**Chiang Mai Coordinated Assessments Training Course Overview**

**Course objectives**

* To provide an understanding of the humanitarian system and the various organisations and structures in place to support multi-sectoral needs assessments
* To provide an overview of the normative guidance and tools developed by the NATF
* To review technical topics related to assessment design, sampling, data collection, data analysis and interpretation and data presentation
* To give participants the chance to practice the skills required to conduct and support a multi-sectoral needs assessment, in line with NATF guidance and tools
* To develop participants’ abilities to support in-country assessment preparedness activities

**Course Summary & Feedback**

1. Great faculty – worked hard and well together. Everyone really made the effort to make the course a success. In future we need to ensure the faculty spends some face-to-face time together ahead of the course, making sure everyone is completely clear on course content but also that everyone is on the same page & using the same language. Doing this will also go some way to ensure we do not have to make dramatic last minute changes during the course.
2. Feedback from participants:
3. was mixed, more so than in Sweden in October, despite the course being further developed and more tools available. We did have some very positive feedback but there were also some concerns that we definitely need to address.
4. Lots of feedback on the MIRA and Dashboard which will be fed back separately.
5. Overwhelming feedback was that people wanted the tools and concrete examples before being asked to do it themselves as part of the scenario simulation. Given the complexities of assessments and different contexts they will be carried out in, we need to consider whether it would be more beneficial to focus on giving people the skills and knowledge to be able to evaluate and adapt whatever tools and methodologies they encounter, as well as to be comfortable working with NATF tools that are produced.
6. Some practical and straightforward feedback which will be easy to implement e.g. suggestions to ensure that content that is sent round in advance is absorbed and understood, thoughts on rejigging the programme to include more teaching time both before starting the scenario and interspersed with the tasks they were being asked to undertake, thoughts on tightening up the scenario & basically setting people up to succeed in it. Overall though, the scenario is sound but could usefully be expanded (e.g. to include exercises around harmonizing assessments, intra-cluster dynamics, etc)
7. Need to ensure time is built in to the training to provide ongoing feedback on completed tasks
8. Course participants - discussions have taken place on this but to summarise:
9. Some were there to learn about ‘doing’ joint assessments, either as assessment experts or data analysts and wanted to get straight into the ‘how’. They were the group targeted by this training and I’d tentatively say they got the most from it
10. Some were keen to learn about joint assessments but didn’t need the depth we provided – in their roles they were not likely to be actively involved in coordinating multi-sectoral assessments but what they did want was to know what to expect from a joint assessment, how they might be expected to input into it or support someone carrying one out. They would also have benefitted from learning more about harmonising assessments and coordinating intra-cluster assessments. We could have met this group’s needs with a shorter induction style course lasting one or two days.
11. Some had arrived unconvinced of the value of joint assessments and we had to spend time on discussions around this – these were discussions that have been happening over the last year or more at global level and we had not anticipated holding them at the training. We could have met this group’s needs by holding ‘sensitisation’ style sessions lasting a day or so.

We need to decide if there is value in continuing to try and meet the needs of these three groups of people in the same course. We need to make sure in the future that participants are not just highly qualified in needs assessments, as those in Chiang Mai undoubtedly were, but also that they are attending a course that best suits their needs. This links in to plans for a broader roll out of NATF strategy and framework. Participants need to come with a clear set of expectations that align with the course learning objectives - we need to communicate more, and maybe more simply with trainees before they arrive on the course.

Other issues to be considered:

* How do we incorporate training on harmonised assessments, use of the dashboard?
* How do we ensure people stay up to date once they have completed training?
* How do we ensure people have achieved the learning objectives of the course – how do we measure competence?