة...

(2019) 

ما الذي وجدته الأكثر فائدة في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الإجابة)

كل موضوع في هذا الفصل مفيد. الزراعة الميدانية ليست بمثابة العنان-الزيارات الميدانية كلما ورد... كان ايجابيًا. كل المواضيع كانت مهمة بالرغم من أن موضوع الصحة والأمن الغذائي والزراعة الحضرية يرجو إعطاؤ الأدوات والدراسية المتعلقة بالمستقبل، وفي زاوي من البحث والدراسات في هذا المجال. لا يوجد تأثير ذكر الاجتماع أو الجدول الصحي مع تقدير تعليمية على الجوانب التنموية (الاقتصادية والاجتماعية).

كيف يمكن أن تعطى لهذه الإجابة (أعتقد أن هذا الإجابة)...
وتشرّب أهمية الأمن الغذائي، الزراعات الصحية. موازيات الاحتياجات للمحافظة على مجتمع أفضل. حسب ظروف العمل توعية المستفيدين لأهمية موضوع الأمن الغذائي وعليكم معالمهم الصحية عن طريق القواعد والمسارات المحددة لذلك. تنفيذ هذه المبادرات لجميع الدروس الزراعية في المدينة. الاستضافات من المبادرات في تنفيذ مشروع الحديقة المنزلية. توسيع نطاق العمل البيئي والتنموي إلى جوانب أبعد وأشمل من خلال استمرار واستبان قياس الأمن الغذائي في مدينتي وتعليم الخطر. يمكن التطبيق من خلال علمي في اطار بناء القدرات لدى المجالس المحلية والمجالس المحلية ونصل بهذا النوعية والتطبيع التي سيكون لها مردود بالغ وفعال في تهيئة قاعدة قوية للعمل. داخل مفهوم الأمن الغذائي والصحة عند أعداد مłatحة مشاريع. توفير غذاء آمن وصحي. التخفيف من التثبيسات استخدام واسع النطاق للمبادرات والرقابة ودراسة تحديد أوتامبات العمل يمكن تطبيق ذلك أولا في عمّل المشاريع كذلك في الحياة العملية وعند عمل الاستبانات الخاصة بالزراعة الحضارية والأمن الغذائي. من خلال إعطاء دور كبير للاحداث بشكل عام وبالصحة بشكل خاص للمزارع والتعاونيات والجهات المثقفة وهميتها بالمشاريع المقررة للزراعة الحضرية. كاستاذ محاضر.

ارى في هذا الفصل مادة مشابهة لوطني كباحث ومدرسة.

هل يمكن أن نعطي نصيحة لتطوير هذا الفصل في المستقبل؟

كيفية تقييم المشاريع التنموية صحيا معنى الطريق والإصلاح المستخدمة للتقييم. التواصل بين المشاركين. تنظيم زيارات ميدانية مرتبطة مباشرة بهذا الفصل. المقرّر غير ميلا بالافتراضات التي تطرأ من خارج عنوان مقرّر. يمكن تطوير الفصل حسب الطرق التي اعتمدها في المثل الذي أعلناه قبلي كمشترك على عمل الفصل الذي قام به. المعلم من دوراته في هذا المجال. تنفيذ الدراسات والبحث في هذا المجال. خصوصاً ومتغلباً مع مواضيع أخرى تخدم أهداف مشتركة تساهم فيها جهات أخرى متعددة حيث أن هذا الفصل ينبع من نموذج راجعنا في ذلك. عرض دراسات أكثر من الأمن الغذائي في الوطن العربي - المتعلق في مفهوم تقييم الخطر (قياس الأمن الغذائي) نأمل دائما أن يكون المقرر في عين الاعتبار خصوصاً البلدان وأوتيكاتها. زيادة دراسات الحالة لتوصيف المبادرات الحديثة. متابعة وتوظيف المعلومات وتوصيف المبادرات المتاحة في مجال الصحة ضمن الزراعة الحضرية من خلال الدخال والتسريبات وتوظيف المعلومات. سلسلة النقاش كان جيدا وجاهز الاستبان وأيضاً استباناً في المستقبل. تعود معالجة الدراسات الجديدة في هذا المجال. المحاضر قام بمحاولات جيدة للحصول على ارقة وهذا جيد جدا، كما نأمل بربط النبات الحضري والصحة والحيوان والصحة.

شكرًا لاتجاهكم.
By looking at the complete evaluation form that the participants had filled at the end of module 4, we can draw the following remarks:

- All participants (100%) felt that the quality of the training within the module was relatively adequate.
- **Suggestions for future modules:**
  - Timing was short and the content of the module is extensive - This module is characterized by the general information it provides - Increase in practical knowledge - Excellent teaching technique - The moderator was very knowledgeable - More practical examples are needed - More interaction between participants - the field visit was irrelevant.
- 92% felt that module 4 was related to their actual line of work.
- 96% felt that they have acquired new knowledge.
- 100% acknowledged that the information they have acquired is useful.
- 100% found out that the content of the module matched the objectives set at the start.
- 100% found that the module was generally useful and 100% felt that the module developed their understanding of the complexity of the topic.
- 100% felt that the ideas transferred through the module could be used in their line of work.
- Module 4 was 100% effective in capturing the interest of participants.
- The case studies related to this module were found to be ineffective.
- Participants felt that the field visits were well organized (100%), knowledgeable (45%) and effective (45%).
- Time for discussion was found to be 60% suitable.
- The interaction among participants and moderators was found to be 96% adequate.
- The speed of the training in the module was found to be 100% suitable with an 88% adequate diversification of pedagogical tools.
- **Most useful:** Incorporating health and food security as a key element in the design and implementation of projects in UA - The concept of healthy cities - New principles - Working in groups - Comprehensive approach - Methodology - Interaction between city teams - Good terminology.
- **Least effective:** The field visits did not add much to the theoretical knowledge - Need to deepen the understanding of concepts used in the module - Participants are not given enough time to interact - Too much stress on health away from the broader concept of development.
- **Application of the module:** Incorporate the health dimension in the design of projects related to UA - Convey the concepts of food security to local communities as part of UA - Analysis of the project components - Develop the capacities of local authorities in this subject.
- **Advice to improve the module:** Use educational tools - Adopt a methodology for the presentation of the content and provide additional documentation to the module content based on practical examples from MENA - Deepen the level of training both in academic information and practical know-how - Consider seriously the comments made by the participants - Provide information on every
participating city for further development of training- Give a clear indication on how to build up a case study or an exercise- Focus on concepts besides practical examples- Better organization of field visits.
Appendix 4 (e)
التدرّب الإقليمي وتبادل الخبرات في الزراعة الحضرية
في منطقة الشرق الأوسط وشمال أفريقيا

MODULE 5

استمارة تقديرية حول الفصل: الوصول إلى المياه لأغراض الزراعة الحضرية

يرجى التفضيل بالأجابة على الأسئلة الارادة اداً ما يتيح لنا تحسين ادانتنا في المستقبل. يرجى اعتماد الصراع والشفافية في اجاباتكم. ان هذه الإجابات، اكتشفت ايجابية أم سلبية. هي قيمة جدا بالنسبة البينا.

1- ما رأيك في هذا الفصل؟
يرجى تصنيف نوعية التدريب في هذا الفصل وفقاً للدرجات من 1 إلى 5 على ان تكون علامة 1 هي الاسم الأدنى فيما تكون علامة 5 الاعلى.

- إذا شعرت بأن السؤال لا يتطابق عليك ان تترك الملاحظات الكافية لإبداء الرأي
- يرجى الإشارة إلى علامة "لا رأي لي".

كيف كانت نوعية تدريب هذا الفصل؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي</th>
<th>الاعلى 5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6.25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ما هي الملاحظات أو الاقتراحات؟

- عرض نماذج لمحارات معالجة على مستوى المدن- كيفية المعالجة للسمائة الواسعة- ضبط القاعة والنقاش.
- أسلوب تشاركي جديد واعتمد على تبادل خبرات بين المشاركين- أدعو الاندية العلمية قبل التدريب يكون أفضل.
- المدرّب تقنية الحروبة على الخروج في بعض التمديدات، رغم أنه ابدى الكثير من الجدية في العمل وهذا يرجى حسب ظنى إلى جانب خبرته في التدريب وإظهار المحاورات. تدكر موضوع مشاركة جميع المندو تقديم مقترحات وأشار إلى جميع المشاركين، لقد، أن إنجاز المعلومة ضعيفة تنقيح المدرّب الخبرة في إعطاء المحاورات. كان يجب أن ارى في الجولة الميدانية نجاح تجربة المياه الرماية غير أن الواقع لم يعكس ذلك.
- أسلوب مناسب، مائدة متنوعة، المشاركة حية رغم ارهاق المشاركين منهجية تقنية متنوعة من تشاركية إلى صيغة محترف، مشاركة الحاضرين طبقيا. المدرّب مثير وطريقة اداء المحاورات ليست بالمستوى المطلوب.
- كان هناك تكرار في الحديث والمداخلات، يفضل أن يتم التركيز أكثر في العناوين والمواضيع وخصوصاً قراءة الشروطية. المعزز كان هناك انطباع وكثيراً وجد هذا التدريب في نهاية الدورة.
- التسلس وضبط الفكر بسبب أو متوسط.

2- مستوى معرفة المواضيع المقدرة في الفصل؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي</th>
<th>الاعلى 5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6.25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

إرتباط هذا الفصل في عمل الحالى

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي</th>
<th>الاعلى 5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6.25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

إلى أي حد اكتسبت/ي معلومات جديدة بالنسبة للائك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي</th>
<th>الاعلى 5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6.25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

مناقش المعلومات التي اكتسبت/ي بالنسبة للائك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرأي</th>
<th>الاعلى 5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6.25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

تركز هذا الفصل على ما ادرك/ي معرفته بالتحديد؟

54
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا رأي لي</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
سعادة اعطاء التدريب

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>غير كاف</th>
<th>مقبول</th>
<th>جيد</th>
<th>ممتاز</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>عمق معالجة الموضوع</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سرعة اعطاء التدريب</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>التلوين في اعتماد الأساليب التدريبية</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ما الذي وجدته الأكثر فائدة في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الإجابة)

الملاحظة: تناول الفكرة الأهمة باستخدام الماء العلاجي يحافظ على جودة الماء ويحقق تحسينًا في توفير المياه. تحلل الوقت خلال المنزل. تساعد الإستراتيجية الجديدة في تحسين جودة الماء. تساعد الإستراتيجية الجديدة في تحسين جودة الماء.

ما الذي وجدته الأكثر فائدة في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الإجابة)

التلوين في اعتماد الأساليب التدريبية

كيف يمكننا أن نطبق ما تعلمنا في هذا الفصل؟ (اعتقاد اما إذا ما يمكن)

 المقترحات المسبقة إلى مدينته (سواء على مستوى المدينة أو المدينة) التسويق مع المجتمع المحلي والجهات المختلفة في تبني فكرة ايجاد بديل لمصدر الماء التقليدي. محاولة التقليل من السهول التي يمكن أن تحقق استخدام الماء الجيد معالجة. في المشروع المحدد لمدينتنا استخدام الماء الجيد مهم في تصميم التمويل. التمويل في هذا الفصل يوفر على بعض المدن الأخرى فسقاً، يصبح بشكل أوسع حيث تجمع المياه الرطبة واعدة استخدامها لمياه الحالة العامة. مساعدة العام في مدينتي في كيفية الاستغلال الأمثل للمياه، بدأ التدريب، ووجه مواد. لهذا الموضوع، لا يمكن استخدام الموظفين بذلك. يمكن تطبيق استخدام المياه مباشرة من خلال استخدام المياه الجيدة، استهداف المحمولة من مياه الأمطار، وتغيير إستراتيجية المياه. أما مأسار هذا الموضوع على أرض الواقع منذ زمن الاستفادة من التجربة في مدن السبع. المشاركة المجتمع المحلي في إعداد واتصال المياه الجيدة في قطاع قطاع الماء من خلال عرض تجربة لجنة فري سيما في الكرك. وتشجيع مجمعتنا وأعمالنا في إعداد واتصال المياه الجيدة في مراحل الملاحظات من خلال برامج تدريبية أو تدريبية كثيفة الاتصال والمياه الجيدة واستعمالاتها في التوعية العامة حول ترشيد
استخدام المياه العاملة والرمانية، البحث عن وسائل تقنية للاستخدامات المقترحة وخاصة في المناطق الجافة وشبه الجافة. موضوع المادَّة عام جداً ومتملَّص مادًة لثنين بعض الأنشطة البيئية أو التنموية.

هل يمكن ان نعطي نصيحة لتطوير هذا الفصل في المستقبل؟

النقطة الأولى: لا تكون أفضل تقنيات التطبيق أكثر في استخدام المياه الرمانية في الزراعة. المداخلات المتزامنة للمشاركين لا تعطي الفرصة لبعض المشاركين على استيعاب الموضوع أكثر. تُرجَّم من السادة المشرفين أن يتفقون في المستقبل إلى مسألة المقارنة بين مستوى المشاركون ومستوى الفصل حيث لاحظان أن مستوى هذا الفصل لا يستجيب إلى التطلعات، هذا أو غيره. قد يكون من الصعب تحديد ع.getIDات التي تحدث على فترات زمنية مختلفة لتصبح على نتائج إضافية إلى عرض سلاسل تجارب أخرى - موضوع المياه مهم جداً والفكرية جيدة جداً. إذا كان الوضع المستخدم في إعادة استخدام المياه تعتبر بديلة وغير عملية وناتجه بموجبة دراسات أكثر بهدف إيجاد طرق أكثر عملية. نريد جهارًا أكثر تنقية وتقصيل أكثر حول نتائج جهان المياه الرمانية. مزيد من الدراسات البحثية على ارض الواقع تعميق معالجة لهذا الفصل. دراسة أعمال لأشكالية المياه في المنطقة من كل جوانب مع إدخال الجانب القانوني. إدخال أساليب مقارنة بين البلدان كي يتم تحليل الشكلية وفهمها بشكل أوسع. البحث بعمق في هذا الموضوع من حيث الجوانب الاجتماعية والاقتصادية والفنية وكيفية طرح هذه الأفكار على المجتمع المحلي عند التفكير فيهم مثل هذه الأفكار. إعطاء مزيد من الوقت لجانب الهندسي تمثل هذه الأفكار. التركيز على الموضوع المهمة. إعطاء أولويات لاستخدام أساليب أفضل للنقاش. لا يمكن أن يكون المدرب مرتاح. حذارة من أن يكون قد شارك في الدورة ومثل باقي المشاركين بحاجة إلى توضيح أكثر ل Украيفي المياه الرمانية وال اللقاء في المجتمع غير التقلدي من نواح تقنية مستخدمة في كل مصادر. بحث علمي دقيق لتوضيح صورة هذا المشروع وانعكاساته السلبية على الإنسان. نص لتطوير هذا الفصل، لو كان هناك تصور آخر عن محطات المعالجة في مدن خاصة من أجزاء_water خصوصاً باستخدام مياهها المعالجة أو زيادة محطة معالجة على مستوى مjni أو الشام. المحاضرة مدمية ومرتبة كثيرة لكنه يفيد السيرة. نص الفصل جيد لذا أرى نجاح الفصل مع هذه المحاضرة ابدي نية حسنة في تقديم المشكلة وتفقدني أن المحاضر جيد لونه. 1- اعطى هيئة للمحاضرات والنقاش والأنشطة الإقراض واضحة. تجربة الأفكار المسبقة إجابة أو سبب. 2- الإلتزام بالتحليل العلمي. تنوي أي أن المحضر في تقني جيد وعيب أخذ بالاعتبار الارتعاح الخارج عن سيطرته.

شكراً لاجابكتكم/ن
Module 5: Water and UA

By looking at the complete evaluation form that the participants had filled at the end of module 5, we can draw the following remarks:

- 91% felt that the quality of the training within the module was relatively adequate.
- **Suggestions for future modules:** - Need to be careful in the selection of moderators- The moderator is not capable of going in depth due to lack of expertise in training- The moderator was not in full control of the material in question- The need to increase practical examples and related field visits- The field visit aimed at showing the success of the experimentation with grey water but it was not the case.
- 100% felt that module 5 was related to their actual line of work.
- 93% felt that they have acquired new knowledge.
- 93% acknowledged that the information they have acquired is useful.
- 93% found out that the content of the module matched the objectives set at the start.
- 91% found that the module was generally useful and 100% felt that the module developed their understanding of the complexity of the topic.
- 100% felt that the ideas transferred through the module could be used in their line of work.
- Module 5 was 93% effective in capturing the interest of participants.
- The case studies related to this module were found to be 100% effective.
- Participants felt that the field visits were well organized (100%), knowledgeable (100%) and effective (93%).
- Time for discussion was found to be 53% suitable, while 25% found out that it was exaggerated.
- The interaction among participants and moderators was found to be 63% adequate.
- The speed of the training in the module was found to be 53% suitable with an 69% adequate diversification of pedagogical tools.
- **Most useful:** Prevent water shortage through the adequate use of grey water- Preservation of the environment- Reduce drinking water consumption- Transfer of knowledge to local authorities- The case of the Islamic network in rural areas of Jordan- Design of grey water technology- Field visits.
- **Least effective:** The dry interpretation of technical points- Stress on special cases without looking at the interpretation of basic concepts- The field visit at Wadi Sir- The elements of the module were highly unorganized- adequate use of natural water sources.
- **Application of the module:** Design new strategies for use of water and analyze existing factors within participating city teams- Coordinate with local communities and concerned authorities to find alternatives for conventional water sources- We were able to get to know the lessons learnt in other cities- Use of rain water and rationalize the use of water- Elicit the awareness of the beneficiaries towards the reuse of water-
- **Advice to improve the module:** Adopt a methodology for the presentation of the content and provide additional documentation to the module content- Consider seriously the comments made by the
participants that distorts the capacity of others to understand the module- Develop participatory methods- Adequate selection of moderators- Use of sound, clear training techniques- Compare between the cases of the cities present- Provide information on every participating city for further development of training- Consider in depth the socio-economic as well as the technical implications to be able to design a suitable approach with local beneficiaries for the design of suitable initiatives- Introduce a successful design of a treatment plant.
Appendix 5

Final Evaluation Form

Regional Training & Knowledge Sharing in Urban Agriculture
For the Middle East & North Africa

Dear Participant,

It is the end of the course which had contributed considerably to the sharing of knowledge and future networking among participants. In an attempt of the organizers of the course to look back and evaluate the process for more elaborate improvements in the future, you are kindly requested to fill in this form. Looking forward for a better cooperation in the future.

1- At the end of this course, what is the definition of Urban Agriculture?

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

2- To what extent was the course able to meet the expectations that you have expressed at the beginning of the course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3- To what extent did the course meet the objectives that you have set at the start?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Remarks and suggestions: ________________________________________________________________

4- Did the course help in developing your knowledge on the following subjects:

- Health, Food security and UA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Environment and UA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Spatial planning and UA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Access to water and UA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Agricultural systems and UA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5- What are your general impressions about the course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Remarks: ________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

6- Accommodation and logistics:

- How do you rate your stay in Beirut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- How do you rate your stay in Jordan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- How do you rate the logistical arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Remarks and suggestions on accommodation and logistics:
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

7- What are you suggestions to improve the level of organization of future courses? ________________________________________________________________

Thank you
Appendix 5a

Final Evaluation Form

Regional Training & Knowledge Sharing in Urban Agriculture
For the Middle East & North Africa

Dear Participant,

It is the end of the course which had contributed considerably to the sharing of knowledge and future networking among participants. In an attempt of the organizers of the course to look back and evaluate the process for more elaborate improvements in the future, you are kindly requested to fill in this form. Looking forward for a better cooperation in the future.

1- At the end of this course, what is the definition of Urban Agriculture?
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

2- To what extent was the course able to meet the expectations that you have expressed at the beginning of the course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29.5% 35.3% 35.3%

3- To what extent did the course meet the objectives that you have set at the start?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6% 23.5% 35.3% 35.3%

Remarks and suggestions:_________________________________________________

4- Did the course help in developing your knowledge on the following subjects:

- Health, Food security and UA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35.3% 47% 17.7%

- Environment and UA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23.5% 53% 23.5%

- Spatial planning and UA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>5Highest</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12% 53% 29.4% 6%

- Access to water and UA
- Agricultural systems and UA

5- What are you general impressions about the course

Remarks:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

6- Accommodation and logistics:

- How do you rate your stay in Beirut

- How do you rate your stay in Jordan

- How do you rate the logistical arrangements

Remarks and suggestions on accommodation and logistics:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

7- What are you suggestions to improve the level of organization of future courses?

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you

What follows in appendices (b), (c), (d) and (e) are testimonials of participants in answer to the question in the above described form.
Appendix 5 (b)

To what extent did the course meet your expectations?

- The course was able to achieve a considerable number of objectives that I did not expect. However, we did not go in details over a number of topics that I thought were of importance (waste disposal in UA and the use of gray water).
- I was late in being nominated to the course and that did not give me enough time to prepare the material so that I could interact more efficiently. I do suggest that the course material be made available to participants before the beginning of the course.
- I was expecting to acquire this comprehensive, clear and well elaborated load of knowledge. I frankly thought that the course was some kind of outing. I truly benefited greatly.
- The course is too extensive. I do suggest reducing the duration of the course.
- Simplify the information circulated to participants. We need to initiate a university degree in UA.
- Some of the objectives were not very clear since the start of the course (networking and the future vision of the training on UA). In general, the academic objectives were met and participants were provided with a considerable load of knowledge on UA.
- What we were able to achieve exceeded by far all my expectations.
- I was hoping that the subject raised in the course be more elaborate however I think that time was a major constraint in this regard. It had prevented the participants to discuss in depth the problems and ultimately reach solutions.
Appendix 5 (c)

What were your general impressions about the course?

- The course was very helpful. The different modules have stressed the importance of UA. The packaging of the modules was well put and had emphasized participation and sharing of experiences among participants.
- The course was a very good course. Some of the field visits were useless. The course duration could be reduced to two weeks as some of the modules could be merged together.
- I wish that the duration of the course was shorter and that more exposure should be scheduled fairly between Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon. I wish we had invited a larger number of city teams to allow for more exposure to UA in different settings.
- More focus is needed to highlight the particularities between countries and regions.
- Fruitful course, competent trainers and warm care.
- The course conveyed a considerable load of information that is useful to our line of work. Some of the moderators had a very academic style and were not confident about what they were teaching.
- Honestly, I would like to congratulate all those concerned with the course on their great efforts to make this endeavor a success and for letting me feel that I am home.
Appendix 5 (d)

To what extent did the course meet its set objectives?

- Project formulation: I wish we had more details on proposal writing and evaluation.
- The course achieved 90% of the expected results in addition to other subjects that were not included within the curriculum like networking and the initiation of a regional network for UA in MENA.
- The course was able to meet the set objectives and introduce new knowledge (water management and environmental impact assessment).
- Getting to know better the city teams and their particular situations. I do suggest that every city team provides a technical report for information.
- I wish we had a one full week of training as part of the course in Damascus.
- As this is a new topic, all the information we have acquired is of great value in the development of UA.
- Training and education are of great value and if I am able to get some funding then I would have achieved what I wanted.
- The course shed the light on issues that I totally ignored at first.
- We need to clarify the objectives set for this course: Is it to introduce new knowledge and general information or is it to introduce tools for development.
- The course met all of our expectations in that it has given us a good load of information on UA which is relatively new to us. This has provided us with a general framework that helps to build projects in this domain.
- Some topics were of great help like gender, social equity, environmental implications of UA and health in UA.
- Considerable efforts were put and resources were mobilized so it is only natural that the objectives set were met.
Appendix 5 (e)

What are the major suggestions to improve the level of organizing future courses on UA?

- The course should include practical applications that highlight the latest developments in agriculture.
- The duration of the course was long and the daily schedule was overloaded. It is preferable that future courses be of a shorter duration. The time allocated for some field visits was a bit exaggerated.
- More courses should be organized and scattered over a longer period of time. The focus on looking at the situation of the cities involved should be more explicit.
- Training should be focused at AUB. This way we need to ensure the sustainability of what we have acquired in the course. This would look at a continued cooperation with the newly instituted network for UA in MENA so that we can formulate a plan for the coming year to include the city teams so that we can establish new steps that would attract funds.
- The course should include a number of cities to allow better exposure of participants.
- Participants in the course could be considered as members of a team that would follow up on the recommendations of the course.
- Time management of the modules ought to be revisited carefully.
- Enlarge the number of participating city teams. This could open the way to include the lessons learnt of some countries and the steps they have achieved in terms of legislations and regulations on the matter.
- Participants need to have the schedule as well as the training material before the start of the course.
- Need to set a clear objective for this learning experiment. Need to have a module that cross-cuts on all the issues related to UA in all the modules.
- Diversify the presentation of the training material in the various modules. We may have to reduce the duration of the course to allow for more interaction and sharing of experiences. In addition, the selection of trainers ought to be looked at carefully; the different levels of expertise were very apparent. Moreover, we need to abide by the set program and stay away as much as possible from improvising.
- The accommodation in Amman was not very convenient. Besides this, we would like to thank everybody for the high level of professionalism. We felt like we were among brothers and sisters.
- Future courses need to look carefully into selecting coherent groups similar to this one where we have sensed harmony and we did not have one single problem.
- The theoretical components of the modules are of good level, however the content should have been reviewed. It was essential to establish a link between the various module to create an integrated approach to UA.