



**Integrating Gender in
Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade:
Training for USAID Africa Missions**

WORKSHOP REPORT

**USAID Office of Women in Development
USAID Africa Bureau
www.usaid.gov**

2004



**Integrating Gender in
Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade:
Training for USAID Africa Missions**

2004

The Integrating Gender in Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade: Training for USAID Africa Missions has been collaboratively developed and implemented by the USAID Africa Bureau and the Office of Women in Development, Bureau for Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade. Additional resources have been compiled in the CD-ROM *Integrating Gender in Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade: Resources for USAID Africa Missions*.

The training materials and CD-Rom have been prepared by DevTech Systems, Inc. under the Short Term Technical Assistance and Training Task Order (Contract #: GEW-I-01-02-00019-00) of the WID IQC. The WID IQC contract is funded by the Office of Women in Development, Bureau for Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade, U.S. Agency for International Development.

DevTech Systems, Inc
1700 N. Moore St., Suite 1050
Arlington VA 22209
Tel: (703) 778-2630
Fax: (703) 351-8184

Workshop Report

Sandra L. Russo and James Barham

May 10, 2004

1. Introduction and overview

Integrating gender into the work of the Agency is a policy imperative and a mandate. In 2003, the Africa Bureau undertook a gender training needs assessment of Missions on the continent (Africa Bureau Gender Training: Needs Assessment, November, 2003). The results of that assessment indicated the need for gender training in several sectoral areas, with EGAT rated highest or second highest in the three sub-regions. The report recommended that a training program should be designed with a major emphasis on practical tools that can be used on participants' projects and programs and that it should focus on a limited number of sectors. Missions preferred an approach that had the largest number of attendees per Mission, and that the training include partners. Due to budgetary constraints, it was decided to hold regional training workshops rather than Mission specific workshops even though the latter were preferred.

As a result of the needs assessment, a gender training program emphasizing economic growth, agriculture and trade was developed using the case study methodology. Content also included a focus on the ADS, activity design, development of indicators, and other activities that would help participants learn how to integrate, and apply, gender into their programming. Three regional workshop locations (Accra, Pretoria, and Addis Ababa) were chosen. Solicitations for participants were sent out in early February, with the start date for the first workshop set for mid-March. While it was suggested that the entire four day workshop be offered to Washington, D.C. staff, time constraints on the part of Agency staff and the trainers, led to more of a run-through of the seven modules over three days. Input was strongly solicited from all participants in the D.C. run-through and used to modify the cases and training methodology prior to delivery in Africa.

We set out four major objectives for the gender training workshops that we expected participants to be able to achieve:

- 1) Understand key gender concepts
- 2) Understand how to apply gender analysis at various levels and its application to their work
- 3) Learn to how to develop and use gender indicators for programming (in accordance with Agency's mandate on gender mainstreaming)
- 4) Develop gender action plans at the mission and partner level with an appreciation of gender issues at the beneficiary level.

We also asked participants about their expectations. Their answers ranged from the very general to the very specific:

- A basic understanding of what gender is about
- Better understand what is meant by gender mainstreaming; to be informed on gender issues and be able to incorporate what we learn in the work we do
- To better understand Mission gender/EG challenges and gaps in order to provide useful technical assistance for programming and address specific needs
- Learn what other missions are doing about gender; interested in different gender experiences of different countries
- New approaches/concepts in gender analysis; cutting edge tools; get to know what tools work and what don't
- Identify best practices, exchange views and ideas of how to improve and better integrate gender in new strategy 2004-2008
- More technically sound experience in gender, beyond day to day
- Accumulate enough knowledge on gender issues to go back and present to the Mission
- Acquire skills that will assist me to do my job as mission WID officer better
- Tools to integrate gender concepts into a regional program strategic plan and draw activity manager attention whenever appropriate to this issue
- To learn how to incorporate gender into upcoming PMP process for economic growth and trade area
- To be able to better address gender issues in the USAID/Dakar private sector SO new activity in business development sector (BDS)

2. Evaluations

Two types of evaluations were used during the three gender training programs: a daily evaluation and a final evaluation. The daily evaluations consisted simply of three flip charts hung by the exit with headings, What did you like? What didn't you like? What would you change? Participants were given post-it notes to write their responses and post as they left for the day, thus ensuring anonymity and freedom of expression. In general, the participants most liked the participatory nature of the training and the opportunities to work in small groups, e.g., one participant wrote, "I love the group work". Another wrote, "I like the way we are doing the exercises; it allows us to share

our experiences”. They also liked the case studies but complained about the amount of reading and having to do “homework” most nights. They appreciated the practicality of the work and the tools presented, having handouts of the PowerPoint presentations, and the focus on application to their work (e.g., “the discussion about indicators, discussion on PMP, learnt a great deal on indicators and policy shaping”). The inclusion of a local gender expert at each location helped the participants from outside that country to understand gender issues specific to that location (e.g., Ghana, South Africa, and Ethiopia).

In contrast, they did not like lectures or presentations that went on too long. Suggestions were made to have some sessions move faster yet, at the same time, others said that the presentations went too fast.

Breaking down the evaluations by country indicates that having different audiences meant that the evaluations had different responses. In South Africa, for example, comments included, “too much emphasis on agriculture and economic growth” indicating that most of the participants were not from EGAT. One participant said, “We’re here to learn about gender, not how to farm”. The evaluations also showed that the trainers were learning along the way, using the previous evaluations to improve the next training. For example, having numerous handouts available beforehand and passing out the PowerPoint presentations in handout form before each PowerPoint presentation improved the evaluations around that issue.

When asked what they would change, the participants all asked for more time to read the case studies and that the case studies needed to be modified or changed, especially the dairy case. One person asked for the case studies to be more general in nature so that people didn’t have to spend time trying to understand the terminology. It was also suggested that the interaction of gender with other crosscutting issues (e.g., environment, HIV/AIDS, poverty) be addressed more thoroughly. It was also suggested that real project documents be used such as PMPs, ISPs, and Workplans.

The formal evaluation (see Appendix X for evaluation form and the quantitative results) was given to each participant on the last day of the training session. Four categories were included:

- A. Overall achievement of the course objectives
- B. Specific skills and knowledge
- C. Application of course content to work
- D. Final thoughts

Three of the four sections can be analyzed numerically. While generally positive responses were received, the differences between locations are apparent. We strongly suspect these are related to the participants’ backgrounds. Only in the case of the Ethiopia workshop were the majority of the participants from EGAT. For most of the questions in the first category (overall achievement of course objectives), participants’ responses were distributed between ‘fully’ and ‘partially’. But, for example, when asked whether the course objectives was met related to providing practice in the application of

gender analysis tools, striking differences appear between the three locations. Only the Ethiopia participants thought this objective was met fully, for the most part, while the other two workshop participants thought this objective was only met partially.

Asking these questions in other ways, (the series of questions on specific skills and knowledge), it becomes clear why the Ghana and South African workshop participants answered as they did – they clearly felt they did not have enough time to learn, practice, and apply the gender information and gender analysis tools, especially given that most of them were not from EGAT. Even Ethiopian participants, to a lesser extent, wanted more time for practice and application although all of them thought they had received enough information. Only one or two individuals in each workshop thought they did not get enough time to work on their own mission program materials while only one person in the Ethiopia workshop thought s/he did not have enough time to prepare and share their action plan.

In Section C, the participants had an opportunity to respond to open-ended questions related to application of the gender integration material to their work. Rather than respond to specifics about the tools, they mostly answered the question, “in what areas can the WID Office and the Africa Bureau help you with your work”? They wanted technical assistance of all types – short term, individual and mission, specifics on how to write indicators, revise PMPs, CSPs, results frameworks, and periodic updates on information. They asked for regular follow-up, annual training and updates, and networking. Over half of the responses had to do with requests for technical assistance including financial support (e.g., for gender assessments or to fund further gender training).

Finally, the differences in participants are again apparent from their responses to the last series of questions. The Ghana workshop participants were only slightly positive, but mostly neutral about the benefit of the focus on EGAT, the South African workshop participants were fairly negative, and the Ethiopian participants either strongly agreed or agreed that the EGAT focus was useful. Interestingly, the Ghana workshop participants felt that they had learned enough to take leadership on gender integration back to their work as did the Ethiopian participants while the South African workshop participants facilitated around ‘agree’ and ‘neutral’ despite the fact that many of these were gender focal persons. Most participants agreed that they were introduced to new ideas and that they are able to improve their use of gender sensitive indicators. Only five participants in all thought that they would not be able to use any of the information in their work.

Recommendations

With respect to the evaluation process itself, the daily evaluations were helpful to the trainers to note where adjustments could be made in terms of flow, process, content, organization, and the like. They were not specific enough, however, nor was enough time given to the participants to provide more thorough answers. We may not have gotten ‘better’ answers in any case. The final evaluation is sufficient to highlight where to change the focus, emphasis or timing of different sections and content. Specific recommendations related to the technical and pedagogical aspects are reported below.

3. Technical lessons learned

3.1 The participants

The training program was designed, as noted above, for EGAT officers. By and large, less than 30% of the participants were EGAT officers or had some rudimentary knowledge of economic growth, agriculture and trade but we don't have the specific figures. In every training, the local Mission's gender focal person or persons plus gender focal persons from other Missions were included as participants. The hosting Mission staff usually comprised the majority of workshop participants, regardless of the location. Finally, while it was anticipated that at least a third of the participants would be partners, in total only a few were from partner organizations.

Having the "right" audience makes a world of difference in the success of the training. Democracy and governance officers, health officers, and education officers had a difficult time with the material, both in terms of relevance to their work and the terminology used. The participants in Ghana and South Africa were not the right participants. This did not prevent them, however, from working hard and participating to the best of their abilities. They should not have had to work so hard to gain mastery of this material.

This was also not a stand-alone gender training course; the content was deliberately and strongly linked to economic growth and agriculture. In many Missions, the selection of the gender focal person is not based on that individual's having gender expertise. It appears that some of the gender focal persons were sent in the hopes (either their own or the Mission's) of their gaining some training in gender. This was not the course for them. In the best case scenario, the gender focal persons should have been resources for the training, not participants in the training.

Holding the workshops in three different regions was meant to encourage the participation of other Missions and countries. Due to the late announcement of the training (and associated costs), not all Missions were able to send staff or partners to the training.

Recommendations

It is our opinion that the announcement of the training and the response time allowed was poorly timed. Four to six weeks notice is not enough time to juggle schedules and find travel funds. Even though the gender assessment had taken place the previous year, it is likely that knowledge of that process and the upcoming training was not well known or understood at the Mission level. Most Mission staff plan their training and professional development a year in advance with concomitant budget decisions. Having such short notice resulted in far fewer participants than would be expected from the results of the needs assessment.

Also, while it was intended for partners to participate, few were able to do so. Including partners has both positive and negative implications. Partners bring richness and reality to the training and should, by all means, be included when possible. Note should be made, though, that some of the activities used in the modules may be procurement sensitive, e.g., revising RFPs. When this occurs, separate work groups have to be formed so that only USAID staff work on the procurement sensitive products and other groups work on non-sensitive products such as indicators.

3.2 The case studies

Regardless of the background of the participants, all agreed that the case study approach was a good training method and that the mythical African country case made it easier to talk about the issues raised. The specific content of the cases on agriculture and economic growth worked very well with the appropriate audience. Nevertheless, almost all participants complained that the cases were too long (especially the micro cases), too complicated and yet, not enough information was available. The country background information did not seem to be used very much. The two meso-cases (hot peppers/okra and dairy) had different responses – the hot pepper/okra case was easy to use and understand, especially since it was laid out in a project format. The dairy case, despite being reduced numerous times, was considered to be too complicated and, in fact, too focused on the micro-level, not the meso-level. We wrote four, very short cases (one paragraph) for the macro-level module. These seemed to be appreciated, for shortness if nothing else.

Participants also especially liked the group work associated with the case studies. The opportunity to use the tools, discuss the cases, argue with each other, present their views and experiences, and relate these to their own work appeared to be the most highly valued aspect of the training program. As always in a gender training, participants wanted a recipe, cookbook, or set of rules to follow for gender analysis yet it is simply not possible to provide such to them.

Recommendations:

The case studies should be edited down as much as possible and be easier to read if it is anticipated that the participants will not be in EGAT. The meso-cases need to be strengthened with more focus on the meso-level, not the micro-level. Most Agency staff work at the meso-level and feel most comfortable working there. One or two more macro-level case studies should be written that address other issues such as cross-border trading. Where possible, mention should be made of the implications of HIV/AIDS and conflict in the cases to infuse some reality into them.

3.3 Other content issues

The issues that were most difficult for the participants to grapple with were how to write gender indicators and how to include gender into their programs. Writing indicators, in general, is not easy especially when trying to balance a good indicator with what information is actually possible to collect.

Another content issue, mentioned before, is that many of the participants came to the training knowing that it was meant for EGAT officers and yet expecting or hoping that somehow, enough gender information would be imparted so as to make the experience useful for their work, whether as WID officers, DG officers or education/training officers. Dissatisfaction, boredom, and, more seriously, an inefficient use of staff time to attend the “wrong” training program was the result. Almost all participants noted how much they and their colleagues want to have some type of gender training. We suspect, therefore, that these three workshops were seized upon as the first such opportunity and that the specificity of the content was less important than the mere fact that the workshops had something to do with gender.

Finally, another content issue was the selection of the Harvard framework for gender analysis. There are numerous frameworks that can be used for gender analysis and the use of such depends on the level of the analysis (micro, meso, macro) as much as on the nature of the work to be performed. For several participants, it would seem that other frameworks would be more useful, e.g., social relations framework. Given the limited time available and the newness of the gender terminology, other frameworks were mentioned and references cited upon request.

Recommendations:

Clearly, a pent-up demand for gender training exists across the region. The Agency must find ways to address these needs, either through the development of online courses, specific training materials, or the delivery of many courses throughout the region. Not one method, framework, or tool will work for all users. While the ADS is an admirable effort to make the reasoning, rules and regulations available to all Agency staff, it is not easy to figure out how to meet the requirements within the specificities of each program (from designing the program through to procurement) and its related objectives, intermediate results, and indicators. One-on-one training with each participant would have been a good idea, given time to do so.

3.4 The training team

There were always two experienced gender trainers with agricultural backgrounds plus numerous staff from the Africa Bureau and the WID office who helped with the training. A local gender expert was hired for each workshop. The local Mission gender focal person and regional gender focal persons were participants. Participants noted, more than once, that there were more people from Washington than from the Missions at the workshops yet most of these were observers.

It was evident that for workshops of this style – very participatory – that many trainers and facilitators are needed. The two lead trainers were fortunate in that at least one or two of the Washington staff were able and willing to act as facilitators in the small group activities. In one or two cases, a Washington staffer delivered a session. At other

times, their presence allowed questions to be answered about procurement, ADS, operational issues, and the like.

The local gender experts were uniformly an excellent addition to the training team although the last minute nature of their participation often left them perplexed and probably did not make the best use of their skills. Their presentations were very useful and their abilities to answer questions and, at times, facilitate small group work and discussions was welcome.

The gender focal persons were not available as trainers and were there either in dual roles (participant and logistics) or just to take the training. This was an inappropriate use of their time and expertise in the former and for both, the wrong training for them to be taking if the intent was to become competent as gender focal persons. There are other staff in the Missions who should have been doing the logistics. It meant that the gender focal persons from the Mission at each workshop had to repeatedly leave the workshop to handle some details and glitches.

Recommendations:

The nature of the workshop requires at least two lead trainers and two competent facilitators at minimum, a local gender expert with training and USAID experience, and a facilitator from Washington knowledgeable about procurement, ADS, mechanisms for getting additional gender work done at the Mission level, and a logistics person who is not the local Mission gender focus person. It is especially important that either one or both of the lead trainers have considerable USAID experience or that there are facilitators with that experience. Gender and EGAT content aside, the participants want to know how to fit this information into the work they do and how Washington would interpret their results of their gender integration efforts.

3.5 Pedagogical issues

More than once, during the training, the African participants noted that they do not come from a “reading culture”, mostly in relation to the length of the case studies and the amount of reading. While we cannot determine if this is a valid issue or complaint, given that the Agency requires a significant amount of reading on a daily basis, the issue was raised frequently enough to merit some consideration. Was it the length of the case studies, the format, the requirement to read beforehand, the terminology, or any combination of the above? Is it necessary to change the cases in some way to make them more user-friendly or provide more time within the day for reading? The participants appreciated using the case study methodology, so that was not the issue. It is difficult for us to determine how best to resolve this. Other trainers within the Agency have said that “nobody ever does the homework or reading” but this is not a good enough reason to not assign readings or homework. Modules were sent out to participants earlier but were not read, for the most part. Perhaps this remains unsolvable.

A New York Times article earlier this year pointed out that PowerPoint “makes you stupid” and decried the use of the method because everything is reduced to the simplest

or most simplistic content. For trainers, it is, and was, easy to prepare PowerPoints for each session yet pedagogically, we felt that we did not get the full attention of the participants when we used PowerPoint. Either they were madly trying to copy the screen down, or if they were given handouts of the presentation, they devoted most of their attention to the paper, not to the trainers. Particularly problematic was the ADS PowerPoint presentation that was prepared for our use. It was too dense yet did not provide the kind of information that the participants needed. We found flipcharts to be a much better tool of engagement. Flipcharts encourage more active participation can be modified during presentation (participants' comments can be added), and are easy to refer back to when needed.

Recommendations:

The participants should be briefed at the beginning of the training about the use of the case study method and the trainers' expectations of them. Time should be given during the day to read the materials. A very brief summary should be done by the trainers (less than five minutes) to highlight the key points of each case. More white space in the text, use of bullets, and easier language would make the cases more readable. For non-native English speakers, a few words had to be translated (e.g., slurry, manure). These should be avoided or substitutes found that are more readily understood.

We highly discourage the use of PowerPoint presentations as the only method of transmitting information to participants. Ideally, a combination of presentation styles should be used.

4. Institutional lessons learned

4.1 The development of the workshops

For some or several reasons, despite the recommendations that came out of the gender assessment, i.e., Mission specific, DG or conflict focused, emphasis on indicators, etc., the gender integration workshop evolved into one with a focus on EGAT. Because both the Africa Bureau and the WID Office were buying into the workshops, a lot of people were involved. However, at some point in the process, the efforts to reach consensus got out of control. The old saying, too many cooks spoil the broth, was true for both the development of the case studies and the training plan/agenda.

4.2 The advertising of the workshops

Despite the activity associated with the gender training needs assessment and the delivery of the final report, the announcement of the workshops was made giving very little time for possible participants to adjust their schedules. All Agency staff are expected to develop their own individual annual plans, including their professional development plans. These are done far in advance so that budgetary decisions can be made. Workshops offered without sufficient notice, as this one was, will not be fully subscribed due to both budgetary and time constraints. It was expected that 30-35 participants would register for each workshop but the numbers were closer to 18-25 per workshop.

4.3 The intended audience

The notice of the training workshop clearly states that the emphasis is on topics in economic growth, agriculture and trade. The case studies were developed to have this content. When participants began to sign up, apparently no one was turned away regardless of her/his job description. Therefore, participants came from all sectors that the Agency works in. Rather than be firm about who should participate and be flexible about delaying the workshops until the right audience could be found, the planners went ahead and held the workshops anyway. Only in the case of the Ethiopia workshop, which had far more lead time in terms of participants being able to arrange their schedules and find funding, were the participants from EGAT. Even in this case, though, the majority of participants were from the Ethiopia mission so that the workshop was not fully regionally integrated.

4.4 The training team

The time pressures to deliver the workshop put an incredible strain on the writers of the cases and on the trainers. Expecting to have the case materials written in less than two months was unrealistic. The sense of urgency seemed manufactured.

4.5 Washington observers

Perhaps because two offices were supporting the workshops, twice as many Washington staff attended the workshop as appeared to be needed. For the most part, they were willing to assist within their capacity but their presence was certainly noted and commented on by the participants, e.g., there are more Washington observers than participants, could some of their funding have been used more wisely to bring more participants, etc. In several instances, the Washington staff did not participate fully in the workshops.

4.6 Follow-up and follow-through

The gender integration workshops entailed a considerable amount of effort and interaction with Missions for almost a year. Getting input into the needs assessment, getting participants to the workshops, getting the three Missions to host the workshops, allowing several dozen staff to come to the training all required work and commitment from a lot of people. It was apparent that there were issues of “who’s in charge” with respect to the Africa Bureau and the WID office, apparent enough that participants noted this in their comments and evaluations. As part of each workshop, the participants developed personal and office action plans for work that they would do upon returning to their offices with expectations of follow-up within a month. We are surprised that there doesn’t appear a system in place for follow-up with the participants from either the Africa Bureau or the WID office. Participants are already reporting back on what they’ve done with their action plans (e.g., delivered a gender training session to the Mozambique Mission) and yet it is unclear who will continue to support them in their efforts. It seemed that Washington staff were responsive one-on-one and with regard to specific questions about mechanisms. However, it is totally unclear who and what office will follow-up with all of the participants as a group.

Appendices

1. Blank evaluation form
2. Numerical summary of evaluations
3. List of participants

EVALUATION
of

The “Integrating Gender in Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade” Course

A. Purpose of the Course and Achievement of the Course Objectives

The Integrating Gender in Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade Course has the following objectives:

1. To develop a shared set of gender concepts appropriate for activity planning for the economic growth and agriculture sector
2. To introduce participants to gender analysis and its application at the micro-level
3. To introduce participants to gender analysis and its application at the meso-level
4. To provide mission participants practice in applying tools of gender analysis in establishing objectives, designing an activity and developing indicators
5. To introduce participants to gender analysis and its application at the macro-level
6. To provide an opportunity for participants to review gender related objectives for their cases and identify related indicators
7. To provide participants an opportunity to plan for reporting back to missions

Overall achievement of the Course Objectives

Keeping in mind the seven objectives listed above, please give us your honest assessment of the course:

Objective	Fully	Partially	Marginally	No	DNA
Did the course achieve Objective 1?					
Did the course achieve Objective 2?					
Did the course achieve Objective 3?					
Did the course achieve Objective 4?					
Did the course achieve Objective 5?					
Did the course achieve Objective 6?					
Did the course achieve Objective 7?					

DNA = did not answer

B. Specific Skills and Knowledge

Thinking about the four days of training, please answer the following questions:

DNA = Did not answer	Too much	Right amount	Not quite enough	Not at all	N/A
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information on gender concepts ?					
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information about the gender requirements in the ADS ?					
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information on methods and tools to conduct a gender analysis ? DNA - 2					
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient time to practice using methods and tools of gender analysis ?					
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information for you to understand the gender implications of macroeconomic policies ? DNA - 1					
Did the workshop provide you with enough information to apply gender analysis to strategic planning and design ?					
Did the workshop provide you with enough information to apply gender analysis to monitoring and evaluation and development of indicators ?					
Did the workshop focus on micro, meso, and macro levels of gender analysis provide you with useful information for your work ?					
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient time to work on your mission's programs ?					
Did you have enough time to prepare your plan to share the lessons learned with your mission colleagues?					

C. Applying the course to my work

1. What skills and knowledge will be most useful to you in your work?

2. What skills and knowledge will be least useful to you in your work?

3. Comments and/or suggestions for improving the workshop.

4. In what areas can the WID office and African Bureau provide you with further assistance?

D. Final Thoughts

Please put a mark in one of the columns that best describes your overall assessment of the impact of this course on your knowledge and skills (SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neutral; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree).

	SA	A	N	D	SD
The focus on EGAT was useful. DNA - 1					
The workshop introduced me to many new ideas that I can apply directly to my work. DNA - 3					
I am able to improve the Mission's use of gender sensitive indicators in the PMP.					
I now feel confident to provide leadership in gender integration to others in my office.					
I did not find much in this course that was relevant or useful for my work at USAID.					
The workshop was interesting but it is not likely that I will be able to use much of the information in my future work.					

Any additional comments:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS – QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

The Integrating Gender in Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade Course has the following objectives:

8. To develop a shared set of gender concepts appropriate for activity planning for the economic growth and agriculture sector
9. To introduce participants to gender analysis and its application at the micro-level
10. To introduce participants to gender analysis and its application at the meso-level
11. To provide mission participants practice in applying tools of gender analysis in establishing objectives, designing an activity and developing indicators
12. To introduce participants to gender analysis and its application at the macro-level
13. To provide an opportunity for participants to review gender related objectives for their cases and identify related indicators
14. To provide participants an opportunity to plan for reporting back to missions

A. Overall achievement of the Course Objectives

Keeping in mind the seven objectives listed above, please give us your honest assessment of the course:

GHANA – 17 participant evaluations

Objective	Fully	Partially	Marginally	No	N/A
Did the course achieve Objective 1?	11	5			1
Did the course achieve Objective 2?	14	2	1		
Did the course achieve Objective 3?	14	2	1		
Did the course achieve Objective 4?	6	10	1		
Did the course achieve Objective 5?	9	5	3		
Did the course achieve Objective 6?	9	5	3		
Did the course achieve Objective 7?	14	3			

SOUTH AFRICA – 12 participant evaluations

DNA = did not answer

Objective	Fully	Partially	Marginally	No	DNA
Did the course achieve Objective 1?	8	4			
Did the course achieve Objective 2?	7	5			
Did the course achieve Objective 3?	5	6			1
Did the course achieve Objective 4?	3	7	2		
Did the course achieve Objective 5?	4	7	1		
Did the course achieve Objective 6?	6	6			
Did the course achieve Objective 7?	10	2			

ETHIOPIA – 20 participant evaluations

Objective	Fully	Partially	Marginally	No	N/A
Did the course achieve Objective 1?	16	4			
Did the course achieve Objective 2?	17	3			
Did the course achieve Objective 3?	14	6			
Did the course achieve Objective 4?	15	5			
Did the course achieve Objective 5?	10	8	1		1

Did the course achieve Objective 6?	9	10	1		
Did the course achieve Objective 7?	13	7			

B. Specific Skills and Knowledge

Thinking about the four days of training, please answer the following questions:

GHANA

DNA = Did not answer	Too much	Right amount	Not quite enough	Not at all	N/A
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information on gender concepts ? DNA - 1	1	13	2		
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information about the gender requirements in the ADS ? DNA - 2	2	3	10		
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information on methods and tools to conduct a gender analysis ?	1	7	8	1	
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient time to practice using methods and tools of gender analysis ?		6	10	1	
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information for you to understand the gender implications of macroeconomic policies ?		10	7		
Did the workshop provide you with enough information to apply gender analysis to strategic planning and design ?	1	13	3		
Did the workshop provide you with enough information to apply gender analysis to monitoring and evaluation and development of indicators ? DNA - 1	1	5	10		
Did the workshop focus on micro, meso, and macro levels of gender analysis provide you with useful information for your work ? DNA - 1	2	12	2		
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient time to work on your mission's programs ?	1	7	7	1	1
Did you have enough time to prepare your plan to share the lessons learned with your mission colleagues? DNA - 2	3	6	6		

SOUTH AFRICA

DNA = Did not answer	Too much	Right amount	Not quite enough	Not at all	N/A
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information on gender concepts ?		10	2		
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information about the gender requirements in the ADS ?		8	4		
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information on methods and tools to conduct a gender analysis ? DNA - 2		5	5		
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient time to practice using methods and tools of gender analysis ?		6	6		
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information for you to understand the gender implications of macroeconomic policies ? DNA - 1		5	6		
Did the workshop provide you with enough information to apply gender analysis to strategic planning and design ?		7	4	1	
Did the workshop provide you with enough information to apply gender analysis to monitoring and evaluation and development of indicators ?		7	5		
Did the workshop focus on micro, meso, and macro levels of gender analysis provide you with useful information for your work ?		8	4		
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient time to work on your mission's programs ?	1	6	4	1	
Did you have enough time to prepare your plan to share the lessons learned with your mission colleagues?	2	9	1		

ETHIOPIA

DNA = Did not answer	Too much	Right amount	Not quite enough	Not at all	N/A
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information on gender concepts ?	2	18			
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information about the gender requirements in the ADS ? DNA - 1	4	9	6		
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information on methods and tools to conduct a gender analysis ?		20			
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient time to practice using methods and tools of gender analysis ?		15	5		
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient information for you to understand the gender implications of macroeconomic policies ?		13	6	1	
Did the workshop provide you with enough information to apply gender analysis to strategic planning and design ?		15	4		
Did the workshop provide you with enough information to apply gender analysis to monitoring and evaluation and development of indicators ?	2	13	5		
Did the workshop focus on micro, meso, and macro levels of gender analysis provide you with useful information for your work ? DNA - 1		19			
Did the workshop provide you with sufficient time to work on your mission's programs ? DNA - 1		11	4	1	3
Did you have enough time to prepare your plan to share the lessons learned with your mission colleagues? DNA - 2	1	9	6	1	1

D. Final Thoughts

Please put a mark in one of the columns that best describes your overall assessment of the impact of this course on your knowledge and skills (SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neutral; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree).

GHANA

	SA	A	N	D	SD
The focus on EGAT was useful. DNA - 3	3	6	5		
The workshop introduced me to many new ideas that I can apply directly to my work. DNA - 1	9	5	2		
I am able to improve the Mission's use of gender sensitive indicators in the PMP. DNA - 2	2	8	5	1	
I now feel confident to provide leadership in gender integration to others in my office. DNA - 3	1	10	3		
I did not find much in this course that was relevant or useful for my work at USAID. DNA - 1		1	1	7	7
The workshop was interesting but it is not likely that I will be able to use much of the information in my future work. DNA - 1	1			8	7

SOUTH AFRICA

	SA	A	N	D	SD
The focus on EGAT was useful. DNA - 1	3		4	3	1
The workshop introduced me to many new ideas that I can apply directly to my work. DNA - 3	3	4	2		
I am able to improve the Mission's use of gender sensitive indicators in the PMP.	1	7	4		
I now feel confident to provide leadership in gender integration to others in my office.		5	6	1	
I did not find much in this course that was relevant or useful for my work at USAID.			3	6	3
The workshop was interesting but it is not likely that I will be able to use much of the information in my future work.			2	5	5

ETHIOPIA

	SA	A	N	D	SD
The focus on EGAT was useful. DNA - 1	9	9	1		
The workshop introduced me to many new ideas that I can apply directly to my work. DNA - 1	7	9	3		
I am able to improve the Mission's use of gender sensitive indicators in the PMP. DNA - 3	7	9	1		
I now feel confident to provide leadership in gender integration to others in my office. DNA - 1	4	13	2		
I did not find much in this course that was relevant or useful for my work at USAID. DNA - 3		2	1	2	12
The workshop was interesting but it is not likely that I will be able to use much of the information in my future work.		4		8	8

**List of Participants
TO BE ADDED**