

**REGIONAL TRAINING & KNOWLEDGE SHARING
IN URBAN AGRICULTURE
FOR
THE MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA
2005-2006**

Final Report

May , 2006

Ramzi Naaman

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 Dakar 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 of information, usefulness, focus on what is needed, matching 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 bench marks 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.

- A great deal of interesting and useful knowledge was generated through the course material.
- Viable ideas for action research in UA were developed and supported.
- The reactions of the participants to the course were positive. They enjoyed and appreciated the interactive style of teaching and the exchange of information among participants in a friendly environment and comfortable accommodation.

“ 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:

- Changes 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.
9. Recommendations for distance learning.
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 30th October 2005.
- \$ 7,500 on submission of the final report, before 30th 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.

Appendix 2

List of advisory committee

	Postal Address	E-mail Address	Main Phone Number	
ry ee ry	Professeur d'Agriculture Périurbaine, Ecole Nationale Supérieure du Paysage Chercheur associé à l'unité SADAPT INRA 10 Rue Marechal Joffre, 78000 Versailles France tél. 33 1 39 24 62 73 Fax 33 1 39 24 62 74	a.fleury@versailles.ecole-paysage.fr	33 1 39 24 62 73	3 3
si	UNDP P.O.Box 11-3216 Beirut Lebanon	Elie.kodsi@undp.org	961 1 978733 961 3 247733	
la	Administrateur Scientifique CIHEAM/IAM Institut Agonomique Méditerranéen 3191, route de Mende 34093 MONTPELLIER CEDEX 5 Tel: 33 (0)4 67 04 60 22	Padilla@iamm.fr	33 467046022	
ni	P.O.Box 8576 ESCWA-Beirut-Lebanon	tappuni@un.org	961 1 978400 961 3 270056	
al- ad	P. O. Box 5314, Zahran Post Office, Amman 11183, Jordan	al-asad@csbe.org	962 6 461 5297	
yk	American University of Beirut Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences/Land and Water Resources Department Hamra, Bliss Street, Beirut, Lebanon P.O.Box: 11-0236	rzurayk@aub.edu.lb	961 1 374374 Ext: 4577/1	
sr	71 Winchester Str., Ap't 4, Toronto, Ont. M4X 1A8, Canada.	joenasr@compuserve.com joenasr@cyberia.net.lb jnasr@ryerson.ca	961 1 336096 [30] 694-698-7673	
sa	American University of Beirut, Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences ESDU, c/o Dean's Office Hamra, Beirut - LEBANON	zm13@aub.edu.lb	961 1 374374 Ext: 4503 OR 961 3 885512	

Appendix 3

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 possess 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

Appendix 4

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 from 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?

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest

Remarks/Suggestions

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

Relevance of this Module to your current work or functions

No opinion	5 Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest

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

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest

Usefulness for you of the information that you have acquired

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	Lowest 1

Focus of this module on what you specifically needed to learn

No opinion	Highest 5	4	3	2	1 Lowest

Extent to which the content of this Module matched the announced objectives

No opinion

Highest 5	4	3	2	1Lowest

Overall usefulness of this Module

No opinion

Highest 5	4	3	2	1Lowest

Improvement in your appreciation of the complexity of the issue

No opinion

Highest 5	4	3	2	1Lowest

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

No opinion

Highest 5	4	3	2	1Lowest

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

No opinion

Highest 5	4	3	2	1Lowest

Usefulness of the cases studies for you

No opinion

Highest 5	4	3	2	1Lowest

Organization of the case studies

No opinion

Highest 5	4	3	2	1Lowest

Information that you gained from that case studies

No opinion

Highest 5	4	3	2	1Lowest

Effectiveness of the case studies

No opinion

Highest 5	4	3	2	1Lowest

Please rate each item below with respect to quantity or intensity

Time allocated for discussions

No opinion	Excessive	Somewhat Excessive	Adequate	Somewhat insufficient	Insufficient

Interaction between participants and trainers

No opinion	Excessive	Somewhat Excessive	Adequate	Somewhat insufficient	Insufficient

Depth of treatment of the issue

No opinion	Excessive	Somewhat Excessive	Adequate	Somewhat insufficient	Insufficient

Pace of the delivery of the module

No opinion	Excessive	Somewhat Excessive	Adequate	Somewhat insufficient	Insufficient

Variety of the training methods used

No opinion	Excessive	Somewhat Excessive	Adequate	Somewhat insufficient	Insufficient

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 الاقليمي وتبادل الخبرات في الزراعة الحضرية
في منطقة الشرق الاوسط وشمال افريقيا

استمارة تقييمية حول الفصل الاول: الانظمة الزراعية Module 1

يرجى التفضل بالاجابة على الاسئلة الواردة ادناه مما يتيح لنا تحسين ادائنا في المستقبل. يرجى اعتماد الصراحة والشفافية في اجاباتكم/ن. ان هذه الاجابات- اكانت ايجابية ام سلبية-هي قيمة جدا بالنسبة الينا.

1- ما رأيك في هذا الفصل؟

- يرجى تصنيف نوعية التدريب في هذا الفصل وفق سلم درجات من 1 الى 5 على ان تكون علامة 1 هي العلامة الادنى فيما تكون علامة 5 العلامة الاعلى.
- اذا شعرت بان السؤال لا ينطبق عليك ام انك لا تمتلك/ي المعلومات الكافية لابداء الرأي، يرجى الاشارة الى علامة "لا رأي لي".

كيف كانت نوعية تدريب هذا الفصل MODULE ؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
9%	50%	36.4%	4.5%		

ما هي الملاحظات او الاقتراحات؟

يجب ان لا تزيد المحاضرة العلمية عن 15-20 دقيقة ثم يفتح باب النقاش.

-المحاضرة ناجحة

-بداية التدريب لم تكن جيدة انما تحسنت لاحقا

-مطلوب الدقة في اختيار المدربين اصحاب المهارة العالية في تدريب المدربين

-الاكثار من الاعتماد على اسلوب المحاضرات

-ضعف في ادارة الجلسات وضعف في المشاركة

-نفضل اعطاء المعلومات المهمة وربطها بواقع المدن المشاركة بالارقام الكاملة

-كان الفصل طويلا جدا حتى اصبحنا في النهاية نمر مرور الكرام

-زيادة المشاهدات العملية

-زيادة المعرفة في المصطلحات الموجودة في التدريب

-عدم الالمام الكافي بالمواضيع بدليل الرجوع الى الوثائق بشكل متكرر

-عدم ضبط الاشخاص والتدخل من المدربين الاخرين اثناء العرض

-عدم تقبل الملاحظات والاعتراف بالنقاط الايجابية من النقاش والافرار بها بشكل سهل

-اداء الدكتور كان جيدا بالعموم ولكن حصل بعض الانفلات

-محاولة انتاج ادوات بيداغوجية اكثر فعالية

2- مستوى معرفة المواضيع المقترحة في الفصل MODULE؟

ارتباط هذا الفصل في عملك الحالي

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
13.6%	41%	22.7%	22.7%		

الى اي حد اكتسبت/ي معلومات جديدة بالنسبة اليك؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
27.3%	41%	22.7%	4.5%		4.5%

منافع المعلومات التي اكتسبت/ي بالنسبة اليك؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
13.6%	54.5%	18.2%	13.6%		

تركيز هذا الفصل على ما اردت/ي معرفته بالتحديد؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
	18.2%	54.5%	27.3%	

لا رأي لي

مدى تناسب محتوى هذا الفصل مع اهداف الفصل المعلنة؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
	13.6%	18.2%	50%	13.6%

لا رأي لي
4.5%

الفائدة العامة لهذا الفصل؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
	9%	41%	41%	9%

لا رأي لي

تطوير فهمك/ي للتعقيدات المحيطة بالموضوع؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
		63.6%	22.7%	9%

لا رأي لي
4.5%

مقدار اكتساب الافكار التي تتوقعون/ين استخدامها في عملك؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
	18.2%	31.8%	45.4%	4.5%

لا رأي لي

فاعلية الفصل في اثارة اهتمامك كامل الفترة الزمنية المحددة له؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
	22.7%	36.3%	31.8%	9%

لا رأي لي

فاعلية دراسات الحالة CASE STUDIES /التمارين

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
	4.5%	45.4%	45.4%	4.5%

لا رأي لي

تنظيم الزيارة الميدانية

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
	4.5%	18.2%	41%	31.8%

لا رأي لي
4.5%

المعلومات التي اكتسبتها من الزيارة الميدانية

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
	13.6%	22.7%	31.8%	27.3%

لا رأي لي
4.5%

فاعلية الزيارة الميدانية

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
	9%	27.3%	31.8%	27.3%

لا رأي لي
4,5%

يرجى تصنيف كل من النقاط الواردة ادناه وفق الكم او النوعية

الوقت المخصص للنقاش

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به
	4.5%	72.7%	22.7%	

لا رأي لي

التفاعل بين المشاركين والمدرّب

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به	لا رأي لي
	4.5%	81.8%	4.5%	4.5%	4.5%

عمق معالجة الموضوع

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به	لا رأي لي
	13.6%	72.7%	4.5%		9%

سرعة اعطاء التدريب

بطيء	نسبيا بطيء	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به	لا رأي لي
	18.2%	63.6%	18.2%		

التنوع في اعتماد الاساليب التدريبية

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به	لا رأي لي
4.5%		81.8%	9%		4.5%

ما الذي وجدته الأكثر افادة في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الاجابة)

-الزيارات الميدانية-بساطة الطرح-السلامة من تشتت الكلمات-المصطلحات الجيدة-محاضرة الضيف السيد دكاش معلومات اضافية تفصيلية-التمارين وطريقة تفاعل الفرق مع بعضها بدأت افكر بوضع استراتيجيتي الخاصة للزراعة الحضرية في مدينتي-الاعتماد على الذات في حل المشكلات-دراسات الحالة-ماذا علي ان احضر قبل كتابة المشروع المتعلق بالزراعة الحضرية-المشاركة والتعاون-زيادة معرفة ومفهوم الزراعة الحضرية-مقرر (7) حول تحديد الوحدات الجغرافية-المقرر (3) العوامل المؤثرة على الزراعة الحضرية.

ما الذي وجدته الاقل افادة في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الاجابة)

نقص في طرح حالات وصور تكميلية-التدخلات الزائدة وغير المركزة وغير المنظمة-عدم الخروج بوضوح باستخلاصات ونتائج واضحة-الضبابية وعدم الترابط في مراحل وتدخلات التدريب بالرغم من اهمية الموضوع- لم تعط الصور نماذج معبرة عن الانظمة الزراعية- ما زال المفهوم غير واضح بالنسبة اليها- لم تكن الزيارات الميدانية على قدر كاف من الفائدة مع تمن بزيارة تعاونيات- لم يعط المتدربون الوقت الكافي للمناقشة- عرضت مواضيع خاصة بلبنان وحيدا لو قدم كل فريق بعضا عن بلده- التمارين- عدم الاتفاق على مفهوم مشترك- لم اجد كل المعلومات ذات فائدة- التركيز على العرض من دون القدرة على ايصال المفاهيم- طول فترة العرض وعدم ملائمتها للمادة- تدوير النفايات واعادة استخدامها- كان هناك خلط بين الزراعة الريفية والحضرية.

كيف يمكن لك ان تطبق/ي ما تعلمته في هذا الفصل؟ (اعط امثلة اذا امكن)

-عبر مشاركة الطلبة في الاطار الاكاديمي- يمكن تطبيقه الى حد كبير وكان ينقصنا ان نشارك ما نملكه من خبرات مع الآخرين من خلال وضع استراتيجيات جديدة عن الانظمة الزراعية وتحليل العوامل الموجودة لدى المدن المشاركة-جمع المعلومات بشكل صحيح وبلورة سياسة لمستقبل تنظيم المدينة وخاصة في الزراعة لنقل المعرفة الى المزارع عن طريق الارشاد الزراعي- تخطيط مشروع صغير -معظم التطبيقات التي شرحت غير ممكنة في لبنان الا في بعض القرى البعيدة عن المدن المتوسطة-افادتني الزيارة الميدانية لانها مشابهة للمشروع الذي اقترح- يمكن البحث في تطبيق مفهوم الزراعة الحضرية في مشاريع تنمية المجتمعات المحلية المستقبلية- ان اكتب المشروع بطريقة سليمة بعد دراسة شاملة لمدينتي والمجتمع الذي ساعمل معه- تطبيق البحث والدراسة وتطوير بنك معلومات قبل تنفيذ اي نظام او نمط زراعي في المنطقة المستهدفة- خلق وعي وادخال مفاهيم الزراعة الحضرية للمجالس المحلية في نطاق مشروع لطرح قضايا الزراعة الحضرية وايضاح دورها في خلق فرص عمل وما تمثله من استغلال للموارد الطبيعية وتوجيهها من اجل تنمية مستدامة للمجتمعات المحلية.

هل يمكن ان تعطي نصيحة لتطوير هذا الفصل في المستقبل؟

-اعطاء منهجية علمية ووثائق بالاضافة الى ما قدمته المحاضرة-اخذ الملاحظات بعين الاعتبار- الدقة في اختيار المدربين- اعتماد منهجيات وتدخلات واضحة للتدريب- تطوير اساليب المشاركة- ضرورة التركيز على المشاركة في اطار TOT -اقتراح المشاركة في التقييم المرحلي والنهائي لمنهاج الدورة للوصول الى التشبيك- من الافضل ان تتوفر معلومات عن المدن المشاركة مسبقا وان يكون هناك دراسة اولية لواقع هذه المدن من قبل فريق ثم يحضر الدورة ممثل عن الفريق وان يكون هناك ورشات عمل لوضع دراسة اولية عن المدن المشاركة لاستكمال الدراسة بحيث تكون اكثر واقعية- التمكين من استخدام الادوات في عرض الانشطة وتمارين تدعيم المحاضرات- اعطاء معلومات واضحة للمشاركين حول اهداف التمارين وطرق الخروج باهداف تحقق الفائدة من التمارين- ان يتم في دول مختلفة لاكتساب خبرات عملية متنوعة في هذا المجال- الدقة في اختيار المصطلحات-التركيز على المفاهيم بالاضافة الى الجانب التطبيقي- زيادة اللقاءات مع اصحاب الخبرة العملية والمؤسسات ذات العلاقة للاطلاع على الواقع من جميع جوانبه- يمكن ان تشكل الورشة حجر الاساس لبدء عمل اقليمي لايقصال 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

استمارة تقييمية حول الفصل الثاني: الأبعاد البيئية للزراعة الحضرية MODULE 2

يرجى التفضل بالإجابة على الأسئلة الواردة أدناه مما يتيح لنا تحسين أدائنا في المستقبل. يرجى اعتماد الصراحة والشفافية في إجاباتكم/ن. إن هذه الإجابات- أكانت إيجابية أم سلبية- هي قيمة جدا بالنسبة إلينا.

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 العلامة الأدنى فيما تكون علامة 5 العلامة الأعلى.
- إذا شعرت بأن السؤال لا ينطبق عليك أم أنك لا تمتلك/ي المعلومات الكافية لبدء الرأي، يرجى الإشارة إلى علامة "لا رأي لي".

كيف كانت نوعية تدريب هذا الفصل MODULE ؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الأعلى 5	لا رأي لي
		10%	45%	45%	

ما هي الملاحظات أو الاقتراحات؟

- كان وقت التدريب ناقص قليلا مما يشعر المتدرب وكأنه في امتحان وعليه الالتزام بالوقت.- يتميز هذا الفصل بالعموميات.- ممتاز- الوقت غير كاف والبرنامج مكتف- إمكانية التكرار واعطاء مزيد من الوقت للشرح الأكاديمي والتدريب العملي- زيادة الخبرات العلمية- أسلوب جيد جدا. واضح ومفهوم والتمارين العملية جيدة وهي تزيد المشاركين خبرة ومعرفة في المدن نريد نسخا عن المحاضرات كان المدرب على مستوى عال من المعرفة- يعتبر هذا الفصل من أهم الفصول من حيث المعلومات وخاصة من حيث المنهجية المتبعة.

2- مستوى معرفة المواضيع المقترحة في الفصل MODULE؟

ارتباط هذا الفصل في عملك الحالي

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الأعلى 5	لا رأي لي
	5%	15%	45%	35%	

إلى أي حد اكتسبت/ي معلومات جديدة بالنسبة إليك؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الأعلى 5	لا رأي لي
		35%	45%	20%	

منافع المعلومات التي اكتسبت/ي بالنسبة إليك؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الأعلى 5	لا رأي لي
		15%	55%	30%	

تركيز هذا الفصل على ما اردت/ي معرفته بالتحديد؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الأعلى 5	لا رأي لي
		20%	60%	20%	

مدى تناسب محتوى هذا الفصل مع أهداف الفصل المعلنة؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الأعلى 5	لا رأي لي

5%	30%	60%	5%		
----	-----	-----	----	--	--

الفائدة العامة لهذا الفصل؟

لا رأي لي	الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
			10%	55%	35%

تطوير فهمك/ي للتعقيدات المحيطة بالموضوع؟

لا رأي لي	الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
			20%	60%	20%

مقدار اكتساب الافكار التي تتوقعون/ين استخدامها في عملك؟

لا رأي لي	الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
			25%	60%	15%

فاعلية الفصل في اثارة اهتمامك كامل الفترة الزمنية المحددة له؟

لا رأي لي	الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
			15%	55%	30%

فاعلية دراسات الحالة CASE STUDIES / التمارين

لا رأي لي	الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
			10%	55%	35%

تنظيم الزيارة الميدانية

لا رأي لي	الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
			20%	45%	35%

المعلومات التي اكتسبتها من الزيارة الميدانية

لا رأي لي	الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
		5%	35%	40%	20%

فاعلية الزيارة الميدانية

لا رأي لي	الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
		5%	35%	40%	20%

يرجى تصنيف كل من النقاط الواردة ادناه وفق الكم او النوعية

الوقت المخصص للنقاش

لا رأي لي	غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به
		15%	85%		

التفاعل بين المشاركين والمدرّب

لا رأي لي	غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به
		10%	90%		

عمق معالجة الموضوع

لا رأي لي	غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به
		25%	70%	5%	

سرعة اعطاء التدريب

بطي ء	نسبيا بطي ء	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به	لا رأي لي
5%	95%				

التنوع في اعتماد الاساليب التدريبية

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به	ممتاز اجري ء 5%	لا رأي لي
5%	85%	5%				

ما الذي وجدته الاكثر افادة في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الاجابة)

-الاهتمام بادخال البيئة كعامل عند دراسة وتصميم وتنفيذ المشاريع وحتى بعد التنفيذ - اهمية الانتاج الحيواني مع النباتي في الزراعة الحضرية -الطريقة - التحليل البيئي للاثر -الافادة العامة نظرا لتنوع اختصاصات المشاركين -التمارين -العمل ضمن مجموعات -عرض النتائج ومناقشتها -عملية طرح المواضيع -الجولة الميدانية - ربط عدة مناهج بيداغوجية للوصول الى الاهداف المرسومة -جعل التدريب ملائم للحالات الخاصة لكل فريق - النظرة الشمولية- المنهجية -التفاعل بين الفرق المشاركة- قوة الضغط/ الاثر / ردة الفعل -اثارة الاهتمام والحث على توقع النتائج -الاسلوب - المشاهدات العلمية.

ما الذي وجدته الاقل افادة في هذا الفصل؟(يرجى توضيح الاجابة)

كله مفيد- الزيارات الميدانية لم تزد المعلومات بعدا عمليا وعميقا -التركيز الاكاديمي في طرح الموضوع بحيث لسنا اصحاب اختصاص -التحكم في زمن الحصص -لم تربط الزيارات الميدانية مع الزراعة الحضرية خارج الاطار اللباني -تعميق معنى المفاهيم المستعملة -المناقشات تحتاج الى وقت اطول.

كيف يمكن لك ان تطبق/ي ما تعلمته في هذا الفصل؟ (اعط امثلة اذا امكن)

- تشجيع الانتاج الحيواني الى جانب النباتي في الزراعة الحضرية وذلك بالنسبة الى السكان المحليين - ايصال المفاهيم البيئية الى المجتمعات المحلية في ما يخص الزراعة الحضرية - طرح اشكالية البيئة في المشروع المقترح- تحليل عناصر المشروع- ربط العناصر البيئية ببعضها البعض ضمن منهجية علمية مترابطة- دراسة اي مشروع وانعكاساته السلبية والايجابية -في تحديد الاثر البيئي للمشروع في التخطيط الاجمالي للمشروع ومطابقة المعلومات العامة في تحديد اولوياتها - تبسيط المعلومات ثم التدرج للتعمق والاثراء- استخدام الطرح المنهجي عند تخطيط المشاريع وتقديمها للتمويل ومن ثم متابعة التنفيذ على الارض- من خلال لجان محلية في المناطق تساهم في درس ورقة عمل المشروع-عمل الكومبوست وتربية الثروة الحيوانية في ضواحي المدينة.

هل يمكن ان تعطي نصيحة لتطوير هذا الفصل في المستقبل؟

-استخدام مزيد من الوسائل التوضيحية لتطوير هذه الدورة الى مستوى دبلوم ومؤهلات اكثر تقدما-ينقص الامثلة الواقعية في المينا لتوضيح اكثر لكل المفاهيم مما يسمح بطرح الموضوع بشكل جيد- الاسلوب والمحتوى والتقديم في منتهى المسؤولية والمعرفة-استغلال بعض الخبرات المشاركة لتقديم خبراتها ومناقشتها وعرض التوجيهات الاكاديمية لتطوير الخبرات التراكمية وخلق نوع من المشاركة الاقليمية-يجب ان يكون من الناحية العلمية اقرب الى التطبيق واعطاء الوقت الكافي للدفاع عن المشروعات المقترحة من قبل الفرق- طباعة المشاريع المقدمة من الفرق وتبادلها ومناقشتها للوقوف على صوابية المشروع في تطبيق معلومات الفصل- ان يبقى شادي هو الاستاذ وان يظل بنفس الروح الجميلة والسلسلة فس اعطاء المحاضرات- اقتراح بان يعرض المدرب الفيلم قبل الفصل ثم النصوص في ان يعرض الفيلم لاحقا للتعليق-تكرار هذا النوع من التدريب ولكن بعمق اكثر من الجانبين الاكاديمي والعملية واعطاء مزيد من الوقت للتدريب-تنويع الحالات الخاصة بالاضافة الى دراسات حول الاخفاقات في مشاريع النمو بصفة عامة-اعطاء وقت اكثر اثناء التمارين لنتمكن في النهاية من مشاهدة كافة نماذج المشاركين-التركيز اثناء المناقشات وعدم وجود شطط فكري في دراسة المواضيع-توسع في بعض المصطلحات-ترتيب اكثر للزيارات الميدانية-مشاهدة تجارب واقعية-زيادة عدد الحصص.

شكرا لاجابتكم/ن

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)

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

استمارة تقييمية حول الفصل الثالث: الولوج إلى الأرض في الزراعة الحضرية MODULE 3

يرجى التفضل بالاجابة على الاسئلة الواردة ادناه مما يتيح لنا تحسين ادائنا في المستقبل. يرجى اعتماد الصراحة والشفافية في اجاباتكم/ن. ان هذه الاجابات- اكانت ايجابية ام سلبية-هي قيمة جدا بالنسبة الينا.

1- ما رأيك في هذا الفصل؟

- يرجى تصنيف نوعية التدريب في هذا الفصل وفق سلم درجات من 1 الى 5 على ان تكون علامة 1 هي العلامة الأدنى فيما تكون علامة 5 العلامة الاعلى.
- اذا شعرت بان السؤال لا ينطبق عليك ام انك لا تمتلك/ي المعلومات الكافية لبدء الرأي، يرجى الإشارة الى علامة "لا رأي لي".

كيف كانت نوعية تدريب هذا الفصل MODULE ؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
		5%	62%	34%	

ما هي الملاحظات او الاقتراحات؟

مراجعة المادة العلمية قبل عرضها-الاثراء اللغوي-عرض مزيد من حالات الدول العربية-تعزيز الجانب اللغوي وتقديم مساندة في الترجمة-سرعة تجهيز المقررات وتوزيعها-توضيح نظام الادارة للسلطة التنفيذية في كل مدينة ايجابا او سلبا على موضوع الدورة-الفصل ممتع وشهد تبادلا معرفيا بين المشاركين-تدقيق في تعريف المفاهيم وتلخيصه-كان يجب اختصار الفصل والتركيز على المهم-كان الافضل التطرق الى هذا الفصل منذ بداية الدورة-غني بالمعلومات-فصل مكثف جدا-مزيد من المناقشات حول خصوصية كل مدينة-تكرار مثل هذه النشاطات مستقبلا وايجاد آلية لمزيد من التواصل بين العاملين والمهتمين في هذا القطاع- اقترح دقة اكثر في التنظيم.

2- مستوى معرفة المواضيع المقترحة في الفصل MODULE؟

ارتباط هذا الفصل في عملك الحالي

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
	4.7%	28.6%	42.8%	23.8%	

الى اي حد اكتسبت/ي معلومات جديدة بالنسبة اليك؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
	4.7%	14.3%	62%	19%	

منافع المعلومات التي اكتسبت/ي بالنسبة اليك؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
		23.8%	52.4%	23.8%	

تركيز هذا الفصل على ما اردت/ي معرفته بالتحديد؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
		19%	71.4%	9.5%	

مدى تناسب محتوى هذا الفصل مع اهداف الفصل المعلنة؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
		14.3%	62%	19%

لا رأي لي
4.7%

الفائدة العامة لهذا الفصل؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
		9.5%	66.6%	19%

لا رأي لي
4.7%

تطوير فهمك/ي للتعقيدات المحيطة بالموضوع؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
		33.3%	52.4%	14.3%

لا رأي لي

مقدار اكتساب الافكار التي تتوقعون/ين استخدامها في عملك؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
		19%	57.14%	19%

لا رأي لي
4.7%

فاعلية الفصل في اثارة اهتمامك كامل الفترة الزمنية المحددة له؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
		38%	48%	14.3%

لا رأي لي

فاعلية دراسات الحالة CASE STUDIES /التمارين

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
		14.3%	71.4%	14.3%

لا رأي لي

تنظيم الزيارة الميدانية

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5

لا رأي لي

المعلومات التي اكتسبتها من الزيارة الميدانية

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5

لا رأي لي

فاعلية الزيارة الميدانية

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5

لا رأي لي

يرجى تصنيف كل من النقاط الواردة ادناه وفق الكم او النوعية

الوقت المخصص للنقاش

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به
	9.5%	81%	9.5%	

لا رأي لي

التفاعل بين المشاركين والمدرّب

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به
		95.2%	4.7%	

لا رأي لي

عمق معالجة الموضوع

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به
	9.5%	81%	9.5%	

لا رأي لي

سرعة اعطاء التدريب

بطيء	نسبيا بطيء	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به
	9.5%	85.7%	4.7%	

لا رأي لي

التنوع في اعتماد الاساليب التدريبية

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به
	24%	76.2%		

لا رأي لي

ما الذي وجدته الاكثر افادة في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الاجابة)

-الاستفادة من تجارب الاخرين- اعطاء الخصوصية للزراعة الحضرية -التمرين الاخير حين اعطى فرصة للمقارنة بين المدن المشاركة بصورة اثرت على معلومات المشاركين- التعرف على تجارب اخرى للمقارنة- معلومات جديدة وطرق تحليل تفاعل الزراعة الحضرية مع التطور الحضري والتخطيط- اهمية التخطيط والتنظيم بين القطاع العام والخاص- الطرح التشاركي لادوات التخطيط الحضري- الالمام عام والشرح واضح- التعمق في طرح مشاكل متعددة الجوانب ومعقدة لايضاح مفاهيم وسياسات جديدة.

ما الذي وجدته الاقل افادة في هذا الفصل؟(يرجى توضيح الاجابة)

-الاطالة بالمواضيع المتعلقة بموضوع الولوج الى الارض (الاستشعار عن بعد)- بعض المصطلحات النظرية - عدم وجود زيارات ميدانية- محاضرة استعمالات الاراضي في لبنان- ترتيب المحاضرات المساندة كان غير موفق- عدم الجدية في طرح بعض النقاط- اسلوب يعطي بشاشة في اثناء النقاش.

كيف يمكن لك ان تطبق/ي ما تعلمته في هذا الفصل؟ (اعط امثلة اذا امكن)

-ايجاد وتفعيل القوانين والتشريعات الزراعية المتعلقة بالزراعة الحضرية- العمل على نقل هذه المعرفة للبلدية واثارة نقاش بين المختصين- تحليل ودراسة اشكاليات الزراعة الحضرية في منطقة معينة- يمكن الاستفادة من بعض المفاهيم في الواقع العملي- الربط بين المعلومات حول الزراعة الحضرية والتنمية العمرانية- لوضع الخطط والاستراتيجيات المتعلقة بالموضوع لدعم الزراعة الحضرية- ربط الفضاء الحضري بالزراعة الحضرية وايجاد الادوات لتحقيق خاصيات التصرف بالارض بعيدا عن الهيمنة الموجودة-ادخال الزراعة الحضرية في المخططات التي اقوم بها- التشارك والتنسيق بين القطاعين العام والخاص- تعميم منطقي وشامل لمقترح المشروع الذي ينوي تنفيذه في منطقتنا- اعتماد النهج التشاركي بين المزارعين والجمعيات الاهلية والحكومية من خلال اقامة لجنة في مدينتي للاهتمام بالزراعة الحضرية.

هل يمكن ان تعطي نصيحة لتطوير هذا الفصل في المستقبل؟

- العمل على امثلة حقيقية لمنطقة المينا- تشكيل فريق عمل مؤلف من المشاركين في المينا لتطوير فكرة الزراعة الحضرية والتواصل دائما- على المدرب ان يتجنب التعمق في الجزئيات- عمل جدول لزيارات ميدانية- مواصلة اللقاءات- تخفيض محتوى الفصل- مراجعة المواد مسبقا قبل عرضها-زيادة النقاش بين المحاضر والمستمعين ولكل بلد خاصته- تنظيم مزيد من الدورات التي تتناول جوانب محدودة للزراعة الحضرية في كل دورة- حصر الاطار: سؤال رئيسي واسئلة فرعية لضبط عناصر عملية وعلمية- اعتماد الفريق الموجود في الدورة كلجنة دائمة.

شكرا لاجابتكم/ن

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

استمارة تقييمية حول الفصل : الزراعة الحضرية-الصحة والامن الغذائي MODULE 4

يرجى التفضل بالاجابة على الاسئلة الواردة ادناه مما يتيح لنا تحسين ادائنا في المستقبل. يرجى اعتماد الصراحة والشفافية في اجاباتكم/ن. ان هذه الاجابات- اكانت ايجابية ام سلبية-هي قيمة جدا بالنسبة الينا.

1- ما رأيك في هذا الفصل؟

- يرجى تصنيف نوعية التدريب في هذا الفصل وفق سلم درجات من 1 الى 5 على ان تكون علامة 1 هي العلامة الادنى فيما تكون علامة 5 العلامة الاعلى.
- اذا شعرت بان السؤال لا ينطبق عليك ام انك لا تمتلك/ي المعلومات الكافية لبدء الرأي، يرجى الاشارة الى علامة "لا رأي لي".

كيف كانت نوعية تدريب هذا الفصل MODULE ؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
		16%	32%	52%	

ما هي الملاحظات او الاقتراحات؟

- كان هناك نقص في اعطاء مثل عملي او زيارة ميدانية حيث كانت الزيارة الميدانية بعيدة عن اهداف الفصل- لم يكن العمل الجماعي مكثفا-زيادة الوقت المخصص لهذا الفصل لانه غير كاف- مزيد من المشاركة والتفاعل بين المشاركين- الامثلة واقعية- المواضيع المطروحة في محلها- كانت نوعية التدريب ممتازة حيث انها كانت متنوعة وشيقة وممتعة ولم نحس باي ملل منها- كنت اتمنى رغم النوعية الجيدة لهذا التدريب في هذا الفصل ولارتباطه بالصحة ان يكون التوسع في مفهوم المدينة الصحية على مستوى كافة المقاييس واحداثها لتفي اهمية ما نحن عليه- الفصل ذو منهج عملي مفيد جدا مع طريقة عمل مشوقة-

2- مستوى معرفة المواضيع المقترحة في الفصل MODULE؟

ارتباط هذا الفصل في عملك الحالي

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
	8%	24%	28%	40%	

الى اي حد اكتسبت/ي معلومات جديدة بالنسبة اليك؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
		8%	48%	40%	4%

منافع المعلومات التي اكتسبت/ي بالنسبة اليك؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
		12%	44%	44%	

تركيز هذا الفصل على ما اردت/ي معرفته بالتحديد؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
		24%	40%	36%	

مدى تناسب محتوى هذا الفصل مع اهداف الفصل المعلنة؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
			44%	56%	

الفائدة العامة لهذا الفصل؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
		8%	56%	36%	

تطوير فهمك/ي للتعقيدات المحيطة بالموضوع؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
		20%	40%	40%	

مقدار اكتساب الافكار التي تتوقعون/ين استخدامها في عملك؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي

فاعلية الفصل في اثارة اهتمامك كامل الفترة الزمنية المحددة له؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
		24%	36%	40%	

فاعلية دراسات الحالة CASE STUDIES / التمارين

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي

ملاحظة: اكمل 11 مشارك من اجمالي 25 تعبئة الاسئلة العائدة للزيارة الميدانية فيما اعتبر الباقون ان 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.

تنظيم الزيارة الميدانية

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
		16%	40%	44%	

المعلومات التي اكتسبتها من الزيارة الميدانية

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
36%	18%	18%	9%	18%	

فاعلية الزيارة الميدانية

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
36%	18%	9%	18%	18%	

يرجى تصنيف كل من النقاط الواردة ادناه وفق الكم او النوعية

الوقت المخصص للنقاش

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به	لا رأي لي
	12%	60%	8%		

التفاعل بين المشاركين والمدرّب

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به	لا رأي لي
		96%	4%		

عمق معالجة الموضوع

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به
		92%		
لا رأي لي				8%

سرعة اعطاء التدريب

بطيء	نسبيا بطيء	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به
		100%		
لا رأي لي				

التنوع في اعتماد الاساليب التدريبية

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به
	12%	88%		
لا رأي لي				

ما الذي وجدته الأكثر افادة في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الاجابة)

-التعرف بشكل عام عن علاقة الزراعة الحضرية بالامن الغذائي- كيفية معرفة الامن الغذائي والصحة بشكل عام في مجتمع ما- مفهوم المدن الصحية-المضمون والاسلوب-الاضاءة على بعض الامور التي كانت بعيدة عن اعيننا بالاختصاص الامن الغذائي واستراتيجيته تدرج المحاضر من البسيط الى المعقد (du simple au complexe- Excellent indicateur)-ادخال عامل الصحة المهنية عند عملية التخطيط والتنفيذ والمتابعة والتقييم للمشاريع التنموية-ربط قضايا الزراعة الحضرية بالامن الغذائي وانعكاساته على صحة الانسان كمكون اساسي من البيئة-طريقة طرح المفاهيم كبدية وتسلسلها وربطها بالخاتمة كنوع من المراجعة العامة وتحقيق الهدف من المادة-طريقة التدريب كانت ممتازة ودالة على مدى تمكن المحاضر من المادة- طريقة تفكير ممتازة لاعداد الدراسات وربط الامن الغذائي بالصحة والزراعة الحضرية- مفاهيم جديدة-اهمية التداخل والتقاطع في عدة موضوعات لتخدم في النهاية هدف واحد مشترك-تقديم الخطر وقياس الامن الغذائي-المضمون واسلوب الطرح والشيء الأكثر تميزا هو الحفاظ على تسلسل الافكار وعناصر الموضوع-تطوير مفهوم الامن الغذائي وربطه بالصحة العامة- تطوير مفهوم الزراعة الحضرية وربطه باهمية التخصصات الاخرى- تطوير مفهوم اعداد مقترح المشاريع-اهمية الزراعة الحضرية وادراجها في التخطيط المدني- الحصول على معلومات صحية هامة في الزراعة الحضرية طريقة النقاش وربط الموضوع بالواقع الذي نعيش-كيفية ربط الزراعة الحضرية بالامن الغذائي والصحة اللذان هما من اساسيات منهجية الزراعة الحضرية وكيفية دمج ذلك في المشاريع التي يتم تجهيزها-المقاربة بين المنافع والمضار الصحية للزراعة الحضرية- فهم اثر الامن الغذائي بالصحة-تعدد الاساليب في طرح الموضوع: الوصف والتحليل، الكم والقياس، كيفية الاستنتاجات-المحاضرات جيدة جدا والطرح كان رائعا على المستوى البيداغوجي والعلمي. نأمل ان يبرمج هذا الفصل منذ بداية البرنامج لانه يشكل سؤال رئيسي في ميدان الزراعة الحضرية-الوحدة الاخيرة (synthetic)

ما الذي وجدته الاقل افادة في هذا الفصل؟(يرجى توضيح الاجابة)

كل موضوع في هذا الفصل مفيد- الزيارات الميدانية ليست بمستوى العنوان-الزيارات الميدانية كل ما ورد كان ايجابيا-كل المواضيع كانت مفيدة بالرغم من ان موضوع الصحة والامن الغذائي والزراعة الحضرية يحتاج الى اعطاء الكثير من الادبيات والدراسة المتعلقة بالمستفيدين والى مزيد من البحوث والدراسات في هذا المجال-لا يوجد التركيز الزائد على الجوانب الصحية مع فقدان التعرّيج على الجوانب التنموية (الاقتصادية والاجتماعية)- كل شيء جديد وله فائدة عندي ولا يوجد شيء اقل افادة-الزيارات الميدانية التي يمكن ان تستبدل لاثراء المفهوم الجديد-كيف يمكن ان تكون الزراعة الحضرية تؤمن الامن الغذائي سواء من الانتاج او من بيع الانتاج والفائدة تعود الى الاسرة-استفدنا جيدا من جميع ما طرح في هذا المجال لدرجة اننا لم نجد أي بند اقل افادة-السؤال الذي يطرح مسألة عامة او ثقافة عامة تعطي اراء متعددة ومتشعبة بدون اطار-

كيف يمكن لك ان تطبق/ي ما تعلمته في هذا الفصل؟ (اعط امثلة اذا امكن)

-عند اعداد المشاريع التنموية لا بد من الاهتمام بالجوانب الصحية البيئية او بمعنى تأثير المشروع على البيئة بشكل عام وعلى صحة الانسان بشكل خاص-من خلال انشاء تعاونية او جمعية تهتم بالزراعة الحضرية

ونشرها-اهمية الامن الغذائي- الزراعات الصحية-اولويات الاحتياجات للمحافظة على مجتمع افضل- حسب ظروف العمل-توعية المستفيدين لاهمية موضوع الامن الغذائي وعلاقته بالمفاهيم الصحية عن طريق القنوات والمسارات المعدة لذلك مثل توصيل هذه المفاهيم للجمعيات التعاونية الزراعية في المدينة-الاستفادة من المعلومات في تطبيق مشروع الحديقة المنزلية-توسيع نطاق العمل البحثي والتنموي الى جوانب ابعد واشمل- من خلال استمارة واستبيان قياس الامن الغذائي في مدينتي وتقييم الخطر-يمكن التطبيق من خلال عملي في اطار بناء القدرات لدى المجالس المحلية والمجتمع المحلي وذلك بهدف التوعية والتثقيف التي سيكون لها مردود بالغ وفعال في تهيئة قاعدة قوية للعمل-ادخال مفهوم الامن الغذائي والصحة عند اعداد مقترحات مشاريع-توفير غذاء آمن وصحي- التخفيف من التلوث- استخدام واساليب البحث الميداني للواقع ودراسة تحديد اولويات العمل-يمكن تطبيق ذلك اولا في عمل المشاريع كذلك في الحياة العملية وعند عمل الاستبيانات الخاصة بالزراعة الحضرية والامن الغذائي-من خلال اعطاء دور كبير للارشاد بشكل عام وبالصحة بشكل خاص للمزارع والتعاونيات والجهات المتفاعلة واهميتها بالمشاريع المقررة للزراعة الحضرية-كاستاذ محاضر ارى في هذا الفصل مادة مضافة لوطني كباحث ومدرس-

هل يمكن ان تعطي نصيحة لتطوير هذا الفصل في المستقبل؟

كيفية تقييم المشاريع التنموية صحيا بمعنى الطرق والاساليب المستخدمة للتقييم-التواصل بين المشاركين- تنظيم زيارات ميدانية مرتبطة مباشرة بهذا الفصل- المقرر غير مبال بالافكار التي تطرح من خارج عنوان مقرره-يمكن تطوير الفصل حسب الطريقة التي اعتمدها في المثل الذي اعطاه عن ندى_شكرا للمحاضر على عمق العمل الذي قام به-المزيد من الدورات في هذا المجال-تبني الدراسات والبحوث في هذا المجال-تخصيص وقت اطول لهذا الموضوع عند التخطيط لبرنامج تدريبي متخصص لاهمية الموضوع-تقاطعات منهجية ومدخلية مع مواضيع اخرى لتخدم اهدافا مشتركة تساهم فيها جهات اخرى متعددة حيث ان هذا الفصل اعطى نموذجا رائعا في ذلك-عرض دراسات اكثر عن الامن الغذائي في الوطن العربي -التعمق في مفهوم تقييم الخطر(قياس الامن الغذائي)-نأمل دائما ان يأخذ المقرر في عين الاعتبار خصوصية البلدان واولوياتها-زيادة دراسات الحالة لتوضيح المفاهيم الحديثة- متابعة وتوصيل المعلومات والتوثيق-المتابعة في مجال الصحة ضمن الزراعة الحضرية من خلال التداخل والتوثيق وتوصيل المعلومات-اسلوب النقاش كان جيد وسهل الاستيعاب وهو من نفس مدرسة د.شادي. انصح الاستمرار بنفس الاسلوب في المستقبل- نود معرفة الدراسات الجديدة في هذا المجال-المحاضر قام ببحوثات جبارة للحصول على ارقام وهذا جيد جدا كما نامل بربط النبات الحضري والصحة والحيوان والصحة-

شكرا لاجابتكم/ن

Module 4: Health, food security and UA

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)

التدريب الاقليمي وتبادل الخبرات في الزراعة الحضرية في منطقة الشرق الاوسط وشمال افريقيا

استمارة تقييمية حول الفصل: الوصول الى المياه لاغراض الزراعة الحضرية **MODULE 5**

يرجى التفضل بالاجابة على الاسئلة الواردة ادناه مما يتيح لنا تحسين ادائنا في المستقبل. يرجى اعتماد الصراحة والشفافية في اجاباتكم/ن. ان هذه الاجابات- اكانت ايجابية ام سلبية-هي قيمة جدا بالنسبة الينا.

1- ما رأيك في هذا الفصل؟

- يرجى تصنيف نوعية التدريب في هذا الفصل وفق سلم درجات من 1 الى 5 على ان تكون علامة 1 هي العلامة الادنى فيما تكون علامة 5 العلامة الاعلى.
- اذا شعرت بان السؤال لا ينطبق عليك ام انك لا تمتلك/ي المعلومات الكافية لابداء الرأي، يرجى الاشارة الى علامة "لا رأي لي".

كيف كانت نوعية تدريب هذا الفصل MODULE ؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
6.25%	31.25%	37.5%	18.75%	6.25%	

ما هي الملاحظات او الاقتراحات؟

-عرض نماذج لمحطات معالجة على مستوى المدن- كيفية المعالجة للمساحات الواسعة-ضبط القاعة والنقاش- اسلوب تشاركي جيد واعتمد على تبادل خبرات بين المشاركين-اعطاء المادة العلمية قبل التدريب يكون افضل- المدرب تنقصة الجرأة على الخوض في بعض التوضيحات رغم انه ابدى الكثير من الجدية في العمل وهذا يرجع حسب ظني الى قلة خبرته في التدريب والقاء المحاضرات-نؤكد موضوع مشاركة جميع المدن وتقديم مقترحات واشراك الجميع في المناقشات-القدرة على اصال المعلومة ضعيفة-تنقص المدرب الخبرة في اعطاء المحاضرات-كان يجب ان ارى في الزيارة الميدانية نجاح تجربة المياه الرمادية غير ان الواقع لم يعكس ذلك- اسلوب مناسب، مادة متنوعة، المشاركة حية رغم ارهاق المشاركين منهجية التقديم متنوعة من تشاركية الى صيغة محاضرة، مشاركة الحاضرين طيبة-المدرب مرتبك وطريقة اداء المحاضرة ليست بالمستوى المطلوب- كان هناك تكرار في الحديث والمداخلات-يفضل ان يتم التركيز اكثر في العناوين واهم المواضيع واختصار الشرح-بداية المقرر كان هناك ارتباك حول شرح المقرر-اثر كثيرا وجود هذا التدريب في نهاية الدورة- التسلسل وضبط الافكار بسيط او متوسط-

2- مستوى معرفة المواضيع المقترحة في الفصل MODULE؟

ارتباط هذا الفصل في عملك الحالي

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
6.25%	25%	56.25%	12.5%		

الى اي حد اكتسبت/ي معلومات جديدة بالنسبة اليك؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
6.25%	18.75%	25%	31.25%	18.75%	

منافع المعلومات التي اكتسبت/ي بالنسبة اليك؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5	لا رأي لي
6.25%	6.25%	50%	18.75%	18.75%	

تركيز هذا الفصل على ما اردت/ي معرفته بالتحديد؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
25%	25%	25%	37.5%	6.25%

لا رأي لي
6.25%

مدى تناسب محتوى هذا الفصل مع اهداف الفصل المعلنة؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
12.5%	43.75%	31.25%	31.25%	6.25%

لا رأي لي
6.25%

الفائدة العامة لهذا الفصل؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
6.25%	31.25%	37.5%	37.5%	18.75%

لا رأي لي
6.25%

تطوير فهمك/ي للتعقيدات المحيطة بالموضوع؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
31.25%	25%	37.5%	37.5%	6.25%

لا رأي لي

مقدار اكتساب الافكار التي تتوقعون/ين استخدامها في عملك؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
25%	37.5%	37.5%	37.5%	

لا رأي لي

فاعلية الفصل في اثارة اهتمامك كامل الفترة الزمنية المحددة له؟

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
6.25%	50%	25%	12.5%	

لا رأي لي
6.25%

فاعلية دراسات الحالة CASE STUDIES /التمارين

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
18.75%	37.5%	37.5%	37.5%	6.25%

لا رأي لي

تنظيم الزيارة الميدانية

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
13.4%	40%	33.4%	13.4%	

لا رأي لي

المعلومات التي اكتسبتها من الزيارة الميدانية

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
13.4%	33.4%	46.7%	67%	

لا رأي لي

فاعلية الزيارة الميدانية

الادنى 1	2	3	4	الاعلى 5
6.7%	13.4%	40%	33.4%	6.7%

لا رأي لي

يرجى تصنيف كل من النقاط الواردة ادناه وفق الكم او النوعية

الوقت المخصص للنقاش

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به
	18.75%	56.25%	25%	

لا رأي لي

التفاعل بين المشاركين والمدرّب

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به
	25%	62.5%	12.5%	

لا رأي لي

عمق معالجة الموضوع

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به	لا رأي لي
	56.25%	43.75%			

سرعة اعطاء التدريب

بطيء	نسبيا بطيء	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به	لا رأي لي
	31.25%	56.25%	12.5%		

التنوع في اعتماد الاساليب التدريبية

غير كاف	نسبيا غير كاف	مناسب	نسبيا مبالغ به	مبالغ به	لا رأي لي
	31.25%	68.75%			

ما الذي وجدته الاكثر افادة في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الاجابة)

معالجة ندرة المياه باعادة استخدام المياه المعالجة-الحفاظ على البيئة-خفض الاستهلاك اليومي للمياه وخاصة مياه الشرب-نقل الافكار للقيادات المحلية مثل خطباء المساجد-عرض دراسات حالة لبعض الدول العربية-مبادئ الادارة التشاركية وافاق تطبيقها في الزراعة الحضرية-تجربة الشبكة الاسلامية في الريف الاردني-تصميم تقنية المياه الرمادية-كيفية الاستفادة من المياه الرمادية والطرق المعتمدة لاستصلاح المياه-كيفية اعادة استخدام المياه بطرق آمنة في ظروف نقص المياه-طريقة تنقية المياه الرمادية رغم عدم وجود جدوى ملحوظة-الزيارات الميدانية-لم يكن الفصل جديدا بالنسبة لي ولكن كان هناك تفاعل مع الاخرين الذين لم تتوفر لهم الخبرة والمعرفة والدراية بهذا الموضوع-التركيز على المواضيع الخاصة بمعالجة المياه العادمة ومعالجتها-اكثر افادة هو نظام معالجة المياه الرمادية من خلال الزيارة الميدانية-ادخل نمط جديد ومفهوم لم نكن نعرفه من قبل-الاطلاع على الواقع التجريبي للمشاريع المنفذة على مستوى الاردن-المشاركة مع الجمعيات الاهلية وتفاعلها-الزيارة الميدانية وكذلك ربط الفصل بالمؤسسة او الشبكة الاسلامية لتنقية مصادر المياه-

ما الذي وجدته الاقل افادة في هذا الفصل؟ (يرجى توضيح الاجابة)

-التعمق احيانا بالاشياء الفنية ذات الاصل العلمي او التفسير العلمي للظواهر بصورة لا يفهمها غير المختص بالزراعة-زيارة مشتل غاندي حيث كان يمكن الاستفادة من الوقت اكثر-التركيز على الحالات الخاصة دون التطرق الى المشاكل الهامة أي اشكالية المياه في البلدان مع اختلافها-الزيارة الميدانية لوادي السير والكرك-الزيارة الميدانية في وادي السير-عدم التركيز على اهمية اعطاء عناصر المقرر او تفصيلاته بصورة متسلسلة ومتراصة-الاستفادة من مصادر المياه الطبيعية-الطرح السلبي او البسيط للمحاضرات-

كيف يمكن لك ان تطبق/ي ما تعلمته في هذا الفصل؟ (اعط امثلة اذا امكن)

نقل الفكرة الى مدينتي (سواء على مستوى الاسرة او المدينة)-التنسيق مع المجتمع المحلي والجهات المختصة في تبني فكرة ايجاد بدائل لمصادر الري التقليدية-محاولة التقليل من السلبيات التي ممكن ان ترافق استخدام مياه الري المعالجة-في المشروع المحدد لمدينتنا استخدام المياه الرمادية مهم جدا في تصميم المشروع-اتاح لي هذا الفصل التعرف على بعض تجارب المدن الاخرى فصار باستطاعتي ان اقرن-يمكن تطبيق ذلك على مدينتي ولكن بشكل اوسع حيث تجمع المياه الرمادية واعادة استخدامها لري الحدائق العامة-مساعدة المحيط العام في مدينتي في كيفية الاستغلال الامثل للمياه-يحتاج التطبيق الى وجود ممولين لهذا الموضوع نظرا لعدم اقتناع المواطنين بذلك-يمكن تطبيق اعادة استخدام المياه بطرق ابسط مباشرة من خلال اعتماد المياه المستخدمة والسقاية بها مباشرة-الاستفادة القصوى من مياه الامطار وترشيد استهلاك المياه-امارس هذا الموضوع على ارض الواقع منذ زمن-الاستفادة من التجربة في المدن السبع-مشاركة المجتمع المحلي في ادخال واعادة استخدام المياه المعالجة في قطاع الزراعة من خلال عرض تجربة لجنة قرى مميزة في الكرك-وتشجيع مجتمعنا واقتناعهم في اعادة استخدام المياه المعالجة في ري المحاصيل-من خلال برامج تدريبية او تثقيفية-كيفية استثمار المياه الرمادية واستعمالاتها-في التوعية العامة حول ترشيد

استخدام المياه المعالجة والرمادية- البحث عن وسائل تقنية للاستخدامات المقترحة وخاصة في المناطق الجافة وشبه الجافة-موضوع المادة عام جدا ويمثل مادة لتثمين بعض الأنشطة البيداغوجية او التنموية.

هل يمكن ان تعطي نصيحة لتطوير هذا الفصل في المستقبل؟

نقل التجارب الى الدول الاخرى تكون اكثر تفصيلا-التعمق اكثر في استخدام المياه الرمادية في الزراعة- المداخلات المتتالية للمشاركين لا تعطي الفرصة لبعض المشاركين على استيعاب الموضوع اكثر-ارجو من السادة المشرفين ان يتفطنوا في المستقبل الى مسألة المقاربة بين مستوى المشاركين ومستوى الفصل حيث لاحظنا ان مستوى هذا الفصل لا يستجيب الى التطلعات-حبذا لو تم عرض تجربة من غير تجارب المينا وقد مر عليها فترات زمنية مختلفة لنحصل على نتائج بالاضافة الى عرض سلبيات تجارب اخرى -موضوع المياه مهم جدا والفكرة جيدة جدا الا ان الوسائل المستخدمة في اعادة استخدام المياه تعتبر بدائية وغير عملية وانصح باعادة دراسات اكثر بهدف ايجاد طرق اكثر عملية-نريد جهازا اكثر تنقية وتفصيل اكثر حول نتائج جهاز المياه الرمادية- مزيد من الدراسات البحثية على ارض الواقع-تعميق معالجة لهذا الفصل-دراسة اعمق لاشكالية المياه في المنطقة من كل الجوانب مع ادخال الجانب القانوني- ادخال اسلوب المقارنة بين البلدان لكي يتم تحليل الاشكالية وفهمها بشكل اوسع-البحث بعمق في هذا الموضوع من حيث الجوانب الاجتماعية والاقتصادية والفنية وكيفية طرح هذه الافكار على المجتمع المحلي عند التفكير بتصميم مثل هذه الانظمة- اعطاء مزيد من الوقت للجانب الهندسي لمثل هذه الانظمة-التركيز على المواضيع المهمة-اعطاء الاولويات-استخدام اساليب افضل للنقاش-ان يكون المدرب مرتاح وان لا يكون قد شارك في الدورة ومرهق مثل باقي المشاركين-بحاجة الى توضيح اكثر لمفهوم المياه الرمادية والتعمق في المصادر غير التقليدية من نواح تقنية مستخدمة في كل مصدر-بحث علمي دقيق لتوضيح صورة هذا المشروع وانعكاساته السلبية على الانسان-انصح لتطوير هذا الفصل لو كان هناك تصور اخر عن محطات المعالجة في مدن خارج المينا وطرق استخدام مياهها المعالجة او زيارة محطة معالجة على مستوى محلي او اقليمي-المحاضر مؤدب ومتزن كثيرا لكنه يفقد السيطرة . نص الفصل جيد لذا ارى نجاح الفصل مموها.المحاضر ابدى نية حسنة في تقديم المشكلة وفي تقدير ان المحاضر جيد لو انه: 1- اعطى هيكلية للمحاضرات والنقاش والاسئلة لاغراض واضحة-2- تجنب الافكار المسبقة ايجابا او سلبا-3-الالتزام بالتحليل العلمي- التنموي اذ ان المحاضر في نظري جبار ويجب اخذ بالاعتبار الازعاج الخارج عن سيطرته.

شكرا لاجابتكم/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 ininterpretation 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?

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest

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

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest

Remarks and suggestions:_____

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

- Health, Food security and UA

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest

- Environment and UA

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest

- Spatial planning and UA

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest

- Access to water and UA

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest

- Agricultural systems and UA

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest

5- What are you general impressions about the course

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest

Remarks: _____

6- Accommodation and logistics:

- How do you rate your stay in Beirut

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest

- How do you rate your stay in Jordan

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest

- How do you rate the logistical arrangements

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest

Remarks and suggestions on accommodation and logistics:

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

Thank you

Appendix 5 a

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?

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest
	29.5%	35.3%	35.3%		

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

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest
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

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest
	35.3 %	47 %	17.7 %		

- Environment and UA

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest
	23.5 %	53 %	23.5 %		

- Spatial planning and UA

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest
	12 %	53 %	29.4 %	6 %	

- Access to water and UA

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest
	6 %	41.2 %	35.3 %	17.7 %	

- Agricultural systems and UA

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest
	12 %	47 %	41.2 %		

5- What are you general impressions about the course

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest
6 %	41.2 %	35.3 %	17.7 %		

Remarks: _____

6- Accommodation and logistics:

- How do you rate your stay in Beirut

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest
	35.3 %	29.5 %	29.5 %	6 %	

- How do you rate your stay in Jordan

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest
6 %	18 %	47 %	29.5 %		

- How do you rate the logistical arrangements

No opinion	5Highest	4	3	2	1Lowest
	12 %	41 %	29.5 %	12 %	6 %

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 domaine.
- 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.

