

REA Training Report – REA+ToT at OFDA Facility, Arlington VA

Prepared by C. Kelly¹

Overview

This report covers a workshop which combined training on the REA and Training of Trainers organized by Interworks in cooperation with Care, OFDA and Benfield Hazard Research Centre from 25 to 29 April 2005 at the OFDA training facility in Arlington Va. The REA component (first 2.5 days) of the training was led by C. Kelly of Interworks. The ToT session (2nd two days of the training) was led by Don Schramm. The schedule for the training is attached.

A total of 18 individuals participated in the REA training, and 14 in the ToT. A total of 16 persons passed the test at the end of the REA portion of the training. A list of participants is attached.

With respect to the REA portion of the training:

- Majorities of the participants rated the course as correct in length, with just enough participants, and gave the course a very good or better rating.
- Some participants felt the course too short and too intense, and that they would not be fully able to conduct the REA at the end of the course.
- Concerns were expressed over the difficulty of having two books (“Green” and “Blue”) in the course, which resulted in confusion as to which pages were being discussed at which point.
- Some participants felt aspects of the presentation of the training could be improved, particularly by expanding presentation on the REA process, terminology and having more than one presenter.

At the start of the course an issue arose with one participant who was concerned that the REA and training did not focus sufficiently on the “non-human” aspect of disaster impact. This participant later decided to not continue with the course as it did not address his needs.

The issue of the human focus of the REA, which has arisen in other trainings, needs more focused attention in future trainings. It may be necessary to introduce a short segment on the concept of environment and how it differs from ecology as well as a more in depth discussion as to the various definitions of disaster.

With respect to the ToT portion of the training:

- All participants found the course to be in the range of useful to very useful, that the overall course to be good to excellent (score 4.29 of 5) and that the trainer as good to excellent (score 4.79 of 5).
- Participants appreciated the trainer’s “calm and patient” presentation skills, and commented positively on the feedback provided by the trainer as well as the opportunities presented to learn new methods and practice training skills.
- Participants felt the ToT could be improved by lengthening the course, providing more opportunities to practice training skills, greater exposure to different training tools, methods and ideas, and more presentations by the trainer.

Comments in the written evaluations and verbally made during the training indicated that the ToT provided a good opportunity for participants to deepen their understanding of the REA process and procedures. This was an intended outcome of the ToT session, although some

¹ Email 72734.2412@compuserve.com

participants suggested that the REA focus of the ToT should have been made clearer (probably in the course announcement).

REA Training Evaluation Results

Question	Average Score (17 responses or as indicated)	Rating Range: Strongly Agree: 5, Agree: 4, Neither Agree or Disagree: 3, Disagree: 2, Strongly Disagree: 1
1. Subject matter was adequately covered	4.12	
2. Content was suitable for my background and experience	4.24	
3. Program was well-paced	3.82	
4. Training materials were relevant	4.5	
5. Participants were encouraged to take an active part	4.76	
6. The program met my individual objectives	4.24	
7. Program was relevant to my job	4.29	
8. I would recommend this program to my colleagues	4.29	
9. I feel prepared to conduct an REA	3.94	
Topic	Average Score	Rating Range: 5=excellent to 1=poor.
10. Lecture method	4.13 (of 16 responses)	
11. Facilitation team	3.92 (of 12 responses)	
12. Small group sessions	4.26	
13. Simulation Exercises	4.12	
14. Meeting space	4.12	
15. Meals/refreshments	4.31 (of 16 responses)	
16. Overall organization	4.06	
17. Other participants	4.40 (of 15 responses)	

Length of workshop:

Correct: 10 answers; Too short: 4 answers; Too long: 1 answer

There were:

Just enough participants: 16 answers.

What is your overall rating of this course?

Excellent: 4 answers; Very good: 12 answers; Good: 1 answer

Suggestions or comments by participants for improving the course:

- Make all start with Issues and Consolidation table or keep posted throughout the course to keep goals in mind.
- It would be nice to have a clearer overview at the beginning of how the rating process works and adds up to the final product.
- Make the session a full three days.
- I strongly believe the course was really too intensive. There are a few steps that would need a more in depth discussion or explanation, i.e., Context Statement and Consolidation and Analysis.
- Given that this workshop focuses on RAPID environmental assessments, I understand the push for completing each group assignment. However, I feel like I have not had time to absorb the flow and importance of each step. Perhaps a recap after each step on the purpose of it would be helpful.
- Label books "Red", "Green", "Blue"
- Combine the "Blue" and "Green" books. Too confusing going back and forth.
- Juggling of different manuals and confusion about page numbers could have been avoided with better preparation.
- The book could use tabs and instructor should have page numbers for relevant sections ready.
- More examples.
- Better organization of material.
- For exercises, indicate page numbers of explanations in all the books.
- Few spelling and format mistakes in the manuals.
- Need overheads printed out to increase absorption of ideas and to make it more easy to take notes.
- (Sessions 3.3 and 3.4 were) too fast.
- We need to reconcile the disaster management and environmental philosophies.
- I would like to see an actual example of an REA completed.
- Present acronyms and general framework issues first.
- Kelly conveys enthusiasm and knowledge. He could clarify some of his definitions and terms (disaster, environ. unique) as they are clearer to him than others.
- The disaster scenarios were relevant, well developed and realistic.
- Perhaps the community level assessment could be made more interesting or better presented. Perhaps have people develop a few of their own questions.
- The course could have benefited from a team approach, i.e., more than one facilitator would have made it more dynamic
- Emphasize the importance of negotiation throughout the process.
- Create more room for the simulation.
- More effective to have presenter to distribute duties.
- Would have liked more disaster professionals in the class.
- I thought there was a lot of down time but noticed others were worn out Tuesday afternoon.
- It was too hot and was rough to stay awake.
- Need more breaks.
- Need reading ahead of class: Sphere, RAP, and ...papers (distributed in class).
- Course was very compacted but some outside time would have been nice.
- Allow just a few minutes to read appropriate section of green book so as to get to know it (feel like I know the blue book but not the green).
- Consider giving time each day to have evaluations at the end of each day, for more specific feedback.

Rating of Individual Workshop Sessions

Scoring: 5 = Excellent 4 = Good 3 = Average 2 = Poor 1 = Unacceptable 0 = Does not apply

Session No. & Title	Quality (17 respondents or as indicated)	Value to my Work (17 respondents or as indicated)
1.1 Welcome / Introductions	3.5 (14 respondents)	3.13 (15 respondents)
1.2 REA Conceptual Framework	3.88 (16 respondents)	4
1.3 Overview of Disaster Management	3.76	4.24
1.4 REA and Disasters Assessments	4.31 (16 respondents)	4.38 (16 respondents)
1.5 Module Four: Green Review of Relief Procurement	3.88 (16 respondents)	4.12
2.15 Module 1: REA Context Statement	4.06 (16 respondents)	4.24
2.2 Factors influencing environmental impacts	4.29	4.29
2.3 Simulation Launch – SimEx 1 and SimEx2	4.25 (16 respondents)	4.25 (16 respondents)
2.4 Presentation / Discussion of results	3.94 (16 respondents)	4.12
2.5 Environmental Threat of Disasters	4.19 (16 respondents)	4.24
2.6 Unmet Basic Needs	4.07 (15 respondents)	4 (15 respondents)
2.7 Participant Experience Sharing	3.88 (16 respondents)	4 (15 respondents)
3.1 Negative Environmental Consequences of Relief Activities	4.24	4.25 (16 respondents)
3.2 Presentation/discussion	4 (16 respondents)	4 (16 respondents)
3.3 Module Two: Community Level Assessment	3.94 (16 respondents)	4.25 (16 respondents)
3.42 Module Three: Consolidation and Analysis	3.82	4.5 (16 respondents)
3.5 REA Implementation Issues	4.06 (16 respondents)	4.4 (15 respondents)

Training of Trainers

Question	Score (14 responses)	Rating Range
1. How useful did you find the following presentations:		
a) Adult Learning & Learning Styles	4	1 to 5, where 5 is “very useful” and 1 is “not useful at all”
b) Presentation Skills	4.57	
c) Effective Facilitation & Discussion Skills	4.43	
2. How useful was “Participant presentations & Feedback” in giving you ideas on how to improve your presentation skills?	4.07	

3. How useful was “Facilitating interactive exercise & Feedback” in giving you ideas on how to improve your skills in designing and facilitating an interactive learning exercise or discussion?	4.21	
4. Overall how would you rate the Training of Trainers Course?	4.29	5 to 1, where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor
5. Overall how would you rate your Trainer for the Training of Trainers course?	4.79	

What did you most like about this Training of Trainers course?

- Interaction between participants
- The practicums, but especially the personal presentations. I would preferred to do more on my own than the “group” presentation.
- Learning effective skills.
- Very sympathetic and non-threatening. Relaxing.
- Watching different presentations and getting a chance to apply and cement REA concepts.
- Quick and simple with practice.
- Practical experience.
- The interaction and exchange of ideas.
- Good clear instructions and lots of interaction and hands on experience.
- Participatory nature.
- A few new ideas, opportunity to spend more time on.
- Since I am more of an active learner I don’t feel I know something until I do it. Even though getting up front is not easy for me the giving of the presentations has made me more sure of the material.
- Calm and patient.
- Quick key constructive feedback.
- Multiple presentation styles.
- Facilitation skills.

How would you improve this course?

- Allow more time for group discussions and presentations.
- Have fewer groups because there were too many presenters – but do at least one more “5 minute” presentation.
- Lengthen facilitation to 30 minutes for more group time.
- Make learning style part shorter.
- Video cameras.
- Doing a second individual presentation.
- I felt the instructor had a lot of impart. I wanted more information!
- Very different skills levels. Consider for the future.
- Building skills side is well. There is a need to improve component side (a training can be well facilitated with poor content).
- More elaboration of the subject would improve this course.
- Outline the objectives more clearly, in terms of the extent of learning more about the REA via facilitating exercises.

What suggestions do you have for your Trainer to improve his training, presentation or facilitation skills?

- Make it 2 days instead of 1.5.
- Very useful to learn from others as well.
- Have us do evaluation (at the) end (of) day. Easier to remember activities.
- More facilitation skills.
- Good course. Reinforces previous training skills.
- More intro/info on use of various media.
- Another day on course design, evaluation could help.
- Good length of the course and I liked how it followed-on to the REA course.
- Additional readings.
- More instructor presentations.
- I found the true case study of Sri Lanka interesting because we could compare what we had learned with the actual REA. True case studies might insight more interest in the activities.

- An illustration of participant learning style can be useful for future self improvement.
- A three day training would make the training to trainers more complete.
- ToT facilitator was very supportive, but could perhaps provide more constructive criticism and comparisons from his wide experiential background.

Participants List

#	ToT	Name	Organization	Email Address
1		Gail Neuforf	CARE/USA	gneudorf@care.org
2	Yes	John D. Waugh	IUCN	jwaugh@iucnus.org
3	Yes	Robin Mason	USAID/NRM	rmason@usaid.gov
4	Yes	Karen McDonald-Gayle	USAID/Jamaica-Caribbean	kmcdonald-gayle@usaid.gov
5	Yes	E. Allyn Moushey	USAID/DCHA/ Food for Peace	amoushey@usaid.gov
6		Patrick Smith	USAID/Biodiversity	pasmith@usaid.gov
7	Yes	Marie Florence Cadet	USAID Haiti	mcadet@usaid.gov
8		Natasha Udu-gama	Disaster Risk Reduction Program, ARI – Virginia Tech	udugama@vt.edu
9	Yes	Paul F. Turner	Chemonics International Inc	pturner@chemonics.com
10	Yes	Wayne Lifshitz	CARE/CERT	sirwayne1@yahoo.com
11	Yes	Marion Pratt	USAID/OFDA	pratt@usaid.gov
12	Yes	Victor Bullen	USAID/LAC/RSD/E	vbullen@usaid.gov
13	Yes	Erika J. Clesceri	USAID/DCHA/FFP/PTD	eclesceri@usaid.gov
14	Yes	Kathy Tim	CARE	ktin@care.org
15	Yes	Margaret Timmer	USAID Haiti	mtimmer@usaid.gov
16		Christopher Howell	PA Consulting Group	Christopher.Howell@paconsulting.com
17	Yes	Yves-Laurent Régis,	CARE-Haiti	regisyl@PAP.CARE.org or yvlaur@yahoo.ca
18	Yes	Rachel Lambeth	ADRA International Programs Desk Officer	Rachel.Lambeth@adra.org

2.5 Day REA Workshop Agenda

Day 1

Time	Sessions
1230	1.1 Welcome and Introduction. Participant experience and overview of the workshop and agenda.
1330	1.2 Disasters and the Environment. Explore the environment/disaster interface through analysis of brief case studies. Explain why the REA was created and its relationship to the EIA.
1400	1.3 REA Conceptual Framework. Overview of the REA process, REA objectives, outcomes, users and the eleven-step assessment process. Introduction to the four REA modules and their objectives.
1430	Coffee Break
1445	1.4 Overview of Disaster Management. Overview of disaster management concepts, terminology and activities.
1530	2.1 REA and Disaster Assessments. An overview of rapid disaster assessments and where REA fits into the broader types of disaster assessments.

1600	3.3 Module Four: Green Review of Relief Procurement. The definition and concept of green procurement, and introduction of the checklist.
1640	End of Day 1

Day 2

0845	Review of Day 1. Plan for Day 2
0900	1.5 Module One: Context statement. The purpose, process and outcome for this element. Introduction of each of the seven questions and description of how each one is addressed and answered. View a sample context statement (Exercise will be integrated into the Simulation Launch)
0930	1.6 Form 1: Factors influencing environmental impacts: Introduction of the objective, the form and process for this element. Also brief explanation of rating scales. (Exercise will be integrated into the Simulation Launch)
1000	1.7 Simulation Launch: Form groups, present and review disaster scenarios & background notes, launch the first two simulation exercises (SimEx 1 and SimEx 2)
1030	Team Work on Exercise #1 & #2 (incorporates coffee break)
1200	Lunch
1300	1.8 Presentations / Discussions Groups present their results from SimEx 1 and Sim Ex 2 and facilitator responds to questions or comments related to the Context Statement and Form 1.
1330	2.2 Form 2: Environmental Threats of Disasters: Introduction of the objective, the form and process for this element. Explanation of shortcuts to filling out form. Exercise: fill out Form 2 based on original situation report and situation update #1.
1430	Coffee Break
1445	2.3 Form 3: Unmet Basic Needs: Introduction of the objective, the form and process for this element. Exercise: fill out Form 3 based on original situation report and situation update #2
1615	2.6 Participant Experience Sharing. Participants present short prepared case studies (3 studies of 5 min each).
1630	End of Day 2

Day 3

0845	Review of Day 2. Plan for Day 3.
0900	2.4 Form 4: Negative environmental consequences of relief activities. Introduce the objective, the form and process for this element. Exercise: fill out Form 4 based on original situation report and situation update #3.

1015	Coffee Break
1045	2.5 Presentation / Discussion. Participants present results of their work on Rating Forms 2, 3 and 4.
1130	3.1 Module Two: Community Level Assessment. Why and how the REA is implemented at the community level, including information collection options as well as “questionnaire versus focused discussion.” Exercise A: Discuss and create a list of guidelines for conducting a rapid community assessment based on REA issues.
1200	Lunch – Including Exercise A
1330	Exercise B: Tabulate Community Level Assessment Forms.
1355	Review of Exercises A and B.
1405	3.2 Module Three: Consolidation and Analysis: Introduction & Procedures. The purpose, process and outcome for this module, followed by application exercise
1425	Consolidation and Analysis Exercise (including coffee)
1525	Presentations and Discussion
1605	3.4 REA implementation issues. Discussion of resource and time requirements, possible modifications to the rating forms and other logistical / management concerns.
1615	3.5 Evaluation and Review of 3 days.
1630	Preview of ToT
1645	End of Day 3.

2 Day Training of Trainers Agenda

Day One

0845	Introduction to ToT
0900	Workshops & adult learning
1000	Coffee Break
1030	Effective Presentations
1100	Participants prepare first practicum
1130	Participant presentations
1200	Lunch

1300	Participants presentations (continued)
1500	Coffee Break
1530	Lessons learned - Presentations
1600	Facilitation and second practicum instructions
1700	End Day 1

Day Two

0845	Team Preparation, Second Practicum
1000	Team 1, Second Practicum
1030	Team 2, Second Practicum
1100	Coffee Break
1130	Team 3, Second Practicum
1200	Team 4, Second Practicum
1230	Lunch
1300	Teams 5 & 6, Second Practicum
1400	Coffee Break
1415	Lessons learned about facilitation
1445	TOT Evaluation
1515	REA Concept Review

All times are approximate.