Evaluation of the Protection Learning Programme

By Clayton R. Wright, Consultant
Email: crwr@shaw.ca, and
Felipe Camargo, UNHCR

Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit

UNHCR's Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit (EPAU) is committed to the systematic examination and assessment of UNHCR policies, programmes, projects and practices. EPAU also promotes rigorous research on issues related to the work of UNHCR and encourages an active exchange of ideas and information between humanitarian practitioners, policymakers and the research community. All of these activities are undertaken with the purpose of strengthening UNHCR's operational effectiveness, thereby enhancing the organization's capacity to fulfil its mandate on behalf of refugees and other displaced people. The work of the unit is guided by the principles of transparency, independence, consultation, relevance and integrity.

Contents

Acknowledgements

Executive summary

Context

The Protection Learning Programme (PLP) was established in 2000 to:

- foster a common understanding amongst all staff members of UNHCR's protection mandate and international legal standards, in order to promote consistency and cohesiveness in UNHCR's approach;

- enhance staff members' knowledge, skills and attitudes, according to their functions, to help ensure the effective protection of refugees and others of concern to UNHCR in all operations.

By autumn 2004, more than 360 UNHCR staff had completed the programme. The programme had not been evaluated, and its impact on individual staff members and the organization had not been measured. Thus, the Department of International Protection (DIP) and UNHCR donors determined that a formal evaluation was required to assess the impact of the PLP and, if necessary, to suggest how it could be improved to better meet the learning needs of UNHCR staff.

Evaluation questions

A two-member evaluation team was contracted to answer the following questions:

- Has participation in the PLP had an impact on the staff members' knowledge, skills and attitudes?

- Has the PLP had an impact on the effective protection of refugees and other persons of concern to UNHCR?

- Can the PLP be improved?

- Should the PLP be made mandatory for UNHCR staff?

- Can the PLP be used or modified to support the protection interests and roles of key UNHCR stakeholders?

Methodology

In order to reach their conclusions, the evaluation team conducted 89 individual interviews with the PLP Evaluation Steering Committee, persons of influence at UNHCR, PLP graduates, non-completers or in-progress PLP participants, supervisors, peers, trainers and other persons of interest to UNHCR and sent out 640 invitations requesting UNHCR staff to complete an online or Microsoft Word–based questionnaire. In addition, the team conducted two focus group sessions, reviewed the self-study material and compared it to distance learning best practices, reviewed

feedback from participants who completed the self-study modules, observed one PLP workshop, reviewed existing evaluation forms and determined how the PLP is coordinated with other UNHCR learning programmes.

Findings

The PLP has a definite **impact** on individuals' knowledge of protection and the UNHCR mandate. PLP graduates are more knowledgeable about and confident in carrying out the UNHCR mandate. They tend to be less hesitant, ask broader and deeper questions and know where they can find the information they need to address a problem. Some have improved their analytical, research, communication and team-building skills, but the effects of the PLP on participants' skills and attitudes are less pronounced than the significant impact on knowledge.

Although a **direct link** between the completion of the PLP and the effect on the protection of refugees was not made during this study, PLP graduates, supervisors and peers indicated that PLP graduates were better informed about the UNHCR mandate and the issues affecting refugees than were non-participants. Supervisors and peers report that the PLP nurtures enthusiasm and renews individuals' interest in their jobs and protection issues in general. Non-governmental organizations also recognised the benefits of having trained protection officers in the field.

The **three components of the PLP** – self-study, workshop, and field study – are appropriate for achieving the objectives of the programme.

- The self-study provides basic protection knowledge and brings people up to a common level of understanding about protection and the UNHCR mandate.

- The workshop consolidates the knowledge learned during the self-study phase, enables participants to develop skills and facilitates an exchange of experience and ideas.

- The Phase 3 project enables participants to apply their knowledge and skills to a meaningful project that is directly related to their functions.

Overall, the contents of the different phases of the PLP are comprehensive and in general appropriate for participants. Nevertheless, the evaluation team proposes that five scenarios be considered in order to make the PLP more effective. The scenarios describe how the PLP could be altered to best meet the needs of UNHCR and its staff. Scenario A presents the essential alterations that should be made to the programme. It requires the fewest resources to implement. Scenario B describes the division of the current PLP into an induction course and a protection course. This scenario has the potential to address all of the concerns raised by PLP participants and graduates. Scenarios C and E are enhancements of Scenarios A and B. Note that the scenarios are arranged in order of the increasing amount of resources required to implement them.

Scenario A

The following changes should be made to improve the current version of the PLP:

- Provide individualised, timely feedback.

- Adjust the content in self-study units 1-4 to form two units, and place several topics under a heading such as Persons of Concern.

- Reduce the number of assignments that must be reviewed by the PLP team or tutors.

- Remove repetitious reading material in the self-study phase and include recent academic material on issues related to UNHCR's mandate.

- Provide simplified summaries of complex material in order to assist those whose first language is not English.

- Allow participants to submit their assignments online.

- Include an assessment component comprising the self-study exercises (each submitted assignment would be graded), the successful completion of the Phase 3 project and assessment reports by a supervisor and one peer 6 months after the completion of the three phases. If individuals have extensive experience and want credit without enrolling in the programme, they must pas a comprehensive challenge examination.

- Increase the time allocation for completing the self-study modules from six months to eight months. (Note that this change would only be necessary if the suggested content changes are not made and individualised, timely feedback is not provided.)

- Increase the length of the workshop by one day to allow additional time for participants to discuss and develop protection strategies and seek feedback and advice regarding their Phase 3 projects.

- Provide additional guidance and support while participants work on their Phase 3 projects. Supervisors need to take a more active support role during this phase.

- Implement an online listserv or refresher course or workshop that will keep PLP graduates informed about relevant changes to UNHCR policies and outline new protection techniques. A community of practice could be established to support graduates and encourage the sharing of ideas and practical tips.

- Engage a PLP committee to review the PLP content and participant feedback on an annual basis. This committee should have representation from the Protection Capacity Section of the Department of International Protection and UNHCR units such as those involved in legal matters, programme and resettlement.

Scenario B

The PLP could be divided into an induction and a protection course.

- The induction would be available online and in a CD format. It would be mandatory for all UNHCR staff. In addition to the basic induction, if there are adequate resources and where there are sufficient numbers, consideration should be given to holding a one-day induction workshop to allow for experience sharing, team building, updates on current and future UNHCR initiatives, and the opportunity to meet UNHCR leaders.

- The protection course would be mandatory for protection, programme, resettlement and field officers as well as public information staff. It would be optional for everyone else.

- The management of protection could be offered as a short module within the Thematic Protection Learning Programme.

Scenario C

The PLP should be available in two additional languages, French and Spanish. This could be considered as complementary to Scenario A or B above. However, it may be feasible to offer only the workshop in additional languages.

Scenario D

The PLP could be converted into a format similar to that of the Management Learning Programme (formally known as the Middle-Management Learning Programme), in which the content and activities are modularised. This format would offer flexibility and provide opportunities for staff to specialise.

Scenario E

An e-learning version of the PLP could be developed that makes the best use of telecommunications technologies and the interactive and just-in-time capabilities of the Internet. The e-learning version would be based on the content in Scenarios A or B above. However, this option may limit access, as all duty stations do not have the necessary telecommunications connectivity. When they do, the quality of the transmission may be unreliable and/or poor.

Despite the extensive list of suggested improvements, the PLP is beneficial to staff and the UNHCR. If modified, it could also be used to meet the training interests of key UNHCR stakeholders. However, given the high demand for the PLP within UNHCR, energies should be focused on targeting UNHCR staff rather than expanding the programme to an external audience.

Conclusion

The UNHCR, particularly the Protection Capacity Section, should be commended for its efforts to improve the quality of training that it provides its staff. However, some changes must be made to the PLP so that it can better serve UNHCR staff and ultimately enable them to provide better services to refugees. Also, the programme must reflect best practices in distance learning. Considering the mandate and size of the organization, it is essential that additional resources be provided to the Protection

Capacity Section so it can ensure that those who directly serve refugees have the knowledge and skills they need. As illustrated throughout the report, UNHCR must decide either to reduce the number of participants in the programme or to add additional resources to PCS. If the number of participants is reduced each year, fewer personnel will have access to this vital UNHCR programme. Adequate learning programmes are essential to maintain and refresh the knowledge and skills of UNHCR staff.

It is imperative that UNHCR improve its coordination of learning programmes in order to remove any overlaps in content and delivery and inform its constituents about all the learning opportunities offered by the organization and how they are linked.

Supervisors must recognise the importance of training themselves and having trained and qualified staff. They must be willing to support their colleagues in their training efforts and actively participate in the role of coach or mentor. Once staff have successfully completed UNHCR or other training, this should be taken into account when career appointments are made or posts are assigned. It is an irony in the humanitarian world that the most challenging places need the best people. The organization must not shy away from its responsibility to ensure that its staff are well-trained and able to do their jobs effectively. Refugees count on qualified personnel to provide guidance and make decisions that significantly affect their lives. We must always keep in mind the trust that refugees have in UNHCR personnel.

The evaluators recognise that further analysis of the reasons for drop-outs or non-completion of the programme is required. Appendix E4 contains a summary of results of the 93 questionnaires received from non-completers or in-progress PLP participants.

Context

Background of the evaluation

1.   The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) has been accorded the mandate by the United Nations General Assembly to provide international protection to refugees worldwide. In order to carry out this mandate, the organization established a number of learning programmes to help its staff acquire and improve their refugee protection and management skills. One of these programmes is the Protection Learning Programme (PLP), the focus of this evaluation.

2.   Prior to 1999/2000, learning practices in UNHCR, and particularly in the Department of International Protection (DIP), were based on a series of thematic workshops focusing on basic protection concepts, refugee status determination (RSD), resettlement and other specialised topics. The main characteristics of these workshops were:

- Brevity (3 to 5 days)

- No self-study or previous preparation required

- No study material distributed in advance of workshops

- Restricted availability (targeted mainly to protection staff)

- Isolation from other learning courses provided by UNHCR

- No record maintained of participants' progress or achievements

- No assessment of participants

- No feedback mechanisms

- No assessment of the impact of the programme on refugees

3.   In 2000, despite resistance from senior management, DIP decided to introduce a more systematic and structured approach to protection learning. DIP staff with support from the Staff Development Section (SDS), agreed to start a pilot phase of the Protection Learning Programme. The first training was initiated in August 2000. The programme was initially divided into two courses. The "Protection Strategies Learning Programme" and the "Protection Foundations Learning Programme". They were similar in design; each had a self-study phase, a workshop and a post-workshop or project-based phase. The rationale for moving from a stand-alone training workshop to a learning programme approach included the following:

- To ensure that training on protection issues is accessible to all staff

- To promote a team-based approach to protection within the organization and an appreciation of the role and 'complementarity' of key counterparts

- To ensure a consistent and coherent approach to protection training by institutionalising the transfer of knowledge and the promotion of particular skills and attitudes

- To ensure the inclusion of a gender and age perspective in protection training

- To achieve a greater impact in terms of participatory learning approaches and the application of learning to daily work

- To facilitate the operationalisation of the UNHCR protection mandate

4. After an internal review of the pilot programmes, DIP decided not to continue with the strategies programme. The following reasons were given for this decision:

- It was extremely demanding in terms of participants' time, and consequently many did not complete it;

- It did not attract the level and seniority of participants that had been anticipated;

- The content did not differ substantially from the protection foundations and did not, in particular, deal sufficiently with strategic planning for, or management of, protection; and

- It was complicated in terms of supervision and follow up by DIP.[1]

5. The basic and advanced PLP courses were combined into one programme. Its objectives were redefined as follows in 2001:

- To foster a common understanding amongst all staff members of UNHCR's protection mandate and international legal standards, in order to promote consistency and cohesiveness in UNHCR's approach; and

- To enhance staff members' knowledge, skills and attitudes, according to their functions, to help ensure the effective protection of refugees and others of concern to UNHCR in all operations.

6. The programme was divided into three phases, similar to those of the Middle-Management Learning Programme (MMLP):

- a 6-month self-study phase during which participants are exposed to key aspects of protection such as displacement and the right to seek asylum;

- a 4.5 day workshop that reviews and consolidates items covered in the self-study units and provides an environment in which participants can interact with others who have different skills and experiences;

---

[1] Protection Capacity Section, UNHCR. (2002). *Proposed Protection Learning Strategy for UNHCR Staff.* Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR. p. 1.

- a 3-month project phase that enables participants to address a key protection problem in their country of operation.

7.   Since its inception, the PLP has targeted a variety of UNHCR staff. One of the reasons for the establishment of the programme was the need to increase the protection knowledge and skills of staff who were involved in different aspects of UNHCR operations but did not necessarily have a protection or legal background.

8.   By the end of October 2004, more than 360 UNHCR staff had completed the PLP. Approximately 200 are currently either completing the programme or waiting for certification. Fewer than 100 persons who enrolled in the programme have dropped out. The programme is considered one of UNHCR's core learning programmes and is managed by the Protection Capacity Section of the Department of International Protection.

9.   A series of internal reviews and short evaluations of the programme have been conducted since its inception. Consequently, some modifications and adjustments have been and are being made to the contents and the format of the PLP. Although the programme has built-in self-feedback and evaluation mechanisms, there is no systematic individual feedback or formal assessment of the participants. Thus, it is difficult to measure its effects and impact on participants' knowledge, skills and attitudes.

PLP evaluation steering committee

10.   In order to guide the evaluation of the PLP, a steering committee was established. Members of the group are listed below.

- Renata Dubini, Chair, Chief, Protection Capacity Section (PCS) of the Department of International Protection (DIP)

- Julianne Di Nenna, Training Officer, Women, Children and Community Development Section, Division of Operational Support (DOS)

- George Kuchio, Training Officer, PCS/DIP

- Alessandra Marinetti, Consultant, Staff Development Section (SDS)/DHRM

- Vanessa Mattar, Operational Policy Officer, Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit (EPAU)

- Terry Morel, Chief, Women, Children and Community Development Section, DOS.

- Lois Purdham-Kidane, Senior Training Officer, SDS/DHRM

- Vilma Rodil, Senior Administrative Officer, Office of the Director, DIP

- Tanja Thonhauser, Senior Training Officer, PCS/DIP

11.   The steering committee drafted terms of reference for the evaluation and then searched for an evaluation team in an open and transparent manner. During August

and September 2004, Dr. Clayton Wright and Mr. Felipe Camargo were selected to conduct the evaluation.

12.   The PLP Evaluation Steering Committee met with the two-member evaluation team on several occasions to discuss the evaluation plan, adjustments to the plan and the progress made. The committee also invited 26 managers, directors and other persons of interest from across UNHCR to discuss the evaluation plans and to raise any concerns about this activity. Throughout the evaluation, members of the committee were in daily contact with the evaluation team.

Goals of the evaluation

13.   As a result of this evaluation, UNHCR will be able to assess the effects of the learning programme on the Protection Learning Programme (PLP) participants and its impact on UNHCR protection delivery functions. In addition, the study will indicate how the PLP could be improved and whether the PLP would be beneficial to UNHCR external stakeholders.

Objectives of the evaluation

14.   The original questions posed by the PLP Evaluation Steering Committee were numerous and wide-ranging. Some included terms such as *consistency*, *cohesiveness* and *common understanding* that are difficult to define and measure. Thus, the evaluation team drafted a finite set of questions that it felt could be accomplished within the short evaluation timeframe. The questions were discussed at the PLP Evaluation Steering Committee meeting on October 8, 2004, and with a cross-section of UNHCR's managers and other persons of concern on October 12, 2004. Below are the questions that this evaluation had to address.

- Has participation in the PLP had an impact on the staff members' knowledge, skills and attitudes?

    - What skills have been developed and how have they been applied? Have participants gained knowledge and skills regarding legal standards, gender and age perspectives relative to protection, community development and team-based approaches to resolving problems?

    - Do participants have a better understanding of the UNHCR's mandate? Note: 'For learning to be genuinely effective, it must impact on the individual (was there a recognisable change in behaviour and performance?) as well as impact on the organization (was there valuable organizational learning and change, how was learning applied to the work situation and how did the organization advance its goals?).'[2]

- Has the PLP had an impact on the effective protection of refugees and other persons of concern to UNHCR?

---

[2] Staff Development Section. (2003). UNHCR Learning Policy and Guidelines: Parameters for the Enhancement of Staff Development in UNHCR. Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR.

- Did the programme yield any significant unintended impact?

- Can the PLP be improved?

  - Is the content of the programme appropriate for the targeted audience? Does the content meet the needs of specific audiences?

  - Is the methodology used by the programme suitable for disseminating the subject matter?

  - What components, whether subject matter or delivery mode, are the most and least effective for participants? Can the reasons for any disparities be determined?

  - Can an assessment of the participants' performance be introduced into the programme? What are the benefits of assessment to individuals and the organization?

15.   The evaluation team was expected to provide concrete recommendations for improving the PLP.

- Should the PLP be made mandatory for UNHCR staff?

- How can the PLP be used or modified to support the protection interests and roles of key UNHCR stakeholders?

  - Should the PLP be expanded to involve other stakeholders?

Evaluation methodology

16.   The evaluation constraints and procedures outlined below were discussed with the PLP Evaluation Steering Committee and with a cross-section of UNHCR managers, and other persons of concern who were invited to a meeting to comment on the evaluation methodology. In addition, the evaluation team reviewed *Impact Evaluation of the Protection Learning Programme: Methodological Considerations,* prepared by Hugh Massey of UNHCR in September 2004, and considered his recommendations.

Guiding principles of the evaluation

17.   The PLP evaluation focused on identifying the impact of the PLP programme, assessing its current state and suggesting how it could be improved. The evaluation was based primarily on the Context, Inputs, Processes, and Products (CIPP) Model developed by Daniel Stufflebeam. The model is based on the following operational definition of evaluation: 'a process of delineating, obtaining, reporting, and applying descriptive and judgmental information about some object's merit, worth, probity, and significance in order to guide decision making, support accountability, disseminate effective practices, and increase understanding of the involved phenomena.'[3]

18.   Below are the core concepts of the CIPP Model:

- 'Context evaluations assess needs, problems, assets, and opportunities to help decision makers define goals and priorities and help the broader group of users judge goals, priorities, and outcomes.

- Input evaluations assess alternative approaches, competing action plans, staffing plans and budgets for their feasibility and potential cost-effectiveness to meet targeted needs and achieve goals.

- Process evaluations assess the implementation of plans to help staff carry out activities and later help the broad group of users judge programme performance and interpret outcomes.

- Product evaluations identify and assess outcomes – intended and unintended, short term and long term.'[4]

19.   Thus, the evaluation team aimed to assess needs, identify problems and outline alternatives that decision makers could employ. The team also sought to suggest alternatives that were feasible and could address intended and unintended outcomes of the evaluation.

---

[3] D. L. Stufflebeam. (2003). *The CIPP Model for Evaluation,* presented at the 2003 Annual Conference of the Oregon Program Evaluators' Network (OPEN). Portland, Oregon. p. 10.
[4] *Ibid.,* p. 3.

20.   The CIPP Model adheres to the standards set by the American Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. Thus, the model meets the following conditions:

- 'Utility – serving the information needs of the intended users

- Feasibility – keeping evaluation operations realistic, prudent, viable, and frugal

- Propriety – conducting evaluations legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of participants and those affected by the results

- Accuracy – revealing and conveying technically sound information about the features that determine the evaluand's merit, worth, probity, and/or significance'[5]

21.   The PLP evaluation followed the above parameters as well as the principles of transparency, independence, consultation and relevance established by UNHCR's Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit.

22.   The evaluation involved UNHCR stakeholders throughout the process. In order to confirm that the evaluation was proceeding in the right direction and that appropriate evaluation questions were being asked, the evaluation team kept the stakeholders informed and asked for their input as the evaluation proceeded. For example, various members of the PLP Steering Committee were asked to review and pilot the questionnaires prior to their distribution to the intended audiences.

23.   The CIPP Model advocates the use of a wide range of qualitative and quantitative methods in order to triangulate the evaluation outcomes. Therefore, the evaluation team did not rely on just one data source, but gathered data from several sources and by different means including but not limited to the following:

- Individual interviews were conducted with members of the PLP Steering Committee, PLP graduates, non-completers or in-progress learners, supervisors, peers, trainers/facilitators, UNHCR persons of influence, UNHCR staff who have not enrolled in the PLP and personnel who work for UNHCR partners.

- Six different online and Microsoft Word-based questionnaires were developed and distributed to six of the groups identified above.

- Focus groups were conducted with PLP workshop attendees.

- The self-study material was compared to distance learning best practices. The results of this comparison led to suggestions that could be used to improve the material.

- One PLP workshop was observed.

- Existing evaluation forms were reviewed.

---

[5] Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1994). *The Program Evaluation Standards* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. p. 10.

24.   A large amount of information was gathered from different people and sources. Thus it was possible to examine ambiguities, crosscheck findings and discern trends from different perspectives.

25.   The evaluators were determined not to fall into the trap that captures many evaluators – the 'popularity contest'. They would present their recommendations based on their best judgment. They would be guided by all the information received, but would not make a recommendation just because it was favoured by most respondents. After critical examination of the issues and options, the evaluators would recommend only those measures most likely to improve the content and process of the PLP.

26.   All of the above concepts were applied to the evaluation of the PLP. Members of the Steering Committee and other members of UNHCR acted as a sounding board and provided guidance as the evaluation proceeded. They were actively involved in the identification of the evaluation questions and the methodology to be employed.

Evaluation constraints

27.   All evaluations are conducted under constraints, usually those associated with time, resources and the availability of the participants. This evaluation was conducted under constraints that were discussed at length with the PLP Evaluation Steering Committee. Despite these constraints, this evaluation has credibility because all PLP graduates, in-progress participants, and in-completers were invited to express their views and a 33.8% response rate was attained.

28.   During the planning of the evaluation, a number of constraints were taken into account. These are outlined below.

29.   *Time limitations*. As DIP's Protection Capacity Section had established a 2-month timeframe for gathering data, the evaluation team had to design triangulation procedures that could be conducted within the specified time and involve participants whose time was limited due to pressures of work and humanitarian emergencies.

30.   *Randomness*. The analysis of statistical or quantitative data is based on randomness – that each participant has an equal chance of being selected. In the PLP evaluation plan, every participant who had completed the PLP received a questionnaire, as did all non-completers and in-progress participants of the programme. However, this procedure could not be followed with all groups that were investigated, such as peers, supervisors and refugees, as these individuals were not all identifiable and it was difficult to associate them with specific PLP graduates. Therefore, the evaluation team received permission from the PLP Evaluation Steering Committee to sample some groups based on the availability of their members.

31.   *Numbers.* Ideally, in order to ensure valid and reliable results, information from a large number of individuals is required. However, it was not practical within the evaluation plan timeframe to expect input from everyone who could offer views. Thus, the evaluation team estimated the number of responses expected from various groups. This response rate was approved by the PLP Evaluation Steering Committee and is outlined in the next section of this report.

32. ***Geographic Locations.*** UNHCR has refugee operations involving over 5,000 staff members in 120 countries. However, only individuals located in Bosnia, Hungary, Kenya and Switzerland participated in face-to-face interviews. Individuals from Europe, Africa and the Americas were involved in the focus group sessions. The evaluation team also used teleconferencing to reach selected individuals in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Hungary, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Turkey. Attempts were made to reach individuals in Ecuador, Egypt, Jordan and Congo by telephone prior to the completion of the data-gathering stage.

33. ***Assessing Refugees.*** The thrust of the PLP is to improve the knowledge, skills and attitudes of those who work to protect refugees. Ideally, the evaluators would need to ask refugees whether they had noticed differences between the knowledge, skills and attitudes of the protection officers who took the PLP and those who did not. Further, for the results to be considered reliable, a large number of refugees would have to participate in the study. The large size of the sample would take into account that some refugees might want something and provide a positive review, while others might consider the PLP evaluation as an opportunity to strongly criticise the assistance they received, even though their complaints might have nothing to do with the protection officer.

34. Although the evaluation team recognised the importance of refugee input, it was unable to ascertain how to obtain it effectively within the evaluation plan timeframe. For example, the team did not have access to any records that could show which PLP graduates worked with which refugees; therefore, the evaluation team could not ask specific refugees for their input. The evaluation team asked others within the UNHCR to suggest how information could be obtained from refugees, but did not receive any feasible suggestions that could be implemented within the evaluation timeframe. The UNHCR has numerous assistance and protection indicators, but few suggestions as to how to measure the more qualitative indicators. Although it is a challenging task, the UNHCR could develop mechanisms that it could use to measure its direct impact upon refugees. Refugees, the recipients of UNHCR services, should have an opportunity to express their opinions about the services they receive.

35. It was proposed by members of the PLP Steering Committee that the PLP evaluation team should observe how PLP graduates and non-PLP participants work with refugee committee representatives and refugee leaders. It was also suggested that the team interview women and children in two refugee camps. Due to the disruption of air service to the refugee camps, the evaluators could not visit Kakuma and the visit to Dadaab was restricted.

36. ***Pre- and Post-assessment.*** One of the most common methods for assessing changes in people's knowledge, skills and attitudes is to assess them at the beginning of the training and compare this assessment with their behaviour after training has been completed. Due to the short timeline, this could not be done. Also, the evaluators would need access to personal records, which would raise concerns about confidentiality. However, if the UNHCR is serious about evaluating the contribution training makes to its humanitarian efforts, it should assess individuals before and after training and formally follow their actions in the field after training has been completed. It could use the information contained in the Performance Appraisal Reports (PARs) database. However, many UNHCR personnel indicated during

interviews that they did not feel that their supervisors had maintained this database or included useful information other than the fact that individuals had attended particular training sessions.

37.   With the above constraints in mind, the evaluation team was able to devise evaluative instruments and procedures that were acceptable to the PLP Evaluation Steering Committee. Everyone agreed that it would be possible to evaluate the impact of the PLP on individual staff, but given the time, resource and access limitations of the study, it would be more difficult to ascertain the impact on refugees. One would need to infer that if the PLP graduates acquired new knowledge, skills and attitudes or enhanced existing ones, they would use them as they worked with refugees. By asking supervisors and peers if they observed changes in those who took the PLP, the evaluation team would obtain an indication as to whether graduates were retaining and applying their new or enhanced skills. Thus, if responses from supervisors and peers yielded positive comments about the effects of the PLP, the Protection Capacity Section could have some confidence that the PLP had an impact upon the lives of refugees.

Data gathering instruments and procedures

38.   The evaluation procedures that were followed are briefly described below. They provided a balance between breadth and depth and were selected to provide a valid and reliable assessment of the impact of the PLP on the participants and an indication as to whether the PLP had an impact on the effective protection of refugees.

39.   *Review of feedback from participants* who completed self-study units. This activity helped the evaluators design the interview and questionnaire questions.

40.   *Interviews.* The purpose of these interviews was to yield an in-depth assessment of the PLP and its impact as well as to ascertain how the programme could be improved. The following groups were interviewed:

- PLP Evaluation Steering Committee

- UNHCR persons of influence

- PLP graduates*

- Non-completers or in-progress PLP participants*

- Trainers/facilitators*

- Supervisors and peers

- Other persons of interest to UNHCR

- Non-involved (those who have not taken the PLP)*

41.   A series of questions was developed for each group above that is marked with an asterisk (*) and used as a guide during the semi-structured interviews. These questions are provided in Appendix A.

42.   In order to elicit their true feelings about their involvement with the PLP, interviewees were assured confidentiality – their comments would not be linked to their names. Note that every attempt was made to include staff members located in French- and Spanish-speaking posts. In addition, those in 'hot' zones were targeted. Initially, face-to-face interviews were to be conducted in Bosnia, Kenya, Pakistan and Switzerland. However, the Protection Capacity Section limited travel and the evaluators were not able to travel to Bosnia and Pakistan to conduct interviews. Interviews were conducted by telephone. The face-to-face interviews were usually 60–90 minutes in length, while the telephone interviews tended to be 30–60 minutes in length.

43.   *Questionnaires.* Online questionnaires using Web-based Zoomerang software, as well as Microsoft Word-based versions, were distributed to the groups of individuals below.

- PLP graduates

- Non-completers or in-progress PLP participants

- PLP workshop attendees

- PLP trainers/facilitators

- Supervisors and peers

- Other persons of interest to UNHCR

44.   Six different questionnaires were developed and distributed – one for each group listed above. These questionnaires are provided in Appendix B. Via e-mail, individuals were requested to complete either the online or Word-based questionnaires. All graduates and non-completers who still worked for UNHCR and had an e-mail address were contacted and invited to participate in the study. Note that more than 50% of the respondents submitted items in a Word format even though many had access to the Internet, thus the evaluators had to enter these Word responses into Zoomerang. Zoomerang allows individuals to submit their comments anonymously.

45.   *Review of self-study material relative to distance learning best practices.* The criteria used for this activity were based on Criteria for Evaluating the Quality of Online Courses.[6] These guidelines are used at universities such as Central Queensland University in Australia to assist lecturers in evaluating the effectiveness of their Blackboard courses. They are also used in institutions such as the University of Calgary in Canada to teach educators how to design distance education courses. A copy can be found in Appendix C.

46.   *Review of existing workshop evaluation forms.* This activity helped the evaluators to decide which questions they would use during the focus group sessions held in Budapest.

---

[6] C. R. Wright. (October, 2003). *Criteria for Evaluating the Quality of Online Courses.* Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Distance and Training Association.

47.   *Focus group sessions* with participants in the PLP workshop in Budapest, Hungary.

48.   Observation of one PLP workshop and distribution of detailed questionnaires to the participants. The questionnaire normally used by the PLP team was rather basic, thus a more detailed form was developed that would help the evaluation team answer the study questions. As the evaluators were able to attend only one PLP workshop, their observations may not be generalised to all PLP workshops.

49.   *Review of field study projects* in order to access their impact.

50.   *Examination of the PLP relative to other UNHCR learning programmes.* This activity looked at coordination between programmes, possible linkages and similarities among the programmes. Available literature regarding these programmes was reviewed and meetings were held with those who offered several of these programmes such as the Middle-Management Learning Programme, now referred to as the Management Learning Programme.

51.   The table below lists the number of individuals who were to be targeted by the evaluators. Note that the total population of PLP completers and non-completers or in-progress participants received questionnaires. As the Department of International Protection was responsible for arranging the interviews, the evaluation team requested that the individuals selected by the department represent a wide variety of staff. The selection criteria took into consideration gender, academic and professional background, geographic coverage and language.

Targeted audience for PLP evaluation			
Category	Questionn-aires	Inter-view	Comments
Steering Committee	-	5	Based on availability prior to Oct. 11
PLP Graduates	320	32	From as many regions as is possible
Non-completers/In-Progress	161	10	Selected based on availability
Supervisors and Peers	60	10	Selected from various regions
Other Persons of Interest	60	10	Selected from HQ, Kenya & Hungary
PLP Trainers/Facilitators	10	5	Selected based on availability
Workshop Attendees	30	-	Focus groups instead of interviews
Non-involved	-	10	Random informal interviews
Total	**641**	**82**	

Discussion and recommendations

Introduction

52.   This section provides responses to the questions raised by the PLP Evaluation Steering Committee. The responses are based on the compiled and summarised information contained in Appendix E: Data Compilation. Below is an overview of the targeted audience and the corresponding response rate.

Targeted audience for the PLP and response rate				
Category	**Questionnaire: target number**	**Questionnaire: number returned**	**Interview: target number**	**Interview: number interviewed**
Steering Committee	Not applicable	Not applicable	5	6
PLP graduates	360	88	32	31
Non-completers/ in-progress	161	93	10	14
Supervisors and peers	60	12	10	7
Other persons of interest	60	4	10	20
PLP trainers/ facilitators	10	12	5	8
Workshop attendees	30	30	Two focus groups	Focus group on content and one on methodology
Non-involved	Not applicable	Not applicable	10	5
Total	681		82	91

The overall questionnaire response rate was 230/681 = 33.8%.

Impact on staff

Has the participation in the PLP had an impact on staff members' knowledge, skills and attitudes?

There is no doubt that the PLP had an impact on participants' knowledge and, perhaps to a lesser extent, skills and attitudes.

53. It must be acknowledged that individuals entered the programme with different levels of experience, knowledge and skills and a diversity of attitudes. Since pre- and post-testing did not occur during the 3-month timeframe for this evaluative study and these measures were not available at the time of the study, it is impossible to definitively identify the extent of the change exhibited by the participants. Also note that the PLP was refined each year, thus everyone did not take the same version of the PLP. Despite these caveats, it can be stated that a significant majority of the participants became more knowledgeable about UNHCR's mandate and protection issues in general. A majority of interviewees and questionnaire respondents indicated that the PLP participants gained or enhanced their knowledge, skills and attitudes in the areas identified below.

Knowledge

54. Although it was not possible to measure the level of knowledge acquired by the participants due to the constraints already mentioned, it is evident that given the overall quality of the material provided, the expertise and knowledge of the workshop facilitators and the 'limited' support of supervisors in the learning process, the protection knowledge of staff improved following the completion of the PLP. The level of improvement was dependent on the self-motivation of staff, the connection between the PLP and their work, the competencies of staff and the follow-up and encouragement provided by supervisors and protection managers.

55. A significant majority of the peers and supervisors overwhelmingly indicated that PLP graduates improve the delivery of protection and implement a rights-based approach to protection and assistance. Although mentioned by only a few, it is important to note that those who graduated from the programme tend to ask their supervisors more complex questions and spend less time asking basic questions. These individuals also tend to be more open to working with others and providing assistance, including teaching their colleagues about protection. Thus, the PLP has an impact not only on the individual, but also indirectly on the working environment within duty stations. The PLP affects the operation of the organization.

56. Some adjustments to the contents of the self-study material and the workshop structure could increase the impact of the PLP on participants' knowledge. These adjustments will be outlined later in this report. Specific suggestions, such as providing a variety of materials to match the various knowledge levels of the participants and the introduction of simple to more complex activities are outlined in Appendix E10: Evaluation of the Phase 1 Self-Study Materials.

57. Those with limited experience and a non-legal background tended to gain the most from the programme. Those who already had an extensive knowledge of protection tended to gain confidence, as they not only consolidated or re-affirmed what they already knew, but also gained an appreciation of UNHCR activities and the need to work across the organization – an awareness that protection was not solely owned by protection officers, but is the responsibility of everyone who works for UNHCR, particularly those involved in the legal, programme, protection and resettlement sections.

Skills

58.   Similarly to the difficulties encountered when measuring knowledge, it was not possible to determine the precise level to which skills were improved by those who took the PLP. Based on the data collected, it can be concluded that analytical and research skills improved the most. The PLP also contributed to the improvement of communication and team-building skills. The PLP does not seem to effectively teach other skills such as negotiation and strategic planning. Thus, further attention must be paid to the development of these skills that are essential to the effective and efficient delivery of protection.

59.   Traditional instruction is not sufficient to consolidate people's skills. It is essential to ensure that the beneficiaries of training activities have the immediate opportunity to use the acquired skills and that a proper system of self and external monitoring and follow-up be established.

60.   According to Merrill (1994)[7] and others such as Jonassen (1999)[8] and Reigeluth (1999)[9], learning is facilitated if learners are:

- Engaged in solving real-world problems

- Presented with the task that they need to perform or the problem they must solve

- Provided with guidelines to help them perform the task

- Actively engaged in the performance and problem-solving event

- Provided with different options to address a situation

- Allowed to practice what they are being taught

- Provided with a progression of problems that they must address so that they can build from simple to more complex skills

- Supported or coached by individuals who are knowledgeable in the subject matter under discussion

- Able to discuss and reflect on their new knowledge or skill

- Able to adapt the skill to their personality and work environment

- Provided with follow-up training or activities that will enable them to refine their new skills.

---

[7] M. D. Merrill. (1994). *Instructional Design Theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

[8] D. Jonassen. (1999). Designing Constuctivist Learning Environments. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional Design Theories and Models: A New Paradigm of Instructional Theory* (Vol. II). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. pp. 215-239.

[9] C. M. Reigeluth. (Ed.) (1999). *Instructional Design Theories and Models: A New Paradigm of Instructional Theory* (Vol. II). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

61.   Initially, the instructors or facilitators do most of the explaining and demonstrating, but as the participants acquire new knowledge and skills, the learners become more involved in addressing the problems they are facing. Thus, they learn new skills, not by listening to an instructor, but by actively engaging in real situations, exploring options and practicing what they have learned.

62.   The learning effectiveness of the PLP could be improved if it incorporated more of the facilitation of learning attributes identified above. For example, any skill taught in the programme should be broken down into various components so that participants can master the basics before engaging in more complex tasks. As they do so, it might be helpful if they had checklists that they could use to guide them through a topic such as negotiations. Then, they need time to practice what they have learned. At a later date, it would be ideal if they could meet again to refine what they had learned. However, this may not be practical unless their supervisor and colleagues at their duty stations are willing to participate in this type of activity. It would also be beneficial if all supervisors had completed the PLP themselves.

63.   In the scenario outlined above, the facilitators must:

- be knowledgeable about the subject matter

- focus the participants' attention on relevant information and connect the learning activity to real situations

- demonstrate the skill by providing examples and non-examples of the proper way to perform a skill

- provide relevant information

- encourage learners to compare different points of view or approaches

- allow participants to practice and make mistakes

- be present to provide encouraging and corrective guidance

- allow participants to explore how they would use the new knowledge and skills.

64.   It may be impossible for the PLP to incorporate all of the suggestions outlined above, but if the programme is to be effective at imparting skills, then additional attention must be paid to the factors that influence skill development.

Attitudes

65.   Providing a precise measure of the impact of the PLP on attitudes is difficult. Based on the data collected and the observations by the evaluation team, it is clear that staff members displayed increased confidence when delivering protection and implementing different approaches such as the rights-based approach and gender and age mainstreaming. To a lesser extent, the PLP impacted skills related to the prevention of sexual and gender violence and persecution, consultation with refugees, team building and problem-solving.

66.   Supervisors and peers, including those who were interviewed and those who responded to the questionnaire, were in the best position to observe changes in their colleagues. They provided numerous examples of what PLP graduates were able to do upon returning to their duty stations. PLP graduates:

- increased their understanding of UNHCR's mandate

- became more confident regarding protection and the role they played

- became more creative in addressing protection issues

- have a common understanding of protection

- work better as team players.

67.   Changing attitudes is a difficult task. Learners must progress through a series of stages, from lowest to highest, as outlined below by Rothwell and Kazanas (1994)[10].

Levels of objectives in the affective domain		
Level	**Stage**	**Explanation**
Highest	Characterization	Adopting a new way of life or outlook
	Organization	Developing/acquiring a new value system
	Valuing	Accepting values/beliefs
	Responding	Participating
Lowest	Receiving	Paying attention

68.   Many of the suggestions provided previously regarding skill development also apply to attitudinal change. Below are the instructional events that Gagné, Briggs and Wager (1992)[11] identify as being effective in the development of cognitive and attitudinal skills. On the right, are examples provided by Rothwell and Kazanas (1998)[12] of actions that can be taken to develop attitudes.

---

[10] W. Rothwell and Kazanas. (1994). *Human Resource Development: A Strategic Approach. Amherst*, Mass.: Human Resource Development Press. p. 205.

[11] R. Gagné, L. Briggs and W. Wager. (1992). *Principles of Instructional Design* (4th ed.). Fort Worth, Texas: Harcourt Brace.

[12] W. J. Rothwell and H. C. Kazanas. (1998). *Mastering the Instructional Design Process*. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass. p. 217.

Developing attitudes	
Instructional event	**Actions that promote attitudinal development**
Capture the attention of the learner	Introduce a change in stimulus
Describe to learners what performance objectives are to be achieved	Give an example of what action is called for
Help learners recall prerequisite learning	Encourage learners to recall information and other relevant skills
Present instruction to facilitate the learners' achievement of performance objectives	Give learners a choice in their actions
Guide the learners through the material so they begin to meet the objectives	Give the learners the opportunity to observe the model or choice of what to do
Prompt the performance	Have the learners describe what they would do in real or simulated situations
Give feedback to the learners	Give the learners reinforcement based on choice
Evaluate how well the learners are beginning to achieve the objectives	Learners choose the desired course of action as appropriate
Work toward helping the learners retain what they have learned and apply it	Give learners new opportunities to choose the desired course of action

69.   The above events are simple, but they need to be followed systematically and consistently. Once the PLP participants have had the opportunity to experience the instructional events as outlined above, it would be beneficial if they were placed in an environment in which the appropriate attitudes are displayed or modelled by their colleagues and/or supervisors. This is not always possible. Thus, every attempt must be made to help participants to maintain connections with those who have participated in the programme and display the appropriate attitudes. This could be done via listservs, newsletters and follow-up and refresher workshops or courses that are held some time after the completion of the PLP. Attitudinal changes do not occur overnight, but gradually due to an individual realizing that his or her outlook needs to change. This internal change is facilitated if the attitudes desired are displayed in the environment in which the individual works. Thus, it is important that colleagues and supervisors take the PLP so that they can mutually support each other. It is also important that UNHCR staff participate in activities that make them aware of the need to change.

70.   Although changing attitudes is a difficult task, it cannot be ignored as attitude has a direct bearing on effective performance[13].

Impact on staff: recommendations

- The following topics within the PLP could be improved if additional details are provided such as checklists and summaries, updated information is inserted and additional reference material is included:

---

[13] W. Rothwell. (1996). Beyond Training and Development: State-of-the-Art Strategies for Enhancing Human Performance. New York, NY: AMACOM.

- community development approach

- internally displaced persons

- resettlement

- statelessness

- consultation with refugees.

- New materials and activities are necessary to make staff aware of their present attitudes and the need for change. Analogies and empirical studies can be used effectively for this purpose.

- In order to measure the impact the PLP has on knowledge, skills and attitudes, UNHCR should consider:

  - Conducting pre- and post-competency tests of PLP graduates.

  - Obtaining formative feedback from supervisors and peers 6 – 12 months after staff have graduated from the programme. The supervisors and peers must be in a position to observe staff before and after they have taken the PLP.

  - Tracking the duty assignments or career development of those who have taken the PLP and those who have not.

  - Reviewing the attainment of learning objectives noted in individuals' Performance Appraisal Reports (PARs).

- As it is difficult, though not impossible, to change people's attitudes, UNHCR could ensure that it is hiring the right people, especially those who can display initiative and empathy, and then provide them with the necessary knowledge and skills.

- New materials and activities are necessary to make staff aware of their current attitudes and the need for change.

Impact on refugees

Has the PLP had an impact on the effective protection of refugees and other persons of concern to UNHCR?

71.   This is an exceedingly important question, but as explained in the methodology section of this report, the evaluation team was unable to ascertain how to obtain valid and reliable answers to this question within the evaluation plan timeframe. The evaluation team did not have access to records that would show which PLP graduate worked with which refugee so it could ask specific refugees or groups for their input.

72.   At the start of the evaluation process, the PLP Steering Committee invited a cross-section of UNHCR managers, directors and other persons of concern to discuss the evaluation plan. During this meeting, the evaluators asked how refugee input

could be obtained within a short timeframe. Few suggestions were enunciated. However, it was proposed that the evaluation team conduct informal interviews with a number of refugees, including women and children in the Dadaab and Kukuma refugee camps in Kenya. Due to transportation difficulties and time constraints, these interviews were not conducted. However, eight interviews were conducted with UNHCR, government and implementing partners' personnel at Dadaab.

73.   The evaluators reviewed some of the Phase 3 project reports and the anecdotal evidence provided by supervisors and peers of PLP graduates. Below are a few samples that illustrate how PLP graduates improved their interaction with refugees.

- The five staff members in one office who took the PLP provided a forum for discussion on various protection issues, particularly gender and age mainstreaming. This led to greater interaction with refugee women and men and helped implementing partners to establish networks to sensitise refugee communities and establish a forum for redress.

- The PLP provided information and strategies on sexual and gender-based violence and thus helped the office to analyse and respond to these types of situations in the refugee camp. Graduates of the PLP organised anti-trafficking seminars and protection sessions that incorporate a gender perspective. These seminars or sessions have been targeted at refugees, asylum seekers and other local actors.

- An associate protection officer who took the PLP has become more professional when he deals with refugees in the camps.

- One staff member with no legal background took the PLP and now handles protection issues more effectively than others. She is especially effective with cases involving women at risk and resettlement.

- Proposals for the improvement of life conditions for refugee women, children/youth, 'vulnerables' and 'urbans' were developed.

- More joint protection, programme and community service meetings were held with refugee communities.

74.   Based on this study, a direct link between the PLP and the quality of services offered to refugees cannot be made. However, the PLP does have an impact upon participants' perception of refugees and the type of activities that they conduct when they return to their duty stations. It can be inferred with a reasonable degree of confidence that PLP graduates improve the services and assistance they provide to refugees.

75.   The extent to which this assistance improved depends not only on the individual graduate, but also on many other factors such as support from supervisors, local authorities and the government.

Impact on refugees: recommendations

- UNHCR needs to develop a mechanism whereby refugees are able to provide feedback regarding the quality of the services they receive. Despite their limited knowledge of their own rights and protection mechanisms, refugees can provide useful feedback regarding the attitudes of UNHCR staff, respect, cross-cultural sensitivity and so forth.

- As recommended in other parts of the report, UNHCR should consider establishing a mechanism to measure the impact of the PLP on participants after they have completed the PLP. For example, this measurement could form part of the existing UNHCR performance evaluation mechanisms.

Improving the PLP

Can the PLP be improved?

76.   Despite the efforts of the PLP team to update the programme each year and maintain adequate quality and quantity levels, the data gathered via interviews and questionnaires reveal that the PLP requires additional revisions. Changes must be implemented to improve its effectiveness. The rationale for these changes and possible solutions to issues raised by PLP participants, PLP graduates, supervisors, peers, facilitators and other persons of interest to UNHCR are presented in this section of the report. These suggestions are based on the best practices within the field of distance education.

77.   An analysis of the data collected reveals that the areas below could be improved.

- Defining or identifying the ideal audience for the PLP.

- Adjusting the contents of the different parts of the PLP to the respective level of the audience.

- Opening the programme to external actors to improve the sharing of experiences.

- Relating the successful completion of the PLP to posting and promotions.

- Offering a core programme and optional units of study.

The audience: mandatory for all UNHCR staff, selected staff or open to stakeholders?

<u>Current audience</u>

78.   If the goals of the PLP are to be achieved, then all UNHCR personnel should be able to enrol in the programme. This is essential to ensure that UNHCR can achieve consistency and cohesiveness regarding the protection of refugees. Most would agree that a mixed audience involving people from different levels of the organization would yield a better understanding of UNHCR's mandate, policies, operation and

implementation practices, as people would be able to learn about the different aspects of protection. A mixed audience would also help UNHCR staff to gain an understanding of the many people involved in protection and their roles and the circumstances in which they operate.

79. Is it possible to offer an effective, quality programme that benefits those who have little or no experience with protection and those who have extensive experience, that caters to those with a law degree or other form of higher education and those who do not, and that suits the needs of both non-professional and professional UNHCR staff? The PLP has been employed to do just that – address an extremely mixed audience. Based on interviews and questionnaire data, the PLP is not meeting everyone's needs, due in large part to the diversity of its participants. The PLP team has tried to walk a tightrope by allowing diverse staff to participate in the programme yet focus on those in professional categories. The Protection Capacity Section and the UNHCR should reconsider the aims of PLP and the people it serves so that the PLP can provide appropriate learning.

80. The first table below identifies the grade levels of PLP graduates and non-completers and in-progress participants who provided this information in the questionnaires they completed. Note that although 88 graduates completed the questionnaire, only 86 indicated their grade. The second table lists their years of service.

Grade level	Graduates N=86		Non-completers/ in-progress N=93	
G5 or above	30	35%	39	42%
NOA/B/C	13	15%	7	8%
P2/P3	30	35%	26	28%
P4/P5	9	10%	13	14%
Other	4	5%	8	9%

Length of service	Graduates N=87		Non-completers/ in progress N=93	
1 – 3 years	7	8%	27	29%
3 – 5 years	28	32%	17	18%
5 – 10 years	30	34%	20	22%
More than 10 years	22	25%	29	31%

81. At a minimum, at least two distinct categories of staff can be identified:

- Non-professionals who need an introduction to UNHCR mandate and policies and an overview of protection.

- Professionals who need an in-depth knowledge of protection. This latter group could also be divided into those with limited or no protection experience and those with extensive experience.

82.   Each of the above groups has different needs and thus requires different programmes. A possible format for these programmes is outlined later in this section.

83.   Also note that a significant number of staff taking the PLP have extensive experience at UNHCR. These individuals may or may not have been involved in protection when they started with the organization, but it is likely that they now have an understanding regarding the protection mandate of UNHCR and the international legal standards that apply. Do they need a programme that covers the basics of protection, or do they need a more intensive or advanced programme? Regarding those with limited experience at UNHCR, how do they do their jobs effectively if they do not have the basic information about the protection mandate of UNHCR and the international legal standards that apply to protection?

<u>Audience recommendations</u>

- The Protection Capacity Section of the Department of International Protection needs to ensure that when selecting staff for the PLP that the staff have a minimum level of expertise and language skills and that they are committed to work for a specified period of time for UNHCR.

- Both professional and non-professional staff can participate in the PLP if they meet a defined and uniformly applied criteria. The criteria could include years of service, type of contract, relevant position, projected interest and potential staff contribution to refugee protection as well as those criteria mentioned above.

<u>Should the PLP be mandatory for UNHCR staff?</u>

84.   Based on the feedback received through interviews and questionnaires, a significant majority of respondents would agree that the PLP should be mandatory. Sixty-five percent (65%) of the 88 PLP graduate respondents and 70% of the 88 PLP non-completers and in-progress participants indicated that the PLP should be mandatory, especially for UNHCR professional staff (NOA to P5) and general staff (G5 to G7). Others would support this initiative if only protection and field personnel were required to take it. The main reason for supporting this action is that everyone who works for the UNHCR should know UNHCR's mandate and its role in protecting refugees and other persons of concern.

85.   The reasons listed below can be given for **not** making the programme mandatory for everyone.

- Staff should be encouraged, but not forced, to take it. It is each staff member's responsibility to ensure sufficient knowledge of his or her job. It should remain as a free choice.

- It would be more effective if the programme is left open for those who are interested in it, as the programme requires interest, commitment and enthusiasm.

- It is not relevant for all staff. Some may choose to undertake a different learning programme.

- It is not necessary for most non-protection posts.

- If UNHCR recognises the PLP certificate for upgrading, it will become self-mandatory, as it will attract students.

- In its current form, it is too technical and specialised for everyone to take.

- It should be mandatory for protection staff only, as it has too much legal detail.

- Anyone who deals with refugees must know UNHCR's mandate. Others should be encouraged to take it.

- It depends on the professional interest of colleagues and would set a precedent. Colleagues may have to take courses they have no interest in or courses that are not relevant to their careers.

86.   Although it is clear that many agree that the PLP should be mandatory, some suggest that it should be changed prior to becoming mandatory and others suggest additional resources are required. Below are a few views expressed by several graduates, in-progress participants and non-completers.

- Yes [the course should be mandatory], if the course is simplified. It covers too many topics in a short time. Make a mandatory shorter course.

- There should be two versions of the PLP – a shorter version for all staff who do not have the relevant background or who are not directly involved with protection matters and a longer one, like the current version, with more legal and practical assignments for those involved directly with refugees.

- Yes, if staff members are given enough time to complete it and if they receive support from their supervisors.

- If the PLP is mandatory, it will need a large amount of resources to sustain it. But if it is not mandatory, what quality of services is provided to refugees?

87.   If one of the aims of the PLP, as outlined in the terms of reference for this evaluation, is to foster 'a common understanding amongst all staff members of UNHCR's protection mandate and international legal standards, in order to promote consistency and cohesiveness in UNHCR's approach', then all UNHCR staff members need to learn about UNHCR's mandate and protection standards, but they do not all have to enrol in the current PLP. The current PLP is too detailed, too legalistic and too long for non-protection staff.

88.   The words 'mandatory' and 'examination' seem to stir great passions among a few people within UNHCR. A course should be mandatory if it is deemed that everyone with a specific designation should have specific knowledge and skills. However, it is not always necessary to designate a course as being mandatory. Instead, when individuals are being hired for a post, those who have the necessary certificate or diploma can be given extra consideration. Eventually, people will perceive that if they want to change posts or obtain a new assignment, they will need to complete certain courses or programmes.

Mandatory options for the PLP: recommendations

- Two courses could be provided to ensure that all staff at UNHCR have the minimum required knowledge about refugee protection. These are outlined below.

  - **An induction course.** This course could provide an overview of UNHCR's mandate and activities, but it would definitely focus on introducing the audience to the basics of protection. It would be available online and in a compact-disc format. It would be mandatory for all UNHCR staff. If there are adequate resources and where there are sufficient numbers, consideration should be given to holding a one-day induction workshop to allow for experience sharing, team building, updates on current and future UNHCR initiatives and the opportunity to meet UNHCR leaders. Note that this induction course is not the same as the planned 'Welcome to the UN' compact disc, as this course will emphasize protection.

  - **A protection course or programme.** This would be based on the current PLP. In addition to the changes recommended in this report, this new course would include advanced material on protection, as many who are likely to take it will have a legal background and/or extensive experience. The course would be mandatory for protection, programme, resettlement and field officers, as well as public information staff. If the individuals assigned to a protection post have not completed the PLP, they should be required to do so within the first three years of their assignment. If the staff believe that they already have the knowledge and skills that the course offers, they should be able to take a rigorous challenge examination. The exam should contain written and oral components so that individuals can demonstrate skills such as effective consultation with refugees and other persons of concern to UNHCR. If they pass the examination, they would not be required to take the course.

- In addition to the above, there should be a **follow-up activity**, perhaps two to three years after an individual graduates from the PLP. This could be a workshop or an e-learning component that keeps graduates abreast of new policies, techniques, and UNHCR protection initiatives. It should build upon the expertise gained or enhanced by taking the PLP and challenge the staff to keep current.

Inclusion of stakeholders

Can the PLP be used or modified to support the protection interests and roles of key UNHCR stakeholders?

89.   The PLP contains information that is of interest to other protection related and humanitarian agencies and organizations. They also need to know about topics such as international refugee law, international humanitarian law, team-building skills and the community development approach to protection. They could benefit from

taking the PLP. Interviews indicated that key UNHCR stakeholders in Kenya would agree with this statement. Externals actors would like to participate in the PLP and other training opportunities offered by UNHCR. They recognise that due to pressures in the field, training is not a priority, but they firmly believe that it is needed. They even suggested that when UNHCR provides funds to partners, a portion of the allocation should be designated for training – perhaps 1% of the budget.

90.   Fifty-three percent (53%) of the 88 graduates who responded to the evaluation questionnaire agreed that the PLP should be open to non-governmental organization (NGO) personnel, and 10 of the 12 trainers and facilitators indicated that the workshop is suitable for other UNHCR stakeholders and NGO personnel. A few of the reasons given for allowing external personnel to participate in the PLP are provided below.

- A mixed workshop audience would be beneficial, as different perspectives would be revealed and discussed.

- As UNHCR personnel need to work with external agencies, they should be invited to participate so that everyone has a common understanding of the UNHCR mandate, policies and operational procedures.

- Since implementing partners are frequently on the front line, they would benefit from taking the PLP.

- Other organizations also perform protection functions. UNHCR could benefit from learning how other organizations handle protection.

- Other stakeholders also require this type of training.

91.   If, however, externals are allowed to participate in the PLP, then the workshop would have to be modified. Comments that support this view are provided below.

- Only minor modifications are required. One would need to elaborate further on some of UNHCR's terms and approaches.

- In its current form, it is too UNHCR-oriented. Additional resources or reference material would be required.

- Including government counterparts may inhibit UNHCR staff.

- The workshop should not be opened to partners, but if we do so, only to non-governmental organizations. If there are no partners in attendance, UNHCR personnel can raise more sensitive issues.

- Currently, we are able to discuss any issue. But with externals present, we may not feel free to discuss problems.

Inclusion of stakeholders: recommendations

92.   Despite the benefits of cross-fertilisation that would be derived from having a mixed audience, given the high demand for the PLP within UNHCR, **the Protection**

Capacity Section should focus on targeting UNHCR staff rather than expanding the programme to an external audience. It is difficult to justify opening up the PLP to external personnel when UNHCR staff members are unable to enrol due to the lack of resources within the Protection Capacity Section and when PLP participants are not able to obtain the support that they need.

93.   The PLP for partners is a worthwhile programme. But when resources are at a premium, perhaps it should be decentralised and implemented as part of the operational training provided by offices in the field. The regional structure can be used for this purpose. The Protection Capacity Section could play an active role in promoting, monitoring and supporting the field offices in providing training to UNHCR stakeholders. Assisting stakeholders with their training is important, but when resources are limited, they should be spent first on ensuring that UNHCR staff have the training they need.

Content

94.   Is the content of the programme appropriate for the targeted audience? Does the content meet the needs of specific audiences?

95.   In order to address the above questions, the evaluation team took into account the perceptions of participants regarding content and the process of determining the programme content. Overall most participants consider the contents of the PLP adequate to their expectations, level of expertise and previous experience. The evaluation team did not focus on the specific technical and legal aspects of the content, as this was not specified in the evaluation terms of reference and UNHCR, particularly the Department of International Protection staff, are recognised worldwide as refugee experts.

96.   In spite of the above, the evaluation team considers that some adjustments should be made to the different parts of the PLP as outlined below.

Self-study content: findings

- The order and flow of the self-study units do not reflect the regular displacement or refugee cycle. Therefore, it was difficult to follow the logic of the present course structure. It is recommended that the units be reviewed accordingly.

- Some non-protection participants and those who had limited legal experience or whose first language was not English felt that the initial chapters of the programme and the mandatory and supplementary readings were too technical and difficult to comprehend.

- Although most participants considered that the language was appropriate, a considerable number of persons interviewed reported to have problems understanding parts of the material due to their lack of fluency with legalistic language.

- Many respondents thought the self-study material could be simplified without compromising essential content.

- A number of participants remarked that there is repetition in some of the self-study units. Several people indicated that units 1–4 are repetitive and could be reduced, perhaps to two units. Similarly, units covering statelessness and internally displaced persons could be combined under a heading such as Persons of Concern.

- Several advanced protection staff, senior P3 and P4, considered the material to be too basic and had higher expectations of the PLP contents. This leads one to consider whether the PLP should be divided into two levels – one portion for junior protection officers and another for senior officers.

- Although most key protection issues are covered in the PLP, some participants felt that the self-study phase could include a section on local integration; more updated material on internally displaced persons, statelessness and resettlement; and additional information on exclusion, regional protection instruments, community development approaches and consultation with refugees. Note that if the audience for the PLP is better defined, it might be easier to select topics to be covered. Regardless, since it will be impossible to please everyone all the time, participants would benefit from having choices. An array of topics could be presented, and they could select the ones that meet their needs.

- The length of the self-study, in terms of both content and time, seems to be a concern for the majority of participants. Given the quantity and complexity of some of the units and their own workload, some participants felt that the timeframe for the self-study was too short and that the schedule for submitting assignments was unrealistic.

- The material provided for both the Phase 1 self-study and the Phase 2 workshop is UNHCR-centred. External sources are used only in a limited manner. The evaluators feel it is important that protection officers be exposed to different points of view and other sources of material, particularly publications by international humanitarian organizations and the academic press.

- Participants indicated that the PLP material is extremely useful as a reference resource. They use the content of the PLP regularly as they perform their daily work and also share it with their colleagues. A few suggested that the material be translated so staff could use it to inform local police and government officials about the rights of refugees.

- Supplementary resources should be added at the end of each unit. This section could include material that does not have to be read during the programme but could be used for further research and reference when necessary.

- Although exercises were in general considered appropriate and relevant, participants felt unmotivated to complete them due to the lack of individual feedback. This concern will be discussed separately in this section.

- Regarding the process of determining content, the evaluation team noted that no stated guidelines or methodologies seem to have been used to develop the latest version of the PLP. A series of informal meetings and exchanges were reported to be used to select content. The extent to which feedback from participants was taken into account during the revision process was unclear. Records of this process were unavailable, and some of the units identified as consultants could not confirm their involvement. For the pilot PLP, a workshop involving representatives from the field and headquarters agreed on the general issues to be covered in the programme.

- Due to resource constraints, no formal editorial mechanism was used to review and agree on the final contents of the PLP. In an ad-hoc manner, the burden of editing and re-writing the entire PLP was completed by two PCS staff. At many educational institutions, distance education courses are developed and revised by a team of individuals with different expertise in content, curriculum and/or instructional design, graphic and/or page layout, media and editing. In the case of the PLP, two individuals with limited experience in these areas, do the best they can to select and produce the course material. With limited resources, they have done a good job.

Self-study content: recommendations

- Without undermining the current level of the PLP, consideration should be given to the **simplification of the contents of the self-study**. The content of the PLP for partners was presented by the Protection Capacity Section as a possible format for a new PLP Phase 1. Below is a proposed structure for a revised self-study component of the PLP.

Unit	Content	Comments
1	Displaced persons, UNHCR and You	Most of the existing units can be retained. Updated material can be added, including recent literature regarding displacement.
2	The legal framework	This new unit would combine existing units 2 and 3. It would focus on key policies and issues such as Agenda for Protection and Convention Plus.
3	Persons of Concern	A more classical approach to the different persons of concern to UNHCR is required. The unit should include descriptions, contexts and other specific legal instruments relevant to refugees, internally displaced persons and stateless persons.
4	Access to asylum and protection	The revised unit would be a combination of chapters 4, 5 and part of 6, including the right to asylum and standards of treatment and protection in urban and rural contexts.
5	Special protection concerns	This unit would cover sexual and gender-based violence, the civilian and humanitarian character of refugee protection and assistance and other cross-cutting issues.

6	Durable solutions	The topics that could be covered include voluntary repatriation, resettlement and local integration.
7	Programming protection	Changes to this chapter should be introduced to reflect more practical recommendations regarding mainstreaming protection in programme design, planning, implementation and evaluation.
Anx 1	Your impact on protection	This is not a study chapter, but it should provide additional guidance.
Anx 2	Material on skills	A series of recent readings on skill development, including materials on communication, negotiations, team building and cross-cultural issues.

- More attention should be paid to **obtaining material and resources from external actors,** particularly on issues not directly under the mandate of UNHCR. Material could be obtained from the academic press and/or specialised agencies such as the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the International Organization for Migration and the Oxford Refugee Studies Centre.

- As indicated above, the self-study could **include a section comprising material about skills**. These materials would not be covered during the workshop and are not included in the current PLP material. Participants need resources they can refer to as they perform their daily functions.

- The PLP should provide more **individual feedback on key exercises**. The exercises could be grouped for Units 1 and 2, 3 and 4, and 5, and participants would receive direct comments and recommendations on them. Exercises for Units 6 and 7 could be discussed during the workshop. This would ensure that participants are motivated to complete them and will address the need for a link between the self-study and the workshop.

- Once the above changes are introduced, the PLP team will need to **re-assess the criteria it uses to admit individuals to the programme**. Consideration should be given to years of experience and expertise prior to accepting enrolment.

Workshop content: findings

97.   The comments below are based primarily on the observations, interviews and focus group sessions that were held in Budapest in November 2004.

- In general, participants felt that the workshop addressed skills and attitudes. Less positive was the response in regards to knowledge acquisition. Participants would prefer additional time be allocated to knowledge acquisition and strategic protection planning. Note, however, that the primary purpose of the workshop is to promote skill development

and attitude enhancement. Therefore, the evaluation team wondered if everyone had completed all the self-study units before attending the workshop. A review of the responses from the PLP trainers and facilitators to the question 'Prior to the workshop, do the participants have the necessary knowledge, skills or attitudes to benefit fully from the workshop?', 50% of the respondents said 'yes' and 50% said 'no'.

- According to the participants at the Budapest workshop, the following topics were not adequately covered:

  - Development of a comprehensive protection strategy

  - 'Cutting edge' protection developments and issues in different regions of the world

  - Clear standards, indicators and guidelines for the mass influx of refugees or emergency situations

  - Cessation

  - Forced migration and mixed flows

  - Knowledge-based material on negotiation

  - Protection partnerships

  - Resettlement

  - Returnee monitoring

  - Statelessness

  Based on the data analysis, it can be concluded that the workshop attendees did not feel that the workshop increased their legal knowledge and understanding of statelessness and resettlement.

- Many workshop participants also felt that more time should be spent on developing skills that are directly linked to protection. Skills related to communication and 'peoples skills' such as cross-cultural awareness, body language, suspension of assumptions and active listening were not adequately covered. More can be accomplished within the existing exercises and timeframe.

- Participants felt that one skill that should be addressed specifically during the workshop is the strategizing of protection. This would include the actual preparation of comprehensive protection strategies for given complex situations.

- There was the perception that the Budapest workshop allotted too much time to negotiation skills. Some of the material could be included in Phase 1. This perception reminded the evaluators that every workshop is different. Participants in previous workshops requested that additional

information be added regarding negotiation. The challenge that facilitators will always face is the adaptation of workshop content to suit a specific audience mix. The more the facilitators know about the audience, the better they will be able to match content and activities to the needs of the participants. Thus, it would be appropriate for the PLP team to send out a broad agenda for the workshop prior to the activity and ask participants to identify topics that interest them, topics they would like to spend more time on and specific questions they would like to have addressed. The participants' responses should then be reviewed and the workshop agenda modified accordingly.

- Participants thought the link between the self-study phase and the workshop was weak. However, care must be taken to build upon the workshop as opposed to repeating the contents of the self-study units. Participants should not be able to take part in the workshop unless they have successfully completed all the necessary self-study at some level of acceptable quality so that they will arrive at the workshop prepared to develop skills rather than simply review the contents of the self-study units.

- A general comment was that attitudes should be covered more extensively in the workshop. Special attention should be given to refugee consultation, cross-cultural issues and community participation.

- Although rights-based approach to protection and team-based approach to problem-solving were properly addressed, participants felt that age and other vulnerability issues were not covered adequately.

- The group felt the need for exercises that covered working in difficult political and social environments in which authorities and communities have extremely negative views of UNHCR and its mandate. This significant addition to the programme would address the concerns of individuals at partner organizations who stated that UNHCR field personnel are too academic in their approach and need to be more practical. These externals also stated that the UNHCR field personnel needed to be more emphatic and improve their refugee consultation skills.

- Although protection officers need to know how to develop partnerships and build protection relationships with other agencies, the workshop is very UNHCR-centred.

Workshop content: recommendations

98.   Based on the responses of workshop participants and the discussions conducted with Protection Capacity Section personnel, **two revised agendas for the workshop** are presented below.

99.   *Scenario 1* includes minor changes that address participants' concerns regarding links between Phases 1 and 2 and includes some content that is not in the present workshop.

Day	Content	Comments
1	Introductory team building exercise	Maintain current exercise but focus on identifying skills and expertise of participants. Participants need time to fully introduce themselves and state their interests and concerns. Due to time constraints, this should preferably be done the evening before the formal start of the workshop. Facilitators should be able to identify key participants who can provide support during specific exercises and sessions.
2	Protection situations	Maintain a similar structure but make the legal session generic and cover more than emergencies. The simulation can be modified by introducing two possible scenarios. One could be related to an emergency in a rural context (Africa or Asia) and the other related to urban refugee situations (Europe or the Americas). The rules and roles for simulations should be clearly enunciated and provided orally and in writing.
3	Refugee status determination (morning) Protection standards and solutions (afternoon)	Maintain the sexual and gender-based focus. Include coverage of exclusion, cessation and cancellation. Review the interviewing skills exercise. A new session should be introduced that focuses on negotiating and develops and implements adequate protection standards for the situations identified above for Day 2. This session should be linked to the exercises that were completed in the Phase 1 self-study. It should include key cutting-edge issues such as migration and asylum.
4	Protection standards and solutions (continuation of previous activities, morning only) Durable solutions Identification of gaps	Group presentations Wrap-up and gap identification Presentation on durable solutions. Video or other methodology could be employed. Participants list topics on which they want more information.
5	Dealing with the gaps Action for Phase 3 Workshop evaluation	Open discussion on issues identified during the previous sessions. Workshop attendees could be actively involved by providing examples and conducting presentations.

100. ***Scenario 2*** changes the structure of the workshop more radically. However, it addresses many of the issues raised by the PLP participants. This scenario is based on the production of a comprehensive protection strategy for two or three situations that take into account the experience and expectations of the audience.

Day	Content	Comments
1	Introductory team building exercise	Eliminate the drawing exercise and replace it with a team-building background-exchange game or activity. Include an exercise that will identify participants' expectations. Introduce an additional information-sharing session in order to increase participants' understanding and knowledge of each other, the situations they encounter and the protection issues they face.
2	Protection strategies (full-day work group)	Provide groups with information on complex protection situations by using an exercise that is similar to the Protection in Emergencies exercise. These can be addressed through the preparation of a comprehensive plan involving UNHCR and partners. The groups will need to develop a plan of action to address protection issues. They must include various perspectives in their plan, including legal and programme views.
3	Protection strategies	Hold group presentations that cover the legal framework, including law and facts analysis, operational responses, proposed solutions and negotiation skills. Identify gaps that must be addressed.
4	Protection callenges	A series of thematic options that address the following topics in a group discussion format: • the migration/asylum debate • internally displaced persons • exclusion and cancellation • the future of international protection • protecting returnees: a new responsibility? • consultation with refugees: making the best of tough situations • new UNHCR directions and initiatives Different methodologies could be used, including structured participatory lectures, seminars, guest speakers, role-plays and so forth.
5	Wrap up Phase 3 workshop evaluation (Session ends at 3:00 p.m.)	Similar to current format, but ensure adequate time is provided to discuss Phase 3 projects. The project outlines could be placed on display earlier in the workshop so that other participants could look at them. On Day 5, everyone would have the opportunity to comment on the project outlines and make suggestions.

101. The above scenario may require additional adjustments, depending on the changes made to the self-study phase.

Methodology

Self-study methodology: findings

102. Below is an overview of the key attributes of the self-study material as well as the concerns participants expressed. An extensive and detailed analysis of the PLP self-study material is reported in Appendix E10: Evaluation of the Phase 1 Self-Study Materials and should be reviewed carefully prior to making any changes to the material.

103. The 6-month self-study portion of the PLP exposes participants to key aspects of protection. Printed material comprising 12 units covers topic such as UNHCR's mandate, displaced persons, the 1951 Refugee Convention, human rights law, international humanitarian law, asylum, refugee status determination, sexual and gender-based violence, internally displaced persons, statelessness, voluntary repatriation and resettlement. It also outlines the Phase 3 project. In addition to the main instructional or learning materials are various print documents, compact discs and a videocassette.

104. Key attributes of the above materials and the instructional methods used are outlined below.

- The introductory section provides basic information about the course, including objectives, a timetable for the completion of each unit, details regarding the submission of assignments, the operation of the peer e-mail group, list of resources and responses to frequently-asked questions. This introduction is satisfactory, but it should provide additional information that will help the learners to know exactly what is expected of them regarding specific learning objectives, sending e-mail and the operation of the *List-servs*. The PLP team might want to go beyond *List-servs* and encourage the development of learning communities as outlined by Palloff and Pratt (1999)[14] and increase the interactivity between the team and students. Interactivity is a fundamental aspect of good teaching[15]. Also missing is a description of the assistance learners can expect from the PLP team. For example, learners need to know how often they will receive feedback and the depth of feedback they will receive. They need to know that they will receive regular announcements[16]:

  - Reminding them about upcoming dates and progress to date

---

[14] R. Palloff and K. Pratt. (1999). *Building Learning Communities in Cyberspace*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

[15] K. Flottemesch. (May-June, 2000). Building Effective Interaction in Distance Education: A Review of the Literature in *Educational Technology*. pp 46-51.

[16] Adapted from S. Ko and S. Rossen. (2004). *Teaching Online: A Practical Guide*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company.

- Offering a preview or overview of the week's activities to reinforce the students' attention to tasks

- Taking stock of progress and encouraging students

- Updating, clarifying or changing the course and schedule

- Providing new information or stories from the news that are directly related to the PLP.

- The content of the material is accessible, as the following are provided: primary objectives for each unit, list of mandatory and supplementary readings, list of exercises, headers and footers. The binder has labelled tabs that help participants to find material quickly. In order to increase accessibility, a comprehensive table of contents should be added, as well as a preview or overview section. Since many technical words are used in the material, a glossary should be added.

- The organization of the material could definitely be improved. Some participants indicated that they experienced difficulty with the flow of the content, as it did not follow the flow of the displacement of persons of concern and the units did not have a discernable structure. A consistent structure provides a framework for learning.

- The writing style is clear and direct, but the language is a major challenge for a significant number of participants. It is likely that they did not have a legal background and for several, their first language was not English. It is probably impossible for a programme of this nature to simplify all the legal terms used. However, if learners are admitted into the programme, their language skills should not be a barrier to learning. They need to focus on the content being taught. When these individuals return to their posts, they will need to convey their messages in the local language, and it may not be English. One way or another, the material should be translated. They will also need to simplify it for their persons of concern. It should be noted that several countries have made it a policy to provide citizens with material that is written in plain English. Perhaps this could be applied to the PLP.

- The material was packaged appropriately in a waterproof three-ring binder. The layout of the material is very basic and functional. It could be improved if a graphic designer is contracted to provide highlighting, illustrations and the effective use of white space.

- Goals and objectives are provided, but the wording of the objectives and what is actually expected of the participants are incongruent. This mismatch must be corrected, as it is giving learners false expectations. Suggestion for writing effective objectives can be found in the writings of Harrison (1999)[17] and Biggs, Gustafson and Tillman (1991)[18].

---

[17] N. Harrison. (1999). How to Design Self-Directed and Distance Learning Programs. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

[18] L.J. Briggs, K. L. Gustafson, and M. H. Tillman. (Eds.) (1991). *Instructional Design Principles and Applications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

- An extensive amount of material is provided. Many found the content to be relevant, appropriate and comprehensive in regard to both range and depth. One article noted for its usefulness was on dysfunctional humanitarian organizations. There is a good balance between theory and practice. However, the material does not seem to address the needs of a mixed audience; ideally, it should be appropriate for different levels of staff. If the current admission policy for this programme is maintained, more diverse materials should be provided. Points of view other than those of the UNHCR should be presented.

- A variety of learning activities are included in the self-study component, but the learners do not often have the option to choose activities relevant to their skills, responsibilities and interests. Some activities are challenging, while a few seem more like 'cut and paste' exercises. The workload was not evenly spread out across the units.

- A major concern about the learning activities is that, for many, the timelines for completing the exercises were unrealistic. If an individual was working full-time, it was even more difficult to complete the exercises on schedule if the supervisor did not allow some study time on the job. In theory, the UNHCR allows up to 2 hours of study time per week for staff enrolled in recognised learning programmes. However, this guideline requires the support of supervisors for its successful implementation.

- Abundant learning resources are provided, but they are primarily print-based. A significant amount of this material is dry and quite technical. However, several PLP graduates noted they referred to programme materials daily as these were the only real reference sources at their duty stations. Participants appreciated the videocassette and compact discs. They would like to have more of this material, but in less lengthy formats.

- A bibliography could be added to assist those who want to learn more about the topics covered in the programme.

- Self-tests should be added to allow participants to practise before doing the exercises they submit. The overwhelming concern about the PLP self-study component is the lack of timely individualised feedback. This concern must be addressed.

Self-study methodology: recommendations

105.   The self-study material is a solid product that does support learning. However, some concerns must be addressed. These are outlined below. Key recommendations are identified first, followed by possible secondary recommendations.

Key recommendations

- **Frequent, timely, individualised feedback and guidance must be provided** as participants work through the self-study materials and complete the Phase 3 implementation project. The lack of individualised

support was the overwhelming complaint voiced by PLP graduates, in-progress participants and non-completers. Feedback is an essential ingredient of any instructional or training system whether it be Gagné's (1985)[19] theory of instructional design, the Elaboration Theory of Reigeluth (1999)[20], the constructivist learning environment promoted by Jonassen (1999)[21] or the problem-based learning model advocated by Savery and Duffy (1995)[22]. Increasing the amount of frequent, timely, individualised feedback to the PLP would significantly improve the learning effectiveness of the programme.

- **The timelines for completing exercises must be increased or the number of assignments must be reduced.** If the content is re-organised, especially Units 1–4, and repetitious reading material is removed, the current overall timeline is acceptable. There can be numerous exercises, provided that not all of them are to be submitted.

- **Simplified versions or summaries of complex legal documents must be provided** to increase understanding of highly technical material.

- **The objectives of each unit must be congruent with the actual activities participants are expected to complete.** The objectives should be more precise and cover the various levels of learning – knowledge, application and problem solving. Ideally, they should also cover cognitive, skill and affective outcomes, but the material may not be appropriate for all three levels. However, the self-study material should not only provide factual information, but also develop skills. Verbs that could be used to write objectives at specific levels of learning can be found in Appendix F: Sample Action Words for Stating Learning Objectives[23].

- **A comprehensive contents page must be added** so that participants can find items easily. Many protection officers use the self-study material as reference material at their duty stations.

Secondary recommendations

106. In order to comply with best practices in the design and delivery of distance education material, the following items could be added to the PLP self-study material.

---

[19] R. M. Gagné. (1985). The Conditions of Learning. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

[20] C. M. Reigeluth. (1999). The Elaboration Theory: Guidance for Scope and Sequence Decisions. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.). *Instuctional Design Theories and Models: A New Paradigm of Instructional Theory (Volume II)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. pp. 425-453.

[21] D. Jonassen. (1999). Designing Constructivist Learning Environments. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.). *Instuctional Design Theories and Models: A New Paradigm of Instructional Theory (Volume II)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. pp. 215-239.

[22] J. Savery and T. Duffy. (1995). Problem-Based Learning. An Instructional Model and Its Constructivist Framework. In B. G. Wilson (Ed.). *Designing Constructivist Learning Environments*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications. pp. 135-148.

[23] C. R. Wright. (1997). Instructing in an International Setting: A Handbook for Those Who Will Provide Training in Developing Countries. Unpublished manuscript. pp. 3-24.

- A statement regarding the intended learners, their attributes and the level of reading proficiency required

- An explanation of how this programme is related to other UNHCR training courses or programmes

- Guidelines for participating in the peer e-mail groups/listserves

- A statement regarding the availability of the PLP team and turnaround time for the responses to learners' questions

- A statement that informs learners about their right to privacy

- A statement regarding the consequences of plagiarism

- A list of the writers/developers and reviewers of the material

- A copyright statement

- A content preview or overview for each unit

- An index

- A glossary

- A consistent structure for each unit

- Additional guidance to aid in the design and completion of the Phase 3 project

- Navigational icons

- Additional white space

- A consistent use of bolding and other highlighting

- Titles and captions for photographs

- Additional photographs and illustrations

- Notifications regarding copyright material used in the self-study units

- Greater selection of learning activities to suit a mixed audience with different interests and background. These should be arranged from easy to difficult so that participants can gain confidence as they work through the activities.

- Self-tests so that participants can practise on their own and check their answers

- Additional in-depth learning resources that will challenge senior protection officers

- Additional materials from non-UNHCR sources that express varied points of view

- Guidelines that encourage participants to seek the assistance of others while working on the material

- Summaries of materials and of each unit

- Additional media material, especially non-print material that will explain some of the legal documents or at least 'bring them to life'

- Bibliography and/or reference list

- Some of the articles have been copied or taken from a secondary source. They should be re-typed and re-formatted. The source of the articles and copyright permission to use the articles should be clearly stated

- The self-study material should be proof-read.

Workshop methodology: findings

107. The purpose of the 4.5-day workshop is to consolidate items covered in the self-study, develop skills and provide an environment in which participants can interact with others who have different skills and experiences. The information provided in this section is primarily based on the workshop conducted in Budapest in November 2004 and comments from trainers and facilitators, as well as those graduates and non-completers who volunteered their opinions.

108. The trainers and facilitators have several challenges to face when they conduct the workshop. These include:

- Getting people to open up to people they have never met. Many participants will have different cultural backgrounds, and their proficiency with English is likely to be varied.

- Providing content and activities that will meet and challenge people with extremely varied backgrounds and experience. Some of the participants have a protection background and others do not. Some have advanced protection skills. The tables below give some indication of the diversity of the audience and present a profile of PLP graduates for comparison.

- Addressing the needs of those who have a firm grasp of the content in the self-study unit and those who do not. Each audience requires a different level of detail.

- Maintaining a balance between theory and practice.

109. Despite these challenges, the facilitators were able to:

- Provide a balanced approach between theory and practice.

- Provide a mixture of activities to suit a mixed audience.

- Encourage and support interaction.

- Provide an environment in which participants felt comfortable in sharing ideas and experiences.

110. PLP graduates, in-progress participants and Budapest workshop attendees noted the following:

- The group was too large to enable everyone to contribute to the discussions. The workshop should be limited to 20-25 people. Adding an additional facilitator does not resolve the problem of participants wanting an opportunity to speak. The larger the group, the less 'air time' for each participant. In some cases, it may be advantageous to conduct two parallel groups of 25 participants at the same location. Thus, it becomes more feasible to bring in people who have expertise in certain areas. For example, some participants wanted to have an external expert on negotiations brought in. This may not be feasible for 25 participants, but would be more cost effective if the expert could address 50 people at the same location.

- Not enough time was allotted to the discussion of the Phase 3 project proposals. Participants were seeking guidance to help them complete their projects.

- Facilitators need to explain some activities better and ensure that there is an adequate follow-up discussion to these activities. Some participants wondered if the reason for some of the short discussions was because the facilitator did not know the topic. Other times, the terms used in an activity were vague.

- Although many appreciated the stimulating, engaging and interactive nature of the workshop, several wanted to have more lectures. Those who wanted more lectures tended to be of three types – those who had limited experience and/or had not completed the self-study units thoroughly, older participants who may have been brought up within the traditional lecture environment and those who were concerned about participating in role plays and simulations because they were uncomfortable with their level of English. These latter individuals were a little hesitant in participating in some other activities such as discussions, but with lectures, they could just sit back. All these examples re-emphasise the need to ensure that a variety of activities are presented.

- As an agenda for the workshop was not sent out prior to the workshop, some participants did not know what to expect or prepare for. Some, of course, spoke to their colleagues who had attended previous workshops, but others did not have this type of access.

- Participants want additional time so that they can introduce themselves more thoroughly. They want to be able to not only provide their name, functional title and duty post, but they would also like to outline their experiences and expertise and identify issues that affect them on a daily basis. Thus, the facilitators would have a greater knowledge of the expertise

and experience of the participants and be able to draw upon this information and upon the individuals as the workshop proceeded.

- Many felt that the workshop was too short. Participants wanted more time for a variety of reasons, but the most consistent reasons were that they wanted more time for discussion, reflection and the completion of exercises. They wanted less information to be presented.

- Although this was not a major concern at the Budapest workshop, it was noted by several formally and informally that after their efforts to complete all the assignments and made the effort to travel so far, they were disappointed when they encountered inexperienced facilitators. Responses to the trainers' and facilitators' questionnaire indicate that some trainers would like a more formal mechanism for exchanging ideas among the groups. Perhaps all that is needed is for a best practices section to be added to the facilitators' workshop notes. But others feel more strongly and would appreciate receiving feedback on their performance and would like to receive training. Currently, they have full-time jobs within UNHCR and only a few work for the Protection Capacity Section. Therefore, obtaining support to improve their knowledge and skills can be difficult as it is not seen as a priority by their supervisors. If the UNHCR wants to refer to itself as a learning organization, then it must encourage and support those who want to learn and improve their skills, particularly those who want to be trainers and facilitators within the organization.

Workshop methodology: recommendations

111. Due to the diverse audience, it will always be a challenge to present a workshop that will suit all the participants. Allocating additional time is not always the solution, as no matter how much time is available, there will never be enough to meet everyone's needs. Facilitators who are required to conduct workshops with a diverse audience must be knowledgeable, experienced and flexible in order to adapt the content to conform to participants' backgrounds and expectations. A mixed audience can lead to the cross-fertilisation of ideas and the development of cohesiveness among different working groups within an organization. Below are a few recommendations for consideration.

- **Limit the enrolment for each workshop to 22–25** in order to permit everyone to participate fully in the activities and discussions.

- **Increase the length of the workshop to allow participants to focus on strategizing protection activities and their Phase 3 project.** Additional time may be required for detailed participant introductions and follow-up to workshop activities. However, eliminating an exercise and reorganising the content as described under the content recommendations should make more time available for these latter activities. It is recommended that one day be added to the workshop.

- **Prior to the workshop, distribute an agenda and ask what issues the participants would like to address.** Allow a minimum of two weeks for PLP participants to respond. It must be clearly stated that the workshop is

not a repeat of the self-study component, but rather builds on it. Facilitators could also ask whether individuals had any work-related success stories that they would like to share with the group. If this is done, learners would be better prepared for the workshop and the facilitators would be better prepared to address the needs of the audience.

- **Ensure that the facilitators are knowledgeable about the topics they are discussing and that they have appropriate facilitator training** such as the Facilitation of Learning Programme offered by UNHCR. Participants expend a lot of effort to complete the self-study so they can earn the right to attend the workshop. Many travel great distances in order to attend. They deserve the best. The PLP workshop facilitators may also benefit from sharing their best practices among themselves, as well as with other facilitators who offer UNHCR learning programmes. When UNHCR helps trainers and facilitators be the best they can be, these individuals will help the organization to grow as they nurture others.

- **Offer the workshop in another language.** Written submissions by PLP graduates, in-progress participants and non-completers, as well as hesitancy on the part of some workshop attendees, made it apparent to the evaluators that not all participants were proficient in English. When they study the written programme material at their duty stations, they can work at their own pace, look up words if they need to or ask someone for assistance. This is not possible in a fast-paced workshop environment, especially when a large number of legal or technical terms are used. It may be a challenge to translate all the self-study material and keep it up to date, but it is feasible to hold a workshop in a language other than English. The United Nations officially supports seven languages, yet this training programme is exclusively in English.

Implementing an assessment component

112. Currently, the PLP does not have a formal assessment component. Participants may enrol in the programme without completing a pre-test on their knowledge and skills. They may also proceed from the Phase 1 self-study to the Phase 2 workshop without being formally assessed. They are required to submit answers to exercises according to a tight timeline, but they do not receive individual feedback on these items. Due to its workload, the PLP team reviews each assignment, then e-mails a general response to participants. This e-mail outlines what should be included in the submitted answers and highlights some shortcomings in participants' exercises. It is the responsibility of each participant to compare his or her answers to the general responses sent out by the PLP team. Since people work at different rates, the general comments may be distributed weeks or more after some students have completed the unit. They could now be working two units ahead without having received any feedback. In other cases, learners may receive the general comments before completing an assignment. Participants can also proceed from Phase 2 to the Phase 3 project without being assessed. However, they do receive some guidance regarding their project. Upon the receipt of the completed project, they are awarded a certificate. Throughout this entire process, no formal assessment is conducted, but limited feedback is provided.

113. When PLP graduates, in-progress participants, non-completers and trainers/ facilitators were asked whether there should be a formal assessment of PLP participants, a significant number indicated 'yes', a few said 'maybe' and the remainder 'no'. During interviews, many paused before answering. For them, a formal assessment of a learning programme did not appear to be part of the UNHCR's culture. Strong opinions were stated for and against an assessment. Below are synopses of many of the responses.

> Very few of us like to take examinations, but it is one way an organization enures that individuals have the required knowledge and skills. Examinations can provide a 'level playing field', as standards are set and can be measured. Although input from supervisors is a valid method for evaluating competencies and should be considered when posts are being assigned, supervisory appraisals can be quite subjective and variable. Examinations have a role to play in the maintenance of standards and should be included in UNHCR's assessment repertoire.

<u>Arguments in favour of assessment</u>

- Assessment is needed so that participants know where they stand. Assessment is one way of measuring what people are capable of.

- By assessing graduates, one gives the PLP a credible stature and indicates that the people have actually achieved something.

- One needs to assess graduates in order to ensure that UNHCR standards are maintained.

- Graduating from the PLP should mean that an individual is willing to take on new challenges and responsibilities.

- Graduating from the PLP should mean something to the organization. It should mean that a graduate is qualified to do his or her job.

- The successful completion of the PLP should be linked with career development and promotion.

- People should not be assigned protection posts unless they have completed the PLP.

- The PLP should not be the only activity that includes an assessment component. All new UNHCR staff should be tested.

- An assessment may encourage people to take the PLP more seriously, especially those who just want to travel to attend the workshop.

- The quality of the PLP is suspect if staff who lack English skills are able to graduate. How did they get through all that heavy legal material? What do they really know? The programme needs to offer simplified versions of the readings so that those whose first language is not English have an equitable

chance to learn. Better yet, offer the programme in another language. Then, it would be fair to assess participants.

- Every UNHCR learning programme should have an assessment component.

- The UNHCR needs to more accurately measure the effects of learning programmes. Individuals should be tested before and after they take any learning programme.

- It is UNHCR's responsibility to determine whether staff have suitable skills. Thus, assessment is necessary.

Arguments in opposition to assessment

- Is assessment necessary?

- Exams are archaic evaluation modes.

- This [assessment] is wrong, as fewer people will take the course

- Assessment should not be mandatory, as it will discourage people from enrolling in the programme.

- People will drop out before they have to write a test.

- Testing alone cannot measure someone's capabilities.

- Unless the organization seriously considers the training that people have, there is no need to evaluate programme participants.

- If the organization does not take the PLP seriously, why should its staff?

- Supervisors' workload will increase if they are required to assess PLP participants.

- Supervisors may not be able to provide feedback, as staff move from one position to another while completing the PLP.

- Assessing attitudinal skills is difficult.

- Precise grades are not possible, as there are too many variables involved.

- There are many elements of the PLP that are difficult to evaluate.

- If one is good at completing an exam, this does not mean that one is good at doing the work.

- The PLP is not meant to test knowledge, but to provide tools and skills to help staff better provide protection.

114.   From the above comments, it is apparent that strong opinions exist on both sides of the question. However, a significant majority felt that an assessment was needed so that:

- individuals could assess where they stood,

- the programme and its graduates could gain credibility,

- the organization could maintain standards.

115.   Interestingly, no one specifically mentioned the importance of ensuring that the refugees are provided with effective assistance.

116.   According to Fenwick and Parsons (2000)[24], there are nine reasons for evaluating learners. These are:

- To compare actual learner performance to the goals of the instruction

- To help learners make decisions about their next action

- To monitor students' ongoing progress

- To assess the teaching methods

- To revise the program

- To provide information for other stakeholders

- To assess a learner's background knowledge

- To determine learner satisfaction

- To develop self-assessment in learners

117.   The evaluation team believes that an assessment of the PLP participants would have the following benefits for individuals and the organization:

- Assist participants with their learning. They need to know that they are achieving something. They need a measure of that achievement, either in the form of a simple 'satisfactory' or 'do over' or, preferably, more extensive individualised feedback. When they know where they stand, they will know where they must expend energies in order to improve.

- Monitor the effectiveness of the programme. Currently, no real measure, other than anecdotal evidence, indicates whether the programme objectives are being achieved and if and how they should be adjusted.

- Ascertain whether the instructional methods being used are effective. Perhaps there shouldn't be a workshop, as everything could be achieved via the self-study and the organization could save travel expenses. Perhaps the Phase 3 project does not significantly improve the capabilities of

---

[24] T. Fenwick and J. Parsons. (2000). *The Art of Evaluation: A Handbook for Educators and Trainers.* Toronto, Ontario: Thompson Educational Publishing. p. 15-16.

participants. None of these questions can be answered with some level of certainty without the implementation of an evaluation scheme. The measurements must be done over time. But first, there must be some specific, agreed upon outcomes that can be measured.

- Ensure that standards for providing services to refugees are being met. The real reason for training at the UNHCR should be to improve services to refugees. The organization cannot determine whether training is having an impact on refugees unless it sets standards and measures them over time.

- To add credibility to the programme and assist with career advancement.

118.   Once an agreement regarding the rationale for implementing an assessment is achieved, it is necessary to determine what and how it should be measured.

119.   When the evaluators asked UNHCR staff how a participant assessment should be conducted, they received the suggestions outlined below.

- Ideally, there should be an assessment after the self-study, workshop and field project.

- Participants could be required to write a test after they complete the self-study and before they attend the workshop.

- An oral test could be conducted following the workshop.

- Rather than using written tests to assess achievement, simulations could be conducted to allow people to demonstrate the skills they have gained. Participants could then be graded on a pass or fail scale.

- Assessment should be graded simply – distinction, pass and fail. An individual who fails should pay a fee to take the course again.

- Supervisors need to be involved in providing assessment. They need to do more than record that one has attended a training session.

- The best time to conduct an assessment is after the participants have completed the programme and have had a chance to implement their new knowledge and skills. Perhaps the assessment could be done 3–12 months following the completion of Phase 3.

- PLP assessment should be included as part of the annual assessment conducted by supervisors.

120.   In addition to the above, 88 PLP graduates who completed the PLP questionnaire were asked to indicate how they would assess the performance of PLP participants. Their responses are shown below.

Possible assessment methods	Number of responses	Response ratio
Administer a test at end of each phase	36	41%
Administer a test at the end of the entire programme	26	30%
Conduct an interview by PLP trainers and facilitators	36	41%
Obtain feedback from supervisor during staff assessment	29	33%
Obtain feedback from peers	21	24%
Prepare an essay to be evaluated	20	23%
Other	17	19%

121. A variety of assessment strategies could be employed; there is no consensus regarding a preferred method. At this time, however, it may not be 'fair' for the PLP team to conduct an evaluation until the following concerns are addressed.

- The objectives of the self-study unit are not clear and measurable.

- The unit objectives are not congruent with the activities individuals must complete.

- The self-study units do not contain practice tests that participants can do before they submit an assignment or take a test that is graded.

- Limited feedback is provided to the participants. It is rarely individualised or timely.

- The PLP contains many legal or technical terms and is offered only in English, yet there are many in UNHCR who regard English as a second or even third or fourth language. Will these individuals be provided with comprehensible summaries of this material or a translation? Would their test be translated? Would they be able to take an oral test instead of a written test? There is no easy answer to some of these questions, and it may not be feasible to address them all, but it must be acknowledged that the legal aspects of the PLP programme can be difficult for some to understand. They are not incapable, but they do not understand some of the nuances of the English language. Any assessment must take the language factor into account.

- Objectives for the workshop are not specified. Individuals are unclear about the specific knowledge and skills they are expected to acquire. (This does not imply that they do not learn at the workshop.)

- If supervisors do not permit participants who have completed the self-study units to attend a workshop, what alternatives do the participants have? How will they obtain the knowledge and skills they need to pass an assessment measure?

- Participants receive limited assistance with the Phase 3 implementation project.

- The success of the implementation project is frequently dependent on supervisors and colleagues. What alternative activities can individuals do if they are unable to complete the implementation project?

- The criteria for measuring the success of the Phase 3 project must be reviewed.

122. From a practical viewpoint, it is not in the interest of some staff to do all the work in a programme and pass various assessment measures unless the PLP certificate is taken into account when positions are assigned. Making the certificate a criteria or at least a consideration in assignments would motivate many staff to complete the programme.

123. If we assume that the PLP team has established a rationale for the evaluation and has addressed the 'just' concerns indicated above, then the feasibility of the assessment must be examined. Below are some of the options the evaluation team reviewed.

- A pre-test to measure capabilities upon entering the programme.

- A test after each unit in the self-study phase to measure cognitive levels such as knowledge, application, analysis and problem-solving.

- A comprehensive examination after the self-study that would include a number of case studies.

- A test of knowledge and skills after the workshop, with an emphasis on skill development. This test could have both a written and an oral or demonstration component.

- An evaluation of the field project report for its creativity, feasibility, and impact.

- Appraisal forms completed by supervisors and peers six months to a year after the field project has been submitted. The purpose of this is to assess whether participants actually exhibited a change in behaviour and applied what they had learned.

- An appraisal performed by supervisors as part of the annual assessment process.

- An appraisal conducted by refugees.

- An appraisal conducted by implementing partners.

Implementing an assessment component: recommendations

124. The evaluation team recommends that the assessments below be considered after the content and delivery changes outlined in this report have been implemented.

- **During the self-study phase, four assignments should be submitted for grading.** Individuals would receive notification that they had satisfactorily completed the activity or they would be required to do it over. Feedback would be provided to assist them with their re-write.

- **During Phase 3, individuals would have the option of implementing a project and writing a brief report that is verified by their supervisor or writing an extensive essay about one of the many challenges faced by UNHCR,** such as how to handle mass displacements. The purpose of these exercises is to consolidate knowledge and encourage participants to analyse situations and suggest solutions.

- **Six months after the Phase 3 report or essay is submitted, a supervisor and a peer must complete an appraisal form outlining how the PLP may have helped the individual improve her or his skills or attitudes.** The emphasis here must not be placed on knowledge, as that was addressed in Phase 1. Ideally, the supervisors and peers would have taken the PLP themselves. The supervisors must play a key role as coaches or mentors and respect the time it takes for individuals to complete Phases 1 and 3.

125. The evaluation team considers the above suggestions to be feasible and congruent with the non-examination culture that seems to pervade UNHCR. At some point, however, the organization may want to consider implementing the following measures:

- A **comprehensive examination** after the completion of the self-study units or the workshop phase. The evaluators strongly believe that it is the right of every refugee to be assisted by individuals who know and are able to apply the humanitarian principles by which the UNHCR operates, international refugee law, and international humanitarian law. At a minimum, they should also be able to demonstrate good analytical and communication or consultation skills. Mechanics, physical therapists, dental assistants, nurses and lawyers all require some form of certification that they are competent in their positions. Shouldn't those who make significant decisions about the lives of refugees and other persons of concern to the UNHCR also provide proof of their competencies? Shouldn't the organization monitor its staff to ensure that they are providing accurate information and guidance?

- A **challenge examination** that would allow those who have extensive experience and a legal background to prove that they already have the basic knowledge and skills and do not need to take the programme.

126. The organization already has several systems in place to monitor and provide recognition to staff who make the effort to improve themselves, but according to several people who were interviewed by the evaluation team, these were not taken seriously. For example, fact sheets were not current, supervisors paid only lip service to the annual appraisals and the organization did not give adequate consideration to training when postings were assigned. Staff can be allocated two hours of work time to study for a recognized course, but not all supervisors permit this and as a result some staff feel that the organization does not value learning.

127. Although assessment is not easy to do, the organization cannot shrug its responsibility to ensure that staff are well trained and able to do perform their jobs effectively. It may cost the organization a significant amount to implement some of the suggestions in this report, but if they are not implemented, what is the cost to refugees who may receive incorrect advice and poor service?

Management of the PLP

128. The overall management of the PLP is the responsibility of Protection Capacity Section. In addition to the PLP, the Protection Capacity Section is responsible for the management of other learning programmes and activities. Currently, the PLP is managed by the three staff described below.

Title	Grade	Function
Senior Training Officer	P4	30% work-time devoted to the overall supervision of the PLP
Training Officer	P3	100% work-time devoted to specific follow up of all managerial and substantive aspects of implementation of the PLP.
Protection Training Clerk	G4	100% work-time devoted to administrative support to the overall organization of the PLP.

129. An Associate Training Officer supported the Protection Capacity Section and the PLP on a temporary basis, in particular, with substantive reviews of the contents of the programme, design of workshops, facilitation and other tasks as required. The Protection Capacity Section also receives temporary support from administrative staff during the peak months in which workshops are conducted and the self-study phase is completed. Other section staff provide additional ad-hoc support as required.

130. Currently, there are two cycles of the PLP per year, each with more than 180/200 participants. This represents two major peak periods for the organization of the workshops, provision and distribution of programme material and feedback to participants. The main reasons provided to justify these two cycles are the northern/western holiday schedule and internal UNHCR operational priorities.

Management of the PLP: recommendations

131. The current PLP team is overwhelmed by the quantity of work that it must do in order to support 240 PLP participants each year. As stated during interviews with PLP graduates, in-progress participants and non-completers and reflected by almost 200 responses to the evaluation questionnaire, the team is not able to provide the frequent, timely and individualised feedback that participants need in order to complete the programme successfully. The provision of quality feedback is essential to the programme. The PLP team has valiantly tried to keep pace with the increasing workload by limiting the intake of students to twice each year, providing limited individualised feedback, providing general feedback via a listserv and arranging for peer e-mail groups to support participants. These attempts have not been very

successful, as attested to by the individuals the evaluation team interviewed and responses to the evaluation questionnaires. Thus, the Protection Capacity Section must decide either to reduce the number of participants in the programme each year or to add additional resources to the department. If the number of participants is reduced each year, fewer personnel will have access to this vital UNHCR programme. The evaluation team therefore recommends that:

- **The current duties of the PLP team members be reviewed**, and where possible those duties that do not pertain to offering and supporting the PLP and Thematic Protection Programmes be off-loaded elsewhere. Within the job descriptions there must be a clear statement as to the role of each individual regarding handling participants' requests and providing feedback. This does not mean that everyone has to perform all functions, but it does mean that someone must be responsible for providing this support in a timely manner. Effective tutoring must be a priority for someone. Ally (2000)[25] describes the various tutoring roles that must be executed to manage the learning process, motivate learners, solve content problems, conduct formative evaluations, facilitate learning, address personal problems, manage delivery, perform administrative functions and enforce appropriate ethical behaviour.

- **Additional resources be added** to the team so that it can maintain, and under ideal conditions, increase the number of PLP participants each year. Any additional resources should primarily be focussed on providing frequent, timely and effective feedback in Phase 1 and supporting and guiding participants through Phase 3. Below are a number of options that can be considered.

  - Ensure that the Training Officer position is filled by a qualified protection professional with extensive teaching or training experience. This is a feasible option, but by itself it will not completely resolve the issue regarding the current workload.

  - Develop an internal protection roster comprising staff who are between assignments (SIBAs) and other protection staff to assist with feedback during peak periods. This option may not provide the continuity that PLP participants expect, as, their first assignment could be reviewed by one person and the second assignment by another who may have different standards. Providing that a SIBA could be assigned for an entire cycle (usually equivalent to a year), this option does have an advantage in that it can expose participants to people who have recently been working in the field.

  - Create an additional Protection Training Officer position with specific responsibilities for the provision of feedback to PLP participants. **This is the option preferred by the evaluators.**

  - Outsource the feedback to a protection-experienced agency such as the International Rescue Committee (IRC). This option should be

---

25 M. Ally. (2000). Tutoring Skills for Distance Education. *Open Praxis*, Volume 1, pp. 31-34.

considered only as a last resort, given that UNHCR staff would expect UNHCR experts to provide the quality feedback.

If additional resources are not added to the PLP team, the team will have to reduce the number of participants it accepts each year in order to provide the individualised feedback that past and current participants demand. This would not be an acceptable solution, as twice as many people currently apply to take the programme as can be accommodated. A reduction of the enrolment would only increase the frustration of those who want to take the training but are prevented from doing so. Even worse, refugees will continue to receive services from individuals who are not as knowledgeable and skilled as they should be and can be.

- **Adequate administrative support be provided**, particularly during the peak weeks that precede a workshop. A more systematic approach to temporary assistance should be established.

- **The criteria for selecting those who are admitted to the programme be reviewed and then published openly.** The criteria may specify, for example, that those who are in a protection position will receive priority, those with less than three years of protection experience will have priority, those who have had their short-term contract with UNHCR renewed three times will be considered and/or, in order to ensure a mixture of people in attendance, 'x' number of positions will be allocated for each type of individual (based on current duties, experience, location and so forth). Once established, these criteria should be used to select a maximum of 30 students per cycle. These actions will lead to a more transparent selection process and improve the quality of participants' experience.

- **Consideration be given to having three or four instead of two intakes each year.** Thus, the registration of students and the workshop and associated travel arrangements would be distributed throughout the year rather than concentrated at two peak periods. This arrangement would reduce the challenges encountered when tutoring large number of participants at the same time[26]. Further, multiple intakes will increase accessibility to the programme. Obviously, this revised arrangement must take into account regional practices and operational requirements.

Linkage of the PLP with other learning programmes

132.   One of the ways the PLP can ensure that it sets and maintains quality standards is by linking with other UNHCR learning programmes to share best practices and ensure that participants receive the best quality of training, support and services. There appears to be some linkage now, but these links could be strengthened.

133.   The UNHCR supports a series of learning programmes and activities that range from operational training such as emergency management to generic skills such as facilitation and writing. Generic or managerial training is normally

---

[26] H. Lentell and J. O'Rourke. (2004). Tutoring Large Numbers: An Unmet Challenge. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*. April.
 http://www.irrodl.org/content/v5.1/lentell_orourke.html

supported and organised by the Staff Development Section (SDS), and specific technical and operational training are undertaken by the respective units and sections. SDS provides the overall coordination and support.

134. UNHCR has three core learning programmes: the Operations Management Learning Programme (OMLP), the Management Learning Programme (MLP), and the Protection Learning Programme (PLP). The three programmes target a similar audience from senior general service to P5 and above. The programmes have similar designs and structures, but their contents differ.

135. Overall coordination should exist between the different learning activities. But the connections are unclear or they have not been communicated to staff. UNHCR staff want to know how programmes were linked – should they take one programme before taking another? Are there other options that are available? Can they be involved in the development of learning opportunities?

136. The UNHCR *Learning Policy and Guidelines* (August 2003) are relevant to the establishment of learning practices and principles. Nevertheless, they appear to fall short, as they do not ensure that minimum standards or common practices are interwoven into the different learning programmes and activities. Issues related to selection criteria for learning, recommended pedagogic practices, assessment, provision of feedback, rewards, sanctions and an appeal process are not mentioned in the policy and guidelines. These important aspects of methodology and pedagogic standards are left to the unit or section provider of training, thus uncoordinated and contradictory practices have been implemented.

137. In addition to the above, other aspects of content and methodology do not appear to be regularly checked within and between the different programmes. Several people who have taken various learning programmes noted the repetition and lack of creativity in the exercises, methodologies and workshop practices. Additionally, there is no proper recording and follow up of training activities undertaken by staff members. Reportedly, a new database is to be introduced that will ensure all training is promptly recorded. This will address a complaint voiced by a significant number of PLP graduates and those who were classified as non-completers when in fact they had completed the programme.

138. While reviewing the PLP, the evaluation team noted the need for additional coordination with other learning activities undertaken outside and within the Department of International Protection. These would include Protection Capacity Section's organised training, as well as training provided by other sections such as Resettlement. Additional support and coordination are required for the provision of training, the sharing of lists of participants and facilitators and so forth. As can be discerned from the above, both the organization and individuals would benefit from stronger links between programmes.

Linkages with other UNHCR learning programmes: recommendations

139. Based on the interviews conducted and the observations made while reviewing programmes and their relationships, the recommendations below are submitted for consideration.

- The UNHCR could **revise its learning policy and guidelines to ensure common or standard practices are employed** regarding practices such as selection criteria, feedback, assessment and rewards.

- **The terms of reference of the existing learning committees or similar coordinating bodies should be clarified** to provide authority to ensure the implementation of common practices and standards.

- **The role of Staff Development Services should be strengthened,** without undermining the specialisation of training providers, to ensure that minimum pedagogic practices are in place and implemented by the different sections.

- **UNHCR training programmes should have a transparent selection process** that takes into account criteria such as the length of service, future potential within UNHCR, pre-requisite skills and pre-testing. Issues such as those related to rotation must be resolved. For example, in several cases, PLP non-completers received support from a supervisor to start the PLP but were later assigned to a different post where the supervisor did not allow them to attend the workshop or finish their Phase 3 project. These individuals become frustrated and sometimes resentful. .

- **The Department of International Protection should review its coordination practices regarding its training activities, workshops and courses.** Particular attention should be given to establishing a field-based capacity for training external actors and partners in a more systematic manner.

- **A more detailed review of the common and repetitive methodologies of the existing UNHCR learning programmes should be conducted**. As indicated above, participants complained about the repetitive exercises and similar methodologies used in the different learning programmes.

Conclusion

140. Brief answers to each of the evaluation questions are provided below. The rationale for each of the conclusions is presented in the preceding Discussion and Recommendation section.

Has participation in the PLP had an impact on the staff members' knowledge, skills and attitudes?

141.   The PLP has a definite impact on an individuals' knowledge of protection and the UNHCR mandate. PLP graduates are more knowledgeable about and confident in carrying out the UNHCR mandate. They tend to be less hesitant, ask broader and deeper questions and know where they can find the information they need to address a problem. Some have improved their analytical, research, communication and team-building skills, but the effects of the PLP on participants' skills and attitudes are less pronounced than its significant impact on knowledge. Note that the impact on individual graduates varied widely, as they entered the programme with different levels of education and experience. Some had law degrees and others did not. About 40% of the graduates had less than five years' experience with UNHCR, while 25% had been with the organization for 10 years or more. Despite these variances, when asked whether they would recommend the programme to a colleague, 100% of the 84 graduates who answered the question said 'yes'.

Has the PLP had an impact on the effective protection of refugees and other persons of concern to UNHCR?

142.   Although a direct link between the completion of the PLP and the effect on the protection of refugees was not made during this study, PLP graduates, supervisors and peers indicated that PLP graduates were better informed about the UNHCR mandate and the issues affecting refugees than were non-participants. Supervisors and peers reported that the PLP nurtures enthusiasm and renews individuals' interest in their jobs and protection issues in general. Non-governmental organizations also recognised the benefits of having trained protection officers in the field. It can be inferred that if the individuals and the duty stations in which they work are affected by the outcomes of the PLP, the refugees benefit. However, the evaluation team suggests that the UNHCR must make additional efforts to actually measure the impact of its services on refugees. It is easy to measure how many refugees are fed and how many blankets are distributed, but it is more challenging to measure the quality and effectiveness of human services. The evaluation team made the attempt, but due to logistical difficulties, it was not able to carry out a direct impact assessment within the brief duration of the study.

Can the PLP be improved?

143.   Overall, the contents of the different phases of the PLP are comprehensive and in general appropriate for participants. Nevertheless, the evaluation team proposes

that five scenarios be considered in order to make the PLP more effective. The scenarios describe how the PLP could be altered to best meet the needs of UNHCR and its staff. Scenario A presents the essential alterations that should be made to the programme. It requires the fewest resources to implement. Scenario B describes the division of the current PLP into an induction course and a protection course or programme. This scenario has the potential to address all of the concerns raised by PLP participants and graduates. Scenarios C and E are enhancements of Scenarios A and B. Note that the scenarios are arranged in order of the increasing amount of resources required to implement them.

Scenario A

144.   The following changes should be made to improve the current version of the PLP:

- Provide individualised, timely feedback. This was the major concern raised by graduates, in-progress participants, non-completers and workshop attendees. It must be addressed. Currently, limited individualised feedback is provided. General feedback is provided to groups of learners, but there can be lengthy delays between when an item is submitted and the receipt of feedback. Additional resources must be added to the PLP team. If not, fewer participants should be admitted to the programme.

- Adjust the content in self-study units 1–4 to form two units and place several topics under a heading such as Persons of Concern.

- Reduce the number of assignments that must be reviewed by the PLP team or tutors. Perhaps only four assignments should be submitted, but participants should still be provided with numerous exercises that they can check themselves or with colleagues. These exercises should require different levels of effort on the part of the participants. Some should be appropriate for those with limited protection experience and others should be appropriate for those with extensive experience.

- Remove repetitious reading material in the self-study phase and include recent academic or non-UNHCR material on issues related to UNHCR's mandate. Participants should be exposed to different points of view, as they are likely to be involved with other agencies and organizations when they are at their duty stations.

- Provide simplified summaries of complex material in order to assist those who do not have a legal background and/or whose first language is not English.

- Allow participants to submit their assignments online. All duty stations do not have this capability, but more than half do and the numbers are increasing each year. Electronic forms of the assignment sheets can easily be provided. The Track Change feature in Microsoft Word can be used to make comments on the participants' submissions. This will not require the level of connectivity that is required for e-learning.

- Include an assessment component comprising the self-study exercises (each submitted assignment would be graded), the successful completion of the Phase 3 field project and assessment reports by a supervisor and one peer 6 months after the completion of the three phases. If individuals have extensive experience and want credit without enrolling in the programme, they must pass a comprehensive challenge examination comprising written and oral components.

- Increase the time allocation for completing the self-study modules from six months to eight months. (Note that this change would only be necessary if the suggested content changes are not made and individualised, timely feedback is not provided.)

- Increase the length of the workshop by one day to allow additional time for participants to discuss and develop protection strategies and seek feedback and advice regarding their Phase 3 field projects. Considering the effort and resources that are required to mount the workshop and cover the travel expenses for the participants, the cost of extending the workshop by one day is negligible. This extra day will be extremely useful for the participants.

- Provide additional guidance and support while participants work on their Phase 3 projects. Supervisors should assume a more active role during this phase. It cannot be overemphasized that supervisors have the responsibility to nurture and support staff in their learning. Further, those staff who are well-trained require less support in the field than those who have limited knowledge and skills.

- Implement an online listserv or refresher course or workshop that will keep PLP graduates informed about relevant changes in UNHCR policies and outline new protection techniques. It should include best practices from around the globe. A community of practice could be established to support graduates and encourage the sharing of ideas and practical tips.

- Engage a PLP committee to review the PLP content and participant feedback on an annual basis. This committee should have representation from the Protection Capacity Section of the Department of International Protection and UNHCR units such as those involved in legal matters, programme and resettlement.

Scenario B

145. The PLP could be divided into an induction and a protection course.

- The induction would be available online and in a compact-disc format. This induction programme could be part of the planned 'Welcome to the UN' compact disc, but it would be preferable to make it a separate disc. It would focus on UNHCR and emphasize its activities and the protection of refugees and other persons of concern. It would be mandatory for all UNHCR staff. In addition to the basic induction, if there are adequate resources and where there are sufficient numbers, consideration should be given to holding a one-day induction workshop to allow for experience

sharing, team building, updates on current and future UNHCR initiatives and the opportunity to meet UNHCR leaders.

- The protection course would be mandatory for protection, programme, resettlement and field officers, as well as public information staff. It would be optional for everyone else. It would be based on the current PLP programme, but more advanced activities would be added.

- The management of protection could be offered as a short module within the Thematic Protection Learning Programme.

Refer also to the comments associated with the next question, which asks whether the PLP should be mandatory.

Scenario C

146.   The PLP should be available in two additional languages, French and Spanish. This could be considered as complementary to Scenario A or B above. However, it may be feasible to offer only the workshop in additional languages. The United Nations conducts its business in seven languages, yet the PLP is restricted to one. Language should not be a barrier to learning in international organizations.

Scenario D

147.   The PLP could be converted into a format similar to that of the Management Learning Programme (MLP), in which the content and activities are modularised. This format would offer flexibility and provide opportunities for staff to specialise. Note that the MLP was previously known as the Middle-Management Learning Programme (MMLP).

Scenario E

148.   An e-learning version of the PLP could be developed that makes the best use of telecommunications technologies and the interactive and just-in-time learning capabilities of the Internet. The e-learning version would be based on the content in Scenarios A or B above.

149.   Although some may be hesitant in implementing e-learning, a form of distance education, it should be noted that 'there is no significant difference in the achievement of students in well-designed distance learning programs and the achievement of those in traditional face-to-face programs, based on standard performance measures'[27] [28]. As reported by Chute, Thompson and Hancock (1999), below are 10 benefits that organizations have achieved with distance education or e-learning.   Note that many are congruent with UNHCR training needs.

---

[27] A. G. Chute, M. M. Thompson and B. W. Hancock. (1999). *The McGraw-Hill Handbook of Distance Learning*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill. p. 15.

[28] T. L. Russel. (1999). *The No Significant Difference Phenomenon*. Chapel Hill, NC: Office of Instructional Telecommunications, North Carolina University.
 http://cuda.teleeducation.nb.ca/nosignificantdifference/

1. Distance learning increases the impact and productivity of dollars invested in training and education programs.
2. Distance learning reduces travel costs and makes time formerly spent travelling available for more productive purposes.
3. Distance learning allows the training of more people, more often, in short learning sessions that are easier to schedule and coordinate.
4. Distance learning is scaleable; it offers the ability to add students and instructors as needed without incurring significant additional expenses.
5. Distance learning programmes deliver a consistent message that can quickly be disseminated company-wide to ensure the consistency and quality of the work performed by employees or students.
6. Distance learning provides for real-time updates and just-in-time information access.
7. Distance learning programs can be delivered to work or home sites that are convenient for students.
8. Distance learning offers live interactive programs that can be delivered to multiple networked sites for group learning and collaborative problem solving.
9. Distance learning programs are learner-centered, affording students more control of the pacing, sequencing, and style of interaction of the learning experience.
10. Distance learning offers easy access to learning resources and remote experts [who are] internal and external to the organization.[29]

150.   However, e-learning may limit access to UNHCR personnel, as all duty stations do not have the necessary telecommunications connectivity. When they do, the quality of the transmission may be unreliable and/or poor. This concern is not an issue if the e-learning course is a glorified page-turner, but good online courses are highly interactive and make full use of the graphic and media capabilities of the Internet. An e-learning version of the PLP could be developed at this time, but it is unlikely to be accessible to those who need it most – those staff assigned to deep duty stations and it will require the expenditure of a significant amount of resources.

151.   If the UNHCR wants to pursue an investigation of the applicability of e-learning to the PLP, it may be helpful to review literature available from the sources below.

- American Society for Training and Development, www.astd.org

- Association for the Advancement of Computers in Education, www.aace.org

- The Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks,

- http://www.sloan-c.org/publications/jaln/index.asp

- Cause/Effect and Educom Review, http://www.educause.edu/

- Commonwealth of Learning, www.col.org

- Distance Education and Training Council, www.detc.org

---

[29] A. G. Chute, M. M. Thompson and B. W. Hancock. (1999). *The McGraw-Hill Handbook of Distance Learning*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill. p. 5-6.

- E-Learning Europa, http://www.elearningeuropa.info/
- European Distance Education Network, www.eden-online.org
- International Council for Open and Distance Education, www.icde.org
- United States Distance Learning Association, www.usdla.org
- Teaching on the Net, www.teachingonthenet.org
- The Web of Asynchronous Learning Networks, www.aln.org
- The World Bank Distance EducatioNet, http://wbweb4.worldbank.org/DistEd/Teaching/design.html

Should the PLP be mandatory for UNHCR staff?

152. In its present form, the PLP should not be mandatory. If it is revised as recommended in this report and learner support issues are addressed, consideration should be given to requiring protection staff to take the programme. The evaluation team recommends that the current programme be split into two as outlined below. Each course or programme would have its own mandatory requirements.

An induction course

153. This course would provide an overview of UNHCR's mandate and activities, as well as introduce the audience to the basics of protection. It would be available online and in a compact disc format. It would be mandatory for all UNHCR staff. If there are adequate resources and where there are sufficient numbers, consideration should be given to holding a one-day induction workshop to allow for experience sharing, team building, updates on current and future UNHCR initiatives and opportunities to meet UNHCR leaders.

A protection course or programme

154. This would be based on the current PLP. In addition to the changes recommended in this report, this new course would include advanced material on protection, as many who are likely to take it will have a legal background and/or extensive experience. The course would be mandatory for protection, programme, resettlement and field officers, as well as public information staff. If the individuals assigned to a protection post have not completed the PLP, they should be required to do so within the first three years of their assignment. If the staff believe that they already have the knowledge and skills that the course offers, they should be able to take a rigorous challenge examination. The exam should contain written and oral components so that individuals can demonstrate skills such as effective consultation with refugees and other persons of concern to UNHCR. If they pass the exam, they would not be required to take the course.

155. Regardless of the format taken by the PLP or any learning programme within UNHCR, learning must be perceived as being mandatory. Everyone should be encouraged to improve themselves continuously. Learning should not be seen as something that interferes with daily work, rather it should be considered as a vital element of the organization. It must be fully supported by supervisors and other decision makers. Once staff perceive that the organization is implementing existing

learning guidelines fairly and that the completion of learning programmes are seriously considered in any career advancement proceedings, learning will become mandatory.

Can the PLP be used or modified to support the protection interests and roles of key UNHCR stakeholders?

156. Yes, the PLP can be used to meet the training interests of key UNHCR stakeholders. However, it is currently very UNHCR-oriented. If it were to be used for stakeholders, additional resources would have to be added to the self-study and workshop components, including a glossary of UNHCR terms, an explanation of UNHCR approaches and readings that present diverse points of view regarding protection. Further, it must be recognised that discussions among UNHCR personnel may be inhibited if externals are present at the workshop. Despite the benefits of cross-fertilisation that would be derived from having a mixed audience, given the high demand for the PLP within UNHCR, the Protection Capacity Section should focus on targeting UNHCR staff rather than expanding the programme to an external audience.

Additional comments

157. The UNHCR, particularly the Protection Capacity Section, should be commended for its efforts to improve the quality of training that it provides its staff. However, some changes **must** be made to the PLP so that it can better serve UNHCR staff and ultimately enable them to provide better services to refugees. Also, the programme must reflect best practices in distance learning. Considering the mandate and size of the organization, it is essential that additional resources be provided to the Protection Capacity Section so it can ensure that those who directly serve refugees have the knowledge and skills they need. Adequate learning programmes are essential to maintain and refresh the knowledge and skills of UNHCR staff.

158. It is imperative that UNHCR improve its coordination of learning programmes in order to remove any overlaps in content and delivery and inform its constituents about all the learning opportunities offered by the organization and how they are linked.

159. Supervisors must recognise the importance of training themselves and having trained and qualified staff. They must be willing to support their colleagues in their training efforts and actively participate in the role of coach or mentor. Once staff have successfully completed UNHCR or other training, this should be taken into account when career appointments are made or posts are assigned. It is an irony in the humanitarian world that the most challenging places need the best people. The organization must not shy away from its responsibility to ensure that its staff are well-trained and able to do their jobs effectively. Refugees count on qualified personnel to provide guidance and make decisions that significantly affect their lives. We must always keep in mind the trust that refugees have in UNHCR personnel.

Appendices

A. Questions used during the PLP interviews

A primary focus of all interviews was the impact of the PLP on the individual and the organisation: Does the PLP help UNHCR and its employees to work more effectively?

Graduates
1. Why did you decide to take the PLP?
2. Did it meet your expectations?
3. How did the programme affect your knowledge, skills, and attitudes?
4. What did you like the most about the programme?
5. What did you like least?
6. How would you change the programme?
7. Should an assessment component be added?
8. Should the PLP be mandatory for everyone? Do you think the PLP targets the appropriate audience?

Non-Completers and In-Progress
1. Why did you decide to take the PLP?
2. When did you start the PLP?
3. At what point did you feel that you were not making progress? Why? Was support an issue?
4. Of what you covered, what did you like the least?
5. What did you like the most?
6. Would you add an assessment component to the programme?
7. Under what conditions would you re-start your PLP studies?

Non-Involved (Non-Enrollees)
The questions below were addressed to those who could and/or should have taken the PLP.
1. Are you aware of the PLP?
2. What perceptions do you have about the programme? What have you heard about the PLP?
3. Why haven't you taken the PLP?
4. Is there anything UNHCR could do to encourage you to enroll or support your enrolment in the programme?
5. What are your learning needs?
6. What courses or programmes have you taken at UNHCR?

Facilitators and Trainers
1. How successful is the workshop in helping participants change their knowledge, skills, and attitudes pertaining to protection?
2. Is the content appropriate for the intended audience?
3. Are the delivery methods appropriate for the subject matter and the audience?
4. What do you like most about the programme?
5. What do you like least about the programme?
6. What changes would you make to the workshop objectives, content, and delivery methods?
7. Should there be an assessment component in the workshop? In the PLP?
8. Is the workshop suitable for other UNHCR stakeholders? NGO personnel?

9. How would you change the workshop to accommodate a broader range of people?

B1. Questionnaire for programme graduates

INSTRUCTIONS

This survey is one component of the evaluation of the UNHCR's Protection Learning Programme (PLP). The results of this evaluation will enable UNHCR to assess the effects of the learning programme on PLP participants and its impact on UNHCR protection delivery functions.

We are seeking your honest opinion to all questions asked. When responding to open response questions or providing free-text responses, a point form response is acceptable.

Please complete and return this questionnaire to Dr. Clayton R. Wright at **wrightc@unhcr.org** by Friday, **November 19, 2004**.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your responses to this questionnaire will be treated confidentially by the evaluators, Clayton Wright and Felipe Camargo (camargo@unhcr.org). Unless you supply specific contact information such as your name and address, your responses will be treated anonymously.

BASIC DATA (Questions 1-4)

Sex
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

Grade
- ☐ G5 or above
- ☐ NOA/B/C
- ☐ P2/P3
- ☐ P4/P5
- ☐ Other

Functional Title at UNHCR:

Length of service at UNHCR
- ☐ 1 – 3 years
- ☐ 3 – 5 years
- ☐ 5 –10 years
- ☐ More than 10 years

QUESTIONS

5. Why did you enroll in the Protection Learning Programme? (Check all that apply.)
   - ☐ To enhance my understanding of UNHCR's mandate for international protection
   - ☐ To perform my job more effectively
   - ☐ To help me serve refugees better
   - ☐ To enable me to take on new responsibilities

☐ To prepare me for my new protection role
☐ To improve my chances of getting a protection post in the future
☐ To increase self-confidence
☐ To enhance my resume and personal fact sheet
☐ To meet other people with similar interests
☐ To exchange ideas and share professional experiences
☐ To comply with my supervisor's request
☐ Other, please explain below.

6. Has the programme been relevant to your area of work?
   ☐ Very relevant
   ☐ Partially relevant
   ☐ Not relevant

7. Rate the programme relative to the extent to which it increased your **legal knowledge and understanding** of the protection areas listed below.

Subject Areas	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
General protection knowledge				
International refugee law				
Asylum and refugee status determination (RSD) procedures				
Statelessness				
Resettlement				
Internally displaced persons (IDPs)				
Voluntary repatriation and reintegration				
International humanitarian law				
Human rights				
Women's and children's rights				

8. Rate the programme relative to the extent to which it advanced your **skills** in the areas listed below.

Subject Areas	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Communication skills				
Interviewing skills				

Presentation skills				
Analytical skills				
Negotiation skills				
Team-building skills				

9. Rate the programme relative to the extent to which it increased your **confidence** in applying the approaches identified below.

Approach/methodology	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Rights-based approach to protection				
Gender and age mainstreaming				
Prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence and persecution				
Community development approach				
Consultation with refugees				
Team-based approach to problem solving				

10. Did the Phase 3 project help you to consolidate your learning and apply the knowledge, skills, and attitudes you acquired while taking the programme?
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

    If no, please explain your response.

11. What did you like **most** about the programme?

12. What did you like **least** about the programme?

13. What did you learn that you did not expect to learn?

14. Rate the overall quality of the programme.
   ☐ Excellent
   ☐ Good
   ☐ Fair
   ☐ Poor

15. Rate the learning effectiveness of each of the three phases of the programme.

Phase	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Self-Study				
Workshop				
Phase 3 Project				

16. Rate the difficulty level of each phase of the programme?

Phase	Very Difficult	Difficult	About Right	Easy
Self-Study				
Workshop				
Phase 3 Project				

17. How much of the assigned readings did you actually read?

Readings	All	Most	Some	None
Mandatory				
Supplementary				

18. Did you need outside assistance or resources to complete any of the following?
    - ☐ Self-study
    - ☐ Workshop
    - ☐ Phase 3 project

    If yes, what type of assistance or resources did you obtain?

19. What helped you to complete the programme? (Check all that apply.)
    - ☐ Personal motivation
    - ☐ Quality of the programme
    - ☐ PLP online listserv
    - ☐ PLP moderator
    - ☐ Peer support
    - ☐ Supervisor support
    - ☐ Need to apply it directly to my work
    - ☐ Need to prepare for future job responsibilities
    - ☐ Obtaining a translation of some of the material
    - ☐ None of the above
    - ☐ Other, please explain.

20. Rate the following aspects of the **administration** of the programme.

Activity	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Applying and registering for the programme				
Obtaining your supervisor's support				
Receiving the materials				

Receiving feedback on the assignments				
Arranging and coordinating workshop attendance				
Receiving certificate and recording on fact sheet				

21. Were any of your needs **unmet** by the programme?
    ☐   Yes
    ☐   No

    If yes, what were your unmet needs?

22. How would you change the programme content, delivery, activities, and resources?
    What specific items would you add or drop in each phase of the programme?

Content
Delivery
Activities
Resources

23. How would you assess the performance of PLP graduates? (Check all that apply.)
    ☐   Administer a test at end of each phase
    ☐   Administer a test at the end of the entire programme
    ☐   Conduct an interview by PLP trainers and facilitators
    ☐   Obtain feedback from supervisor during staff assessment
    ☐   Obtain feedback from peers
    ☐   Prepare an essay to be evaluated
    ☐   Other, please explain.

24. How long did it take you to complete various phases of the programme?

Phase	1-3 Months	4-6 Months	7-9 Months	10-12 Months	More than 12 Months
Self-Study					
Project					

25. Now that you have completed the programme, **how have you changed**? What have you done with the knowledge and skills you have obtained? What can you do now that you couldn't do before? How has consultation with and assistance to refugees been improved?

26. What has made or will make it difficult for you to apply what you have learned in the PLP? (Check all that apply.)
    □ Delay between completing the PLP and using my new skills
    □ Lack of resources
    □ Lack of protection strategy
    □ Pressure of workload
    □ Work-related emergency situations
    □ Negative attitude of colleagues
    □ Unsupportive supervisor
    □ Unsupportive management practices
    □ Unsupportive local authorities
    □ Unsupportive government
    □ Presence of military
    □ Cultural pressures
    □ Other, please explain.

27. What was the greatest benefit of the programme? (Check your top **three** benefits.)
    □ Better understanding of UNHCR's mandate for international protection
    □ Ability to perform my job more effectively
    □ Ability to serve refugees better
    □ Ability to take on new responsibilities
    □ Better preparation for my new protection post
    □ Improved my chances of obtaining a protection post in the future
    □ Personal development and increased self-confidence
    □ Enhanced resume and personal fact sheet
    □ Meeting other people with similar interests

☐ Exchanging ideas and shared professional experiences
☐ A satisfied supervisor
☐ Other, please explain.

┌───┐
│   │
│   │
│   │
└───┘

28. Which of the following would you suggest that UNHCR implement in its efforts to improve the impact of the PLP? (Check all that apply.)
☐ Restrict the programme only to those who have or soon will have a direct protection responsibility
☐ Make the programme compulsory for UNHCR professional (NOA to P5) and general (G5-G7) staff
☐ Open the programme to non-government organization (NGO) partners in order to increase the diversity of experience being shared and to encourage collaboration
☐ Offer core programme and optional units of study
☐ Offer a more flexible schedule for completing each phase of the programme
☐ Allow individuals to take any units or modules of study when they need them
☐ Develop an online or e-learning version of the PLP
☐ Offer the programme in another official UN language such as French
☐ Provide certification upon the successful completion of specified units of study and/or activities
☐ Assess the performance of participants during and/or after programme completion
☐ Increase supervisor involvement
☐ Take into consideration the successful completion of the programme when individuals apply for jobs or postings
☐ Other, please add your suggestions below.

┌───┐
│   │
│   │
│   │
└───┘

29. Would you recommend this programme to a colleague?
☐ Yes
☐ No

Why?

┌───┐
│   │
│   │
│   │
└───┘

30. If you have any additional suggestions for improving the programme, please use the space below to tell us about them.

Thank you for taking the time to express your views!

Please remember to send you completed questionnaire to **wrightc@unhcr.org** by **November 19, 2004**. If you are submitting a completed Microsoft Word version of the questionnaire, do not complete the online Zoomerang version.

B2. Non-completers/in-progress questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS

This survey is one component of the evaluation of the UNHCR's Protection Learning Programme (PLP). The results of this evaluation will enable UNHCR to assess the effects of the learning programme on PLP participants and its impact on UNHCR protection delivery functions.

We are seeking your honest opinion to all questions asked. When responding to open response questions or providing free-text responses, a point form response is acceptable.

Please complete and return this questionnaire to Dr. Clayton R. Wright at **wrightc@unhcr.org** by Friday, **November 19, 2004**.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your responses to this questionnaire will be treated confidentially by the evaluators, Felipe Camargo (camargo@unhcr.org) and Clayton Wright. Unless you supply specific contact information such as your name and address, your responses will be treated anonymously.

BASIC DATA (Questions 1-4)

Sex
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

Grade
- ☐ G5 or above
- ☐ NOA/B/C
- ☐ P2/P3
- ☐ P4/P5
- ☐ Other

Functional Title at UNHCR:

Length of service at UNHCR
- ☐ 1 - 3 years
- ☐ 3 - 5 years
- ☐ 5 -10 years
- ☐ More than 10 years

QUESTIONS

5. Why did you enroll in the Protection Learning Programme? (Check all that apply.)
- ☐ To enhance my understanding of UNHCR's mandate for international protection
- ☐ To perform my job more effectively
- ☐ To help me serve refugees better
- ☐ To enable me to take on new responsibilities
- ☐ To prepare me for my new protection role

☐ To improve my chances of getting a protection post in the future
☐ To increasing self-confidence
☐ To enhance my resume and personal fact sheet
☐ To meet other people with similar interests
☐ To exchange ideas and share professional experiences
☐ To comply with my supervisor's request
☐ Other, please explain

6. Was the programme relevant to your area of work?
☐ Very relevant
☐ Partially relevant
☐ Not relevant

7. Was the content of the programme difficult to understand (complex or technical language, too much jargon, or content that was too abstract.)
☐ Very difficult
☐ Difficult
☐ About right
☐ Easy

8. Which part of the programme was the most difficult to complete?

☐ Self-Study
Which units?

☐ Workshop
Which topics?

9. What are your preferred learning methods? (Check your top **three** methods.)
☐ Lectures and guest speakers
☐ Readings
☐ Workbooks
☐ Brainstorming and discussions
☐ Case studies
☐ Role plays and simulations
☐ Field trips
☐ Projects
☐ Team projects
☐ Technology (e.g., CD-ROM, Internet, and videos)

10. Overall, how did you find the quality of the contents of the programme?
☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Poor
☐ Very poor

11. Did taking the programme have any impact on your knowledge, skills, or attitude?
   □   Yes
   □   No

   If your answer to question 7 is yes, please explain and provide an example of how you applied any changes to your knowledge, skills, or attitudes.

   ┌───┐
   │   │
   │   │
   │   │
   │   │
   └───┘

12. Why did you **not** complete the PLP? (Check all that apply.)
   □   PLP required me to do more work than I expected.
   □   I needed individualized feedback and encouragement.
   □   Feedback was delayed.
   □   Material arrived late.
   □   Material was difficult to understand.
   □   The self-study material had too many components (e.g., print materials, videos, and CD-ROMs).
   □   I wasn't interested in the material.
   □   My workload prevented me from devoting enough time to study.
   □   I was unable to work effectively on my own.
   □   Personal reasons such as illness made it impossible for me to continue.
   □   The PLP is irrelevant to my current post.
   □   My post, assignment, or mission changed.
   □   I lacked support from my supervisor.
   □   The PLP took too much effort for the recognition received.
   □   The quality of the programme was poor.
   □   I never stopped taking the programme. I am just behind schedule.
   □   Others, please explain.

   ┌───┐
   │   │
   │   │
   │   │
   │   │
   └───┘

13. Would you complete or undertake the programme again if you are given a chance?
   □   Yes
   □   No

   Why?

   ┌───┐
   │   │
   │   │
   │   │
   │   │
   └───┘

14. What do you need that will help you undertake the programme again? (Check all that apply.)
    □ A simpler and shorter version of PLP
    □ More background knowledge
    □ A translation of the material into a language that I am proficient in
    □ More experience
    □ More time
    □ Additional support from PLP team
    □ Additional support from my supervisor
    □ Additional support from peers
    □ A protection-related assignment
    □ More recognition
    □ Greater commitment to my personal development
    □ Other, please explain.

15. Do you believe that PLP should be mandatory for all UNHCR staff?
    □ Yes
    □ No

    Why?

16. Please provide additional recommendations on how the PLP could be improved.

Thank you for taking the time to express your views!

Please remember to send you completed questionnaire to wrightc@unhcr.org by **November 19, 2004**. If you are submitting a completed Microsoft Word version of the questionnaire, do not complete the online Zoomerang version.

B3. Workshop attendees' questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS
This survey is one component of the evaluation of the UNHCR's Protection Learning Programme (PLP). The results of this evaluation will enable UNHCR to assess the effects of the learning programme on PLP participants and its impact on UNHCR protection delivery functions.

We are seeking your honest opinion to all questions asked. When responding to open response questions or providing free-text responses, a point form response is acceptable.

Please complete and return this questionnaire to Dr. Clayton R. Wright at **wrightc@unhcr.org** by Friday, **November 19, 2004**.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Your responses to this questionnaire will be treated confidentially by the evaluators, Clayton Wright and Felipe Camargo (camargo@unhcr.org). Unless you supply specific contact information such as your name and address, your responses will be treated anonymously.

BASIC DATA (Questions 1-4)

Sex
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

Grade
- ☐ G5 or above
- ☐ NOA/B/C
- ☐ P2/P3
- ☐ P4/P5
- ☐ Other

Functional Title at UNHCR:

Length of service at UNHCR
- ☐ 1 – 3 years
- ☐ 3 – 5 years
- ☐ 5 –10 years
- ☐ More than 10 years

QUESTIONS

5. Why did you enroll in the Protection Learning Programme? (Select all that apply.)
- ☐ To enhance my understanding of UNHCR's mandate for international protection
- ☐ To perform my job more effectively
- ☐ To help me serve refugees better
- ☐ To enable me to take on new responsibilities
- ☐ To improve my chances of getting a new protection role
- ☐ It may help me to get a protection post in the future

☐ For personal development including increasing my self-confidence
☐ To enhance my resume and personal fact sheet
☐ To meet other people with similar interests
☐ To exchange ideas and share professional experiences
☐ To comply with my supervisor's request
☐ Other, please explain

6. Has the programme been relevant to your area of work?
☐ Very relevant
☐ Partially relevant
☐ Not relevant

7. Rate the workshop relative to the extent to which it increased your **legal knowledge and understanding** of the protection areas listed below.

Subject Areas	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
General protection knowledge				
International refugee law				
Asylum and refugee status determination (RSD) procedures				
Statelessness				
Resettlement				
Internally displaced persons (IDPs)				
Voluntary repatriation and reintegration				
International humanitarian law				
Human rights				
Women's and children's rights				

8. Rate the workshop relative to the extent to which it advanced your **skills** in the areas listed below.

Subject Areas	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Communication skills				
Interviewing skills				
Presentation skills				
Analytical skills				
Negotiation skills				

Team-building skills				

9. Rate the workshop relative to the extent to which it increased your **confidence** in being able to deal effectively with any of the areas identified below.

Subject Areas	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Rights-based approach to protection				
Gender and age mainstreaming				
Prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence and persecution				
Community development approach				
Consultation with refugees				
Team-based approach to problem solving				

10. Describe how your attitude to specific aspects of protection changed during the workshop.

11. Following the workshop, what knowledge, skills, and attitudes acquired during the workshop will you be able to apply to your work?

Instructions: For each of the statements in questions 7-11, indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree.

12.

The workshop was:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

At an appropriate level for the audience				
Well-organized				
Accurate and current				
Interesting				
Well-paced				

13.

During the workshop, we were:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Allotted adequate time to deal with important or difficult concepts				
Given adequate time to practise or use concepts or skills				
Encouraged to participate in discussions				
Encouraged to examine issues, and to analyze and evaluate new concepts				
Encouraged to think about how we would apply the skills we learned				

14.

The instructional team:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the subject matter				
Communicated clearly				
Was responsive to our needs				
Provided a positive learning environment				
Displayed cultural sensitivity				
Respected the opinions of others				
Worked together				

seamlessly				

15.

The workshop exercises and activities:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Were directly related to the workshop objectives				
Were appropriate for the audience				
Were challenging				
Enabled me to practise new skills				
Enabled me to reflect on my past performance and consider how I might do things differently in the future				

16.

Instructional aids used during the workshop:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Were varied				
Were used appropriately				
Were suitable for the tasks being taught				

17. What aspects of the workshop did you like the **most**?

18. What aspects of the workshop did you like the **least**?

19. How would you improve this workshop?

```
┌──────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                    │
│                                                    │
│                                                    │
└──────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

20. Rate the overall quality of the workshop.
    ☐ Excellent
    ☐ Good
    ☐ Fair
    ☐ Poor

21. If you have any additional suggestions for improving the workshop or any other comments regarding the Protection Learning Programme, please use the space below to tell us about them.

```
┌──────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                    │
│                                                    │
│                                                    │
│                                                    │
│                                                    │
│                                                    │
│                                                    │
│                                                    │
│                                                    │
└──────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

Thank you for taking the time to express your views!

Please remember to send you completed questionnaire to **wrightc@unhcr.org** by **November 19, 2004**. If you are submitting a completed Microsoft Word version of the questionnaire, do not complete the online Zoomerang version.

B4. Trainers' and facilitators' questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS
This survey is one component of the evaluation of the UNHCR's Protection Learning Programme (PLP). The results of this evaluation will enable UNHCR to assess the effects of the learning programme on PLP participants and its impact on UNHCR protection delivery functions.

We are seeking your honest opinion to all questions asked. When responding to open response questions or providing free-text responses, a point form response is acceptable.

Please complete and return this questionnaire to Dr. Clayton R. Wright at **wrightc@unhcr.org** by **November 19, 2004**.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Your responses to this questionnaire will be treated confidentially by the evaluators, Clayton Wright and Felipe Camargo (camargo@unhcr.org). Unless you supply specific contact information such as your name and address, your responses will be treated anonymously.

BASIC DATA (Questions 1-6)

Sex
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

Grade
- ☐ G5 or above
- ☐ NOA/B/C
- ☐ P2/P3
- ☐ P4/P5
- ☐ Other

Functional Title at UNHCR:

Length of service at UNHCR
- ☐ 1 - 3 years
- ☐ 3 - 5 years
- ☐ 5 -10 years
- ☐ More than 10 years

Number of PLP workshops you have facilitated:

Have you completed the PLP yourself?
- ☐ **Yes**
- ☐ **No**

QUESTIONS

7. Rate the extent to which the **workshop** helps participants to increase their **legal knowledge and understanding** of the protection areas listed below.

Subject Areas	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Protection standards				
International refugee law				
Asylum and refugee status determination (RSD) procedures				
Internally displaced persons (IDPs)				
Durable solutions				
International humanitarian law				
Human rights				
Women's and children's rights				

8. Rate the extent to which the **workshop** helps participants advance their **skills** in the areas listed below.

Subject Areas	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Communication skills				
Interviewing skills				
Presentation skills				
Analytical skills				
Negotiation skills				
Team-building skills				

9. Rate the extent to which the **workshop** helps participants increase their **confidence** in being able to deal effectively with any of the areas identified below.

Approach/methodology	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Rights-based approach to protection				
Gender and age mainstreaming				
Prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence and persecution				

Community development approach				
Consultation with refugees				
Team-based approach to problem solving				

10. Does the content of the workshop meet the needs of the mixed audience present in these sessions?
- □ Yes
- □ No

If no, please explain.

11. Prior to the workshop, do the participants have the necessary knowledge, skills, or attitudes to benefit fully from the workshop?
- □ Yes
- □ No

If no, what shortcomings do they have?

12. What aspects of the workshop seem to benefit the participants the **most**?

13. What aspects of the workshop seem to benefit the participants the **least**?

14. What **content** did the workshop participants seem to have the greatest difficulty with?
- □ Gender and age mainstreaming
- □ Prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence and persecution
- □ Rights-based approach to protection
- □ Negotiation skills
- □ Analytical skills

- ☐ Communication skills
- ☐ Presentation skills
- ☐ Team-based approach to problem solving
- ☐ Consultation with refugees
- ☐ Other topics, please specify below.

```



```

15. What **delivery method** did the workshop participants seem to have the greatest difficulty with?
- ☐ Lectures
- ☐ Open discussions
- ☐ Case studies
- ☐ Role play or simulations
- ☐ Team work
- ☐ Presentations in which technology was used
- ☐ Other, please specify below.

```



```

16. What can be done to address the difficulties identified in questions 8 and 9 above?

```



```

17. What changes would you make to the workshop?

```
Objectives


Content


Delivery


Resources

```

18. Should an assessment component be added to the **workshop**?
    □   Yes
    □   No

    Please explain your response.

    ```
    
    
    
    ```

19. Should an assessment component be added to the **entire** Protection Learning
    Programme?
    □   Yes
    □   No

    Please explain your response.

    ```
    
    
    ```

20. Is the workshop suitable for other UNHCR stakeholders and non-
    governmental personnel?
    □   Yes
    □   No

    If not, why not?

    ```
    
    
    
    ```

21. In order to attract a broader audience, should the workshop be changed?
    □   Yes
    □   No

    If you think the workshop should be changed, what changes would you
    suggest?

    ```
    
    
    
    ```

22. Do the workshop facilitators meet to exchange best practices?
    □   Yes
    □   No

If your response is no, how can the exchange of ideas among facilitators be encouraged and supported?

23. Please provide additional suggestions that could be used to improve the workshop and/or the entire Protection Learning Programme.

Thank you for taking the time to express your views!

Please remember to send you completed questionnaire to wrightc@unhcr.org by **November 19, 2004**. If you are submitting a completed Microsoft Word version of the questionnaire, do not complete the online Zoomerang version.

B5. Colleagues' (supervisors and peers) questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS
This survey is one component of the evaluation of the UNHCR's Protection Learning Programme (PLP). The results of this evaluation will enable UNHCR to assess the effects of the learning programme on PLP participants and its impact on UNHCR protection delivery functions.

We are seeking your honest opinion to all questions asked. When responding to open response questions or providing free-text responses, a point form response is acceptable.

Please complete and return this questionnaire to Dr. Clayton R. Wright at **wrightc@unhcr.org** by Friday, **November 19, 2004**.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Your responses to this questionnaire will be treated confidentially by the evaluators, Felipe Camargo (camargo@unhcr.org) and Clayton Wright. Unless you supply specific contact information such as your name and address, your responses will be treated anonymously.

BASIC DATA (Questions 1-5)

Sex
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

Grade
- ☐ G5 or above
- ☐ NOA/B/C
- ☐ P2/P3
- ☐ P4/P5
- ☐ Other

Functional Title at UNHCR:

Length of service at UNHCR
- ☐ 1 - 3 years
- ☐ 3 - 5 years
- ☐ 5 -10 years
- ☐ More than 10 years

Number of PLP graduates supervised in the last 2 years:

QUESTIONS

6. Are you aware of the PLP and its contents?

- ☐ I have taken the programme.
- ☐ I am fully aware of its contents.

☐ I have some knowledge of its contents.

7. What are the main implications of PLP to the work of your unit, section, operation, or office? (Check all that apply.)

☐ Improve delivery of protection
☐ Change attitude of staff
☐ Develop better relations with refugees
☐ Improve interaction between units (i.e., protection or programme)
☐ Improve relations with implementing partners and governments
☐ Improve team work
☐ Implement a rights-based approach to protection and assistance
☐ Incorporate gender perspective
☐ Improve responses to sexual and gender-based violence

8. Please provide two examples that show how the PLP has had an impact on any of the items noted above. If possible, provide an example that illustrates improved consultation with and assistance to refugees.

9. Please rate the impact of the PLP on the performance of your office as a whole?
☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor

10. Rate the extent to which PLP graduates demonstrated an increase in **legal knowledge and understanding** of the protection areas listed below.

Subject Areas	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
General protection knowledge				
International refugee law				
Asylum and refugee status determination (RSD) procedures				
Statelessness				
Resettlement				

Internally displaced persons (IDPs)				
Voluntary repatriation and reintegration				
International humanitarian law				
Human rights				
Women's and children's rights				

11. Rate the extent to which PLP graduates advanced their **skills** in the areas listed below.

Subject Areas	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Communication skills				
Interviewing skills				
Presentation skills				
Analytical skills				
Negotiation skills				
Team-building skills				

12. Rate the extent to which PLP graduates increased their **confidence** in being able to deal effectively with any of the areas identified below.

Subject Areas	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Rights-based approach to protection				
Gender and age mainstreaming				
Prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence and persecution				
Community development approach				
Consultation with refugees				
Team-based approach to problem solving				

13. How did you contribute to the work of colleagues involved in the PLP?
   ☐ Permitted release time
   ☐ Provided technical or knowledge support
   ☐ Participated in exercises

☐ Directed participants to other resources for assistance
☐ Provided motivation or encouragement
☐ None of the above
☐ Other, please specify

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

14. Please identify factors that would make it difficult for PLP graduates to apply the protection standards and policies in your workplace? (Check all that apply.)
    ☐ Lack of resources
    ☐ Lack of protection strategy
    ☐ Pressure of workload
    ☐ Work related emergency situations
    ☐ Negative attitude of colleagues
    ☐ Unsupportive management practices
    ☐ Unsupportive local authorities
    ☐ Unsupportive government
    ☐ Presence of military
    ☐ Cultural pressures
    ☐ Other, please explain

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

15. Do you believe that the PLP should be mandatory for all UNHCR staff?
    ☐ Yes
    ☐ No

Why?

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

16. Should UNHCR continue to provide the PLP in its current format?
    ☐ Yes
    ☐ No

If no, please explain.

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

17. Please provide any other recommendations on how the PLP could be improved.

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

Thank you for taking the time to express your views!

Please remember to send you completed questionnaire to **wrightc@unhcr.org** by **November 19, 2004**. If you are submitting a completed Microsoft Word version of the questionnaire, do not complete the online Zoomerang version.

B6. Other persons of interest questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS
This survey is one component of the evaluation of the UNHCR's Protection Learning Programme (PLP). The results of this evaluation will enable UNHCR to assess the effects of the learning programme on PLP participants and its impact on UNHCR protection delivery functions.

We are seeking your honest opinion to all questions asked. When responding to open response questions or providing free-text responses, a point form response is acceptable.

Please complete and return this questionnaire to Dr. Clayton R. Wright at **wrightc@unhcr.org** by Friday, **November 19, 2004**.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Your responses to this questionnaire will be treated confidentially by the evaluators, Felipe Camargo (camargo@unhcr.org) and Clayton Wright. Unless you supply specific contact information such as your name and address, your responses will be treated anonymously.

BASIC DATA (Questions 1-4)

Organisation:

Functional Title or Position:

Location:

Sex:
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

QUESTIONS

5. Do you work closely with UNHCR in providing protection and assistance to refugees?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

6. Please indicate the nature of your organisation's mandate below:

- ☐ Refugee protection
- ☐ Legal advice
- ☐ Human rights
- ☐ Migration
- ☐ Advocacy

☐ Care and maintenance of refugee settlements

7. Are you familiar with UNHCR protection, community services, and programme staff?

    ☐ Yes
    ☐ No

8. Are you satisfied with the quality of knowledge, skills, and attitudes of the UNHCR staff working in your country or operation?
    ☐ Yes
    ☐ Partially
    ☐ No

    Please explain your response.

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                         │
│                                         │
│                                         │
│                                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

9. From your perspective, are UNHCR staff providing adequate services to refugees?
    ☐ Yes
    ☐ Partially
    ☐ No

    Please explain.

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                         │
│                                         │
│                                         │
│                                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

10. Are you aware of the Protection Learning Programme (PLP) received by UNHCR staff?
    ☐ Yes
    ☐ No

11. If you answered yes to question 10, do you know any UNHCR staff who participated in the Protection Learning Programme?
    ☐ Yes
    ☐ Partially

If no, please go to question 14.

12. Rate the extent to which UNHCR staff demonstrated the knowledge and skills listed below:

Subject Areas	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
General protection knowledge				
Communication skills				
Interviewing skills				
Presentation skills				
Analytical skills				
Negotiation skills				
Team-building skills				
Gender and age mainstreaming				
Rights-based approach to protection				
Community-based approach				
Consultation with refugees				

13. Please provide two examples of a situation in which UNHCR staff changed their performance following their participation in the Protection Learning Programme? If possible, provide an example that illustrates improved consultation with and assistance to refugees.

14. Do you believe UNHCR staff require additional training?
   □   Yes
   □   No

   If yes, in what areas?

15. Do you believe that the Protection Learning Programme should be available to non-UNHCR staff from government and non-government agencies?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Why?

┌───┐
│   │
│   │
│   │
└───┘

16. What is necessary to improve the protection of refugees in your operation or country?

┌───┐
│   │
│   │
│   │
└───┘

17. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, PLEASE ENTER THEM BELOW.

┌───┐
│   │
│   │
│   │
└───┘

Thank you for taking the time to express your views!

Please remember to send you completed questionnaire to **wrightc@unhcr.org** by **November 19, 2004**. If you are submitting a completed Microsoft Word version of the questionnaire, do not complete the online Zoomerang version.

C. Criteria for evaluating the quality of online courses

Clayton R. Wright
wrightc@macewan.ca
Instructional Media and Design
Grant MacEwan College, Edmonton, Alberta T5J 4S2

Based on the national and international experiences of Instructional Media and Design at Grant MacEwan College, the criteria were developed to assist educators to evaluate as well as to develop effective online courses. The list was piloted and then reviewed by a diverse group of professionals:

- Wayne Baillie, South Shore District School Board, Bridgewater
- Maureen Baron, English Montreal School Board, Montreal
- Cathy Conroy, Athabasca University, Athabasca
- Rod Corbett, University of Calgary, Calgary
- Genevieve Gallant, Memorial University, St. John's
- Doug Hamilton, Royal Roads University, Victoria
- Judith Johnson, Grant MacEwan College, Edmonton
- Bryan Shepherd, Norquest College, Edmonton
- Ingrid Stammer, CPR, Calgary
- Val Stewart, Grant MacEwan College, Edmonton
- Michael Szabo, University of Alberta, Edmonton

Initially, the criteria may seem overwhelming, but each item was selected because it has proved to be helpful to the learner and/or instructor. When using this list, focus first on the major question or questions under each heading. Then, as you review a course or develop one, refer to the bulleted items that may jog your memory of items that need to be addressed. Many courses are reviewed by internal and external reviewers. Consider assigning each reviewer the list of items presented under one heading. Thus, the reviewer is able to focus on one aspect of the online course. As you become more familiar with the items on the list, you will need to refer to it less and less and it will no longer seem overwhelming.

General Information

At the beginning of the course, are learners provided with general information that will assist them in completing the course and in understanding the objectives and functioning of the course?

- The language in which the course is written (e.g., English, French, Spanish, or Mandarin) and the level of proficiency in that language required to complete the course successfully
- Brief description of course including goal and learning objectives and/or outcomes
- Program map and/or rationale indicating how this course is related to other courses in the program and the credit value of each course
- Prerequisites and/or corequisites
- Required and recommended resources including textbooks, courseware, and online resources. If learners must access online databases, then instruction is provided on the location of the resources, how these resources may be accessed including password information. If the materials are located in a library, then

information is provided as to whether the items are on reserve and for how long.

- Special requirements such as recommended modem speed or Internet bandwidth requirements, hardware (computing speed and storage capacity), software including e-mail that will allow suitably-sized attachments, and plug-ins. In addition, online sources for these items are provided.
- Estimated time required to complete module and/or course. If feasible, a timeline is provided that outlines dates by which specific activities must be completed
- Guidelines for participating in online discussions, also referred to as "netiquette", is provided as well as suggestions for handling incoming e-mail, e-mail attachments, viruses, and e-mail filters.
- Learners are informed about group work activities and the guidelines that specify how groups will be formed, grading procedures for group participation and assignments, and their responsibilities of group members.
- The introduction to the course takes into account the learners' background, ability level, and expectations including their personal learning goals and objectives or specifies the attributes of the learners for whom the course is designed.
- The availability of technical support is stated and links to online technical information is provided. The technical support hours are clearly specified including the time zone of operation.
- The availability of the instructor is specified including the turnaround time for responses to learners' questions.
- Learners are directed to a source for "Frequently Asked Questions" that pertains to online learning and may provide information that covers many of the items listed above as well as items related to plagiarism, virus protection, and firewalls.
- Learners are informed about their right to privacy and the conditions under which their name or online submissions may be shared with others.
- Learners are directed to a Web site that helps them determine whether online education is appropriate for them.
- The developers and reviewers of the course are specified and perhaps brief biographies are provided so that students may feel comfortable with the expertise used to develop the course.
- Copyright statement or disclaimer is provided so that the ownership of the course is clearly stated and students can be assured of the source of the material they are about to learn.

Accessibility

How accessible is the course material? Can learners find the needed information quickly?

- The function of each icon or button is explained and/or is naturally evident to the learners.
- Detailed table of contents provides a list of objectives, learning outcomes, or topics.
- Summary or preview of each course section or module
- Links on every page to the previous page, start of the module, to the beginning of the course, and to e-mail so that learners may contact instructors, other learners, or pertinent sources for clarification and discussion. Some course

management systems do not allow designers to place a link on every page, but links may be placed on the screen frame or interface page.

- Links to other parts of the course
- Page headers or footers to identify where the learner is in the course
- Index listing key topics or words
- Glossary that explains words or terms in course and provides links to other sources
- Consideration given to learners who may have visual or auditory challenges
- Has the instructor taken into account the infrastructure and server that can handle the number of learners enrolled in the course?

Organization

Is the material organized in such a manner that learners can discern relationships between one part of the course and another?

- The table of contents gives an accurate indication of how the material is arranged.
- The organization or sequencing of the content is appropriate for the subject matter and the intended audience.
- Units of instruction or topics are divided into sub-units or sub-topics.
- Subtopics are related to main topics.
- The course organization or structure is consistent throughout the material; for example, the course modules may have the following sections: introduction, objectives, pretest, directions, explanatory text intertwined with learning activities such as case studies, suggested answers for learning activities and links to additional information, module summary, self-test, self-test answers, references, additional readings, and module assignment.
- Required course elements are clearly delineated from supplementary elements.
- References to other parts of the material are correct.
- Links to other parts of the course or external source are accurate.

Language

Is the level of the language used appropriate for the intended audience?

- Clear, direct writing style
- Clear directions are given.
- Familiar or common words are used.
- Conversational tone that uses the second person voice
- Active voice
- Short sentences are used.
- Short paragraphs are present.
- Numbers are used to identify sequential steps in a task or process.
- Bullets are used to list items that are not prioritized or one of several sequential steps.
- Provides encouragement
- Terminology is used consistently.
- Abbreviations and symbols are defined.
- Bullets, dashes, and numbers are used consistently.
- Instructions are stated simply and are easy to understand.

- Spelling and grammar are consistent and accurate.
- Age, cultural/ethnic, racial, and gender biases in language are addressed
- Has the course material been edited for grammar, language, and content verification?

Layout

Does the layout facilitate learning? Is the material attractive and appropriate for the course content and the intended audience? Note that it can be impossible to design a page that is displayed in the same manner on every computer screen; thus, if the equipment and software available to the learners are unknown, a simple layout is best.

- Layout is appropriate for the content and intended audience.
- Consistent navigational icons or cues are used.
- Typeface is appropriate for the content and common to all programs and computers, e.g. Times Roman.
- Capitals, bold face, and underlining are used sparingly.
- Uppercase letters are used only for acronyms.
- Underlining is used only for hyperlinks and not to denote emphasis.
- Key words, especially when they are first used, are enhanced.
- Headings and subheads are used to separate content.
- Lack of clutter; white spaced is used.
- Ragged right margins are present or letters are kerned or evenly spaced on a line.
- The contrast between text and the background material makes the text legible.
- Colour is used effectively.
- Graphics, illustrations, and photographs illustrate or explain an idea or concept covered in the text.
- Illustrations and photographs can be seen easily on a computer screen and JPEG flies are used to accommodate different download speeds.
- Text explaining a graphic is aligned to the non-textual material.
- To assist those who may use screen readers, a description of the illustration should be available as an image tag.
- Frames are used effectively to provide a consistent format.
- The material is displayed attractively.

Goals and Objectives

Are goals and objectives provided to outline learning expectations at the beginning of the course and, where appropriate, at the beginning of each module? If you are using a constructivist approach, you may ask your learners to select their own goals, objectives, content, learning strategies, resources, and evaluation scheme.

- Goals and objectives cover course content and outline their relation to the program of study.
- They have relevancy to the subject matter and to the "real world" in which the content may be used.
- Objectives specify learning outcomes related to knowledge, skills, competencies, behaviours, and/or attitudes.

- Appropriate action verbs are used and those with multiple interpretations, such as "understood" and "become aware", are not used.
- Objectives state clearly and concisely what must be done.
- Different levels of outcomes are present especially those that address critical thinking and problem-solving outcomes.
- Goals and objectives provide a discernable sequence of expectations.

Course Content

Is the content appropriate, given the subject matter and the learners' backgrounds and abilities? If you are using a constructivist approach to your online course, you may want to substitute the term "learning experiences" for the word "content" below.

The content is:

- Directly related to learning objectives
- Complete and provides all the content or learning experiences needed to achieve the learning objectives
- Appropriate to the learners' characteristics (ability and maturity level) and experiences
- Comparable and at least equal to the rigor offered by similar on-campus courses
- Accurate
- Relevant
- Broken into small, incremental learning steps
- Sequenced logically for the subject matter
- Related to other material the learners may have studied or experiences they may have encountered
- Illustrated by examples and/or case studies when new information is presented
- Linked to other sources and the portion of the linked Web site that learners must review is specified
- Has copyrighted material been noted and cleared where necessary? Has the content been reviewed by a second content expert?

Instructional or Learning Strategies and Opportunities for Practice and Transfer

Do the instructional or learning strategies enable learners to learn effectively in a variety of ways and to engage in activities that promote practice and the transfer of skills?

- Instructions or directions are clear and concise.
- Learners are informed regarding those activities that may be performed asynchronously and those that must be performed in a synchronous manner.
- Learners are informed about their responsibility for online teaching and evaluation.
- Learners are informed as to whether they should proceed in a specified manner or whether they can complete tasks in any order.

- Expectations are clearly specified for participation in collaborative or team-based learning activities.
- Procedures for grouping learners for team-based learning activities are specified.
- Deadlines are clearly specified. If deadlines are not met, a mechanism for dealing with this issue should be specified and timelines given for resolving the issue.
- A variety of instructional or learning activities are used to promote interactivity; these may include online discussions, online conferencing, collaborative assignments, and listserv participation.
- Illustrations, photographs, animations, and other forms of multi-media are used to present and reinforce an idea or concept; note that if a large number of media material is built into a course, learners may need more advanced computer hardware and software as well as a high-speed Internet connection. If there is an option of receiving this multimedia on a CD-ROM or DVD, this must be stated as well as any additional cost for providing this media.
- Learners can select activities that are appropriate for them.
- Learners can proceed at a pace that is appropriate for them and can repeat sections as often as they need to.
- Activities actively engage and motivate the learners. Learners must frequently respond to questions, select options, provide information, or contact others.
- Activities address appropriate cognitive, affective, and psychomotor skills.
- Activities encourage critical thinking, creativity, and problem-solving.
- Activities and materials differ in levels of difficulty.
- Learners are encouraged to interact with others and benefit from their experience and professional expertise.
- Learners are linked to resources beyond the course material.
- Activities are sequenced logically, perhaps in a hierarchical or chronological manner.
- A sufficient number of activities are provided.
- Activities are realistic and appropriate and can be performed with the resources and time available to the learners.
- Frequent opportunities are provided for practice and knowledge transfer.
- Constructive, relevant, and frequent feedback is provided to promote clarification, elaboration, and transfer.
- Summaries are provided throughout the material, particularly at the end of topics, lessons, and modules.
- Is the instructor placed primarily in the role of learning facilitator rather than in the sole role of content provider?

Learning Resources

Are the learning resources accessible, appropriate, and accurate?
- Learning resources are listed and divided into "required" and "optional".
- A variety of learning resources are used to address the wide variety of learner interests, abilities, and learning styles.
- Multimedia clips, such as audio and video clips, are included only if the learners have access to the appropriate hardware and software and these items are specified at the beginning of the course. If students have purchased a computer within the last two years, this should not be an issue.

- The format of multi-media materials is specified and a direct link to a required plug-in is provided.
- Learning resources reflecting different points of view are provided when appropriate.
- The resource material is accurate, current, and related to the content.
- A bibliography or reference list is available and includes a variety of material such as Web links (URLs), print, CD-ROMs, and videos. URLs are included when they have an obvious and intrinsic relation to the course material.
- Learning material is appropriate for the learners and the subject matter.
- Links to material within and external to the course are provided.

Evaluation

Are the evaluative activities feasible, relevant, accurate, and congruent with the objectives, content, and real-life applications of the content?

- Learners are given clear expectations and criteria for evaluation and grading.
- Appropriate links to institutional policies on learner grading and evaluation are provided.
- The relationship between course learning outcomes, evaluation strategies, and course assignments is clearly evident to the learner.
- The relationship between individual assignments and the final course grade is clearly specified.
- Clear, step-by-step instructions are provided for each evaluative exercise.
- Guidelines for submitting assignments are provided.
- Students are informed about the criteria that will be used to evaluate their participation in online activities such as discussion groups.
- Sample assignments, which learners may refer to, are provided.
- A variety of feasible and content-relevant assignments or evaluative exercises are provided.
- The evaluative exercises are relevant to the learners and the career or profession they may pursue.
- Learners are able to evaluate their own progress. Self-tests are provided and they are similar to those on the final evaluation instruments.
- Criteria and procedures for peer review and evaluation requirements are clearly specified.
- The number of assignments and their due dates are reasonable.
- Evaluation and grading procedures are clear and explicit.
- Learners are informed about the consequences of plagiarism and the failure to properly cite copyright material.
- Learners are informed about the time when they can expect to receive feedback.
- Evaluation procedures are congruent with the objectives and reflect any priorities that may have been established for each objective.
- Learners are able to track their progress.

Overall

- Is there evidence that the course has been piloted and that learners can actually achieve the objectives of the course?

- Has the course been reviewed by experts in content and design?
- Is the course up to date – current in both content and technical aspects? When was it last revised and the URLs updated.
- If the course will be used by instructors who did not participate in its development, can the course be modified and what permission is needed before this modification can occur?

Online learning is the latest trend to sweep education. Its success will depend on the quality of its instructional design and the academic and technical support provided to learners and instructors. This document as well as those prepared by others such as the *Canadian Recommended E-Learning Guidelines* available from www.FuturEd.com will help you ensure that online learning is successful.

D. List of PLP interviewees

No.	Name	Title	Section/Location/Institution
**Category: Steering Committee**		
1	Tanja Thonhauser	Senior Training Officer	Protection Capacity Section(PCS)/DIP
2	Vanessa Mattar	Operational Policy Officer	Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit (EPAU)
3	Renata Dubini	Chief	PCS/DIP
4	Alessandra Marinetti	Consultant	Staff Development Section (SDS)
5	Lois Purdham-Kidane	Senior Training Officer	SDS
6	Julianne Di Nenna	Training Officer	Women, Children and Comm. Dev. Section
**Category: Facilitators**		
1	Brenda Goddard	Legal Officer	Protection Policy and Legal Advice Section/DIP
2	Mohamed Toure	Senior Protection Officer	Protection Operations Support Section/DIP
3	Arjun Jain	Training Officer	PCS/DIP
4	Malar Smith	Programme Assistant	CASWANAME
5	Grainne O'hara	Legal Officer	Protection Policy and Legal Advice Section/DIP
6	Veronique Robert	Senior Training Officer	PCS/DIP
7	Mark Manly	Protection Officer	Bogota, Colombia
8	Julian Herrera	Legal Training Officer	Ankara, Turkey
**Category: Graduates**		
1	Dominik Bartsch	Senior Policy Officer (Ops)	EPAU
2	Richard Floyer-Acland	Senior Field Safety Advisor	Field Safety Section
3	Kemlin Furley	Senior External Relations Officer	Inter-Organisational Desk
4	Mignone Van der Liet-Senders	Information Officer	Protection Information Section
5	Anne-Birgitte Krum-Hansen	Associate Training Officer	Resettlement and Special Caseloads Section (RSCS) /DIP
6	Belen Garcia	Executive Assistant	Africa Bureau
7	Abid Mir	Senior Admin Officer	RBE
8	Chansa Kapaya	Senior Desk Officer	East and Horn of Africa Liaison Unit
9	Alemtsehai Zeleke	Community Services Officer	Women, Children and Comm. Dev. Section

10	Myriam Baele	Resettlement Officer	RSCS/DIP
11	Eddie Gedaloff	Senior Officer	Women, Children and Comm. Dev. Section
12	Jeniffer Thambayah	IUNV Programme Officer	RO Bangkok, Thailand
13	Maja Lazic	Eligibility Officer	RO Bangkok, Thailand
14	Sevithri Weragoda	Senior Protection Assistant	BO Colombo, Sri Lanka
15	Yamini Pande	Assistant Protection Officer	OCM New Delhi, India
16	Nayana Bose	Associate External Relations Officer	OCM New Delhi, India
17	Shasha Ali	Protection Assistant/Resettlement	SO Peshawar, Pakistan
18	Ayesha Nawaz	Senior Protection Clerk	BO Islamabad, Pakistan
19	Kenneth Conteh	Assistant Protection Officer	SO Kenema, Sierra Leone
20	Catherine Harding	Community Services Assistant	BO Freetown, Sierra Leone
21	Moijama Siafa	Protection Assistant	BO Freetown, Sierra Leone
22	Margaret Atieno	Protection Officer	SO Kenema, Sierra Leone
23	Abdullah Imam	Field Officer – Protection UNV	SO Banjaluka, Bosnia & Herzegovina.
24	Edina Dziho	Associate Protection Officer	SO Mostar, Bosnia & Herzegovina
25	Adla Brck	Senior Protection Clerk	SO Mostar, Bosnia & Herzegovina
26	Jahingir Durrani	Assistant Protection Officer	BO Islamabad, Pakistan
27	Sadia Khan	Senior Protection Clerk	BO Islamabad, Pakistan
28	Farhat Jabeen	Senior Eligibility Assistant	BO Islamabad, Pakistan
29	Mohammed Iqbal	Protection Assistant	BO Islamabad, Pakistan
30	Andrea Szobolits	PI Officer	BO Budapest, Hungary
31	Bessy Mwongeli Makau	Resettlement Assistant	SO Kakuma, Kenya
Category: Non-completers			
1	Hiroko Araki	Programme Officer	East and Horn of Africa Liaison Unit
2	Esin Gullu	Senior Resource Manager	CASAWNAME
3	Gloria Chinebuah	Senior Resettlement Clerk	RSCS/DIP
4	Agnes Mikantwali	Desk Officer	Southern Africa Operations
5	Craig Sanders	Coordinator	NGO Liaison Unit
6	Jacinta Goveas	Senior Training Officer	SDS
7	Monica Sandri	First Officer	Post Classification Unit/DHRM

8	Inge Colijn	Senior Programme Coordination Officer	Programme Coordination-Operations Section(PCOS)/DOS
9	Soufiane Adjali	Protection Officer	SO Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina
10	Salaton Leteipan	Protection Assistant	BO Nairobi, Kenya
11	Sato Shigeyuki	Associate Resettlement Officer	BO Nairobi, Kenya
12	Lillian Odipo	Protection Assistant	SO Daadab, Kenya
13	Rose Mwebi	Resettlement Assistant	SO Dadaab, Kenya
14	David Owalo Magolo	Field Assistant	SO Dadaab, Kenya
Category: Other persons of interest			
1	Carolynn Oleniuk	Training Officer	SDS
2	Richard Stainsby	Special Advisor	PCS/DIP
3	Francis Pallen	Human Resources Officer	WHO
4	Dianne Goodman	Refugee Policy Director Former Senior Training Officer (PCS/DIP)	Human Rights Watch
5	Terry Morel	Chief	Women, Children & Community Dev. Section/DOS
6	Peter Kimanthi	Deputy Secretary Refugee Department	Government of Kenya
7	Simon Clements	Programme Manager, Urban Refugee Assistance Programme	German Cooperation, GTZ –IS Nairobi, Kenya
8	Lena Barret	Regional Policy Advisor	Jesuit Refugee Service, JRS Regional Office Eastern Africa, Nairobi, Kenya
9	Judy Wakahiu	Executive Director	Refugee Consortium of Kenya Nairobi, Kenya
10	Eva Maina-Ayiera	Advocacy Officer	Refugee Consortium of Kenya Nairobi, Kenya
11	Bobby Waddell	Country Director Lutheran World Federation (LWF)	Nairobi, Kenya
12	Elizabeth O'Brien	Representative Joint Voluntary Agency (JVA)	Nairobi, Kenya
13	Brain Beaupre	Counselor Immigration Canadian High Commission	Nairobi, Kenya
14	David Derthick	Director of Operations	

		International Organization for Migration (IOM)	Nairobi, Kenya
15	Dennis O'Brien	Country Director CARE	Nairobi, Kenya
16	Jalal Bhuiyan	Senior Manager Refugee Operations CARE	Nairobi, Kenya
17	John Kyovi	District Officer Daadab Government of Kenya	Dadaab, Kenya
18	Ummkalthum Abdirashid	Women and Children Development Leader, CARE International	Dadaab. Kenya
19	András Kováts	Programme Coordinator MENEDEK	Budapest, Hungary
20	Willemijn Zaadnoordijk	Training Clerk	PCS DIP
Category: non- involved			
1	Philippa Candler	Senior Investigation Officer	Inspector General's Office
2	Robert Gitau	Eligibility Assistant	SO Kakuma, Kenya
3	Mwihaki Kinyanjui	Eligibility Assistant	SO Kakuma, Kenya
4	Mildred Ouma	SGBV Legal Consultant	SO Kakuma, Kenya
5	Nur Issak Kassim	Field Assistant	SO Dadaab, Kenya
Category : supervisors and peers			
1	George Okoth-Obbo	Representative UNHCR Kenya	Nairobi, Kenya
2	Jelvas Musau	Associate Protection Officer	SO Dadaab, Kenya
3	Toshiro Odashima	Head of SO Dadaab	Dadaab, Kenya
4	Vesna Vukovic	NGO Liaison Officer	Regional Unit, Hungary
5	Sean Henderson	Senior Resettlement Officer	BO Nairobi, Kenya
6	Stephen Corliss	Deputy Rep, Protection	BO Ankara, Turkey
7	Stephen Gonah	Senior Protection Officer	BO Kampala, Uganda

E. Data compilation

This section provides a summary of the data collected during the evaluation. The major items covered during the interviews are presented, followed by summaries for each of the questionnaires. The raw data for each questionnaire are available in a PDF format, as it is the format of the output provided by the Zoomerang software used to collect and compile the questionnaire data. **Note:** In the tables in this section, the percentages do not always total 100% because they have been rounded off. In addition, some of the respondents did not answer all parts of a question, thus the percentage for one portion may be slightly different than another portion. It is the trend in the data that is important not the precise number.

The table below provides an overview of the targeted audience and the response rate. Note that the overall response rate for the questionnaires was a respectable 33.8%. In studies of this type, one could reasonably expect that 10% to 20% of those asked would respond. Also note that more than half (93 out of 161) of the non-completers and in-progress participants completed a questionnaire. The high response rate indicates that individuals wanted to have their views recorded. The response rate could have been much higher if all the individuals, especially the 360 graduates, had current e-mail addresses. When e-mail addresses provided by PCS were entered into the UNHCR e-mail system, about 30% of the addresses were not recognised by the system – they were returned to the evaluation team as undeliverable. This led the evaluation team to speculate that the individuals had left UNHCR. A short informal investigation was conducted by checking other sources to ascertain whether some of the individuals with undeliverable e-mail addresses had left UNHCR. This speculation was confirmed. However, all names were not checked

Targeted audience and response rate

Category	Questionnaire Target No.	Questionnaire No. returned	Interview: Target No.	Interview: No. Interviewed
Steering Committee	Not applicable	Not applicable	5	6
PLP Graduates	360	88	32	31
Non-completers In-Progress	161	93	10	14
Supervisors and Peers	60	12	10	7
Other Persons of Interest	60	4	10	20
PLP Trainers/ Facilitators	10	12	5	8
Workshop Attendees	30	30	Two focus groups	Focus group on content & one on methodology
Non-Involved	Not applicable	Not applicable	10	5
Total	681		82	91

THE OVERALL QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE RATE WAS 230/681 = 33.8%.

in this manner. E-mail addresses tended not to work for those who graduated from earlier offerings of the programme, whereas e-mail addresses for those who completed the programme within the last two years seemed to reach their targets.

Note also that the evaluation team conducted 91 interviews instead of the 82 targeted. The team was not able to arrange appointments with as many supervisors and peers as it would have liked, but 12 supervisors and peers responded to the online questionnaire. If this study is conducted again, greater attention should be placed on identifying the supervisors and peers of PLP graduates, as these individuals can verify the extent to which graduates applied their new or enhanced skills after graduation.

E1. Summary of interviews with UNHCR personnel

Below is a summary of the points raised during the 78 interviews conducted with UNHCR and former UNHCR staff. Care was taken to note not only those points that were frequently mentioned, but also those that were mentioned infrequently. This balance can be found in all the summaries in this section of the report. Points mentioned by the interviewees are grouped under topic headings rather than by question, as each group of interviewees was asked slightly different questions, but the content of many questions was similar.

Reasons for Enrolling in the PLP

Individuals enrolled in the PLP primarily to:
- Learn about new UNHCR policies and their ramifications in the field
- Consolidate existing knowledge and experiences
- Obtain a foundation in protection
- Prepare for a post in protection
- Improve protection services offered to refugees
- Experience the integration of UNHCR mandate, policies and implementation strategies
- Follow advice provided by their peers and/or supervisors

Reasons for Not Enrolling in the PLP

- Wanted to enrol, but was not selected
- Unable to because on short-term contract
- Lack of support from supervisor; needed time to study and permission to travel to workshop
- Unable to see connection between PLP and current career aspirations

Reasons for Dropping out of the Programme

Frequently mentioned
- Pressures of daily UNHCR work
- Overwhelmed by personal challenges
- Unable to exert the effort needed to complete course within the suggested timeframe

Occasionally mentioned
- Lack of feedback on assignments submitted
- Needed to be supported by others who were working on the same course
- Challenged by the quantity of reading required
- Overwhelmed by the amount of resources provided
- Found it difficult to work through the material when English was not one's first language
- Lacked legal background needed to complete the self-study component
- Left on a mission
- Changed duty posts
- Had unsupportive supervisor

- Late arrival of materials from headquarters

Primary Overall Benefits of the PLP

- Gives participants confidence
- Provides foundation for protection
- Sensitises participants to the needs of refugees
- Provides reference materials that can be used in the field

Knowledge Gained or Enhanced

Frequently mentioned
- UNHCR mandate
- Human rights
- Refugee status determination (RSD)
- Statelessness
- Gender and sexually-based violence

Occasionally mentioned
- Refugee law
- Displaced persons
- Internally displaced persons (IDPs)
- Asylum seekers
- Gender issues
- Resettlement

Skills Gained or Enhanced

Frequently mentioned
- Team-building and collaborative skills
- Negotiation skills
- Interviewing skills
- Research skills, as one knows where to find information about protection

Occasionally mentioned
- Perception skills, e.g., non-verbal behaviour of refugees
- Analytical skills
- Logical thinking skills
- Communication skills, including writing and being able to communicate with the public

Attitudinal changes

Note that the extent to which attitudinal changes occur depends on the willingness of participants to embrace new ideas and methods.

Frequently mentioned
- Increased confidence and enthusiasm due to increased knowledge and skills; thus, more willing to take on new challenges. Became more focused and productive.
- Increased confidence, thus graduates asked more in-depth questions and took up less time with supervisors with rudimentary questions
- Gained an appreciation of the various roles that UNHCR plays
- Realised the need for everyone across UNHCR to work together

Occasionally mentioned
- Understood that refugee have rights; it's not a privilege to obtain assistance, but a right
- Acknowledged that each refugee has different needs
- Developed empathy for refugees
- Learned to meet challenges with patience
- Acknowledged that there are limits to the helping professions
- Able to deal with refugees in a more positive manner
- Identified the need to give the benefit of the doubt to refugees
- Learned that refugees can contribute, thus they can be involved in planning and implementation activities

Liked the least about the PLP

Frequently mentioned, sometimes passionately
- Lack of feedback. Many noted that the distance education Effective Writing Course was effective because of the personal, timely feedback provided by its tutors.
- The timeline for completing the self-study units was too tight and unrealistic.
- Too much reading. Sometimes it was repetitive.
- E-mail peer groups did not work. Not everyone participated. Individuals received too many e-mails.
- Upon completing the program, graduates experienced significant delays in receiving their certificate and the recording of the PLP on their fact sheet.

Occasionally mentioned
- Legal sections were dry and not action oriented. They should be simplified and the sections could be more visually appealing.
- The workshop was too short.
- The workshop should integrate and not repeat content contained in the self-study units.
- Participants needed to be competent in English in order to understand some of the content and complete the exercises.
- More guidance was needed for the Phase 3 projects.

- It was a challenge to study the PLP while working in the field, thus individuals experienced competing priorities – the needs of work and the need to study.
- Those with a law degree and extensive experience at UNHCR needed more intellectual challenge.
- The programme covered too much material. It had breadth, but not depth.
- The workload varied greatly from unit to unit.
- The PLP materials arrived late.
- Too many resources were provided.
- The program contains knowledge and skills, such as the prevention of the abuse of woman, that can be difficult to implement in parts of the world such as Nepal. The programme content must help people apply skills in the 'real world'.

Liked the most about the PLP

Frequently mentioned
- The workshop enabled one to share ideas. The cross-fertilisation that occurred was essential to the understanding of UNHCR's extensive activities.
- Via the workshop and online discussion, one was able to meet people with various backgrounds and different points of view.
- The various delivery methods used in the workshop were appreciated, especially the role plays.
- The programme was very interactive, especially the workshop.
- The readings provided a foundation for protection work and were valuable references in the field.
- The PLP provide a linkage between theory and practice.
- Participants were able to gain a good understanding of UNHCR's mandate and policies.

Occasionally mentioned
- The format of the programme, including the self-study, workshop and field project, was appropriate and provided a diverse number of activities.
- The workshop consolidated ideas.
- The self-study gave people the opportunity to obtain some knowledge about humanitarian law and the UNHCR mandate prior to the workshop.
- The self-study component allowed individuals to work at their own pace. But the timelines imposed by the PLP team were unreasonable.
- There was a clear linkage between the self-study and workshop. Note that others felt that this linkage may border on repetition.
- The lectures were informative. (Older staff tended to prefer lectures.)
- The PLP sensitised people to refugee issues.
- The Phase 3 project helped participants to apply what they had learned.

Changes to the programme

Frequently mentioned
- No radical changes are needed, as the basic format – self-study, workshop and project – is satisfactory.

- Provide individualised feedback in a timely manner so that people can improve their knowledge and skills before moving on to the next topic.
- Ensure that the timelines for the completion of the assignments are realistic. More time is required. The submission times must be adjusted to the quantity of work required.
- Reduce the readings. Remove repetitious material.
- Simplify the readings by presenting them in non-technical legal terms. Perhaps, provide a summary of key ideas presented in the legal documents.
- Simplify the legal framework, especially for participants whose first language is not English.
- Lengthen the workshop. (Most suggested it be lengthened by 2 days and a few felt it should be 2 weeks in length.)
- Drop the e-mail peer groupings or make them more effective or self-directing.

Occasionally mentioned
- Limit the workshop enrolment to 22–25 people.
- Update the materials more frequently, perhaps on an annual basis.
- Provide additional time during the workshop for participants to discuss and reflect on the issues presented.
- Provide the materials in another language for those participants whose first language is not English. Sometimes English is a person's third or fourth language.
- Break the PLP into smaller chunks. Perhaps the programme should be modularised like the Middle-Management Learning Programme.
- Ensure that supervisors have a definite role in monitoring and supporting staff.
- Increase the focus on refugee status determination and on asylum seekers.
- Provide more guidance and support during the development and implementation of the Phase 3 project.

Infrequently mentioned
- Add the topic of security. Since September 2001, it can no longer be ignored. It should be a concern of every UNHCR staff member.
- Include more information about internally displaced persons and urban refugees.
- Add additional information about gender and sexually-based violence.
- Include more case studies and activities that involve government bodies and non-government agencies.
- Provide participants at the workshop with an opportunity to fully introduce themselves. They should have time to outline their duties and interests. This would promote information sharing and potentially link people together who have common interests or are seeking information.
- Provide more checklists that individuals can use in the field.
- Provide additional explanations and note the impact of the following: statelessness, exclusion, illegal immigration and rights-based approach.
- Encourage individuals to fully participate in their peer e-mail activities.
- If activities require that information be drawn only from one or two articles, then remove the extra articles.
- Edit the material. Reduce grammatical mistakes and be consistent with the use of capitalisation and bolding.

- Refine the learning objectives. Make them more specific. People were unsure what was expected of them.
- Re-state the self-study questions so that their meaning is clear.
- Provide more information in a point-form format so that it is easier to understand and scan.
- Discuss more substantial issues in the workshop.
- Ensure that contacts provided in the learning material are accessible and willing to respond.
- Ensure that the workshop facilitators are senior people who have received facilitator training.
- Ensure that the knowledge and skills, especially those regarding gender issues and sexual-based violence, can be applied in the circumstances in which protection officers find themselves. Provide alternative scenarios to match different situations.
- Allow participants to submit assignments digitally.
- Add more visual content to the material.
- Provide an alternative format for the media material, as people may not have access to a video or compact disc player. A summary sheet outlining the contents of the video could be provided.
- Note that the Phase 3 project can be a challenge to implement, depending on the duty post and the supervisor. Thus, alternative means for completing this phase must be considered.
- Place all resources on compact discs. [This may be physically convenient, but many people would still need to print off the resources in the field so that they can read them and make notes. The duty stations may not have this capacity.]
- Place information on compact discs on videocassettes, as compact discs are not accessible.

Assessment of PLP participants

Frequently mentioned
- Assessment is needed so that participants know where they stand.
- By assessing graduates, one gives the PLP a credible stature and indicates that the people have actually achieved something.
- One needs to assess graduates in order to ensure that UNHCR standards are maintained.
- Participants cannot be assessed unless they receive frequent and effective feedback.
- Graduating from the PLP should mean something to the organisation. It should mean that a graduate is qualified to do his or her job.
- The successful completion of the PLP should be linked with career development and promotion.
- People should not be assigned protection posts unless they have completed the PLP.

Occasionally mentioned, sometimes passionately
- Whatever assessment is implemented, it must be feasible.
- Every UNHCR learning programme should have an assessment component.
- Ideally, there should be an assessment after the self-study, workshop and field project.

- Assessment should not be mandatory, as it will discourage people from enrolling in the programme.
- People will drop out before they have to write a test.
- Testing alone cannot measure someone's capabilities.
- Unless the organisation seriously considers the training that people have, there is no need to evaluate programme participants.
- If the organisation does not take the PLP seriously, why should its staff?
- Assessment is one way of measuring what people are capable of.
- An assessment may encourage people to take the PLP more seriously, especially those who just want to travel to attend the workshop.
- Graduating from the PLP should mean that an individual is willing to take on new challenges and responsibilities.
- PLP assessment should be included as part of the annual assessment conducted by supervisors.
- Supervisors' workload will increase if they are required to assess PLP participants.
- Supervisors may not be able to provide feedback, as staff move from one position to another while completing the PLP.
- Participants could be required to write a test after they complete the self-study and before they attend the workshop.
- An oral test could be conducted following the workshop.
- Rather than using written tests to assess achievement, simulations could be conducted to allow people to demonstrate the skills they have gained. Participants could then be graded on a pass or fail scale.
- Assessment should be graded simply – distinction, pass and fail. If people fail, they should pay a fee to take the course again.
- Assessing attitudinal skills is difficult.
- Precise grades are not possible, as there are too many variables involved.
- Supervisors need to be involved in providing assessment. They need to do more than record that one has attended a training session.
- The best time to conduct an assessment is after the participants have completed the programme and have had a chance to implement their new knowledge and skills. Perhaps the assessment could be done 3–12 months following the completion of Phase 3.
- The quality of the PLP is suspect if staff who lack English skills are able to graduate. How did they get through all that heavy legal material? What do they really know? The programme needs to offer simplified versions of the readings so that those whose first language is not English have an equitable chance to learn. Better yet, offer the programme in another language. Then, it would be fair to assess participants.
- The UNHCR needs to more accurately measure the effects of learning programmes. Individuals should be tested before and after they take any learning programme.
- The PLP should not be the only activity that includes an assessment component. All new UNHCR staff should be tested.
- It is UNHCR's responsibility to determine whether staff have suitable skills. Thus, assessment is necessary.

Contributions of supervisors

Supervisors were appreciated when they:
- Recognised the time commitment involved in taking the PLP and allowed some work time to be used as study time. The current 2-hour allowance for study on the job was too short for those who were completing the PLP.
- Enabled participants to attend the workshop. Sometimes they had to adjust participants' workloads so that they could attend the workshop.
- Were willing to discuss topics in the PLP.
- Provided feedback as participants worked through their exercises.
- Helped participants to integrate coursework with daily fieldwork.
- Helped with determining the focus of the field study.
- Provided encouragement.
- Encouraged people to participate in the PLP and other learning programmes.

Many noted that supervisor support is pivotal to the success of the PLP, as participants needed the opportunity to apply their knowledge and skills after they completed Phase 1 and 2 of the programme.

Administration of the PLP

Frequently mentioned
- The PLP management team is making great efforts to cope, but it appears to be overwhelmed.
- It's a matter of quality versus quantity – they need to add resources to improve quality or reduce the number of participants who can take the programme.
- The feedback provided by the team is too general and ineffective. It should be individualised and sent out in a timely manner.
- The PLP management team is flexible when informed that participants are unable to submit assignments on time due to the need to undertake a mission.
- They do not seem to be able to keep track of who has completed the programme or who has not, thus certificates are delayed and PLP completion is not noted on fact sheets.
- It could take up to a year to receive a certificate after completion of the course.

Occasionally mentioned
- The PLP seems to be only one of the priorities of the PLP management staff. They should concentrate on the PLP.
- The PLP facilitators should all have facilitator training.
- The PLP management team needs to be more flexible regarding the submission of assignments. The timelines are too restrictive.
- The issue of learner support and changing assignments should be addressed. An individual may have permission from his first supervisor to participate in the PLP, but when the individual is re-assigned to a different post, the second supervisor may not support this activity.
- A clear admissions policy should be announced. A person who applies for admission to the programme and is rejected but told to re-apply should be higher on the priority list the second time.

- The admission guidelines should be revised to include provisions for those on one-year or term contracts. As UNHCR is increasingly employing short-term contract personnel, it must recognise its responsibility to train them. These individuals want to receive training so that they can better serve refugees. They are not able to register for the PLP because they do not have an extended contract with UNHCR. However, several of these individuals have served several one-year contracts with UNHCR.
- Since headquarters does not seem to allow those on short-term contracts to enrol in training programmes, the field offices have to provide the training because they need trained personnel to work in the field. Either those on short-term contracts should be able to take the PLP or field offices should be provided with the resources to train these individuals locally.

Making the PLP Mandatory

Frequently mentioned
- Make the PLP mandatory for all protection staff and supervisors.
- Make it mandatory for all P3s, P4s and GL3-GL5.
- Make it mandatory for all staff. Everyone who works for UNHCR needs to know about protection.
- Encourage people to recognise the benefits of having a common understanding of what UNHCR does.

Occasionally mentioned, but sometimes with great passion
- Make the PLP mandatory for protection staff and optional for everyone else.
- Divide the PLP into an introduction, protection and management/supervisory component.
- Provide a short induction program, perhaps on compact disc or during a one-day workshop.
- If the PLP is made mandatory, it will need a large amount of resources to sustain it. But if it is not mandatory, what quality of services is provided to refugees?
- Ensure senior management takes the PLP, as it will polish their skills.
- The programme should be voluntary for everyone.
- Note that people learn when they voluntarily take a programme.
- The PLP should be part of a complete UNHCR learning system.

PLP audience

- There should be a mixed audience so that people can learn what others do in the organisation.
- Protection is everyone's business; therefore, all in UNHCR should take the PLP.
- The current audience is very diverse. It should be targeted more for protection officers or those who want to be protection officers. Thus, more in-depth issues could be discussed.
- The current audience is too diverse. Only professional officers should be allowed to take the programme.

Allowing external personnel to participate in PLP

Frequently mentioned
- A mixed workshop audience would be beneficial because different perspectives would be revealed and discussed.
- As UNHCR personnel need to work with external agencies, they should be invited to participate so that everyone has a common understanding of the UNHCR mandate, policies and operational procedures.

Occasionally mentioned
- If external participants are allowed to participate, the programme, especially the workshop, would have to be changed. Currently, we are able to discuss any issue. But with externals present, we might not feel free to discuss problems.
- Since implementing partners are frequently on the front line, they would benefit from taking the PLP.
- Other organisations also perform protection functions. UNHCR could benefit from learning how other organisations handle protection.

E2. Summary of interviews with non-UNHCR personnel

Below is a summary of the 13 interviews conducted with non-UNHCR personnel in Kenya during November 2004. Originally, interviews were also to be conducted in Pakistan and Bosnia and Herzegovina, but the PLP Steering Committee limited the interviews to Kenya.

Frequently mentioned
- UNHCR does not have the capacity to do all that needs to be done despite good intentions.
- UNHCR's field staff seem to be over-worked and overwhelmed.
- Since many UNHCR staff appear to be over-worked, they get irritable, fatigued and sometimes careless.
- UNHCR appears to be under-staffed.

Occasionally mentioned
- UNHCR is a bureaucracy – large, cumbersome, slow to react – but it does its job. (For example, refugees may wait all day and not be seen or may have difficulty contacting the right person. If they are persistent, they will be seen.
- UNHCR's resettlement efforts are highly regarded, as well as its organisation and management skills.
- The work of Rosella Pagliuch-Lor and Sean Henderson, who both work in the UNHCR Sub-Office in Nairobi, was highly praised.
- In general, UNHCR's staff are dedicated, qualified and well-trained, especially with respect to protection. About two-thirds are good, but a third are not so good – they need to adjust their attitude towards refugees.
- It is possible to tell if someone has protection training, but not necessarily whether they have PLP training.
- UNHCR staff tend to be academically inclined; they need more practical skills.
- UNHCR field staff need more practical protection skills – some have them, others do not.
- UNCHR does not appear to have a training or continuous improvement focus.
- As the UNHCR field staff seem to be over-worked and showing signs of stress, they should receive training sessions on how to handle stress as well as counselling sessions. It is unclear whether UNHCR get together on a regular basis to discuss concerns and problems and thereby diffuse some of their stress.
- External organisations are willing to receive training from UNHCR because the organisation has expertise that partner organisations lack. The externals are willing to participating in offering joint training sessions.
- UNHCR could take a leadership role in providing training to non-governmental agencies (NGOs). NGOs would like to be informed about eligibility requirements, resettlement policies and the protection of women and children.
- Members of some NGOs have tried to enrol in the PLP, but their applications were rejected.
- UNHCR's field manual is highly valued by humanitarian groups.
- A significant amount of serious work is being assigned to part-timers or short-term contract personnel. These people need training.

- Due to the scandal in the UNHCR Nairobi office, NGOs lost confidence in the sub-office. However, since new management was installed, the sub-office management team and the UNHCR team at Dadaab are doing a good job.

Infrequently mentioned
- UNHCR tends to be a reactionary body, but it should be future orientated.
- UNHCR maintains high standards.
- Due to pressures in the field, training is not a priority for humanitarian groups. Even though it is inconvenient for day-to-day operations, training is needed.
- When UNHCR provides funds to partners, a portion of the allocation should be designated for training – perhaps 1% of the budget.
- A few personnel from external organisations have participated in UNHCR's sessions dealing with refugee law and resettlement.
- UNHCR staff need additional training about humanitarian law, refugee law, women's rights, children's rights, team building, negotiation and presentation skills.
- Some UNHCR staff are cynical; they lack empathy for the refugees and the implementing partners.
- Protection officers in Kakuma tend to be combative and do not present a professional demeanour when dealing with refugees. They are not providing protection to children in Kakuma.
- UNHCR needs to do more to protect people in camps from rape and sodomy. They know that these activities exist. They need to practise what they preach.
- It's not common, but it does exist – some UNHCR staff give the impression that all refugees are liars.
- UNHCR staff need to display compassion, openness and a willingness to listen.

E3. Summary of responses to graduate questionnaire

Below is a summary of the 88 responses to the Graduate Questionnaire. The PLP programme has been updated several times since 2000. Thus, individuals who responded to the questionnaire did so based on their experiences at the time they took the programme. **Caution** should be taken to look for trends in the data rather than precise numbers. For example, depending on the audience at a particular workshop, more time was spent on one topic compared to another. That does not mean that the topic wasn't covered in the workshop, it just means that the audience helped determine what would be emphasised. Further, several of the questions in this questionnaire asked participants if they increased their knowledge and skills. Those who have considerable experience may not have improved their skills, but they still may have benefited from the experience. They may have confirmed what they already know and gained confidence in the experience. These factors are not reflected in the tables presented in the data section. In addition, the numbers in some of the tables do not total correctly due to rounding error and the fact that some respondents did not answer all parts of a question. Thus, trends rather tan precise numbers should be examined.

Basic Data (Questions 1–4)
- Seventy four percent (74%) or 87 of the respondents to this question were female and 26% were male.
- Thirty-five percent (35%) had a grade of G5 or above, 15% were classified as NOA/B/C, 35% were P2/P3, 10% were P4/P5, and 5% were classified as other.
- Forty-three percent (43%) of the graduates who responded were classified as protection officers, associate protection officers, assistant protection officers, regional protection officers, protection clerks or field assistants. The remaining respondents had a mixture of functional titles, including resettlement officer, eligibility officer, programme officer, community services officer, legal assistant, legal officer, senior policy officer, finance assistant, assistant public information officer, public information officer, senior regional registration officer, executive assistant, repatriation assistant, senior field safety adviser, head of sub-office and representative.
- The respondents' lengths of service are summarised below:
  - 1 – 3 years, 8%
  - 3 – 5 years, 32%
  - 5 – 10 years, 34%
  - more than 10 years, 25%

5. *Why did you enrol in the Protection Learning Programme?* (Check all that apply.)

Reason for Enrolling in the Protection Learning Programme	Number of Responses	Percentage of Respondents Who Selected This Option
To enhance my understanding of UNHCR's mandate for international protection	74	85%
To perform my job more effectively	72	83%
To help me serve refugees better	67	77%

To enable me to take on new responsibilities	46	53%
To prepare me for my new protection role	23	26%
To improve my chances of getting a protection post in the future	29	33%
To increase self-confidence	32	37%
To enhance my resume and personal fact sheet	24	28%
To meet other people with similar interests	22	25%
To exchange ideas and share professional experiences	51	59%
To comply with my supervisor's request	3	3%
Other	9	10%

Other reasons for enrolling in the PLP included:
- To refresh and systematise my knowledge
- To follow recommendations of Rebuttal Committee
- To ensure my understanding of the principles
- To serve clients, yet prevent emotional burnout
- Protection is the core mandate of UNHCR.
- To systemise knowledge and experience
- To have a more global policy harmonisation
- I was told it was necessary for my assignment.
- To determine whether I deliver appropriate protection

6. *Has the programme been relevant to your area of work?*
    Eighty percent (80%) found the programme relevant and 20% found it to be partially relevant.

7. *Rate the programme relative to the extent to which it increased your* **legal knowledge** *and* **understanding** *of the protection areas listed below.*

Knowledge Area	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
General protection knowledge	52%	38%	10%	0%
International refugee law	27%	56%	16%	1%
Asylum and refugee status determination (RSD) procedures	18%	60%	20%	2%
Statelessness	14%	56%	26%	3%
Resettlement	14%	52%	33%	1%
Internally displaced persons (IDPs)	15%	50%	29%	6%
Voluntary repatriation and reintegration	21%	56%	19%	4%
International humanitarian law	21%	41%	32%	6%
Human rights	15%	57%	22%	6%
Women's and children's rights	12%	66%	19%	3%

8. *Rate the programme relative to the extent to which it advanced your* **skills** *in the areas listed below.*

Skill	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Communication skills	20%	52%	21%	7%
Interviewing skills	20%	48%	24%	8%
Presentation skills	12%	50%	27%	11%
Analytical skills	23%	52%	19%	6%
Negotiation skills	22%	42%	32%	4%
Team building skills	21%	49%	28%	1%

9. *Rate the programme relative to the extent to which it increased your* **confidence** *in applying the approaches identified below.*

Approach/Methodology	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH TO PROTECTION	38%	52%	9%	1%
Gender and age mainstreaming	25%	55%	17%	2%
Prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence and persecution	24%	53%	20%	2%
Community development approach	15%	40%	38%	6%
Consultation with refugees	24%	52%	21%	2%
Team-based approach to problem solving	29%	50%	19%	2%

10. ***Did the Phase 3 project help you to consolidate your learning and apply the knowledge, skills, and attitudes you acquired while taking the programme?***

Eighty-seven percent (87%) or 75 responses indicated that Phase 3 consolidated their knowledge, while 11 responses indicated it did not. Those who added comments noted that they may not have taken Phase 3 seriously. Perhaps they did not place the effort into it, they did not receive adequate guidance and feedback, the local environment was not conducive to implementing a project in such a short-time or they had already been implementing most of the knowledge, skills and attitudes presented in the programme and thus learned nothing new.

11. *What did you like* **most** *about the programme?*

Below is a synopsis of the responses.

Frequently mentioned
- Overview of UNHCR's mandate and activities
- Practical nature of programme; opportunities to practise what one has learned
- Case studies
- Workshop, as it was stimulating, engaging and interactive
- Meeting colleagues and sharing experiences
- Legal framework of protection, including humanitarian and refugee law
- Reading materials that could be used as a reference once the programme was completed

Occasionally mentioned
- The comprehensive or broad perspective of the programme
- Role plays and simulations
- Discussions
- Negotiations and mediation skills development
- Self-study materials
- Discussions on refugee status determination

Infrequently mentioned
- The three-phase format – self-study, workshop and field study
- The theoretical basis for protection practices
- Interview techniques and skills
- Peer groups and working with a virtual team
- Reading documents one did not have the time to read before
- Team-building skills development
- Completing assignments
- The distance learning approach to the programme
- Feedback provided by headquarters
- The quality of the presentations by staff
- Videos
- Discussions on:
    - Statelessness
    - Human rights standards and their applications
    - Internally displaced persons
    - Rights-based approach to protection
    - Exclusion clause
    - International trafficking

12. *What did you like **least** about the programme?*

Below is a synopsis of the responses.

Frequently mentioned
- Tight timelines for the submission of assignments.
- Lack of individualised and timely feedback. When it was provided, it was too general.
- Online discussion groups. Little or no feedback was provided by peers.
- Short length of the workshop. There was not enough time for discussion and the completion of exercises.
- Excessively legalistic approach. The program only seemed appropriate for those with a law background.
- Lack of monitoring during Phase 3. No mentor provided.

Occasionally mentioned
- Too much reading; too much repetition in reading materials
- Workshop facilitation and presentation by inexperienced staff
- Link between Phase 3 project to course and work
- The theoretical nature of the programme. It should be more practical.
- Lack of follow-up after the programme was completed

Infrequently mentioned
- Too many assignments to be submitted
- Some self-study exercises
- The dryness and boring presentation in the unit covering protection
- The difficult reading level of the material
- Level of content. The level was too low for those with a master's degree.
- General nature of the programme. It lacked depth.
- Workshop presentations that were confusing, e.g., gender-related protection issues
- The lack of intensity in the workshop
- Size of workshop audience. As a large number of people were in attendance, discussion and interaction were inhibited.
- Videotaping exercises
- Studying and working at the same time
- Phase 3. It was a challenge because its successful implementation involved other people and circumstances beyond one's control.
- Self-study units
- Discussions on:
  - Resettlement
  - International law
  - Interviewing techniques
  - Refugee status determination
  - Negotiations
- Nothing

13. ***What did you learn that you did not expect to learn?***

Below is a synopsis of the responses.

Frequently mentioned
- Negotiation and advocacy skills
- Greater understanding of protection work

Occasionally mentioned
- Information about human rights, humanitarian law, international law, refugee law and their interplay
- Team-building skills
- Greater insight into other areas of UNHCR's work
- How to respond to emergency situations
- How to assist refugees in urban settings
- Information about:
  - Gender issues
  - Gender and sexually-based violence
- Nothing

Infrequently mentioned
- Learning from the experiences of other staff members
- The existence of all the legal conventions
- Protection does not have to be done only by lawyers.

- Security issues that must be addressed
- How protection and programme are integrated
- Different attitudes organisations have with respect to refugees
- Information about:
  - Trafficking of humans
  - Repatriation
  - Refugee status determination

14. *Rate the overall quality of the programme.*

Rating	Number of Responses	Percentage of Total Responses
Excellent	31	35
Good	54	61
Fair	3	3
Poor	0	0
Total	88	100

15. *Rate the learning effectiveness of each of the three phases of the programme.*

PLP Component	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Number Who Responded
Self-Study	45%	48%	7%	0%	88
Workshop	51%	38%	11%	0%	88
Phase 3 Project	19%	51%	28%	1%	88

16. *Rate the difficulty level of each phase of the programme.*

PLP Component	Very Difficult	Difficult	About Right	Easy	Number Who Responded
Self-Study	4%	35%	52%	9%	85
Workshop	0%	11%	65%	8%	85
Phase 3 Project	2%	17%	65%	16%	83

17. *How much of the assigned readings did you actually read?*

Readings	All	Most	Some	None	Number Who Responded
Mandatory	76%	23%	1%	0%	87
Supplementary	11%	52%	36%	1%	85

18. *Did you need outside assistance or resources to complete any of the following?*

PLP Component	Number of Responses	Reponses Compared to Total Number Who Responded to Questionnaire (N=88)
Self-Study	28	32%
Workshop	1	1%
Phase 3 project	14	16%

Assistance was needed from:

Frequently mentioned
- Colleagues
- Supervisor

Occasionally mentioned
- Reading materials
- Internet, including UNHCR website
- Workshop facilitators
- Legal officer

Type of information sought:
- Legal regulations
- Constitutional framework within a given country
- Protocols and conventions signed by a particular government
- Local laws regarding refugees and gender issues
- How to conduct refugee status determination
- Presentation skills
- Assistance with reviewing submissions

19. ***What helped you to complete the programme?*** (Check all that apply.)
    Note that the response ratio in the table below represents the number of responses received for a particular item compared to the number of individuals who responded to this question.

Source of Assistance	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Personal motivation	83	97%
Quality of the programme	58	67%
PLP online listserv	9	10%
PLP moderator	17	20%
Peer support	30	35%
Supervisor support	22	26%
Need to apply it directly to my work	49	57%
Need to prepare for future responsibilities	27	31%
Obtaining a translation of some of the material	0	0%
None of the above	1	1%
Other	2	2%

Other:
- Wide and diversified sources of information
- Staff in office taking course at the same time

20. *Rate the following aspects of the* **administration** *of the programme.*

Administrative Activities	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Applying and registering for the programme	43%	52%	5%	0%
Obtaining your supervisor's support	41%	47%	8%	5%
Receiving the materials	49%	34%	14%	3%
Receiving feedback on the assignments	13%	41%	33%	14%
Arranging and coordinating workshop attendance	44%	47%	7%	2%
Receiving certificate and recording on fact sheet	32%	31%	18%	19%

21. *Were any of your needs unmet by the programme?*

Of the 79 individuals who responded to this question, 32% indicated 'yes' and 68% indicated 'no'.

A synopsis of the unmet needs is provided below.

Frequently mentioned
- Feedback on assignments and Phase 3 project

Occasionally mentioned
- In-depth discussion on specialised protection issues
- Negotiation skills
- Receiving a certificate and recording the PLP on fact sheet

Infrequently mentioned
- In-depth discussion of legal matters
- High-quality discussions
- Additional case studies
- Additional practical information at workshop
- More detail on developing protection strategies
- Additional information on how to deal compassionately with difficult clients in difficult situations
- In-depth discussion of exclusion clause
- Deeper analysis of internally displaced persons
- More information on refugee status determination and voluntary repatriation
- Better understanding of 'particular social group'
- In-depth discussion on programme content
- Fully operational peer groups
- Appropriate attention to participants
- More case studies
- Unanswered questions on emergency situations

22. *How would you change the programme* **content, delivery, activities** *and* **resources?** *What specific items would you add or drop in each phase of the programme?*

Below is a synopsis of the responses submitted for this question. The responses are grouped under the following headings: Content, Self-Study, Workshop, Project and Overall Comments. A few comments could be placed under more than one heading, but they are listed only once.

Content
- Provide a consistent definition of protection and discuss all facets such as registration.
- Provide more information on the following:
  - Refugee status determination (frequently mentioned)
  - Internally displaced persons
  - Statelessness
  - Negotiation skills
  - Political awareness
  - Cultural sensitivity
  - National asylum systems and procedures
  - Interviewing skills

Self-Study
- Provide concise individualised, prompt feedback. (frequently mentioned)
- Less emphasis on peer group work as it was de-motivating (frequently mentioned)
- Provide more concise reading material. (frequently mentioned)
- Eliminate repetitive reading material. (mentioned occasionally)
- Require less mandatory reading. (mentioned occasionally)
- Lengthen completion time.
- Study guides should clarify key points.
- Increase the number of case studies.
- Introduce an exercise and a deadline for completing Unit 7 on programme matters.
- Provide questions that stimulate academic and practical applications.
- Ask participants to contact a protection officer in the field and discuss their experiences.
- Add more videos.

Workshop
- Increase the length of the workshop to allow more time for reflection, discussion and group work. Increase the length by one to six days. (frequently mentioned)
- Make link between self-study and workshop stronger. (mentioned occasionally)
- Make it more practical.
- Provide more practice time during workshop.
- Make workshop interesting.
- Focus on core issues as well as techniques and methods.
- Add programme-driven activities, as protection and assistance are interlinked.
- Increase personal introductory time.
- Ensure facilitators are knowledgeable in the topic they are addressing.
- Make it more lecture-centred.

- Reduce the number of 'games' such as the drawing exercise.
- Have protection staff spend a few days with programme staff.
- Hold the workshop in countries with refugees so that real-life activities can occur, instead of using role plays.
- Add field visits and study trips.

Project
- Provide better support. (mentioned occasionally)
- Strengthen Phase 3 and make it meaningful.
- Drop Phase 3 and replace it with an essay.

Overall Comments
- PLP is a good programme.
- Leave format as is.
- The content is fine.
- The materials are excellent.
- The activities were interesting.
- The PLP should be offered in different forms based on the background of the participants.
- A PLP should be developed for a specific field of work, e.g., refugee status determination, resettlement or refugee camps.
- An e-learning format could be used.
- There should be a follow-up activity to the programme.
- Allow experienced staff to participate in the Thematic Protection Learning Programme.

23. ***How would you assess the performance of PLP graduates?*** (Check all that apply.)

Possible Assessment Methods	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Administer a test at end of each phase	36	41%
Administer a test at the end of the entire programme	26	30%
Conduct an interview by PLP trainers and facilitators	36	41%
Obtain feedback from supervisor during staff assessment	29	33%
Obtain feedback from peers	21	24%
Prepare an essay to be evaluated	20	23%
Other	17	19%

A synopsis of the responses submitted by those who selected 'other' is provided below.

Occasionally mentioned
- Is assessment necessary?
- One could grade responses at end of each unit.

Infrequently mentioned
- Any, but not all, of the above are good suggestions.
- Exams are archaic evaluation modes.

- No, this [assessment] is wrong, as fewer people will take the course.
- It should be an incentive-based approach.
- Implement online testing.
- The current system is ok.
- The test should not be extremely difficult.
- Administer a test at the end of the workshop at the workshop site.
- Focus on Phase 3 and monitor it closely and seriously.

24. *How long did it take you to complete various phases of the programme?*

Phase	1-3 Months	4-6 Months	7-9 Months	10-12 Months	More than 12 Months
Self-Study	12%	62%	20%	5%	1%
Project	71%	19%	3%	4%	4%

25. *Now that you have completed the programme,* **how have you changed?** *What have you done with the knowledge and skills you have obtained? What can you do now that you couldn't do before? How has consultation with and assistance to refugees been improved?*

Below is a synopsis of the comments provided by the respondents.

Frequently mentioned
- Strengthened knowledge of the framework of protection
- Gained better knowledge of refugee problems and associated protection issues
- Became more confident in carrying out duties
- No real change
- Gained knowledge of UNHCR's mandate
- Improved:
  - Interviewing skills
  - Team-building skills
  - Negotiation skills
- Improved interactions with local authorities

Occasionally mentioned
- Able to do my job better
- No major changes, but many little changes made to my job on a daily basis
- Gained knowledge of:
  - Humanitarian laws
  - Refugee status determination
- Paid more attention to gender- and age-related vulnerabilities
- Implemented sexual and gender-based violence programme
- Able to address specific protection activities
- Improved:
  - Communication and presentation skills
  - Advocacy skills
- Able to argue my case more effectively
- Can build protection into programme

- Able to assist colleagues and answer their questions

Infrequently mentioned
- Consolidated my knowledge and experiences gained at UNHCR
- Gained knowledge of:
  - Refugee laws
  - International laws
  - Resettlement
  - Internally displaced persons
  - Human trafficking
  - Durable solutions
  - Repatriation
  - Reconciliation
- Gained a better understanding of the link between international laws and associated legal documents and work in the field
- Improved services to refugees
- Improved writing skills leading to better fund-raising proposals, donor reports and strategy reports
- Used inquiry rather than advocacy techniques when working with refugees and others
- Improved handling of political and diplomatic issues
- Increased motivation
- Paid more attention to the needs of women and children
- Gained an awareness of other areas of protection work
- Obtained a broader, world-view of protection
- Better able to coordinate protection activities with other groups and agencies
- Able to facilitate workshops better because of the knowledge and skills gained
- Give benefit of doubt to asylum seekers and refugees when information gathered is incomplete and perhaps contradictory
- Started to work with program colleagues and implementing partners
- Improved working relationships with colleagues, supervisors and implementing partners
- Able to sensitise local authorities about the rights of refugees
- Able to supervise staff better
- Require less supervision when handling refugee cases
- Can research protection issues myself and answer questions posed by others
- Established a protection filing system
- No major changes, but able to identify and state issues clearer and became better organised

26. ***What has made or will make it difficult for you to apply what you have learned in the PLP?*** (Check all that apply.)

Note that 72 individuals responded to this question.

Challenge	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Delay between completing the PLP and using my new skills	8	11%

Lack of resources	18	25%
Lack of protection strategy	21	29%
Pressure of workload	34	47%
Work-related emergency situations	17	23%
Negative attitude of colleagues	17	23%
Unsupportive supervisor	15	21%
Unsupportive management practices	28	38%
Unsupportive local authorities	32	44%
Unsupportive government	27	37%
Presence of military	8	11%
Cultural pressures	10	14%
Other	11	15%

The following is a synopsis of responses that were provided by those who selected 'other':

- No problems of the kind listed.
- PLP is limited by its generality.
- A new emergency can arise.
- Child rights conventions are not government supported.
- Everyone should know about the rights-based approach.
- Inexperienced protection staff may be a difficulty.
- Change in work location can be a problem.
- Nothing. Difficulties can be overcome.
- There is no such obstacle in front of me.
- None. We have an excellent working atmosphere.

27. *What was the greatest benefit of the programme?* (Check your top 3 benefits.)

Benefit of the Programme	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Better understanding of UNHCR's mandate for international protection	64	73%
Ability to perform my job more effectively	54	61%
Ability to serve refugees better	46	52%
Ability to take on new responsibilities	16	18%
Better preparation for my new protection post	9	10%
Improved my chances of obtaining a protection post in the future	7	8%
Increased self-confidence	29	33%
Enhanced resume and personal fact sheet	7	8%
Meeting other people with similar interests	17	19%
Exchanging ideas and shared professional experiences	27	31%
A satisfied supervisor	1	1%
Other	4	5%

The following are the responses provided by those who checked 'other':

- Personal development

- Increased knowledge of refugee and human rights law
- No response provided (2)

28. *Which of the following would you suggest that UNHCR implement in its efforts to improve the impact of the PLP?* (Check all that apply.)

Action to Improve PLP	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Restrict the programme only to those who have or soon will have a direct protection responsibility	8	9%
Make the programme compulsory for UNHCR professional (NOA to P5) and general (G5-G7) staff	57	65%
Open the programme to non-government organization (NGO) partners in order to increase the diversity of experience being shared and to encourage collaboration	47	53%
Offer core programme and optional units of study	42	48%
Offer a more flexible schedule for completing each phase of the programme	16	18%
Allow individuals to take any units or modules of study when they need them	18	20%
Develop an online or e-learning version of the PLP	31	35%
Offer the programme in another official UN language such as French	18	20%
Provide certification upon the successful completion of specified units of study and/or activities	13	15%
Assess the performance of participants during and/or after programme completion	35	40%
Increase supervisor involvement	21	24%
Take into consideration the successful completion of the programme when individuals apply for jobs or postings	51	58%
Other	6	7%

The responses provided by those who selected 'other' are provided below.
- Participants need to allow time for the course.
- Compulsory or voluntary? Additional evaluation is needed.
- Increase the interactivity of the programme.
- Add refresher for those who completed it 3-4 years ago.
- No response provided (2).

29. *Would you recommend this programme to a colleague?*

Eighty-four (84) respondents would recommend this programme to a colleague. No respondents indicated that they would not recommend the programme.

A synopsis of the reasons for recommending the programme is provided below.

Frequently mentioned
- PLP is the most useful training programme offered by UNHCR.
- Staff need to have an understanding of protection, the mandate and policies of UNHCR and the international framework in which UNHCR operates.
- It provides a broad view of UNHCR's activities.

- PLP should be mandatory for all.

Occasionally mentioned
- It would ease communication – everyone would have similar language and understanding.
- It is useful and practical. It is relevant to one's daily work.

Infrequently mentioned
- This programme is recommended for those with limited UNHCR experience. Those with several years of UNHCR experience should take the Thematic Learning Programme.
- The programme helps everyone to either broaden his or her knowledge or refresh it.
- People need to constantly upgrade themselves.
- Those who want to advance their career should take the PLP.
- It is interesting, challenging and motivating.
- Staff need to learn about international laws and other factors that affect refugees.
- The PLP provides a more integrated rather than a departmental approach to learning.
- The programme provides useful documentation that can be used on a daily basis.
- The PLP helps those people with no legal background to become protection officers.
- The programme is useful but not recommended for those on short-term contracts, as they may use up limited UNHCR resources.
- The programme is useful but is not for everyone because it has a heavy workload.
- The programme is useful, but the mixed audience may be a handicap for those who have protection experience.
- By taking the PLP, individuals will improve the protection of refugees through enhanced commitment and the right attitude.

30. *If you have any additional suggestions for improving the programme, please use the space below to tell us about them.*

Below is a synopsis of the suggestions that were submitted to improve the programme. They have been grouped under the following headings: General Comments, Self-Study, Workshop, Phase 3 Project, Delivery, Assessment and Administration. Some items could be placed under more than one heading; however, comments are placed under only one heading.

General Comments

Frequently mentioned
- More feedback and guidance are needed for the self-study and the Phase 3 project.

- Provide two PLPs – one intense course for protection staff that focuses on protection, programme and their applications and the other general course for non-protection staff.

Occasionally mentioned

- A more advanced and/or refresher PLP should be implemented so that people can continue to learn after graduation.
- Consideration should be given to offering specialisations in refugee status determination, repatriation, resettlement, internally displaced persons and the mass influx of refugees.
- The programme should help me to obtain a protection post, but I am not sure that participation in the programme will be considered during the hiring process.
- The PLP gave people a forum for the common understanding of international law and principles.
- The programme should be taken by all staff regardless of their experience or title.

Infrequently mentioned

- Learning about protection is a continuous process and should not be limited to one course.
- Any changes, modifications and clarifications should be shared with graduates after they complete the PLP.
- The programme interweaves theory with practice.
- There should be two protection courses. One would be a basic course that is compulsory for all protection staff and open to personnel from non-governmental organisations. The other would be an advanced level and open to protection staff.
- The current program is too ambitious. It should be broken down into smaller courses and include other aspects of protection such as registration and gathering country of origin information.
- The programme should be updated and perhaps offered in a format similar to the Middle-Management Learning Programme.
- E-learning or online options should be considered.
- UNHCR should offer more workshops for protection officers.
- The PLP should only be taken by the 'most potential' staff so that money and resources are not wasted.
- People need to look beyond their respective sections. 'Refugees and their protection is not about numbers, it is about humans.'
- UNHCR staff need to recognise the contribution of all staff. Protection is a shared responsibility.
- It may be difficult to apply what one has learned during the PLP because of 'inexperienced protection staff with a negative outlook for refugees and inflated self-image coupled with lack of recognition of the advantage of teamwork'.
- Nothing prevented me from applying what I have learned. One must have an optimistic approach and a commitment to his or her job.
- The PLP is not considered a value-added asset by UNHCR management. It should be taken into account when postings are assigned.

- One needs to address the problem of changing supervisors – the first one supported my participation in the PLP, the second one does not.
- Key government officials should be invited to participate in the PLP.

Self-Study

- The amount of reading was overwhelming. (occasionally mentioned)
- The self-study units were unbalanced – some were easy and others were extremely challenging.
- More time is needed to complete the self-study.
- Reduce the number of assignments or group them into three-month periods.
- Provide an exercise for Unit 7.
- The refugee status determination unit should be more in-depth.

Workshop

- Key messages concerning resettlement should be clarified.
- More time is needed for skill development during the workshop.
- The workshop had too many role plays and exercises and not enough content being delivered.

Phase 3 Project

- The project was used to inform local authorities about differences between refugees and economic migrants.

Delivery

- The workshop should be held earlier in the programme so people can get to know one another.
- Videotapes should be recycled.
- A community of practice should be established.
- The materials should be translated so they can be shared with local government officials.

Assessment

- Administer and grade an assessment after each unit is complete. (occasionally mentioned)
- There should be an incentive approach to evaluation. It does not have to be recorded on fact sheets.
- The performance of PLP participants should not be assessed, as fewer people would take the course.
- Our work should be evaluated by refugees and partners.

Administration

- The administration of the PLP must be improved. This includes keeping track of assignments, responding to e-mails promptly and sending out certificates in a timely manner.

- PLP certificates have not been sent out nor has the PLP been noted on the fact sheet.

E4. Summary of responses to non-completers/in-progress questionnaire

Below is a summary of the responses from the 93 non-completers and in-progress PLP participants. Originally, the evaluators received a list of names from the Protection Capacity Section that should have contained only those who had not completed the PLP. As the questionnaires were being administrated, a significant number – perhaps 40% of those who were contacted – indicated that they had not dropped out of the programme. These individuals were simply behind schedule. The evaluation team decided to keep responses from non-completers and in-progress questions in one database, as it was too late to separate the non-completers from those in-progress. Further, the questions the evaluators would ask both groups were similar. As the evaluation proceeded, it became evident that approximately 15% of those included on the list of non-completers had actually completed the programme.

Basic Data (Questions 1-4)
- Eighty-two (82%) of the 93 respondents were female and 18% were male.
- Forty-two percent (42%) had a grade of G5 or above, 8% were classified as NOA/B/C, 28% were P2/P3, 14% were P4/P5 and 8% were classified as other.
- Twenty-six percent (26%) of the respondents were classified as protection officers, associate protection officers, assistant protection officers, regional protection officers, senior protection clerks or field assistants. The remaining respondents had a mixture of functional titles including resettlement officer, eligibility assistant, eligibility officer, programme officer, community services officer, registration assistant, legal assistant, assistant legal officer, legal officer, senior policy officer, administrative officer, finance assistant, assistant public information officer, public information officer, regional public information officer, senior external relations officer, associate evaluation and policy analysis officer, senior regional registration officer, executive assistant, repatriation assistant, senior field safety adviser, senior secretary, senior secretary to the representative, senior desk officer, head of sub-office, representative and United Nations volunteer. The non-completers and in-progress group of participants appeared to contain a greater number of different functional titles than did those the group of graduates.
- The respondents' lengths of service are summarised below:
  - 1 – 3 years, 29%
  - 3 – 5 years, 18%
  - 5 – 10 years, 22%
  - more than 10 years, 31%

5. *Why did you enrol in the Protection Learning Programme?* (Check all that apply.)

Reason for Enrolling in the Protection Learning Programme	Number of Responses	Percentage of Respondents Who Selected This Option
To enhance my understanding of UNHCR's mandate for international protection	89	96%
To perform my job more effectively	75	81%

To help me serve refugees better	74	80%
To enable me to take on new responsibilities	54	58%
To prepare me for my new protection role	19	20%
To improve my chances of getting a protection post in the future	28	30%
To increase self-confidence	47	51%
To enhance my resume and personal fact sheet	33	35%
To meet other people with similar interests	13	14%
To exchange ideas and share professional experiences	42	45%
To comply with my supervisor's request	4	4%
Other	3	3%

Other reasons for enrolling in the PLP included the responses below:
- To follow recommendation from my rebuttal procedure
- Very strong interests in refuge, international humanitarian law and human rights laws
- To be better able to represent UNHCR to journalists

6. *Was the programme relevant to your area of work?*

Relevancy	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Very relevant	69	74%
Partially relevant	20	22%
Not relevant	4	4%

7. *Was the content of the programme difficult to understand (complex or technical language, too much jargon, or content that was too abstract)?*

Level of Difficulty	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Very difficult	1	1%
Difficult	19	20%
About right	60	65%
Easy	13	14%

8. *Which part of the programme was the most difficult to complete?*

Eighty-two (82) individuals respondent to this question. A few only indicated the difficulty encountered while others checked the self-study or workshop box, then specified the units or topics that they found difficult. Thus, the response ratio accounts for this mixture of responses.

Relevancy	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Self-Study	64	79%
Workshop	9	11%
Difficult unit specified below	23	28%

Below are units or topics respondents found difficult.

Frequently mentioned
- Phase 3 needs clarity; difficult for those stationed at headquarters to implement a project.

Occasionally mentioned
- Units 2 and 5 (The 1951 Refugee Convention and Protection in Asylum)
- Unit 3 (International Refugee Law)
- Refugee status determination
- Time – need more time

Infrequently mentioned
- Units 3 and 6 (International Refugee Law, Protection in Asylum – Displaced Persons in Camps)
- Units 6 and 7 (Protection in Asylum – Displaced Persons in Camps, Preventing and Responding to Sexual and Gender-Based Violence)
- Unit 7 (Preventing and Responding to Sexual and Gender-Based Violence)
- Unit 12 (Protection Driven Operations)
- Internally displaced persons
- Camps
- Resettlement
- Statelessness
- Gender-related persecution
- Legal documents and conventions
- Also noted:
  - Overlap of mission and study schedule
  - Reading country information on CD
  - Keeping up with readings
  - Activities in which one had to concur with colleagues
  - Heavy workload; one year required for programme
  - Abstraction of material
  - In general, I found it ok.

9. *What are your preferred learning methods?* (Check your top three methods.)

Learning Method	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Lectures and guest speakers	36	39%
Readings	35	38%
Workbooks	25	27%
Brainstorming and discussions	45	48%
Case studies	56	60%
Role plays and simulations	28	30%
Field trips	26	28%
Projects	13	14%
Team projects	16	17%
Technology (e.g., CD-ROM, Internet and	17	18%

videos)		

10. *Overall, how did you find the quality of the contents of the programme?*

Quality Rating	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Excellent	37	40%
Good	52	56%
Poor	1	1%
Very Poor	3	3%

11. *Did taking the programme have any impact on your knowledge, skills or attitude?*

Eighty-nine percent (89%) of the respondents indicated that the programme had an impact on their knowledge, skills or attitudes, whereas 11% indicated that it didn't have an impact. Below is a synopsis of the comments submitted by the respondents.

Frequently mentioned
- Provided an overview of the mandate and international activities of UNHCR
- Provided a conceptual framework for daily activities
- Provided knowledge and skills that can be used at work on a daily basis
- Increased self-confidence
- Enabled participants to better analyse situations and take appropriate decisions
- Learned that UNHCR's protection programme and administrative sections must act as one unit, they must work together
- Enabled participants to provide protection training to peers and inform others about the protection activities of UNHCR
- Learned about refugee rights

Occasionally mentioned
- Helped to prepare individuals for new position/post
- Learned how to involve refugees in the decision-making process
- Enabled participants to provide better advice to refugees and other persons of concern
- Became more sensitive to refugees and aware that cultural differences can affect perception
- Opened mind to different points of view regarding specific situations
- Learned about:
  - Trafficking and smuggling
  - Asylum claims
  - Resettlement
  - Refugee status determination
  - Refugee law
  - Internally displaced persons
  - Reintegration
  - Statelessness
  - Rights-based approach

Infrequently mentioned
- Raised performance to a higher level
- Able to prove to other colleagues that individual knows the topic
- Garnered better understanding of the interface between refugee work and human resource matters
- Strengthened knowledge and understanding of refugee and asylum-seeking children
- Led participants to act more cautiously and to examine the protection aspects of situations
- Improved presentation skills
- Reminded of past protection activities
- Emphasised the importance of learning to the organisation
- Learned about:
  - Refugee concerns
  - Repatriation
  - Reconstruction
  - Negotiations
  - Gender issues
  - Sexual and gender-based violence
  - Communication development approach
  - Camp situations

12. *Why did you not complete the PLP?* (Check all that apply.)

Reason for Not Completing PLP	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
PLP required me to do more work than I expected.	13	14
I needed individualised feedback and encouragement.	6	6
Feedback was delayed	4	4
Material arrived late	7	8
Material was difficult to understand	2	2
The self-study material had too many components (e.g., print materials, videos and CD-ROMs).	6	6
I wasn't interested in the material.	0	0
My workload prevented me from devoting enough time to study.	27	29
I was unable to work effectively on my own.	3	3
Personal reasons such as illness made it impossible for me to continue.	8	9
The PLP is irrelevant to my current post.	2	2
My post, assignment or mission changed.	7	8
I lacked support from my supervisor.	5	5
The PLP took too much effort for the recognition received.	1	1
The quality of the programme was poor.	0	0
I never stopped taking the programme. I am just behind schedule.	39	42
Other	54	58

The 54 respondents who selected the 'other' response to the question 'Why did you not complete the PLP?' provided responses that could be grouped into the following categories:
- Completed the programme – 15 responses
- In-progress – 23
- Other reasons – 16

Under the category of 'other reasons' can be placed the items below.
- I kept abreast but on my own time.
- Lack of individual e-mail address and lack of feedback
- I did all assignments and workshop except for the project.
- I completed all the lectures.
- I missed the PLP because my supervisor did not release me.
- Due to the Iraq crisis, my supervisor did not release me.
- I was not permitted to go to the workshop.
- Change in location of duty station
- My post was discontinued and I had no time for taking the course.
- Too many missions

Note that five respondents indicated that their explanations can be found in the answer to question 16.

13. ***Would you complete or undertake the programme again if you are given a chance?***

Eighty-two percent (82%) or 59 out of 72 respondents indicated that they would complete or undertake the course again, but 18% or 13 respondents indicated that they would not.

Synopsis of comments in response to this question are grouped under the following headings: Yes, No, or Other.

Yes

- Yes (4 responses with no further explanation)
- The course is interesting, relevant and important. (3 responses)
- But the language used in the PLP was difficult
- I will complete the programme.
- To gain deeper knowledge
- I would like to be part of a team in my office rather than be the only one.
- But not exactly the same course
- I need more time to complete it.
- It provides a good foundation.
- It expands my knowledge and enables me to work better.
- The course gives a chance for all, not just lawyers, to learn about protection.
- I would do it again if my Phase 3 project is not accepted.
- The programme assisted me in my daily tasks.
- The PLP helps me to see clearer through the protection glasses.
- It reminds one of the overall responsibilities of a humanitarian worker. It exposed me to areas of UNHCR's work that I had never thought of.
- It's knowledge for free!

No

- I would rather take a course in a thematic area.
- Since I already knew the contents, I would choose another programme such as the refugee status determination or management programmes.
- I would take a longer, in-depth course designed specifically for protection staff.
- I do not fully understand the documents I am reading.
- I have already obtained the knowledge I am seeking.
- If UNHCR recognised the PLP certificate, I would do more.
- There is no need to repeat it.
- I am leaving UNHCR.

Other

- The question is not applicable, as I am still working on the PLP. (27 responses)
- An advanced PLP would be of interest. (3 responses)
- Lost my Phase 3 project due to a computer crash.
- If UNHCR recognises this certificate, I would be happy to take a diploma or degree programme.
- I am reading and improving my understanding of the present documents that I have not fully understood.
- It would be beneficial to continue to improve my knowledge and skills about the activities of UNHCR.
- The programme meets my personal needs for personal development.

14. ***What do you need that will help you undertake the programme again?*** (Check all that apply.)

Sixty-six (66) individuals selected the options presented below. Obviously, in-progress PLP participants tended not to respond to this question as they were still completing the programme.

Condition That Will Help Participants Undertake the Programme	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
A simpler and shorter version of the PLP	14	21%
More background knowledge	10	15%
A translation of the material into a language that I am proficient in	3	5%
More experience	9	14%
More time	37	56%
Additional support from PLP team	19	29%
Additional support from my supervisor	13	20%
Additional support from my peers	6	9%
A protection-related assignment	10	15%
More recognition	4	6%
Greater commitment to my personal development	10	15%

Other	17	26%

A synopsis of the comments submitted under the 'other' selection is presented below.
- Nothing, currently finalising the programme (4 responses)
- More feedback from PLP team during Phase 3 (2 responses)
- Receiving a diploma instead of a certificate. It is too intensive.
- Permission to complete my project
- Another colleague to do it with
- Examples of PLP action plan
- Basic protection introduction provided to all staff
- Refer to responses in question 16.
- Not applicable (5 responses)

15. *Do you believe that the PLP should be mandatory for all UNHCR staff?*

Seventy percent (70%) or 62 out of 88 respondents indicated that the PLP should be mandatory for all UNHCR staff, whereas 30% or 26 respondents indicated 'no'.

A synopsis of the comments provided by respondents is provided below. Comments are listed under the following headings: Yes, No and Maybe.

Yes

Frequently mentioned
- Everyone, regardless of job function, should know UNHCR's mandate and its role in protecting refugees and other persons of concern. (39 responses)

Occasionally mentioned
- Yes, if course is simplified. It covers too many topics in a short time. Make a mandatory shorter course. (6 responses)
- There should be two versions of the PLP – a shorter version for all staff who do not have the relevant background or who are not directly involved with protection matters and a longer one, like the current version with more legal and practical assignments for those involved directly with refugees. (5 responses)
- It should be mandatory for protection staff only, as it has too much legal detail. (4 responses)
- Anyone who deals with refugees must know UNHCR's mandate. Others should be encouraged to take it. (3 responses)

Infrequently mentioned
- It should be mandatory for protection, programme and field staff.
- Non-field personnel need to understand UNHCR's role.
- It could increase the quality of UNHCR's activities.
- Yes, if staff members are given enough time to complete it and if they receive support from their supervisors.

No

- Staff should be encouraged, but not forced, to take it. It is each staff member's responsibility to ensure sufficient knowledge of his or her job. It should remain as a free choice.
- It would be more effective if the programme is left open for those who are interested in it, as the programme requires interest, commitment and enthusiasm.
- It is not relevant for all staff. Some may choose to undertake a different learning programme.
- It is not necessary for most non-protection posts.
- If UNHCR recognises the PLP certificate for upgrading, it will become self-mandatory, as it will attract students.
- It is too technical and specialised for everyone to take.
- Many lower-level staff are not literate enough to take the programme.

Maybe

- It should be strongly encouraged, but more thought is required on this issue.
- It depends on the professional interest of colleagues and would set a precedent. Colleagues may have to take courses they have no interest in or courses that are not relevant to their careers.

16. *Please provide additional recommendations on how the PLP could be improved.*

Below is a synopsis of the 70 comments that were submitted. These comments are listed under the following headings: General Comments, Structure of the PLP, Content, Self-Study, Workshop, Phase 3 Project, Assessment and Administration.

General Comments

- Individualised feedback must be provided. (9 responses)
- The PLP is very good as it is. (8 responses)
- Links between participants and headquarters and between participants should be improved. (3 responses)
- It was lonely doing the PLP. I needed feedback. I found a colleague in my office who was also taking the PLP.
- Encourage teamwork within one office.
- The expectations for the PLP are too high. Not all colleagues who completed the course know protection.
- The PLP is a little too basic for protection staff.
- The diversity of PLP participants was a big plus.
- Unless a participant has a legal background, the successful completion of the PLP does not qualify a staff member to be appointed in a protection post.
- Increase the enrolment capacity of the PLP so that more people can take it.
- The PLP is time consuming.
- Due to the amount of work involved, one should receive more than a certificate. The PLP needs to be more user friendly like the Middle-Management Learning Programme.

- I did not complete the PLP because of my re-assignment to a different duty station. There were many personal and professional factors that affected my ability to study.
- While completing the PLP, my studying was affected by missions and emergency situations.
- Managers should allow PLP participants one day each week for study.
- Supervisors should release their staff to participate in the workshop.
- Eliminate hard copies of the materials. Provide materials on CD and/or online.
- People in the field need to have Internet access so that they can access additional resources.

Structure of the PLP

- The PLP was well-structured and followed the 'life cycle' of refugees.
- In order to stimulate staff to complete the PLP, hold an introductory meeting or workshop.
- Consider offering the PLP in parts or modularise the programme.
- The programme should be split into two parts. The first should be easy and have an unlimited time for completion.
- All UNHCR staff should be required to take an induction course. More in-depth courses should be optional.
- The participants for the PLP should be divided into protection and non-protection. Appropriate courses should be provided to each group.
- Protection officers should participate in a mandatory one-month training programme.
- Introduce a mid-term workshop.
- If the PLP will continue to serve a mixed audience, then it must be simplified, yet be comprehensive.
- Increase the length of time to complete the PLP rather than reduce its contents.
- Individual workshops that will allow participants to show their experiences should be held on humanitarian law, negotiation, training for partners, eligibility for refugee status, inclusion, exclusion, cessation, statelessness, refoulement, voluntary repatriation, resettlement, refugee camps and urban refugees. These workshops would be open to all staff.
- The PLP should be in the form of online lectures like the Effective Writing course.
- Those who take the PLP should be given the opportunity to visit posts in different countries in order to see how refugees are assisted.
- Additional meeting with trainers is preferred over electronic learning.
- I need to be harassed in order to complete my work.
- It is difficult to participate in peer-to-peer discussions when you are on a mission.
- The online discussion among peers was virtually non-existent.
- Eliminate the online peer discussion groups.

Content

- Additional content regarding assistance/protection and refugee status determination is necessary.
- Additional audio, video and reading materials are needed that provide an overview of UNHCR's work in different regions.
- From the perspective of a non-protection staff, some of the content was too abstract.
- Add content regarding forced migration, terrorism, security threats posed by the AIDs pandemic, international humanitarian assistance and the changing roles of stakeholders in addressing the refugee crisis.

Self-Study

- The time allocated for the completion of the units must be more realistic. (4 responses)
- The material was too much to digest. Either lengthen the programme or reduce the content. (4 responses)
- The material should be simplified, user friendly and practical (3 responses)
- Units 1 and 2 contained lots of reading material. Spread the material over the entire programme.
- Reduce the amount of reading material and add more audio and video material.
- Provide knowledge reviews or summaries of each unit.
- Explanations of technical terms used in the material are needed.
- Additional practical examples on how to identify and address protection are required.
- The statelessness unit was too simplified.
- Add units on the completion of resettlement registration forms and on gender and age mainstreaming.

Workshop

- The time allocated for the workshop was too short. Participants were not able to absorb all sessions.
- The workshop allowed for practical exercises and an exchange of knowledge and experiences with peers.
- The workshop was too superficial and should draw on the content of the self-study.
- The workshop should not repeat items covered in the self-study phase.
- Include more case studies.
- Case studies are useful learning tools, but they must be discussed more thoroughly.
- Smaller discussion groups should be implemented.
- Facilitators should adhere to the workshop schedule.
- Facilitators should encourage everyone to speak.
- The workshop facilitators were excellent.
- Negotiation and interview skills activities should be removed from the workshop.
- Additional training on negotiation skills is needed.

- Reduce the number of lectures in the workshop. Add more simulations, case studies and dynamic participatory sessions.
- Reduce the number of role plays in the workshop and increase the time for discussion.

Phase 3 Project

- Additional clarity is needed – expectations, methodology and report.
- It was difficult to complete. Instead, have an assessment after each unit.
- Eliminate the project, as protection staff are constantly implementing projects and policies.

Assessment

- An impact assessment of participants is needed. Feedback from refugees, colleagues and members of other agencies should be provided.
- Each participant should be given an opportunity to select one of five protection areas or issues to write a two-page essay on.

Administration

- The PLP team is flexible.
- The PLP team needs to be more flexible. They need to take into account participants' need to go on mission and their duty station workloads.
- Those who are responsible for the PLP should either be private consultants or UNHCR staff whose sole task is the PLP.

E5. Summary of responses to workshop attendees' questionnaire

Below is a summary of the responses from the 30 participants in the workshop in Budapest in November 2004.

Basic Data (Questions 1-4)

- Sixty percent (60%) or 18 of the respondents were female and 18% or 12 were male.
- Twenty percent (20%) had a grade of G5 or above, 23% were classified as NOA/B/C, 33% were P2/P3, 10% were P4/P5 and 13% were classified as other.
- Only 14 individuals indicated their functional title. The following functional titles were submitted: protection assistant, protection officer, public information clerk, public information assistant, field officer protection, resettlement officer, eligibility assistant, legal officer, senior public information officer, senior operations officer, field officer and head of field office.
- The respondents' lengths of service are summarised below:
  - 1 – 3 years, 21%
  - 3 – 5 years, 10%
  - 5 – 10 years, 48%
  - more than 10 years, 21%

5. *Why did you enrol in the Protection Learning Programme?* (Check all that apply.)

Reason for Enrolling in the Protection Learning Programme	Number of Responses	% of Respondents Who Selected This Option
To enhance my understanding of UNHCR's mandate for international protection	28	93%
To perform my job more effectively	25	83%
To help me serve refugees better	24	80%
To enable me to take on new responsibilities	15	50%
To prepare me for my new protection role	9	30%
To improve my chances of getting a protection post in the future	9	30%
To increase self-confidence	19	63%
To enhance my resume and personal fact sheet	8	27%
To meet other people with similar interests	5	17%
To exchange ideas and share professional experiences	13	43%
To comply with my supervisor's request	1	3%
Other	3	10%

Other reasons for enrolling in the PLP included the following:

- To brush up on protection knowledge and skills
- To stop being considered just a public information clerk
- No spaces available in the courses (asylum and migration) wanted

6. *Has the programme been relevant to your area of work?*

Seventy percent (70%) found the programme relevant and 30% found it to be partially relevant.

7. *Rate the workshop relative to the extent to which it increased your **legal knowledge and understanding** of the protection areas listed below.*

Knowledge Area	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
General protection knowledge	28%	52%	14%	7%
International refugee law	24%	48%	17%	10%
Asylum and refugee status determination (RSD) procedures	38%	34%	21%	7%
Statelessness	17%	17%	31%	34%
Resettlement	14%	21%	41%	24%
Internally displaced persons (IDPs)	21%	31%	31%	17%
Voluntary repatriation and reintegration	14%	46%	32%	7%
International humanitarian law	32%	36%	25%	7%
Human rights	24%	41%	31%	3%
Women's and children's rights	34%	38%	21%	7%

8. *Rate the workshop relative to the extent to which it advanced your **skills** in the areas listed below.*

Skill	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Communication skills	7%	45%	38%	10%
Interviewing skills	17%	55%	14%	14%
Presentation skills	3%	48%	31%	17%
Analytical skills	21%	62%	10%	7%
Negotiation skills	34%	34%	24%	7%
Team-building skills	31%	34%	28%	7%

9. *Rate the programme relative to the extent to which it increased your **confidence** in applying the approaches identified below.*

Approach/Methodology	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH TO PROTECTION	34%	52%	10%	3%
Gender and age mainstreaming	31%	38%	28%	3%
Prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence and persecution	24%	45%	24%	7%
Community development approach	7%	28%	52%	14%
Consultation with refugees	21%	36%	32%	11%
Team-based approach to problem solving	29%	46%	18%	7%

10. *Describe how your attitude to specific aspects of protection changed during the workshop.*

Although this question asked participants to discuss attitudinal changes, a variety of responses were provided. A number of the responses dealt with knowledge and

a few responses were incomprehensible. The abbreviated responses are arranged under the following headings: Attitudes, Knowledge and Other.

Attitudes

- My attitude did not change much, as I knew most of the material. (3 responses)
- My attitude did not change, but I learned a lot about issues I am not dealing with.
- It refreshed me.
- Felt confident in my knowledge of protection. Now able to bring protection knowledge to bear in operations, but also able to identify when and where a lawyer is needed.
- Obtained a more global view of protection
- Became much more attentive and dedicated to international human rights laws and treaties
- Showed how important it is to take an expansive view of protection, beyond just refugee protection
- Re-examined my assumptions about instruction that seemed to lead to competition for scarce resources
- Realised the importance of people skills in terms of communication, understanding others' points of views, finding common ground and identifying strengths and resources
- Helped me to see our persons of concern more compassionately in the broader context of migration flows
- Redefined team work and co-operation
- Appreciated the need for teamwork in emergencies
- Learned it was important to consult with my colleagues
- Realised the need for better co-operation inside and outside the office
- Makes it easier to deal with the interrelationships between protection and operations
- Gained understanding of the difficult balance between protection elements and operational necessities
- Realised that we often focus on our discourse and agenda instead of asking the reason or rationale behind the position. We often appear to be imposing foreign concepts.
- Realised that inquiry is a very important part of negotiation skills
- Increased my appreciation for the need to base all action on the law
- Realised that it is important to deliberate and build a strategy before acting

Knowledge

- Did not take the PLP to enhance my attitude. It was taken to increase, systematise and consolidate understanding of protection in UNHCR.
- Gained or improved an understanding on protection-related issues
- Learned about cessation clauses, refugee status determination interviews and negotiation skills
- Reminded me of the fundamental principles of protection
- Learned that experiences in one country do not necessarily apply to another country

- Improved my knowledge of protection, thus it will be easier to deal with issues that are inter-related between protection and operations
- Learned about the pressures of emergency situations
- Increased understanding of important elements, in particular refugee status determination procedures
- Enhanced knowledge and application of major international humanitarian laws, human rights and refugee
- Learned what international laws address refugees
- Changed perspective on exclusion clauses
- Became aware of structured approaches to caseloads
- Helped me to prepare action plans

Other

- The workshop, its materials and facilitators were excellent.

11. *Following the workshop, what knowledge, skills and attitudes acquired during the workshop will you be able to apply to your work?*

A synopsis of the responses to this question is provided below. Responses are arranged under the following headings: Knowledge, Skills, Attitude and Other.

Knowledge

Frequently mentioned
- Sexual and gender-based violence
- Exclusion clauses

Occasionally mentioned
- Complementary approaches to refugee law, human rights law and international humanitarian law
- Human rights law
- Gender-based approach
- Refugee status determination
- Trafficking and smuggling
- Rights-based approach
- Matching facts to law

Infrequently mentioned
- Durable solutions
- International humanitarian laws
- Protection issues
- Country operations
- Statelessness

Skills

Frequently mentioned
- Negotiation
- Team building

Occasionally mentioned

- Communication

Infrequently mentioned

- Continuous local integration
- Writing funding proposals
- Analytical skills
- Using legal tools

Attitude

- Made me aware that I need to suspend my assumptions
- Refreshed attitudes towards refugee status determination and durable solutions
- Acquired broader and more positive interpretation of human rights laws
- Feel more confident in conducting presentations and answering questions
- Reminded me of the importance of teamwork, especially in emergency situations
- Appreciated the need for sensitivity and tolerance
- Aware of need to address apathy towards refugees
- Renewed my enthusiasm
- Learned not to impose empathy, but to advocate for it
- Reminded me that learning is a continuous process

Other

- All
- None, but not in a negative way
- Not able to apply many due to my current job responsibilities
- Excessive reference to time pressures
- Don't take up important assignment if not comfortable with it.

Note: For each of the statements in questions 12–16, the 30 participants were asked whether they strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statements.

12.

The workshop was:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
At an appropriate level for the audience	37%	53%	10%	0%
Well-organised	62%	34%	3%	0%
Accurate and current	57%	40%	3%	0%
Interesting	60%	33%	7%	0%
Well-paced	37%	53%	10%	0%

13.

. During the workshop, we were:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Allotted adequate time to deal with important or difficult concepts	20%	63%	13%	3%
Given adequate time to practise or use concepts or skills	10%	53%	37%	0%
Encouraged to participate in discussions	57%	33%	10%	0%
Encouraged to examine issues and to analyse and evaluate new concepts	55%	41%	3%	0%
Encouraged to think about how we would apply the skills we learned	40%	50%	10%	0%

14.

. The instructional team:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the subject matter	90%	10%	0%	0%
Communicated clearly	70%	23%	7%	0%
Was responsive to our needs	67%	33%	0%	0%
Provided a positive learning environment	75%	21%	4%	0%
Displayed cultural sensitivity	70%	27%	3%	0%
Respected the opinions of others	73%	27%	0%	0%
Worked together seamlessly	70%	30%	0%	0%

15.

The workshop exercises and activities:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Were directly related to the workshop	50%	50%	0%	0%
Were appropriate for the audience	33%	60%	7%	0%
Were challenging	17%	63%	17%	3%
Enabled me to practise new skills	30%	47%	23%	0%
Enabled me to reflect on my past performance and consider how I might do things differently in the future	43%	43%	13%	0%

16.

Instructional aids used during the workshop:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Were varied	31%	62%	7%	0%
Were used appropriately	43%	50%	7%	0%
Were suitable for the tasks being taught	43%	50%	7%	0%

17. *What aspects of the workshop did you like the* **most?**

A synopsis of the responses to this question is provided below.

Frequently mentioned

- Discussions with colleagues; exchanging experiences
- Negotiation
- Facts and law approach to the exercises
- Simulations/role plays
- Case studies
- Group work/teamwork
- Presentations

Occasionally mentioned
- Questions and answers
- Refugee status determination
- Facilitation of workshop

Infrequently mentioned
- Durable solutions
- Asylum seekers
- Interviewing
- Focus on protection and human rights
- Applying legal framework in an emergency
- Substantive law discussions
- Practical exercises
- Debriefing
- Balance between contents, skills and attitudes
- Importance given to skills and attitudes
- Clear introductions
- Clearly linked exercises
- Variety of audio-visual aids
- Nothing stood out.
- Everything

18. *What aspects of the workshop did you like the* **least?**

A synopsis of the responses to this question is provided below.

Frequently mentioned
- Time constraints

Occasionally mentioned
- Emergency simulation not well explained
- Emergency simulation had little learning value.
- Large number of participants, thus poor group dynamics
- Lengthy sessions without sufficient breaks during first two days

Infrequently mentioned
- Slow presentations
- Lack of time for some activities
- Lack of specific topics
- Not dealing with some topics in-depth
- Durable solutions was too short and superficial.
- Focus on limited view of protection; needed world-wide view

- Focus on soft skills rather than knowledge and attitudes appropriate to the level of the audience
- Trafficking was too long.
- Endless discussion questions on legal views
- Video on camp situation in Tanzania
- Lack of a warm atmosphere
- The impression of amateurism and self-learning experience rather than knowledge
- Accommodation and lunch

19. *How would you improve this workshop?*

A synopsis of the responses to this question is provided below.

Frequently mentioned
- Add an extra day.

Occasionally mentioned
- Allocate more time to practical activities.
- Provide the participants with an agenda for the workshop several weeks prior to the workshop.
- Distribute more handouts that provide information, background and references.
- Add more on resettlement.
- Add additional refugee status determination exercises of the facts and law type.

Infrequently mentioned
These responses are grouped under the following headings: Content, Delivery and Other.
Content
- Include more current protection issues and UNHCR initiatives.
- Allot more time to interview techniques.
- Include discussion on returnees and monitoring of UNHCR.
- Add more on migration, smuggling and trafficking.
- Provide guidance for voluntary repatriation.
- Introduce statelessness and protection of internally displaced persons.
- Include something on fraud in refugee status determination and resettlement.
- Provide practical approaches to topics such as voluntary repatriation.
- Discuss durable solutions first, then other topics.
- Allocate more time for difficult protection issues on durable solutions.
Delivery
- Provide more structure.
- Increase the connection between self-study assignments and workshop.
- Limit the number of issues.
- Limit the time dedicated to each issue.
- Prove more time for feedback regarding exercises; ensure that there is time for all groups.
- Add more roles in exercises.

- Provide written rules for simulation.
- Elaborate simulation activity and provide more realistic environment for it.
- Pace it better. Spread the materials from days 1 and 2 over four days.
- Shift from skills and attitudes to facts and knowledge in line with the rights-based approach.
- Revise the intellectual level of the workshop without making a new course.
- Use a professional facilitator.
- Vary trainers and bring in outside sources.
- Build and incorporate the expertise of the audience.

Other
- Limit participation to 20–25 people.
- Provide a list of the names of participants and facilitators as well as their titles and locations.
- Open PLP to lower-grade personnel.
- Use the workshop to lure participants into protection-driven work.
- Introduce supervisor and peer review.
- Did facilitators have time to review our responses to the self-study units?
- Nothing

20. *Rate the overall quality of the workshop.*

Overall Quality	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Excellent	18	60%
Good	9	30%
Fair	2	7%
Poor	1	3%

21. ***If you have any additional suggestions for improving the workshop or any other comments regarding the Protection Learning Programme, please use the space below to tell us about them.***

A synopsis of the respondents' comments is provided below.

Frequently mentioned
- Provide feedback during the self-study and workshop.
- Take advantage of colleagues from different functional units to strategise and operationalise protection, e.g., how to coordinate protection with programme.

Occasionally mentioned
- By providing generic responses to assignments, shows disrespect to the individuals and their work.

Infrequently mentioned
These responses are grouped under the following headings: Workshop and PLP in General.
Workshop
- Mix colleagues from different regions of the world in one workshop.

- Allow participants to provide more details about themselves, their work and their duty stations.
- Adopt a more individualised approach to the workshop, e.g., invite participants to share their experiences, their failures.
- Provide more focus on international humanitarian law and international human rights standards and their use in protection.
- Include more examples from UNHCR about what is done in practice.
- Include regional instruments and approaches.
- Provide informational handouts during workshop.
- Incorporate protection activities from Workshop on Emergency Management.
- Co-ordinate exercises in other learning programmes; avoid repetition.
- Provide refresher training for trainers.
- Allocate more time for exercises.
- Hold the workshop at the headquarters in Geneva so that participants have an opportunity to visit it and feel that they belong to the organisation.
- The workshop enabled me to learn from peers.
- The workshop had a very high level of quality.

PLP in General
- Provide the PLP in another language, such as Spanish.
- Provide a French version of the PLP.
- Clearly identify who has ownership for the success of the PLP.
- Provide feedback to Phase 3 submissions.
- Phase 3 should not be mandated. Phase 3 is artificial.

E6. Summary of responses to trainers' and facilitators' questionnaire

Below is a summary of the responses from the 12 trainers and facilitators who completed the questionnaire.

Basic Data (Questions 1-4)

- Sixty-seven percent (67%) or 8 of the respondents were female and 33% or 4 were male.
- Eight percent (8%) or one person had a grade of G5 or above, none were classified as NOA/B/C, 67% or 8 individuals were P2/P3, 17% or two individuals were P4/P5 and 8% or one person was classified as other.
- Eleven individuals submitted their functional titles. The distribution of titles is provided below.
  - 5 protection officers
  - 2 legal officers
  - 3 training officers
  - 1 programme assistant
- The respondents' lengths of service are summarised below:
  - 1 – 3 years, 0%
  - 3 – 5 years, 2 or 17%
  - 5 – 10 years, 8 or 67%
  - more than 10 years, 2 or 17%

5. *Number of PLP workshops you have facilitated*

Number of Workshops	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
1	6	50%
2	1	8%
3	1	8%
4	2	17%
5	2	17%
More than 5	0	0%

6. *Have you completed the PLP yourself?*

Eighty-three percent (89%) or 10 respondents indicated 'yes' and 17% or 2 individuals indicated 'no'.

7. *Rate the extent to which the* **workshop** *helps participants to increase their* **legal knowledge and understanding** *of the protection areas listed below.*

Workshop: Knowledge of Legal Topics	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Protection standards	33%	58%	8%	0%
International refugee law	25%	67%	8%	0%
Asylum and refugee status determination (RSD) procedures	8%	67%	25%	0%
Internally displaced persons (IDPs)	0%	25%	58%	17%

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
International humanitarian law	0%	25%	58%	17%
Human rights	0%	58%	33%	8%
Women's and children's rights	33%	42%	25%	0%

8. *Rate the extent to which the* **workshop** *helps participants advance their* **skills** *in the area listed below.*

Workshop: Skills	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Communication skills	0%	58%	42%	0%
Interviewing skills	0%	67%	33%	0%
Presentation skills	8%	17%	67%	8%
Analytical skills	33%	33%	33%	0%
Negotiation skills	25%	42%	33%	0%
Team building skills	33%	58%	8%	0%

9. *Rate the extent to which the* **workshop** *helps participants increase their* **confidence** *in being able to deal effectively with any of the approaches or methodologies identified below.*

Workshop: Skills	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Rights-based approach to protection	0%	83%	17%	0%
Gender and age mainstreaming	17%	58%	25%	0%
Prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence and persecution	8%	75%	17%	0%
Community development approach	8%	42%	50%	0%
Consultation with refugees	17%	67%	17%	0%
Team-based approach to problem solving	58%	42%	0%	0%

10. *Does the content of the workshop meet the needs of the mixed audience present in these sessions?*

Sixty-seven percent (67%) or eight individuals indicated 'yes' to this question and 33% or four individuals indicated 'no'. An abbreviated version of their comments is provided below.

- The mixed nature of the audience creates some challenges in terms of the degree of detail required for the different audiences. This challenge is surmountable. A mixed audience allows people to share their experiences.
- The main challenge is to define the content that meets the needs of protection and non-protection staff as well as those with advanced protection skills. The content is currently suitable for non-protection staff and less experienced and less knowledgeable staff. The advanced protection staff require more specialised content that concentrates on legal analysis, refugee status determination and the rights-based approach.
- It will always be difficult to meet the needs of everyone. The PLP strikes the right balance.

- Yes, but it might be worthwhile to place additional material relating to the legal framework, rights-based approach as a refresher at the end of the workshop.
- It is still valid for the mixed audience, as they learn from each other and gain a common understanding of protection. Specialised courses for specific aspects can be offered at a separate stage for a much smaller audience.
- Non-protection staff have often expressed that the content of the workshop is too technical.

11. ***Prior to the workshop, do the participants have the necessary knowledge, skills or attitudes to benefit fully from the workshop?***

Fifty percent (50%) or 6 respondents indicated 'yes' and 50% indicated 'no'. A synopsis of their responses is provided below.

- Often, the self-study module is completed in a hurry and people do not take the time to absorb these messages. The self-study could be shortened.
- Given the mixed audience, there will be variations among the knowledge, skills and attitudes of the participants.
- The majority of the staff have the right skills and attitudes. A small minority do not have attitudes that are congruent with UNHCR's humanitarian mandate. Some do not have appropriate attitudes to human rights in general, and gender and age-based approaches to protection.
- On paper, yes; they don't make the connection between the workbook and the workshop.
- Many are new to protection and have difficulty coping with the amount of new information.
- There is too much information to fit into the short session on international legal framework.
- Most participants have the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes. But in large groups, some are not very active, thus they are difficult to assess.
- In most cases, participants are not fully prepared when they come to the workshop and expect to receive training and answers at the workshop.
- In some cases, it seems that the materials covered in the PLP workbooks have not been fully understood by the participants.

12. ***What aspects of the workshop seem to benefit the participants the* most?**

A synopsis of the comments is provided below.

Frequently mentioned
- Team building/teamwork
- Negotiation
- Refugee status determination
- International legal framework
- Simulations, role plays and participatory exercises (e.g., interviewing, negotiations and teamwork)

Occasionally mentioned
- Durable solutions

- Gender and age approaches

Infrequently mentioned
- Balance between content, skills and attitudes
- Importance of right attitude
- Need to remain empathetic
- Exchanging knowledge and experiences with others
- Exclusion clauses
- Trafficking video

Other responses included the following:
- Those with limited experience or work in specific environments tend to benefit the most, as they are exposed to a wider environment.
- The workshop needs to be modified from time to time, as participants know what to expect from previous workshop participants.
- I do question whether I and other facilitators have the necessary skills to effectively address skills and attitudes.

13. *What aspects of the workshop seem to benefit the participants the* **least?**

Frequently mentioned
- Negotiation

Occasionally mentioned
- Complex legal issues such as exclusion and international humanitarian law as well as the dry presentations

Infrequently mentioned
- Refugee status determination, as it is a broad subject, but an overview for PLP participants is appropriate.
- Interviewing role play
- Emergencies
- Work plan; for much of the protection staff, the legal content is rather basic.
- Pace of workshop does not give time for discussion.
- All sessions are beneficial, but some are more beneficial than others, depending on the participants. Those from Africa benefit little from the discussion of rural asylum, as it's routine for them.

14. *What* **content** *did the workshop participants seem to have the greatest difficulty with?* (Check all that apply.)

Responses to question 14 were submitted by 11 trainers and facilitators.

Workshop Content	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Gender and age mainstreaming	2	18%
Prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence and persecution	8	73%
Rights-based approach to protection	6	55%
Negotiation skills	2	18%

Analytical skills	5	45%
Communication skills	0	0%
Presentation skills	4	36%
Team-based approach to problem solving	0	0%
Consultation with refugees	2	18%
Other topics	4	36%

The other topics included the following:
- Gender persecution and application of the exclusion clause
- Co-ordination within and outside UNHCR

15. *What **delivery method** did the workshop participants seem to have the greatest difficulty with?* (Check all that apply.)

Delivery Method	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Lectures	6	60%
Open discussions	2	20%
Case studies	1	10%
Role play or simulations	2	20%
Teamwork	0	0%
Presentations in which technology was used	1	10%

16. *What can be done to address the difficulties identified in questions 14 and 15 above?*

A synopsis of the suggestions submitted is provided below.
- Simplify or improve role plays and simulations.
- Allocate more time to explain objectives and background to activities.
- Reduce the amount of information provided.
- Clearly explain exclusion.
- Change lecture style for the session on international legal framework and gender persecution.
- Provide enough time to discuss content.
- Keep participants on track during discussions.
- Evaluate (provide feedback) immediately after exercises.
- Bring in an external facilitator for the negotiation session.
- Engage facilitators who have specialised skills regarding gender-based persecution and the rights-based approach.
- Invite experienced persons within the audience to help with facilitation.
- Provide continuous training and coaching.
- Provide a legal refresher at the end of the workshop.
- Since different people have different learning styles and appreciate different learning styles, it can be a challenge to address everyone's needs.

17. *What changes would you make to the workshop **objectives**, **content**, **delivery** and **resources**?*

A synopsis of the responses is provided below. Many of the responses are related to how the workshop is delivered.

- Limit the number of workshop attendees to 25.
- Increase efforts to understand participants' expectations.
- Shorten the workshop, as it's too intense.
- Keep the workshop length at 4.5 days.
- Make sessions more digestible, e.g., Monday afternoon.
- Focus more on basic protection principles.
- Reduce theoretical discussion.
- Allocate more time for session on international legal framework.
- Improve lectures on complex subjects; use flipcharts and provide handouts that contain summaries of the content.
- Make some exercises clearer.
- Include non-UNHCR roles in emergency simulation.
- Provide a more structured debriefing of the emergency situation.
- Improve negotiation exercise.
- Provide external facilitators for negotiations.
- Add additional facilitators – 4 per group.
- Allocate more time for questions and discussion.
- Respect 'parking lot' on last day.
- Move away from having too many flipchart and PowerPoint presentations.
- Provide prompt, individualised feedback when assignments are submitted.

18. *Should an assessment component be added to the* **workshop?**

Fifty-eight percent (58%) or 7 respondents indicated that an assessment component could be added to the workshop, while 42% or 5 would disagree with this action. A synopsis of their comments is provided below.

- Evaluation should be completed by participants of the pre-workshop phase.
- Participants should be tested on their knowledge prior to workshop attendance.
- Assessment of participants' contribution could be done immediately after the workshop by facilitators.
- A periodic review of the content of the workshop should be conducted.
- At the end of each day, the workshop should be evaluated.
- Assessment of the participants should be conducted by the supervisor as part of each staff member's overall evaluation.
- One could evaluate the material covered in the workshop, but it would be best to assess all the content in the PLP.
- The PLP team in Geneva plays a supervisory role to ensure that the workshop meets standards.
- We need to assess how people can work in the real world. The workshop only assesses what people learn from the 'bookish/workshop' process.
- Although I am in favour of assessment, it might ruin the energy and 'drive' of the workshop.
- Assessing the performance of the participants would not be feasible.

- I am unfamiliar with assessment methodology and how it might be incorporated into the PLP.

19. ***Should an assessment component be added to the* entire *Protection Learning Programme?***

Eighty-three percent (83%) or ten respondents indicate that there should be an assessment component added to the Protection Learning Programme and 17% or 2 respondents indicated 'no'. A synopsis of their comments is presented below.

- The third phase of the PLP should be better monitored and can be evaluated with a pass or fail grade. (frequently mentioned)
- Pre- and post-PLP assessments would be useful to evaluate progress.
- Evaluation is needed to make the programme more credible and to get participants to take it more seriously.
- An evaluation of the entire program should be conducted.
- There should be a test to ensure that participants have a basic knowledge and understanding of protection principles.
- The PLP is not meant to test knowledge, but to provide tools and skills to help staff better provide protection.
- An assessment should be conducted by facilitators.
- Supervisors of staff taking the PLP should be required to provide feedback.
- An exam after the workshop is useless, as people need time to reflect on what they have learned.
- A test of knowledge and the participants' capacity to analyse protection-related issues could be implemented after the participants have returned to their duty stations. It could be in the form of multiple-choice questions and case studies.
- If one is good at completing an exam, it does not mean one is good at doing the work.
- There are many elements of the PLP that are difficult to evaluate.

20. ***Is the workshop suitable for other UNHCR stakeholders and non-governmental personnel?***

Seventy-five percent (75%) or 9 of the respondents indicated that the PLP workshop is suitable for other UNHCR stakeholders and non-governmental personnel, while 25% or 3 respondents indicated that it is not. A synopsis of their comments is provided below.

- Yes, with minor modifications. One would need to elaborate further on some of UNHCR's terms and approaches.
- Yes, it is important to involve personnel from non-governmental organisations.
- Other stakeholders also require this type of training.
- Including government counterparts may inhibit UNHCR staff.
- In its current form, it is too UNHCR-oriented.
- No. The workshop should not be opened to partners, but if we do so, only to non-governmental organisations. If there are no partners in attendance, UNHCR personnel can raise more sensitive issues.

21. *In order to attract a broader audience, should the workshop be changed?*

The respondents are equally split on their responses. Fifty percent (50%) or 5 indicated 'yes' and 50% or 5 indicated 'no'. A synopsis of their comments is provided below.

- The PLP could be made clearer and simpler.
- Given the current demand, there is no need to attract a broader audience. What is needed is greater resources to make it more accessible to colleagues.
- In order to cater to a wider audience, the PLP should be watered down. Thematic issues can be dealt with separately.
- The audience is already quite broad. What is needed is more participation by managers.
- In order to attract more managers, divide the workshop into groups, for example, Gs to P3 and P4 and above.
- The PLP should be made mandatory for newly recruited staff at the professional and senior national level.
- More time should be allotted to the simulation exercise and it should be more practical.

22. *Do the workshop facilitators meet to exchange best practices?*

Thirty-three percent (33%) or 4 respondents indicated 'yes' and 67% or 8 respondents indicated 'no'. A synopsis of their comments is provided below.

- Key messages should be addressed through a formal mechanism.
- There is no formal mechanism between all facilitators.
- No exchange of ideas among facilitators takes place.
- We need to develop a better way to exchange ideas and to channel them to the PLP team so that our experiences are taken into account.
- Initially, facilitators meet at the Train the Trainers session. Then, small teams of facilitators meet who are going to deliver a workshop. E-mail and teleconference meetings are held to discuss assignments.
- Perhaps facilitators who have Train the Trainers experience could meet with the PLP team to re-design the course.
- As the PLP team constantly improves the facilitators' notes, perhaps all we need is the addition of a best practices/techniques section.
- A best practice document could be maintained by the PLP team and added to after each workshop.
- There needs to be a more transparent procedure for selecting facilitators.
- Facilitators should receive feedback on their performances.
- Facilitators should receive mandatory training.
- Facilitators are not encouraged or supported to improve their knowledge, skills and expertise.
- Most facilitators have full-time jobs and participate in the PLP voluntarily. Any ideas to improve contact between facilitators should not be added to their workload.

23. ***Please provide additional suggestions that could be used to improve the workshop and/or the entire Protection Learning Programme.***

A synopsis of the comments is provided below.
- Provide more specialised units for protection staff.
- Reduce the pace of the workshop in order to reduce participants' frustration and allow time for them to raise questions and discuss cases.
- Allocate adequate time for the discussion of action plans.
- Remove the 'vision of protection' exercise.
- Reduce the use of e-mails, as most field locations cannot access the Internet.
- Participants in the 'deep field' could be clustered together and provided more workshops.
- The facilitation of learning programme is an excellent model to follow. Independent consultants mark assignments and provide relevant and timely feedback.

E7. Summary of responses to colleagues' (supervisors and peers) questionnaire

Below is a summary of the responses from the 12 supervisors and peers who completed the questionnaire.

Basic Data (Questions 1-4)
- Ninety-two percent (92%) or 11 of the respondents were female and 8% or one was male.
- Of the 11 respondents who indicated their grade, 9% or one individual selected a grade of NOA/B/C, 36% or 4 individuals selected P2/P3 and 55% or 6 individuals indicated they were P4/P5.
- Twelve individuals submitted their functional titles. The distribution of titles is provided below.
  - 3 protection officers
  - 4 senior protection officers
  - 1 associate field/protection officer
  - 1 deputy chief of mission (protection)
  - 1 chief of mission
  - 1 head of field office
  - 1 deputy representative
- The respondents' lengths of service are summarised below:
  - 1 – 3 years, 1 or 8%
  - 3 – 5 years, 0 or 0%
  - 5 – 10 years, 5 or 42%
  - more than 10 years, 6 or 50%

5. *Number of PLP graduates supervised in the last two years*

Number of Workshops	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
1	0	0%
2	3	30%
3	3	30%
4	2	20%
5	2	20%
6-10	0	%

6. *Are you aware of the PLP and its contents?*

Knowledge of PLP	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
I have taken the programme	5	42%
I am fully aware of its contents	2	17%
I have some knowledge of its contents	5	42%

7. *What are the main implications of PLP to the work of your unit, section, operation or office?* (Check all that apply.)

Implications of PLP to Work Unit	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Improve delivery of protection	12	100%
Change attitude of staff	8	67%
Develop better relations with refugee	5	42%
Improve interaction between units (i.e., protection or programme)	9	75%
Improve relations with implementing partners and governments	6	50%
Improve teamwork	7	58%
Implement a rights-based approach to protection and assistance	11	92%
Incorporate gender perspective	8	67%
Improve responses to sexual and gender-based violence	8	67%

8. *Please provide two examples that show how the PLP has had an impact on any of the items noted above. If possible, provide an example that illustrates improved consultation with assistance to refugees.*

A synopsis of the comments provided by supervisors and peers is provided below. Note that the first item was mentioned by several respondents.

General Comments
- Graduates have a better understanding of how UNHCR works.
- Graduates are more creative in formulating strategies to protect refugees and other persons of concern.
- Graduates are more confident when discussing protection issues.
- Graduates see the broader picture.
- Programme staff gained a better understanding of UNHCR's protection mandate and objectives.
- Those who graduate from the PLP speak the same language. They have a common understanding of terminology whether their background is in protection, refugee status determination or legal areas. They understand the linkages to a right-based approach versus a humanitarian approach.
- Graduates demonstrate an improvement in teamwork.
- Inputs from all units were more easily co-ordinated when there was a need to find solutions to specific problems.
- The changes in attitude of PLP graduates lead to a more analytical approach to their daily work.
- Generally, the programme contributed to the strengthening of the protection skills and capacities of the staff.
- It is not possible for me to identify that the PLP itself had a direct impact, although I believe that the increased knowledge and added focus on protection contributed to the work of the office.

Specific Examples
- The five staff members in one office who took the PLP provided a forum for discussion on various protection issues, particularly gender and age

mainstreaming. This led to greater interaction with refugee women and men about the issue and helped implementing partners to establish networks to sensitise refugee communities and establish a forum for such redress.

- Field officers are now able to address sexual and gender-based issues.
- The PLP provided information and strategies on sexual and gender-based violence and thus helped the office to analyse and respond to these types of situations in the refugee camp. Graduates of the PLP have engaged themselves in organising anti-trafficking seminars and protection session that incorporate a gender perspective. These seminars or sessions have been targeted at refugees, asylum seekers and other local actors.
- One PLP graduate who handled primarily resettlement and voluntary repatriations developed a greater understanding of refugee status requirements and procedures. Thus, she was able to reduce the burden on protection officers by addressing some of their routine questions.
- An associate protection officer who took the PLP has become more professional when he deals with refugees in the camps. He also assumes greater responsibility when handling protection issues and has become more active in facilitating staff learning.
- Following his enrolment in the PLP, my protection assistant organised a series of protection training activities that benefited government officials, implementing partners, UN sister agencies and other humanitarian agencies in the region. Thus, there has been an improved relationship with all stakeholders.
- One staff member with no legal background took the PLP and handles protection issues more effectively than others. She is especially effective with cases involving women at risk and resettlement.
- One PLP graduate approaches protection problems from a broader perspective. His supervisor is more confident in him, as he can perform beyond his job description and work in a more independent manner.
- Proposals for the improvement of life conditions for refugee women, children/youth, 'vulnerables' and 'urbans' were developed.
- Time management and distribution of duties within the section have improved.
- More joint protection, programme and community service meetings with refugee communities were held.
- The co-ordination of actors involved in the intervention during the Cyangugu Emergency in June 2004 was effective.

9. *Please rate the impact of the PLP on the performance of your office as a whole.*

Impact on Office	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Excellent	5	42%
Good	7	58%
Fair	0	%
Poor	0	%

10. *Rate the extent to which PLP graduates demonstrated an increase in* **legal knowledge and understanding** *of the protection areas listed below.*

Knowledge Area	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
General protection knowledge	58%	42%	0%	0%
International refugee law	33%	58%	8%	0%
Asylum and refugee status determination (RSD) procedures	17%	75%	8%	0%
Statelessness	10%	50%	40%	0%
Resettlement	18%	73%	9%	0%
Internally displaced persons (IDPs)	20%	40%	40%	0%
Voluntary repatriation and reintegration	55%	45%	0%	0%
International humanitarian law	27%	27%	36%	9%
Human rights	13%	75%	13%	0%
Women's and children's rights	25%	63%	13%	0%

Responses to question 10 were submitted by 12 supervisors and peers.

11. *Rate the extent to which PLP graduates advanced their **skills** in the areas listed below.*

Skill	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Communication skills	45%	45%	9%	0%
Interviewing skills	30%	60%	10%	0%
Presentation skills	36%	64%	0%	0%
Analytical skills	36%	55%	9%	0%
Negotiation skills	30%	40%	20%	10%
Team-building skills	45%	36%	18%	0%

Responses to question 11 were submitted by 11 supervisors and peers.

12. *Rate the extent to which PLP graduates increased their **confidence** in being able to deal effectively with any of the areas identified below.*

Approach/Methodology	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH TO PROTECTION	64%	36%	0%	0%
Gender and age mainstreaming	36%	64%	0%	0%
Prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence and persecution	36%	64%	0%	0%
Community development approach	18%	73%	9%	0%
Consultation with refugees	36%	55%	9%	0%
Team-based approach to problem solving	73%	18%	9%	0%

Responses to question 12 were submitted by 11 supervisors and peers.

13. *How did you contribute to the work of colleagues involved in the PLP?* (Please check all that apply.)

Contribution to the	Number of	Response Ratio

Work of Colleagues Involved in the PLP	Responses	
Permitted release time	9	75%
Provided technical or knowledge support	6	50%
Participated in exercises	4	33%
Directed participants to other resources for assistance	5	42%
Provided motivation or encouragement	11	92%
None of the above	0	0%
Other	4	33%

Responses to question 13 were submitted by 12 supervisors and peers.

The responses below were also provided.
- Enrolled in course myself
- Provided lectures on the definition of refugee and refugee status determination
- Exchanged information and experiences
- Encouraged colleagues to take course

14. *Please identify factors that would make it difficult for PLP graduates to apply the protection standards and policies in your workplace.*

Challenge	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Lack of resources	5	45%
Lack of protection strategy	1	9%
Pressure of workload	7	64%
Work-related emergency situations	5	45%
Negative attitude of colleagues	1	9%
Unsupportive management practices	2	18%
Unsupportive local authorities	7	64%
Unsupportive government	6	55%
Presence of military	3	27%
Cultural pressures	2	18%
Other	3	27%

Responses to question 14 were submitted by 11 supervisors and peers.

The responses below were also provided.
- Lack of knowledge is a hindrance to the team in the field.
- Negative attitude of implementing partners
- None

15. *Do you believe that the PLP should be mandatory for all UNHCR staff?*

Ninety percent (90%) or nine of the ten supervisors and peers who answered this question indicated that the PLP should be mandatory for all UNHCR staff, while 10% or one person indicated 'no'.

Below is a synopsis of the comments submitted by the respondents. The first item was frequently mentioned.

- As international protection of refugees is UNHCR's core mandate, all staff should be familiar with the broad meaning of protection and how it relates to their daily work.
- A shorter format of the PLP should be available to enhance the understanding of the role and mandate of the UNHCR and to demystify protection.
- All junior staff must take the PLP. All programme colleagues should be advised to take the PLP. Protection officers with a background of protection and substantial experience should not need to take the PLP.
- GL-6 and above should all take the PLP.
- As the academic and cultural background of UNHCR staff is so diverse, it is essential that they be exposed to a basic course focusing on basic refugee law, principles and standards.
- Only if all UNHCR staff are fully equipped with protection knowledge skills could it be possible for government, implementing partners and non-governmental organisations to provide quality projects and activities for refugees.
- The PLP should be required of all staff who want to become managers.

16. ***Should UNHCR continue to provide the PLP in its current format?***

Ninety percent (90%) or 10 of the 11 supervisors and peers who answered this question indicated that the PLP should continued to be offered in its current format, while 10% or one person indicated 'no'.

Below is a synopsis of the comments submitted by the respondents.

- The Middle-Management Programme (2002-2003) and the PLP have similar format. This format should be continued.
- The non-protection staff need something less tedious. The length of the current PLP and the work involved deters non-protection colleagues from taking it.
- Two formats are required – one for GL-6 and above, a lighter version for everyone else.
- It is difficult to participate in the PLP while completing one's daily work for the UNHCR. One needs to work in the evenings and on weekends to complete the programme. The self-study component should not be as difficult to complete.
- If the PLP becomes mandatory, then it should be offered in several languages in order to ensure that participants fully understand it.

17. ***Please provide any other recommendations on how the PLP could be improved.***

Below is a synopsis of the comments submitted by the respondents.

- Make it compulsory for all programme and community services staff.
- Decrease the length of time required to complete the programme.

- Generally, there has been a positive impact on interaction between protection and programme personnel.
- The colleagues who took the PLP exchanged information and experiences, developed relationships and assisted each other with responses to the exercises.
- It was difficult to apply protection standards and policies because of the behaviour of refugees and the negative or unsupportive attitude of implementing partners, refugee leaders and/or the local population.
- The basic knowledge of the PLP should be present in other learning programmes so that all staff enrolled in UNHCR learning programmes will learn about protection.
- Could consideration be given to allowing P3 protection staff to enrol in the Thematic Protection Learning Programme?
- Congratulations. The course is very good. Please keep it up!

E8. Summary of responses to the other persons of interest questionnaire

Below is a summary of the responses from the 4 individuals who completed the questionnaire. A number of people who work in organisations that deal with UNHCR in Kenya were invited to complete this questionnaire. The response rate was extremely low, thus **care** must be taken in reviewing the data and in drawing any definitive conclusions.

Basic Data (Questions 1-4)
- Responses to this questionnaire were received from 3 individuals who work for the German Agency for Technical Co-operation, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH and one respondent who works for the Refugee Consortium of Kenya.
- The functional titles of the respondents are as follows:
  - Executive Director
  - Medical Co-ordinator
  - Community Services Co-ordinator
  - Senior Programme Officer
- All respondents were based in Nairobi, Kenya.
- One female and three males completed the questionnaire.

5. *Do you work closely with UNHCR in providing protection and assistance to refugees?*

   The four respondents indicated that they work closely with UNHCR.

6. *Please indicate the nature of your organisation's mandate below.*

Mandate	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Refugee protection	2	50%
Legal Advice	0	0%
Human rights	0	0%
Migration	0	0%
Advocacy	0	0%
Care and maintenance of refugee settlements	0	0%
Other	2	50%

   Note that GTZ is a German development agency whose aim is to enhance the quality of life in its partner countries. The Refugee Consortium of Kenya provides legal advice to refugees and works with UNHCR and other organisations to advocate for the rights of refugees.

7. *Are you familiar with UNHCR protection, community services, and programme?*

   All respondents indicated that they were familiar with UNHCR staff.

8. *Are you satisfied with the quality of knowledge, skills, and attitudes of the UNHCR staff working in your country or operation?*

Satisfaction with Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes of UNHCR Staff	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Yes	1	25%
Partially	3	75%
No	0	0%

9. *From your perspective, are UNHCR staff providing adequate services to refugees?*

Satisfaction with Provision of Services	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Yes	1	25%
Partially	2	50%
No	1	25%

10. *Are you aware of the Protection Learning Programme (PLP) received by UNHCR staff?*

None of the respondents were familiar with the PLP.

11. *If you answered yes to question 10, do you know any UNHCR staff who participated in the Protection Learning Programme?*

None of the respondents knew a UNHCR staff member who had taken the PLP.

12. *Rate the extent to which UNHCR staff demonstrated the knowledge and skills listed below.*

Note, only two of the four questionnaire respondents completed this question.

Knowledge and Skills	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
General protection knowledge	0%	50%	50%	0%
Communication skills	0%	0%	100%	0%
Interviewing skills	0%	50%	50%	0%
Presentation skills	0%	50%	50%	0%
Analytical skills	0%	100%	0%	0%
Negotiation skills	0%	50%	50%	0%
Team-building skills	0%	0%	100%	0%
Gender and age mainstreaming	0%	50%	0%	50%
Rights-based approach to protection	0%	50%	0%	50%
Community-based approach	0%	50%	50%	0%
Consultation with refugees	0%	0%	50%	50%

13. *Please provide two examples of a situation in which UNHCR staff changed their performance following their participation in the Protection Learning*

Programme. If possible, provide an example that illustrates improved consultation with and assistance to refugees.

No responses were received for this question.

14. *Do you believe **UNHCR staff require additional training?***

The one person who answered this question said 'yes'; however, two comments were submitted. These are provided below.

- Yes, in consultation with refugees, empathy, debriefing, interview skills and attitude change
- Team building, consulting and taking other people's view

15. *Do you believe that the Protection Learning Programme should be available to non-UNHCR staff from government and non-government agencies?*

Three respondents indicated 'yes' that the PLP should be available to others. Four respondents provided comments. A synopsis of these is provided below.

- Yes, as non-UNHCR staff deal with the same challenges. This training would improve the protection of refugees.
- This kind of training would enhance collaboration and partnership.
- Since implementing partners have even more direct contact with refugees than UNHCR staff, this type of training is necessary for non-UNHCR staff.
- Since UNHCR offices are understaffed and require assistance and collaboration in achieving its mandate, this training is necessary.
- This training could enhance the skills of partners who are charged with the actual implementation of protection policies.

16. *What is necessary to improve the protection of refugees in your operation or country?*

A synopsis of the responses is provided below.

- There is a need for collaboration between the different actors. If UNHCR focused on its mandate and encouraged host countries to follow a legal framework, refugee protection would be improved and UNHCR would have more time and resources to promote refugee protection.
- UNHCR could do a little more listening to alternative voices.
- Governments need to increase their involvement in refugee matters, e.g., policy, registration, security, mandate and so forth.
- Law enforcement officers should have training regarding refugee rights and human rights.
- Aid workers need to be sensitised to the needs of refugees.
- Lobbying for pro-refugee government legislation should occur.
- Partners need to mobilise additional resources.

17. *If you would like to add additional comments, please enter them below.*

The comments are outlined below.

- All new UNHCR staff, especially those in protection, should undergo basic protection training and counselling, as they need to understand refugees and change their attitude towards them.
- Staff working closely with refugees would benefit from training covering refugee rights and refugee status determination.
- Senior staff in the UNHCR Branch Office, Nairobi, are doing a commendable job under challenging circumstances.

E9. Focus group sessions

Two focus group sessions were held at the end of the Phase 2 workshop in Budapest, Hungary, in November 2004. One focused on the methodology used in the PLP and the other on content. The purpose of these sessions was to elicit responses from the participants regarding the PLP and how to improve it. The primary reasons for using groups is that they focus on a finite set of issues and propose ideas based on synergy – one person mentions an idea and this idea sparks other ideas. Below are the notes that were recorded on the flipcharts during the two focus group sessions.

Methodology Focus Group

Self-Study Pros
- Materials were systematised – it was easy to find what you were looking for.
- Relevant material
- Appropriate material
- The self-study materials were and are useful in one's daily work.
- The material was comprehensive in regard to both range and depth of topic.
- Good, solid material
- You could take the material away from the office. It was packaged appropriately.
- The self-study units were accessible to non-protection staff. Some shared their units with others who were not enrolled in the programme.
- Responses to exercises were shared with colleagues.
- Appropriate format of the materials
- Great article on dysfunctional humanitarian organisations
- Some exercises were challenging.
- Material is current and updated.
- Good to have some supplementary material
- Peer teams were an asset.
- Good balance between theory and practice
- Easy reading
- Good audiovisual material

Self-Study Cons
- Impossible to do during work time
- Generic feedback is disrespectful.
- Lack of warm atmosphere
- Exclusion clause was not covered.
- More individualised feedback is needed.
- Reassurance is required when working on a tight schedule.
- People who are not normally involved in protection may need a separate introduction.
- Not all materials arrived on time.
- The material was a little bulky to carry around.
- Material should be organised into binders.
- The exercises were not challenging, as they required one to copy from the required text.

- Would be preferred if the activities were spread out more evenly.
- Group system doesn't work, as few responded to e-mail items submitted by participants.
- One should be able to meet the tutor in-person prior to the workshop.

Workshop Pros
- Balanced approach between contents and attitudes
- Excellent facilitators
- Well-prepared facilitators
- Mixed audience
- Good to be away from duty station for training
- Good variety of activities
- Excellent initiative
- Suitable for all backgrounds
- Good logistics
- The European Youth Centre site was good.
- Able to learn from the experiences of colleagues
- Excellent interaction
- Good practical exercises

Workshop Cons
- Some issues were not allocated sufficient time, e.g., statelessness and IDPs.
- Some activities did not have suitable follow-up. Perhaps this was due to lack of time.
- Groups may be too large to enable everyone to have sufficient 'air' time. (Headquarters had originally planned for fewer participants. In addition, one facilitator was unable to attend. Thus, at the Budapest workshop, the facilitator to participants ratio was higher than normal.)
- Participants did not introduce themselves in detail; e.g., duty station, country and nature of operations should be provided.
- Not enough time was allotted to the discussion of Phase 3. The proposals should have been completed and submitted previously. They should have been displayed for others to see during the workshop.
- The video on trafficking was too long.
- The video on trafficking was not accurate.
- Exercises from Workshop on Emergency Management regarding protection activities should be incorporated in PLP or used as a base for other activities.
- A workshop agenda was not distributed in advance.
- More feedback on exercises should be provided. Participants worked hard on their assignments and received insufficient feedback for their efforts.
- First day's exercise was a complete failure.

Changes to the Delivery of the PLP
- Hire tutors who will provide feedback.
- Tutors need to develop an individualised approach to learning. Group responses are not acceptable.
- More simplified exercises are needed.
- The deadlines must be realistic. People work hard but always feel they are behind, as the deadlines do not seem to take into account that people are working as they complete the learning programme.

- Group members should be fully introduced to other members of their group.
- Workshop should have 22–25 participants. There were too many people in attendance at the Budapest workshop.
- Headquarters did not notify participants about the status of submitted items.
- Headquarters needs to be more efficient and its database containing student records should be up-to-date.
- If it is to be successful, headquarters must facilitate self-study group work.
- Rather than have the workshop facilitators playing roles, the workshop participants should be involved in the role plays.
- A senior UNHCR personnel should be invited to the PLP workshop to speak about the policy under discussion and to discuss future UNHCR directions.
- The PLP needs to be taken early in one's career, but not right at the beginning, as people need to have a context in which to learn. Once introduced to real situations in the UNHCR environment, participants will appreciate the content of the PLP.
- Perhaps a case study should be presented before the workshop. The case study could introduce participants to the various issues that will be addressed during the workshop.
- Videoconferencing could be used to link individuals at the beginning of the PLP.
- Place the workshop before the self-study units so that participants are able to get acquainted.
- Case studies and exercises presented in the self-study should be more closely related to life at duty stations.
- Supervisors need to pay more attention to the PLP. They should allow time for study, remove barriers to attending the workshop and appreciate the efforts the participants are making to improve themselves.
- More time at the workshop is needed for individuals within regions and/or countries to meet and discuss common issues and how they can be addressed.

How Could an Assessment/Evaluation System Be Added to the PLP?
- Assessment of PLP participants is required. Everyone should be assessed.
- If you are a P3 and you want to become a P4, the PLP should be mandatory. Thus, an assessment is required.
- The PLP should be part of the Career Management System (CMS).
- If the PLP will be considered when postings are assigned, then there must be some form of evaluation.
- A tutor should mark all exercises and provide individual feedback.
- Grading should be simple, such as fail, do-over, and pass. Perhaps there should be a limited number of completers who achieve distinction.
- Just a pass or fail designation is all that is required.
- The assessment should not vary because of the background of the individual. Consistent assessment is required.
- Divide the PLP into two – an introduction and a second or advanced level. The first level is purely an awareness programme and would not require an evaluation. The second level requires the development of competencies and should be graded.
- One group of individuals should mark all Phase 3 Projects.
- Consider conducting an evaluation at the end of the workshop.

- If an assessment is placed at the end of the workshop, it will inhibit the cooperativeness and openness displayed by participants throughout the workshop.
- No evaluation should be placed in the workshop because it will introduce stress.
- Phase 3 should be signed off by supervisors and peers.
- Participants must pass Phase I prior to proceeding to Phase 2.
- Self-study deadlines are too tight. Perhaps there could be monthly deadlines.

Should the PLP Be Mandatory?
- All professional staff should be required to take the PLP.
- There should be a French and/or Spanish version of the PLP.

Contents Focus Group

Were Phase 1 (self-study) and Phase 2 (workshop) linked adequately?
- There was a general agreement that there was a link between the two phases, but due to time constraints and structural concerns with the workshop, not all issues were properly covered.
- The group considered that adjustments to the contents of the workshop (especially days 1 and 2) would allow important issues to be covered as indicated below.

Were the contents of the workshop adequate to address your knowledge needs?
- The majority of the group felt that certain parts of the workshop could have been reduced to allow more time to address knowledge-based issues.
- Knowledge areas that were not adequately covered included:
  - development of a comprehensive protection strategy
  - returnee monitoring
  - protection partnerships
  - 'cutting edge' protection developments and issues in different regions of the world
  - clear standards, indicators and guidelines for refugee mass influx or emergency situations
  - cessation
  - resettlement
  - forced migration and mixed flows
  - knowledge-based material on negotiation

Was the content of the workshop adequate to develop targeted skills?
- In general, participants felt that the workshop was good at addressing some of the targeted skills such as communication, interviewing, presentation, analytical, negotiation and team building.
- Although not unanimous, most participants felt that more focus on skills linked to protection was needed. Skills related to communication and people skills such as cross-cultural awareness, body language, suspension of assumptions and listening were not adequately covered. More could have been done within the existing exercises and timeframe.

- All participants felt that one skill that should be addressed specifically during the workshop is strategizing protection. This would include the actual preparation of comprehensive protection strategies for a given complex situation.
- Participants felt that there was too much on negotiation skills during the workshop and that some material on skills could be included on Phase 1.

Was the content of the workshop adequate to develop UNHCR approaches and attitudes?
- More attitudinal skills should be covered in the workshop. Special attention should be given to refugee consultation and community participation.
- The workshop is very UNHCR-centred and additional focus should be given to partnerships and building protection relations.
- Although gender approach and sexual- and gender-based violence were properly addressed, participants felt that age and other vulnerability issues were not adequately covered.
- Regarding the development of attitudes, the group felt that exercises should also include working in difficult political and social environments in which authorities and communities are extremely negative to UNHCR and its mandate.

Additional Issues
- Many specific issues were not addressed by the facilitators and there was little time for discussion.
- A survey of topics or issues could be introduced in Phase 1 to provide a focus for the workshop.
- More flexibility regarding the content was needed.
- Facilitators needed to have a greater knowledge of the expertise and experience of participants. This information could benefit the workshop and help the facilitators.
- More challenging issues could be role-played (more challenging cases).

E10. Evaluation of the Phase 1 self-study materials

The criteria used to compare the self-study material relative to distance learning best practices are outlined in *Criteria for Evaluating the Quality of Online Courses*, by Wright[1]. These criteria are provided in Appendix C. Although the publication focuses on online courses, all the non-technical criteria apply to any distance or open education course. Below is an outline of the current self-study material as well as suggestions on how it can be improved. Throughout this section, text bolding is used to highlight items that must be considered when the self-study materials are revised.

General Information

The Getting Started section provides:
- An introduction
- Overall objectives (or goals) for the programme
- Overview of the three phases within the programme
- Timetable for the completion of each unit
- Details regarding submission of exercises and peer e-mail group operation
- List of resources included with the units of study
- Responses to frequently-asked questions

In order to improve this section, the items listed below could be added.

- A statement regarding the **intended audience**, its attributes and the level of reading proficiency required to complete the readings. There is a reference to the fact that the rate of progress will depend on whether or not a participant's first language is English. However, it must be emphasised that learners need a good command of English or assistance to complete the units dealing with legal matters. Perhaps some of these more challenging sections could be simplified or summaries made in order to help those whose first language is not English. Better yet, the PLP should be offered in another language such as French or Spanish. In an international organisation such as UNHCR, language should not be a barrier. If the PLP retains its present form, then a statement should be included indicating that those with a legal background will be able to proceed quickly through the self-study phase.
- An explanation as to **how this programme is related to other learning programmes** offered by UNHCR, such as the Thematic Learning Programme and the Middle-Management Learning Programme. If there is no relationship between these programmes, at least participants should be made aware that they exist so that they can consider how to further their professional development.
- A comprehensive **list of all the topics** covered in each unit.
- Additional acknowledgement that all UNHCR sites may not have **individualised e-mail** accounts and access to the Internet and thus communication may be difficult and online research may be limited.
- **Guidelines for participating in the peer e-mail group** should be expanded, particularly the inclusion of statements emphasising the benefits of

---

[1] C. R. Wright, *Criteria for Evaluating the Quality of Online Courses* (Edmonton, Alberta, Alberta Distance and Training Association, October 2003).

participating and providing timely feedback to other members of the peer group. In some distance courses, participants are given points for their participation and online contributions. In the case of the PLP, this would not be fair unless all participants had access to an individualised e-mail account. Further, the current version of the PLP is not assessed, thus gaining points for participating would not serve as a motivational technique. Note that many PLP participants were unhappy with the operation of the peer e-mail groups. Some members of the groups did not participate, and thus those who submitted items received little or no feedback. Some were not happy because they received too many e-mails. Others received no e-mails, as they did not have an individualised e-mail account. It would seem that the peer e-mail activity should be reconsidered and possibly be made voluntary. Regarding individualised e-mail accounts, UNHCR is slowly implementing them in various field posts. For example, they were implemented at the Dadaab refugee camp in Kenya in November 2004 and were to be implemented in Kakuma in December 2004.

- A statement regarding the **availability of the PLP team**, moderators, mentors and/or tutors and the **turnaround time for learners' questions**. A minimum turnaround time for those who provide questions via e-mail or facsimile machines should be no more than three working days. Obviously, responses handled via mail will take longer to travel between headquarters and the field posts, but the turnaround time within headquarters should be the same as that for questions received via e-mail or facsimile machines. Participants are depending on feedback to help them progress through the programme. Note that the turnaround time for assignments will be longer than three working days and will depend on the length of the assignment. However, assignments should be reviewed and returned to the learner as quickly as possible but within 10 working days. Regardless of the turnaround times that are set, the participants have a right and expectation to be informed of the guidelines to which the PLP team will adhere.

- A statement that informs learners about their **right to privacy** and the conditions under which their names, e-mail addresses or submissions may be shared with others. It is assumed that UNHCR e-mail addresses are accessible to everyone who works for UNHCR and therefore privacy is not an issue. However, personal information such as personal e-mail addresses, telephone numbers and addresses should not be made available to anyone unless the participant gives permission.

- A **list of the developers and reviewers** of the programme and their positions. A short biography for each person could also be provided. PLP participants need to be assured of the experience and expertise that went into designing the course. They need to know that this programme had input from the protection, legal, resettlement, programme and community services sections within UNHCR.

- A **copyright statement** that clearly identifies the owner(s) of the course material and that efforts have been made to identify and seek permission, where necessary, to reproduce materials included in the self-study units. If the materials cannot be copied, this should be clearly stated. One of the benefits noted by graduates and non-completers of the PLP is that the material serves as a resource. Some share the material with colleagues and some would like some

of the material translated so that they could share it with local government officials.

Accessibility

The following information is provided for each unit:
- Primary unit objectives
- Recommended completion time for each exercise
- List of documents provided in the unit, both mandatory and supplementary
- List of exercises
- Quotations pertaining to each unit provided at the beginning of the unit
- Headers and footers to help learners determine where they are in the programme

Accessibility for each unit could be improved if:
- a comprehensive **table of contents** is provided,
- a **content preview** or overview of each unit is added,
- an **index** for the program is developed,
- a **glossary** is provided to explain the many terms and abbreviations used throughout the material.

Organisation

An overview sheet for each unit provides the following information:
- Primary unit objectives
- Recommended time
- Documents and materials provided
- Exercises to be completed

However, it can be difficult to ascertain all the topics to be covered in each unit and their relationships, as a table of contents does not exist that lists topics and subtopics, and the headings hierarchy is unclear. In addition, units seem to lack a **discernible structure** such as the following:
- Introduction
- Objectives
- Pre-test
- Instructions
- Explanatory text
- Learning activities
- Answers for learning activities
- Unit or module summary
- Self-test
- Answers to self-test
- References
- Unit or module assignment

Numerous readings are provided at the end of each unit. Thus, participants did not need to seek additional information from other sources such as libraries. This feature is of particular benefit to those who are located in isolated duty stations. PLP graduates have indicated that there is too much reading involved in the completion

of the programme. Perhaps this issue could be addressed by reducing the amount of mandatory reading, but it is still beneficial to provide resources to those in the field who are not able to access any other information but what they bring to their duty stations.

If most of the readings are kept, perhaps the self-study units could be built around the readings. Rowntree (1990)[2] suggested that the following structure could be used when a self-study course is built around reading materials:

- Overviews and/or summaries of the topic
- Concept maps or other diagrams showing how the main topics and ideas are related
- Learning objectives
- An annotated bibliography
- Guidance as to which chapter/sections/articles to study and which to ignore
- Specifically-written (or audio-taped) alternative explanations – to be studied instead of sections in the materials that may be inaccurate, biased, out-of-date, confusing and so forth
- Local examples or case studies – which are prepared because they will be more appealing than those (if any) in the existing material
- A paragraph-by-paragraph commentary on the argument expressed in the text
- Questions and activities based on the materials, section by section
- Model or specimen answers to activities, and/or checklists whereby learners can evaluate their own responses to questions or activities that seem likely to produce unpredictable responses
- Suggestions for practical work or experimental activity, e.g., guidelines or worksheets
- A glossary of technical terms
- A self-assessed test related to the objectives
- Questions to discuss with fellow learners
- Instructions for an assignment to be sent to a tutor for comment and/or marking[3]

Language

The language used in each unit is appropriate for an audience that has a good command of English. The units display the attributes listed below.
- The writing style is clear and direct.
- Clear directions are given in all units, but participants may require **further guidance when completing Unit 13** and the development of a field project. This perception was confirmed during interviews with graduates and following the review of the questionnaire data.
- Familiar and common words are used, but the topics covered included a lot of legal jargon that is appropriate for the topics but may be difficult for some of the intended audience to comprehend. It may be helpful to include a **glossary**. One of the participants interviewed by the PLP evaluation team indicated that

---

[2] D. Rowntree (1990). *Teaching Through Self-Instruction: How to Develop Open Learning Materials.* London: Kogan Page.

[3] *Ibid.*, adapted, p. 90.

it would be an interesting challenge for the UNHCR legal section to **make legal documents more comprehensible** for the non-legal staff. It would be helpful to have a plain English version of many of the documents provided in the programme.

- A conversational tone exists in the self-study material but not in the huge amount of reading material. Many of the required and supplementary readings are legalistic and long-winded. PLP participants, especially those whose first language is not English and/or those who do not have a legal or protection background, could benefit from a **simplified version of the reading or summaries** comprising short sentences and brief paragraphs. Although very few of the participants implied that the language level of the material was a challenge, it is clearly evident when one reviews the raw comments on the questionnaire or observes participants in a PLP workshop that some participants are struggling to understand the material because English is not their first language.
- Rhetorical questions – those which are asked, but an answer from the reader is not expected – could be used to engage the participants in the learning material.
- Verbs are in the active voice.
- Sentences vary in length; there are a few whose length makes them difficult to understand.
- Except for the reading materials, the tone of the writing is positive and supportive. It could be even more encouraging, as some participants may be overwhelmed by the quantity of material to be read.
- Terms are used consistently.
- Abbreviations are defined.
- The writing does not convey biases. However, topics covered by the material do address biases such as those related to age and gender.
- The course appears to have been edited, but it may need to be **proof-read** a second time.

Layout

- The layout is simple and appropriate for the content. Although not essential, the page layout could be more attractive. However, this would require the efforts of a **graphics designer**.
- No **navigational icons** are used. Icons help participants to scan material and know what is expected of them. They also can make a page more attractive.
- Two typefaces are used – an italic for quotes and likely a Times Roman for the body of the text.
- Bold-face type is used to highlight important terms, but **bolding is used inconsistently.** For example, bolding is used in the objectives for Units 1–5, but not used in objectives for Units 6–12.
- Headings and subheadings are used to provide some structure to the material.
- The layout can appear to be cluttered because there is **minimal use of white** space and extensive footnotes in some sections.
- Justified text is used, so there is uneven spacing in some lines. However, the uneven spacing is unlikely to affect reading.
- There is good contrast between text and the background, thus the text is legible and can be seen under poor lighting conditions.

- A few small maps and photographs are included with the text. Many **lack titles or explanatory notes**. In some cases, the relationship between the graphic element and the text is unclear.
- The layout is simple and functional.

Since the reading material provided with each unit is taken from various sources, the format of this material is not consistent. However, a **few documents should be re-typed or re-formatted** to make them easier to read. These include "Strengthening of the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Emergency Assistance of the United Nations" (December 19, 1991). Other documents use small type and are slightly blurry. These may be difficult to read under the poor lighting conditions at some duty stations.

Goals and Objectives

At the beginning of each unit, objectives are provided to outline learning objectives. These objectives:

- are directly related to the programme of study;
- are relevant to the subject matter;
- **rarely cover all three levels of learning outcomes**, i.e., knowledge, skills and attitudes;
- **frequently include vague terms** such as *understand*, *be aware of* and *be familiar with* rather than more precise action verbs such as *define*, *list*, *summarise* and *analyse*;
- **rarely cover critical thinking and problem-solving skills**.

The major concerns about the objectives are that they are vague and do not require the learners to apply what they have learned. Well-written objectives address the performance, conditions and criteria associated with success. Due to the nature of the subject matter, it may be difficult to include these three components in all objectives, but it is possible to go beyond the terms *understand* and *be aware of* and ask people to apply their skills (verbs such as *defend*, *demonstrate*, *explain*, *illustrate*, *predict* and *use* are appropriate) and to problem solve (verbs such as *analyse*, *appraise*, *compare*, *contrast*, *differentiate*, *evaluate*, *justify*, *plan*, and *solve* can be used). Note also that the **objectives are not congruent with the learning activities** participants must complete. For example, in Unit 5, the two objectives include the verbs *understand* and *be familiar with*, yet Exercise 5.2 requires learners to *analyse* situations and *recommend* ways to address flaws in the refugee status determination. The learners' expectations, based on the objectives that they read at the beginning of the unit, will be incongruent with what they actually have to do in order to complete the exercises.

Course Content

The course material is:

- directly related to the learning objectives;
- complete, as all the content is provided to achieve the objectives;
- accurate;
- relevant;
- mostly current;
- presented in a logical sequence;

- related to other material the learners may have studied or experiences they may have had;
- linked to other sources.

The primary concern about the content is **whether it is appropriate for the mixed audience** that enrols in the programme. Those students with a law background and protection experience will be able to handle the material much better than those without a law degree and no protection experience. If the PLP is not divided into an induction programme covering the basics of protection and a programme covering the more advanced topics on protection, then it would be helpful if the content could be simplified, repetition in readings removed, and summaries of important documents be provided. These latter suggestions would assist those who have limited knowledge of the law and/or poor English comprehension skills.

It is unclear as to whether **permission to reproduce copyright material** is needed or has been obtained for all the reading material that has been copied and included in each unit.

A content reviewer or review committee was not listed in the materials. Since the materials are being used by a cross-section of UNHCR staff and the material should be the most current available, it would be beneficial to have a **cross-sectional content review or advisory committee**.

Detailed suggestions regarding changes to the actual content are presented in the Recommendations section of this evaluation report.

Instructional or Learning Strategies

The PLP comprises three phases, each with its own instructional emphasis as outlined below.
- The Phase 1 self-study focuses primarily on knowledge acquisition and analysis of cases or situations.
- The Phase 2 workshop focuses on skill development and attitudinal changes through discussions, simulations and role plays.
- The Phase 3 project requires learners to consolidate and apply their new knowledge and skills to a real situation or activity.

Thus, the instructional strategies provided in the self-study component do not have to address all levels of learning (knowledge, application and critical thinking) and all domains of learning (cognitive, affective and psychomotor), as these are covered in other phases of the programme.

The various attributes regarding the instructional strategies of the PLP self-study units are outlined below.

- Learners are informed regarding which exercises must be completed and when they should be submitted. Consequences for missing deadlines are stated.
- The instructions are clear and concise. In some cases, learners are directed to specific parts of the reference material to find answers. This is helpful, as a large quantity of reference material is provided.

- Learners are informed that they must take part in a peer e-mail group, but additional information could be provided about how the **peer e-mail groups** were selected and how they operate. For example, could participants form their own peer e-mail groups?
- A variety of learning activities are provided, including reading, viewing videos or compact discs, participating in a peer e-mail group and completing exercises. The exercises may require learners to answer true and false questions, fill columns in a table and respond to short-answer questions. The questions are usually based on case studies and may require critical thinking skills.
- **Illustrations and photographs are used sparingly**.
- Although a variety of learning activities are provided, none are optional. **Learners are not able to select from a variety of activities** that are geared to different ages, cultural backgrounds, country settings or experience. Senior protection officers who take the PLP may need more challenging exercises.
- Timelines for completing the units are specified. Generally, participants are expected to complete one unit every two weeks, but this timeline is not appropriate because the workload varies significantly from unit to unit. Also, learners are not able to proceed at a pace that is appropriate for them because the **timelines seem to be unrealistic for most of the intended audience.** In order to address this concern, some readings could be eliminated, summaries of the content of the reference materials could be provided, the workload could be spread more evenly throughout the units, the number of assignments could be reduced and/or the completion time for the self-study units could be extended.
- Many of the activities engage the learner and several encourage critical thinking. **Activities are not always presented in order of difficulty** so that participants gain confidence by successfully completing an activity before progressing to a more challenging one. Perhaps there is no alternative to introducing legal matters early in the programme, but readers without a legal background or whose first language is not English find these sections difficult.
- **Learners are not encouraged to link with others** beyond their peer e-mail group. They could be encouraged to approach any of the following in their learning activities: local peers, supervisors, personnel at non-governmental organisations and government staff. Participants can be encouraged to obtain assistance; they do not need to work on the programme in isolation. Note that one or two respondents to the online evaluation questionnaires stated that they were not able to contact an individual mentioned in the PLP material and became frustrated. What is being suggested here is that participants be encouraged to link with people in their environment rather than specific individuals. However, if a specific individual is named, that person should be accessible to the PLP participants.
- The activities are realistic and appropriate and can be performed with the resources available. As previously stated, learners may not be able to complete all activities within the required timeframe.
- According to those who completed the online evaluation questionnaires, **constructive, relevant and frequent feedback is not provided**. After a number of participants within a group have submitted their assignments by e-mail, the PLP team provides general feedback. Participants must then review their submission to ascertain whether it contains the content suggested by the PLP team. PLP participants do not receive the specific individual feedback they want and need as frequently as they would like.

- **Summaries of the material are not provided** and could be provided. They would be particularly useful after lengthy legal passages and/or at the end of each unit.
- Due to workload constraints, **members of the PLP team tended to be programme administrators** rather than tutors or mentors. Those who responded to the online evaluation questionnaires indicated that the PLP team was flexible and understanding but rarely had time to provide detailed feedback in a timely manner. Considering the effort participants had made to complete the assignments within tight timelines, a few of the individuals interviewed by the evaluators as well as one focus group felt offended that their submissions were treated so lightly. Participants need feedback so they can clarify their understanding and measure their progress.

Learning Resources

Attributes of the learning resources provided in the self-study unit are outlined below.

- The learning materials are generally appropriate for the intended audience. The reading materials covering the legal framework are somewhat challenging for those who lack a law background or have minimum protection experience. This does not mean that the materials should be removed. as they are the basis of UNHCR's mandate and guide its activities. Further, participants can refer to them when they are at their duty stations. But it would be helpful if **non-technical summaries** of these documents were made available. These documents could also be translated into other languages such as French and Spanish. It is extremely important that those working directly with refugees have a full understanding of the policies and laws that affect refugees. **Language should not be a barrier to understanding**.
- During the interviews conducted by the PLP evaluation team, several **senior protection officers wanted access to more challenging material,** as they felt that the PLP provided primarily basic information.
- Mandatory and supplementary materials are clearly identified at the beginning of each unit.
- Various learning resources are provided. Perhaps there are too many reading materials. **Some of the reading material is repetitious and could be eliminated**. The learning materials appear to be UNHCR-centred. Perhaps participants could be **exposed to other literature and different points of view** as expressed by the academic press, UNHCR partner organisations and public broadcasters such as the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC).
- The video and compact disc learning materials are excellent, although their content could be a little shorter. **Additional video and compact disc material would be beneficial,** as it can counter the dryness of the extensive written material and bring a 'face' to the challenges encountered by refugees and those who help them. A few participants who completed the online evaluation questionnaires would like to view more videos.
- Activities that require participants to 'cut and paste' answers from the reading material should be removed or used sparingly.
- It is difficult to advise which media format should be used – video or compact disc – without knowing what is available in the field. Based on the responses to

the PLP evaluation online questionnaire, it appears that **some duty stations only have access to one media or the other**. Some individuals did suggest that all the self-study materials should be placed on compact discs in order to reduce the weight of the material. However, if individuals in the field do not have access to compact-disc players, this suggestion should not be implemented. Further, most people who receive compact discs just print off the materials so that they can make notes and store them for easy reference. Few people want to read reams of text on a computer screen. Would duty stations be able to handle the printing of all the written material associated with the course? If three or four staff needed to print off their programme materials, it is likely that this type of activity would place a strain on the limited resources at a number of duty stations.

- The resource material is accurate, current and related to course content.
- A **bibliography or reference** list of additional books, journals, compact discs, videos and websites is not provided. Considering the quantity of material currently provided with the programme, a reference list may not be necessary. Further, providing a list of resources that individuals in some duty stations could not access may lead to frustration and the perception that the programme is biased towards those who work at headquarters or large urban centres. An increasing number of duty stations are being provided with Internet access, thus it would seem appropriate to provide a list of relevant Web links or URLs. Despite the above arguments, a reference list would allow participants and graduates of the programme opportunities to extend their knowledge and research issues that they may encounter on the job.

Evaluation

The existing evaluative activities are feasible, relevant and accurate. However, they are not congruent with the stated objectives for each unit. As previously mentioned, the objectives must be changed in order to reflect the knowledge, application and problem-solving skills that are required to do the exercises. Also, participants need to receive individualised, detailed and timely feedback following the submission of their assignments.

Below are a few comments that pertain to the evaluative activities contained in the self-study units.

- The instructions associated with the evaluative activities can be followed easily. Due dates are provided.
- **Adjustments may need to be made to the number of assignments and/or the due dates**. Since many participants encountered some difficulty with submitting the assignments according to the published schedule, and the PLP team is so overwhelmed with work that it is unable to provide timely and appropriate feedback, the number of assignments submitted for correction could be reduced. One assignment could cover several units. In addition, the timetable for completing the self-study portion of the programme could be extended.
- Examples of assignments that meet the criteria expected are not provided to the learners. Thus, they do not have a clear indication of expectations. (This concern is also valid for the Phase 3 project.)

- As the submissions are not graded, grading procedures and policies are not provided. **No clear relationship seems to exist between the quality of the submitted assignments and the learner's advancement to Phase 2**.
- As indicated earlier, the programme learning outcomes (objectives), evaluation strategies and course assignments are not congruent, and therefore the relationships between them may not be evident to the PLP participants.
- Guidelines for submitting assignments are provided.
- As participation in peer e-mail groups is not evaluated, no evaluation criteria are provided for this activity.
- A variety of feasible and content-relevant assignments are provided. Many require learners to analyse situations and to solve problems.
- The assignments are relevant to the learners and their humanitarian careers.
- **No self-tests are provided** to allow learners to check their understanding prior to submitting assignments to the PLP team.
- No criteria and procedures for peer review and evaluation are provided, as these elements are not present in the self-study phase of the PLP.
- Learners are not informed about the **consequences of plagiarism** and the failure to properly cite copyrighted material. The peer e-mail activity may encourage plagiarism, as those who do not post their assignments may obtain information from those who post their assignments early and frequently.
- Learners are not told when they can expect to receive feedback, but they are informed that they will receive a general reply with comments for each exercise based on the assignments from their group.

Overall

- The self-study programme materials have been revised several times since the programme was initiated in 2000. Since that time, more than 360 people have successfully completed the programme. Thus, it is possible to state that the self-study units can help the learners to increase their level of understanding of protection. However, as limited feedback is provided and the assignments and activities are not graded, it is **difficult to ascertain the quality of the learning that has occurred.**
- No evidence is provided that the course has been reviewed by **experts in content and design,** as those involved with the development of the materials are not identified.
- The programme content was revised in 2003, thus it should be correct. However, considering the breadth of material covered, it would seem advantageous to **establish a PLP steering or advisory committee** that meets at least once each year to review the content, evaluation and delivery of the programme. The steering or advisory committee should have representation from other UNHCR departments, particularly those involved in the legal, programme and resettlement sections of UNHCR. Thereby, the ideals of teamwork and collaboration expressed in the PLP would be practised in the design and development of the programme.

E11. UNHCR learning programmes

The table below is incomplete, but it does give an indication of the variety of learning programmes available at UNHCR.

Summary of a few UNHCR internal learning programmes
Prepared by Alessandra Marinetti, December 2004

Category and Programme	Content	Audience	Assessment/ Feedback	Structure and Length
Management				
Management Learning Programme (MLP)	Four certificate programmes, made up of 23 individual distance-learning modules, leading to a Diploma in Managing and Leading in UNHCR. Modules focus on diverse subject areas necessary for strengthening managerial and leadership behaviour in UNHCR. Previously, the MLP was structured similar to the PLP.	A grade of G4 or above. JPOs and United Nations volunteers can be participants.	Feedback provided to individual module assignments. Final assign-ment for each certificate is also assessed.

360-degree feedback is used as a development tool. | EACH MODULE DEMANDS 10-15 HOURS OF PARTICIPANT TIME. A MODULE SHOULD BE COMPLETED WITHIN THREE MONTHS OF RECEIPT, BUT FLEXIBILITY EXISTS. NO FIXED TERM FOR A CERTIFICATE, BUT IT IS ESTIMATED THAT IT COULD TAKE 2 YEARS TO COMPLETE ALL FOUR CERTIFICATES. |
Protection				
Protection Learning Programme (PLP)	Core refugee protection principles and standards as well as basic skills for protection delivery.	Open to all UNHCR staff	Limited individual feedback provided No formal assessment required to move from phase to phase	Phase 1: Self-Study/6 months Phase 2: Workshop/4.5 days Phase 3: Project /3 months
Thematic Protection Learning Programme	Variety of specific training on different protection issues. Topics include	Senior protection staff and senior	Limited assessment or individual feedback is	

(TPLP)	migration and armed conflict.	management	provided.	
Operations				
Operations Management Learning Programme (OMLP)	Provides specific managerial skills and knowledge of UNHCR operations including specific indicators, programme design and monitoring.	P1 to P4 (professional staff) as well as G6 and above.		The programme comprises a self-study, pre-workshop, workshop, and a post-workshop project.
Emergency Workshop on Emergency Management	Emergency response training	All UNHCR staff can apply, but selection is based on relevance, need and skills.		Materials 9-day workshop
Resources Management				
Facilitation of Learning Programme	Focuses on the development and enhancement of the facilitation of learning. Skills include learning design, facilitation (distance and face-to-face) and assessment/evaluation, as well as planning and logistics.	All UNHCR staff can apply but selection is based on relevance and need. Priority is given to current training providers and learning coordinators.	One-on-one feedback is provided by a facilitator. Peer-to-peer feedback is built into the progamme as well as a formal assessment component.	Distance learning with an external facilitator and seminar to practice skills.

Other UNHCR Learning Opportunities

Operations
- Operations Management Learning Programme (OMLP)
- Emergency Workshop on Emergency Management
- Operations Management Systems
- Situational Emergency Training

Resource Management
- Financial Training
- Human Resources

- Facilitation of Learning
- Induction and Orientation
- Staff Safety
- Staff Welfare
- Supply Chain

General
- Effective Writing Course
- Information Technology
- Language
- E-learning. Staff Development Services and Information Technology and Telecom Services co-manage the e-learning courses for UNHCR. Currently, more than 80 courses are offered to staff. There are about 1,600 registered users and over 600 active users who are taking these courses online or via CD-ROM. Recently, a number of courses in French were added to the library. Some e-learning courses are included in Management Learning Programme modules as part of the course requirements.

F. Sample action words for stating learning objectives

Listed by domain and levels of learning

	Knowledge /Comprehension		Application		Problem Solving	
C O G N I T I V E	Arrange Cite Classify Convert Copy Define Describe Discuss Distinguish Duplicate Explain Express Extend Give example Identify Indicate Label List Locate Match Name	Order Outline Paraphrase Quote Recall Recite Recognize Record Relate Repeat Report Reproduce Respond Restate Review Rewrite Specify Summarize Tell Translate Underline	**Apply Assemble Calculate Change Choose Compute Defend Demonstrate Discover Draft Dramatize Draw Employ Estimate Explain Extend**	**Illustrate Infer Interpret Manipulate Modify Operate Practise Predict Prepare Produce Relate Schedule Select Show Sketch Use**	**Analyze Appraise Argue Arrange Assemble Assess Calculate Categorize Choose Combine Compare Compose Conclude Construct Contrast Convert Create Criticize Debate Defend Design Devise Diagram Differentiate Discriminate Distinguish Estimate Evaluate Examine**	**Experiment Explain Formulate Generate Illustrate Infer Inspect Interpret Judge Justify Manage Manipulate Modify Organize Originate Plan Predict Prepare Propose Question Rate Relate Reorganize Score Select Solve Support Test Write**
A F F E C T I V E	**Accept Accumulate Ask Describe Follow Give Identify**	**Locate Name Point to Respond to Select Use**	**Adhere Affirm Approve Assist Choose Commend Complete Comply Conform Describe Discuss Follow Form**	**Initiate Invite Join Justify Perform Practise Propose Select Share Study Subscribe to Work**	**Act Adapt Change Defend Display Influence**	**Integrate Mediate Organize Revise Solve Verify**
P S Y C H O M O T O R	**Complete Demonstrate Distinguish Hear Identify Locate Manipulate Move Pick up Point to Practise**	**Press Pull Push See Select Set up Show Sort Specify Touch Transport**	**Activate Adjust Assemble Build Calibrate Close Construct Copy Demonstrate Disassemble Disconnect Draw Duplicate Execute**	**Load Locate Loosen Manipulate Measure Open Operate Perform Remove Replace Rotate Select Set Slide**	**Adapt Combine Compose Construct Convert Create Design Devise Diagram**	**Fix Generate Illustrate Modify Organize Plan Repair Service**

From: C. R. Wright. (1997). *Instructing in an International Setting: A Handbook for Those Who Will Provide Training in Developing Countries.* p. 3-24.

G. The PLP primary unit objectives

Unit 1: Displaced Persons, UNHCR and You
- Consider the **complexity and impact of forced displacement** on women, men, girls and boys of concern to UNHCR.
- Be aware of how the **changing global context** creates difficult conditions under which we are forced to make difficult decisions.
- Reflect on some of the **common humanitarian values**, in particular the **UNHCR Code of Conduct**, that assist us in ensuring the effective protection of the women, men girls and boys of concern to UNHCR.

Unit 2: The 1951 Refugee Convention: A Timeless Treaty Under Attack
- Assist you in becoming familiar with the fundamental principles of **international refugee law**, in particular the **1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees** and its Protocol.
- Assist you in understanding the challenges facing the organization as well as the 1951 Convention today, and some of the **protection tools** that UNHCR is using to respond to these challenges.
- Understand the importance of **building effective partnerships** with and outside UNHCR for the protection of person of concern.

Unit 3: Principles Underpinning International Refugee Law
- Assist you in becoming familiar with the fundamental principles of **human rights** law and **international humanitarian law**, and appreciate how they assist in protecting refugees.
- Be aware of possible violations of **human rights** that affect refugees.
- Be aware of how **national mechanisms** can effectively protect persons of concern to UNHCR.

Unit 4: The Right to Seek Asylum – Who Said It Was Easy?
- Understand the right of refugees to **seek and enjoy asylum** and the principle of *non-refoulement*.
- Reflect on means by which States, especially those with sophisticated asylum systems, attempt to **restrict access to territory and asylum procedures** (or equal access to asylum) especially in industralised countries.

Unit 5: Protection in Asylum: Urban Situations
- Understand the difficulties, dangers and protection problems many women, men, girls and boys of concern to UNHCR are confronted with in **urban situations**.
- Be familiar with **refugee status determination** and the key elements of **fair asylum procedures** especially for women and children.

Unit 6: Protection in Asylum – Displaced Persons in Camps
- Be familiar with some of the protection concerns in refugee camps affecting the women, men, girls and boys of concern to UNHCR.
- Understand the role of UNHCR and the partnership approach in refugee camps.
- Be aware of the different security concerns that can arise in UNHCR's refugee camps and the need to maintain the civilian and humanitarian character of refugee camps.

- Understand how best you can analyse the protection situation in refugee camps, so that you can develop effective strategies.

Unit 7: Preventing and Responding to Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)
- Understand UNHCR's protection responsibility to prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence and be aware of the related international legal instruments.
- Enhance your gender awareness.
- Review some important strategies to consider while working towards preventing and responding to sexual and gender-based violence including the importance of working with men and women to reduce sexual and gender-based violence.
- Understand how the misuse of power as a humanitarian worker can lead to sexual exploitation and abuse.

Unit 8: Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)
- Understand who internally displaced persons are and the difference between their legal status and that of refugees.
- Understand the rationale, mandate and criteria for UNHCR's involvement with internally displaced persons.
- Understand the collaborative framework in which protection and assistance activities for internally displaced persons are carried out and UNHCR's role with that framework.
- Be familiar with the *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*.
- Be aware of some of the protection challenges in working with internally displaced persons.

Unit 9: Statelessness
- Be aware of UNHCR's separate mandate on preventing and reducing statelessness.
- Be acquainted with UNHCR's role and activities under the statelessness mandate.
- Be alerted to root causes for statelessness and possible consequences of being stateless.
- Enhance your understanding of the 1954 *Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons* and the 1961 *Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness* and to key reference points in international law concerning nationality.

Unit 10: Voluntary Repatriation and Returnee Monitoring
- Understand UNHCR's role and responsibilities in the voluntary repatriation process and appreciate current challenges/dilemmas;
- Understand the legal and conceptual framework for voluntary repatriations;
- Consider UNHCR's role in voluntary repatriation in both country of asylum and origin and the challenges that this presents;
- Be acquainted with the tripartite framework of voluntary repatriation;
- Be familiar with the *4Rs* strategy

Unit 11: Resettlement
- Appreciate the role of resettlement as a protection tool and a durable solution.
- Consider the strategic use of resettlement in the country of asylum.
- Be familiar with the structure of the UNHCR Resettlement Handbook in particular the chapter relating to UNHCR's resettlement criteria.

• Be familiar with effective resettlement management practice.

Unit 12: Protection Driven Operations
  • Be aware of the key elements of UNHCR's Operations Management System (OMS) and your role in contributing to OMS cycle.
  • Understand how the OMS is a mechanism for achieving protection goals.
  • Be aware of UNHCR's main implementing instruments and the reporting, planning and implementation calendar.
  • Consider a team and partner approach for protection-driven operations.

Your Impact on Protection
  • Apply the knowledge and skills you have acquired in the first phase of the Protection Learning Programme and carry out actions to enhance the protection of the women, men, girls and boys of concern to UNHCR.
  • Evaluate the outcome of the actions using protection impact indicators.
  • Evaluate the impact that the self-study phase of the Protection Learning Programme has had on you until now.
  • Prepare for the workshop.
  •