PARTICIPANT NUMBERS

- 1397 participants registered on the course
- 268 participants completed the course in its entirety (all 16 elements plus the course survey) and were awarded a certificate
- 30 participants completed the majority of elements in the course (e.g. over 8 elements) but were not awarded a certificate, considered course ‘non-completers’
- 149 participants participated in the course to an extent but completed less than 8 elements, considered course ‘drop-outs’
- The final 950 did not participate at all

This gives a course non-completion rate of 2%, a drop-out rate of 11%, a completion rate of 19% and a non-starter rate of 68%.

PARTICIPANT DATA

Organisation Type
Participants from INGOs made up the biggest percentage of users (34.28%), followed by students (17.3%) and local/national NGOs (14.78%). There were no huge discrepancies in feedback based on user group.

Geography
The countries with the highest representation of participant sign ups were:
- Democratic Republic of the Congo (16.5%)
- Ivory Coast (16.3%)
- Haiti (14.8%)
- Burkina Faso (14.5%)

This was followed by Cameroon (5.5%), Niger (5.1%), and Mali (4.6%). In total, 45 countries were represented.

COURSE FEEDBACK

Course Rating
The overall course feedback and ratings were consistently high, suggesting a good learning experience for users.

- 90.55% of the recipients thought that the overall training was “excellent” or “very good”
- While the weighted average of the majority training components was high (above 4 out of 5), there was less satisfaction regarding the breakout rooms (e.g. the lack of facilitators/moderators in each room)
- Amongst some of the best aspects of the training, some of the frequently mentioned highlights include:
A- Scenario-based e-learning modules  
B- Live webinars (exchanges between facilitator and participants)  
C- The professionalism and knowledge of the trainer  
D- The rich and instructive module content on Moodle

• Amongst some of the recommendations for changes, some of the frequently mentioned requests include:
  A- Simplify concepts for non-humanitarian participants  
  B- More/longer breakout rooms  
  C- Better scheduling of the live webinars (Weekends etc)  
  D- Increase the length time of the course (as to give people more time to complete everything)

Use of Sphere

Most participants expressed that they used Sphere in their work, with the most common use being for MEAL purposes (78.62%). All other answers were rated similarly (around 69%), suggesting Sphere guidelines enjoys varied usage amongst service users.

Course Accessibility

Participants who did not complete the course were sent a separate survey, to assess any potential barriers to entry or completion of the course. Recipients expressed that they did not follow/complete the course due to reasons such as:

A- 54% expressed that they did not have enough time to engage with the training  
B- 9.84% expressed that they were not aware that the training had begun  
C- 1.64% expressed that they did not enjoy the training  
D- 55% who chose to write down the reasons, highlighted:
  - internet connection issues  
  - hard time accessing the course/webinar via their phone  
  - the training clashed with work responsibilities

Efforts could be made to make the course more accessible still for those with low bandwidth or network, and more options regarding times (e.g. sessions at different times, more flexibility/time to complete course overall)

Amongst some of the recommendations for changes, recipients highlighted:

A- Change the time of the training (weekends, OOO hours)  
B- Send by e-mail all pdf files of each module  
C- Give participants more time to complete the course  
D- Organise face-to-face training

KEY SUGGESTIONS/LEARNING

Consider ways to reduce the drop-out rate on the course, such as:

• Consider more support in live sessions in regards to moderators, co-facilitators, especially for breakout rooms  
• Consider having different options for live session times (e.g. two sessions a week, catering to different timezones)  
• Consider an accessibility audit of wording on the course, ensuring minimal over-technical language, jargon or acronyms are used  
• Consider allowing more time, both for the live sessions and breakout discussions, and the course overall (e.g. longer for participants to complete work)
• Explore more ways to make the course accessible to those with low bandwidth or internet connection issues