



**Commonwealth Of Learning Capacity Building
Workshop: Developing Digital Content**

3-14 September 2007

Facilitated by Mindset Schooling

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	5
1. Purpose and scope of the workshop.....	9
2. Approach to the workshop	9
3. Stakeholders	10
4. Results framework and objectives	10
5. M&E workplan and methodology	11
6 M&E Activities	12
6.1 Monitoring activities	12
6.2 Evaluation activities	12
7. Results and Discussion.....	14
7.1 Pre-workshop evaluation	14
7.1.1 Workshop arrangements.....	14
7.1.2 Workshop expectations.....	16
7.2 Facilitator day-by-day debriefing.....	20
7.3 Facilitator Interviews	23
7.4 Final Participant evaluation.....	24
7.4.1 Expectations of the workshop	25
7.4.2 Satisfaction with the workshop.....	26
7.4.3 Learning that has taken place.....	28
7.4.4. Specific areas of learning that will be useful	29
7.4.5 The methodology of the workshop	30
7.4.6 Facilitation and organisation	31
7.4.7 Value of the content, method of learning workshop.....	32
7.5 Yahoo! Groups evaluation	33
7.6 COL interview	35
7.6.1 The rationale behind the capacity building workshop’s formulation and the main objectives	35
7.6.2 Participant selection and benefits	36
7.6.3 The way forward	37
7.6.4 Perceptions of Mindset organisation and planning	37
Appendix A – Evaluation activities.....	38
Evaluation Activity 1 – Facilitator feedback.....	38
Evaluation Activity 2 – Facilitator interviews	39
Evaluation Activity 3 – Pre-workshop evaluation	39
Evaluation Activity 4 – Yahoo group input	41
Evaluation Activity 5 – Final participant evaluation	41
Evaluation activity 6 – COL representative interview	43
Appendix B – Time table of workshop	44
Appendix C – List of participants	51

Executive Summary

This research evaluated a capacity building workshop offered by Mindset Network, South Africa, and initiated by Frances Ferreira of the Commonwealth of Learning. The objectives of the workshop were to build capacity in the area of digital content, including input into video, multimedia and print as well as the integration of media. The purpose of the workshop was to build confidence, exposure, knowledge, skills and values around the area of ICT in participants from countries that are developing these areas or would like to develop these skills in their institutions.

Eight countries sent two participants each to the workshop with an almost equal gender split to ensure equal knowledge building and technology empowerment for women who are often under represented in this area. The countries included: Zambia, Tanzania, Kenya, Malawi, Namibia, Lesotho, India and Bangladesh (a final list of participants appears in Appendix C). The geographic diversity of the participants emerged as a strength as well as a challenge in the workshops. Most significantly, the ability to work with one's peers, from different contexts and with different solutions and responses to similar challenges was highly valued by participants. However, this diversity also meant that some participants had different levels of exposure to digital content development than others. In addition, speaking in a second language was also a challenge for some participants, although having a partner from the same country aided the learning process. However, all participants indicated that they learnt something new, were excited about the area and wished to continue their development indicating that the level at which participants entered the workshop was not as significant as the benefits they perceived themselves to have attained.

The workshop was performed over two weeks and participants were given the opportunity to apply the skills they had been shown in participatory presentations. This production was then facilitated and instant and consistent feedback was provided to and by participants. There were also opportunities to tour Mindset, see certain Mindset content examples, and also view the manner in which Mindset creates products. Although not explicitly planned for, participants also indicated they found the observation of Mindset colleagues beneficial in terms of team work, professionalism and ability to work in the area that Mindset colleagues demonstrated. An overall perception of quality and dedication was perceived from participants about the Mindset organisation.

The evaluation incorporated data triangulation, with one element utility based. Triangulation of data was performed by evaluating pre-workshop expectations from participants, day to day facilitator feedback, post-workshop evaluations from participants, facilitator interviews post-workshop and the COL interview. All stakeholders were thus asked to participate in the evaluation which was both qualitative and quantitative in nature. The day to day facilitator review sessions were utility based as they provided a platform for the modification, evaluation and re-structuring of the next day or the rest of the workshop.

The pre-workshop evaluation found that participants had a clear, if broad idea of what they were expecting: input into digital content. They were also asked to rate the organisation of the workshop to date and the use of the Yahoo! Groups as a means of communication. The participants mentioned certain organisational difficulties for individual participants that were related to organisational delays from their countries or organisations, but a clear positive perception by most participants was emphasised. The Yahoo! Groups analysis demonstrated that not all participants necessarily registered but the majority did read the electronic notice-board. Ms Ferreira of COL reiterated the importance of using such technology and all participants felt that this method of communication should be used for future workshops for the following reasons: getting to know the other participants, being prepared, saving time for when one arrives and instant and constant information sharing.

The day to day facilitators' review was utilised by most facilitators for planning for the next day but also raised issues on the workshop as a whole. Facilitators found the workshop to be beneficial to both the participants and themselves. The facilitators noted the importance and exceptionally useful nature of the participatory methodology utilised, the enthusiasm from participants, the interaction and knowledge sharing that occurred. Challenges such as some language difficulties and diverse levels of knowledge were noted. From an occupational perspective, facilitators contrasted the fulfilling nature of working with the group to the time consuming and tiring nature of facilitation. This often led to frustration as there was an unrealistic expectation that both 'normal' work and the workshop should be completed simultaneously. On the whole, however, facilitators were positive and thought the workshop was an excellent resource that could be extended into support to each participant in their own context with benefits to both Mindset and partner organisations.

The post-workshop evaluation by participants demonstrated that participants felt the objectives were met, that their knowledge and skills had increased and changed, and that their perspective on pedagogy in the area of ICT was altered. Interpersonally, participants felt that they were more confident and demonstrated enthusiasm about the area. Concrete and useful suggestions for change were made.

These findings are mirrored by the facilitator interviews. Facilitators felt the benefits to the participants were in the area of practical application, greater exposure to the diverse media as well as the change in inter- and intrapersonal perspectives on ICT. However, the short amount of time to cover all the content was noted (as it was by participants) and also the understanding that not all content and skills learning could be covered in two weeks. The utility of providing further support, partnerships and relationships between the participating countries and Mindset was mentioned by almost all facilitators.

The above themes were also mentioned by Frances Ferreira of COL, who provided a macro perspective detailing the positive role of Mindset in this capacity building workshop, the importance that this workshop has for participants, the direct and indirect benefits, the values attained and the importance of seeing an example of a digital content organisation. She emphasised the point that the way forward was for participants to return to their countries and organisations and write proposals on their requirements and needs directed to their CEO's or appropriate authorities. These could then be supported by COL and the necessary input provided.

In summary, this workshop has provided Mindset with the opportunity to host a capacity building workshop, to learn useful and specific lessons at a personal and organisational level, and to fulfil elements of its three year strategy. Both direct and indirect benefits to participants were attained, and consistent feedback from participants demonstrated the value they found in the workshop.

1. Purpose and scope of the workshop

The two week workshop aimed to build capacity in developing digital content in African and Asian educational institutions' representatives (Bangladesh, India, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Namibia, Tanzania and Zambia). The workshop was based on a participatory and production driven approach, enabling participants to learn from Mindset Network's lessons over the last four years, as well as to practically implement the skills. It was envisaged that by the end of the workshop each participant would be able to develop digital content and produce this content in various formats (print, video and multi-media). The purpose of the workshop was to build capacity in individuals identified as being able to disseminate and demonstrate their skill development when they returned to their respective organisations. In this manner, the workshop's objectives were:

- To build capacity in digital content development in the African and Asian setting. The aim of this was to encourage the dissemination of skills implementation
- To secure relationships with various representatives from diverse organisations to build a community of learning
- To change pedagogic practices and develop a greater understanding of ICT and its possibilities in developing countries.

The above objectives specifically fulfil the following strategic objectives of Mindset Network:

- Changing pedagogic practices in line with changing educational practices in Africa. "*Mindset's strategy will be to support the continuous improvement in pedagogical practices*".
- Mindset aims to be a "one-stop-shop" in content development, distribution and usage, in the area of large-scale educational technology projects. "*In seeking to develop capacity in this area, Mindset will also focus on becoming a 'thought leader' in the field of educational technology through networking, conference participation, innovative testing of technologies and methods, publishing results of research and other work*".

2. Approach to the workshop

The workshop took the approach of providing participants with the knowledge and lessons learned that Mindset has accumulated in the area of digital content development. Dialogue around these lessons learned were facilitated, with the focus being on discussions, knowledge sharing and interaction and learning by all participants (Mindset and other countries' colleagues alike). Participants were then presented with various digital content developments and productions, with the aim of their being able to develop their own content and produce this with the resources they have available. In this manner, the participatory, action-oriented approach of the workshop aimed for the most effective and long lasting learning.

3. Stakeholders

The Stakeholders in this project included:

1. Commonwealth of Learning – Frances Ferreira
2. Mindset Network
3. Participants in the project: Bangladesh, India, Zambia, Malawi, Tanzania, Namibia, Lesotho and Kenya.

4. Results framework and objectives

Table 1 below outlines the M&E framework and objectives of the project. This table details the format that the evaluation followed, the evaluation criteria of relevance to the project and the expected outputs of the project. Each portion will be detailed in the discussions that follow, with reference to the evaluation instruments employed.

Table 1. Results Framework Template

Name of project	Short description of the project	Objectives for the project	Impact goals for the project (these are the expected outputs from the Mindset interventions)	
			Intermediate	Long term
Developing Digital Content: Capacity building workshop between Mindset and COL	<p>Effectiveness: Two week, participatory, capacity building workshop with 2 representatives from Bangladesh, India, Lesotho, Malawi, Namibia, Tanzania and Zambia education institutions and 2 representatives from Kenya Institute of Education (KIE).</p> <p>Impact: There is a need to build capacity in developing content for digitisation.</p> <p>Relevance: Relevance for this expertise lies in the policy documents of the various educational institutions and their respective countries.</p> <p>Sustainability: This project complements the Tafakari project as a fore-runner to implementation. In addition, this project will run as a pilot for training and capacity building workshops that Mindset may run in future.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Share experience about digital content (interactive lessons and video) development 2. Develop skills in digital (interactive lessons, print and video) content development 3. Develop skills in digital content production 4. Utilise Mindset Network experiences as a foundation and knowledge resource for capacity building 	Promote greater understanding of digital content development and production in an African & Asian context	<p>Develop partnerships with African & Asian Educational representatives</p> <p>Build capacity in ICT in Africa</p> <p>Change pedagogic practice</p>

5. M&E workplan and methodology

This section outlines the inputs, processes, outcomes and impacts of the workshop. These were utilised to develop an M&E plan to monitor the project as well as evaluate the outcomes. All instruments of evaluation will be detailed below.

The following table (Table 2) outlines the M&E Inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes and impacts of the project.

Table 2. M&E processes of the project

Monitoring			Evaluation	
Input	Processes	Outputs.	Outcomes	Impact
Mindset expertise in digital content development	1. Present the developing world context of digital content development and production	1. Understanding the developing world context in digital content development	1. Understand the developing world context of digital content production (context applicable)	Promote greater understanding of digital content development and production in an developing world context
Mindset expertise in production of digital content	2. Present and discuss Mindset's content development approach	2. Understand Mindset's content development approach	2. Evaluate the merits and de-merits of different content media (video, print and interactive lessons) development approaches	Develop partnerships with developing world Educational representatives
Mindset's past experience and lessons learned	3. Present and discuss the merits and demerits of different formats (video, multi-media and print)	3. Evaluate the different formats	3. Use lessons learnt at Mindset to apply content development skills	Build capacity in ICT in Africa
Mindset training and facilitation expertise	4. Participation/facilitation on developing content for video	4. Develop content for video	4. Use lessons learnt at Mindset to apply production lessons learnt	Change pedagogic practices
	5. Participation/facilitation on developing content for multi-media	5. Develop multi-media content		
	6. Present Mindset's experience and approach to video production	6. Understand and experience video production at Mindset		
	7. Participation/facilitation on print production	7. Understand and experience print production at Mindset Network		

6. M&E Activities

6.1. Monitoring activities

The Monitoring responsibility of the project rested with individual facilitators who took responsibility for their section of the workshop. Continuous feedback from colleagues provided input on time and input monitoring. In addition, a review process at the end of each day (see later evaluation) provided a platform for feedback on this monitoring role. Overall, the time table was adhered to in a dynamic manner allowing for extra time and flexible work sessions. The evaluation instruments provide input on whether this monitoring role was comprehensive and suitable.

6.2 Evaluation activities

Facilitator directed evaluations:

Activity 1 – Facilitator feedback

At the end of each day (with the exception of the last day), a debrief session was run, where the strengths, weaknesses, contingencies, deviations and accomplishments were discussed. This forum was monitored and data collated by both the evaluator and facilitators in order to provide an evaluation of the process as well as the content, capabilities of the participants, logistics and so forth. These sessions provided both a monitoring function as well as the start of discussions around the evaluation of the project.

Evaluation Activity 2 – Facilitator interviews

Once the workshop was completed, an interview with each facilitator and logistics coordinator was completed. This enabled each facilitator to reflect on the entire workshop and present their overall perceptions, impressions and observations. The approach of an individual interview was chosen as the debriefing sessions at the end of each day were in a group format, thus the individual interviews complemented this format and enabled each facilitator the opportunity to evaluate and reflect on their own portions of the workshop and the workshop as a whole.

Participant directed evaluations:

Evaluation Activity 3 – Pre-workshop evaluation

Each participant was asked to fill in a brief questionnaire/rating scale regarding the preparations for the project, the organisation of the project, their perceptions of what the workshop would entail and their experience of the Yahoo! Groups contact. This was provided to participants before the start of the project.

Evaluation Activity 4 – Yahoo! Groups input

Input and interactions with the Yahoo! Groups that was set up before the project were evaluated after the workshop.

Evaluation Activity 5 – Final participant evaluation

An evaluation was provided to each participant to gauge their impressions and experiences of the content, facilitators, organisation, participation sessions, usefulness and intended uses of the workshop.

Evaluation Activity 6 – Stakeholder input - COL

The Commonwealth of Learning coordinator for this product, Frances Ferreira was interviewed in terms of her perceptions of the project, the objectives and purpose of the project and her vision on the way forward.

Table 3. Evaluation methodology matrix

Focus: Mindset/COL workshop on digital content development						
Questions	Indicators	Timing of data collection	Data Collection			
			Sources	Method	Sample	Instruments
1. Did the participants find the workshop useful?	1a) Comments from participants.	Pre-workshop	-Facilitators	-Facilitator debriefing	Facilitators	-Facilitator debriefing
2. Did the participants find the workshop well organised?	b) Feedback from participants.	Throughout the two weeks	-Organisers	-Facilitator interviews	Participants	observation
3. Was the content well received?	c) Level of interaction of participants	Post-workshop	-Participants	-Participant evaluations		-Facilitator interviews
4. Was the participatory method effective?	2a). Perception of organisation of workshop		-Yahoo activity	– pre-workshop		-Rating scale/questionnaire for participants (pre and post workshop)
5. Were the participants able to manage the activities?	b) Identification of any difficulties			-Participant evaluations		-Yahoo analysis by objectives
6. What were the strengths of the workshop?	3a) Perception and rating of content in terms of usefulness, effectiveness, level.			– post-workshop		-Content evaluation by objectives
7. What were the de-merits of the workshop?	4a) Rating of satisfaction of participating			-Yahoo content evaluation		
	b) efficacy of participation as a method					
	5a) evaluation of content and method as					

	manageable b) production of final products 6a) lists of strengths 7a) lists of weaknesses					
Data Analysis	Data interpretation	Results be communicated		Notes		
		To whom	By when, where, how			
Rating scales - Descriptive statistics – generating means and frequencies Interviews - Content analysis of rating scales Content and Yahoo analysis – content analysis	Quantitatively and Qualitatively	Report to COL Report to Mindset Network Summary to Marketing and NBD	Within 4 weeks of the workshop. Sent via Shafika to COL, Mindset and M&NBD. Written report (email and hard copy)			

7. Results and Discussion

7.1 Pre-workshop evaluation

Participants were asked to fill in a pre-workshop evaluation regarding the following:

- The arrangements that had been made for the workshop
- What their expectations of the workshop were, and
- Any additional comments or communications they wanted to add.

7.1.1 Workshop arrangements

The following table outlines the participants' experiences of the way the workshop was organised.

Table 4. Workshop arrangements (number of people who cite the theme in brackets)

Was the workshop well arranged?		Action to be taken
Responses		
Describe one thing that was well organized.	Describe one thing you think could have been improved.	
Welcome and Introductory session, including Yahoo! Groups (meet other people and made information available well in advance), general communication [7]		Yahoo! Groups set up and Introductory sessions before workshop commences retained
Information on what to bring, what to expect, what information to bring with [5]		
Transport from the airport and tickets [7]		Transport Logistics retained and formalised
Accommodation [4]		Accommodation logistics to be retained and formalised
Support provided to get visa [1]	A formal invitation provided for visa requirements [2]	Logistics support retained, but formalise an invitation letter
All arrangements [2]		
	Name of the Hotel not supplied, thus could not find it [2]	Provide 'arrival pack' of Name of hotel, transport details, list of telephone numbers, contact people
	Needed a list of telephone numbers for when arrived [1]	As above
	"Reception at the airport and at the hotel" [1]	Interpretation not possible
	"could have arranged accommodation and venue in the same place" [1]	Possibility for future workshops, but within budget and learning objectives of workshop

The above table demonstrates an overwhelmingly positive response to the logistical arrangements, including accommodation, travel and general preparation. Specific suggestions from two main difficulties were mentioned: Two participants did not know where their hotel was and 2 participants struggled to get a visa. An analysis of these difficulties found that the hotel name difficulty arose on the participants' part as they had been informed of these details. The visa difficulty arose due to late requests for additional letters of invitation to be sent, and late applications to COL. The challenge of providing logistical support in situations where organisations do not reply to offers of training on time, or who do not identify delegates early enough has been emphasised by Ms Ferreira. These difficulties were, however, resolved.

The comment that one participant mentioned: "*could have arranged accommodation and venue in the same place*" requires clarification. Having the presentation and learning occur within a hotel setting

would not have achieved the objectives of the workshop in terms of viewing and working within Mindset. The learning and observation benefits were felt to outweigh the small distance to travel each day. While future workshops may consider place of training, this is tempered by the learning objectives of the model.

The main positive element of the workshop centred on communication and information dissemination. Participants valued the pre-workshop communication via e-mail and the Yahoo! Groups organisation. They mentioned the benefits of meeting people before the workshop, knowing what to bring and what to expect.

Welcoming of participants by the organizers or presenters. This was a perfect introductory session where all the participants and presenters or organizers got to know each other and have a feeling of becoming a member of the group before you physically meet. This was well organized.

*“The fact that Mindset made it possible for participants to interact before meeting.”
“And making the general information of the workshop available to the participants well in advance”*

7.1.2 Workshop expectations

Participants were then asked for their interpretation of the expectations of the workshop. In addition, this section includes the participants' interpretation of why they were chosen to attend and what benefit they perceive to gain from the workshop. The following table outlines the content analysis of the responses received.

Table 5. Content analysis of the expectations of the workshop

Why do you think you were chosen/chose to come?	What benefits will this workshop have to you?	What benefits will this workshop have to your country?
Knowledge development, improvement and learn new skills [3]	Information on “interesting” digital content, digital learning materials [7]	Add value, quality to current content [4]
Have knowledge of Mindset and partnered with them before [1]	Digital content writing, aligned with curriculum [3]	Complement that which is already produced [3]
Appropriate to occupation in education, and position within organisation [10]	Knowledge sharing [6]	Benefit the organisation [4]

Will complement existing programmes [5]	Video media in content development [2]	Take new skills home [2]
	Multimedia content development [1]	Ease of methodology – educator can prepare easier and learner access easier [3]
	“identification of areas in which digital material can be used” [1]	Improve communication [1]
	“Evaluating the performance of learner (digitally) if any” [1]. (could not interpret)	Form partnerships [1]
	Theoretical approach to digital content development [2]	
	Practical application of the work [1]	
	Participation [2]	
	Use Mindset as a model [3]	

In terms of the benefits participants expected to get from the workshop, the main theme was on knowledge development:

“to learn more on the subject of digital content development”

“Get different strategies how this can be done”

Three participants expressed the view that they felt the workshop would help them increase their knowledge and skills surrounding digital content.

Further, certain participants mentioned that this workshop would benefit their development of digital content, either as a complement to existing programmes or for its own sake. This theme was more specific than knowledge development and focussed specifically on digital content.

“I want to be more competent in digital content for the development of our country in the distance education context”

Ten participants mentioned that they had been chosen and were appropriate to come to the workshop as they already occupied relevant positions within their organisations to benefit from the workshop. The workshop was perceived to be applicable to the position of the participant in the education arena. For example:

“I am a manager for course materials development for secondary school and teachers”

Participants were then asked what benefits they expected to gain from the workshop. The following themes emerged:

- Digital content development (including specific areas of video and multimedia production)
- Writing for digital content

- Knowledge sharing
- An understanding of the context in which ICT may be used
- Mindset as a model of a digital content developer
- Theory and practice of content development – theoretical understanding of the background and the opportunity to apply it
- Participatory approach

Many participants mentioned the benefits of sharing knowledge and experience with other countries. For example:

“get an overview of what other countries are doing in the area of digital content development; learn and share new ideas; discuss challenges facing us in digital content development and possible solution

And

“become aware of ICT enabled education in other countries”

Knowledge development was also frequently mentioned, with specific reference made to video production and multimedia production. In addition, one participant mentioned:

“identification of areas in which digital material can be used”

Some understanding of the theory behind digital content was expected, as well as the practical application of the theory. In addition, having face to face participation and discussions was anticipated:

“face to face – consultation with experts in evaluation of the workshop participation”

One participant mentioned the benefit of seeing Mindset as a digital content provider:

“as a study ...to the institution/centre which has experience on this process of digital”

Participants were then asked to reflect on the benefits this workshop would have to their countries in an effort to evaluate the participants' understanding of the far reaching application and further role they will have to play once they return home. Themes that emerged from this question included:

- Adding value to content produced
- Complementing content that is already designed
- Adding new skills
- Improving efficiency and efficiency of the organisation
- Impacting on teaching and learning
- Impacting on communication

- Forming partnerships

Participants mentioned adding value and quality to content that will be produced or that is already produced. In addition, the benefits of taking new skills home as well as this skill input benefiting the organisation were mentioned:

“I assume it will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the organisation”

“New skills for development and production of learning materials”

One participant mentioned that having digital content will affect pedagogy in that educators and learners would benefit from the methods employed and the ease of access:

“It will enable me as a tutor to prepare the subject contents in the digital form and be easy for learner to access it without my presence”

Communication was mentioned in the sense that digital content would aid communication and broaden reach:

“Continuous and systematic arrangement of communication/networking among members/participants as well as between my country or institution”

Lastly, one participant mentioned the benefit of forming partnerships (which could be broadly interpreted as partnerships with Mindset and the countries who participated):

“Meet people that can assist in production”

As a final question, participants were asked if they had any other information to add to the questionnaire. Only five responses were received and these centred on the theme of looking forward to the workshop and positive messages to Mindset. For example:

“Thanks for preparing this kind of workshop. I look forward to its content” Kenya

“Look forward to learning and sharing ideas on this subject, digital content development”

“Well done for your good work and please assist others to get to the heights you have reached”

7.2 Facilitator day-by-day debriefing

This section outlines the results of the day by day findings of the programme evaluation. This evaluation was utilisation focused in that as evaluations were discussed at the end of each day, the lessons learned were implemented for the following day. The full set of results is available for review, but for the purposes of this report, the main findings of strengths, weaknesses, and the way forward are outlined.

The discussions were transcribed, entered into a standardised format and then qualitatively analysed. The analysis presented here is thematic analysis, focusing on the following areas:

- Logistics and organisation
- Support – including IT, Mindset colleagues
- Methodology employed by programme

Table 6. Thematic analysis of the facilitator reviews (including suggestions on the way forward)

Theme	Strength	Weakness	Way forward
Organisation/ planning	Organisational problems solved rapidly	Organisational difficulties due to responsibilities for activities not well clarified	Roles and responsibilities need to be clarified and documented/formalised pre-workshop (including 'culture' of workshop – behaviour around professional workshop)
	Facilitators drove their respective sections well, independently		Independent and well motivated team, dedicated to the process. People worked well together
		Participants asked for extra resources – e.g. special meetings, CDs, tours etc.	Pre-workshop information should be clear and decisions made within budget concerning tours, resources etc.
	Slides and presentations at correct level	Participants asked for notes from presentations without them.	Evaluate whether having a resource file of all slides and presentations at start of the programme.
	Every day review sessions raised issues and debates surrounding content, presentation etc		Quality assurance should adopt this process in formalised manner for future workshops. Build into planning.
		Time is often too short, there is a lot of information to cover (but should not be cut down) and need time to practice skills	Having off site support to continue work at night and on weekends a possibility
Logistics	Mindset well placed to host. Good overview of context of work, venue, amenities etc	Venue too small, set up not conducive to facilitation (support material missing)	Planning around workshop setting regarding large area, round table, support structures (such as podium, speakers etc)

IT	Positive to have computers dedicated to participants' use within Mindset work areas	IT did not work at times (network connections in boardroom, programmes on machines etc).	IT needs to be set up well before hand to be tested. All facilitators should test their needed technology.
	IT support was quick and fast from Mindset side		
Methodology	Welcome session worked well to introduce people, set tone of workshop, knowledge sharing	Welcome session a little unstructured	Use support to structure for less planned session (such as Welcome).
	Use of technology in presentations worked well – effective method	Some presentations had certain technology breakdown	All colleagues should test presentations before they arrive
	Tour of Mindset was well received. Colleagues approachable and friendly	Concern that workshop impinges on colleagues (space, requests, noise, interactions?).	Emphasise inclusion of Mindset staff not involved in the project
	Interactive sessions exceptionally positive (mentioned almost every day). Participants valued interactions, sharing knowledge, experience, peer education, collaborative learning		Review current time table and evaluate whether more interactive sessions could be included
	Group work at workstations positive, and were even extended. Found to be more useful than presentation	Generally worked well, but a few IT problems needed fixing	Check all workstations pre-workshop. Review time table to ensure maximum time allowed for independent work/activities
		Afternoon sessions very long – participants tired	Review time table to evaluate what activities should be morning or afternoon based on level of concentration necessary/novelty
	Positive feedback received – participants enthusiastic, appreciated extra help from Mindset colleagues, content and methodology		Supports dedication of Mindset colleagues and relevance of content covered
	Content positive, relevant. Also, input from other sections of Mindset (e.g. Health) valuable.		Overall, integrative overview of Mindset valuable.
	Logistics of setting up a studio was appreciated		Consider putting logistical requirements for each area (print, IL and video) into resource pack
Facilitation	Facilitators positive, professional, dedicated		Facilitators should be encouraged to refine their programmes for future, engage in self evaluation, peer input etc.
	Worked well to have many colleagues involved as workshop intensive. Breaks between	Facilitators found the process tiring (normal workload also needed to be covered)	Ensure time tables make allowances for diversity of facilitators, expertise, and breaks for facilitators

	facilitation for facilitators positive, and provided diversity for participants, and also constant expert input		
	Group work works well – valuable and necessary for participants	Need extra facilitators to move between groups so all get input. But also concern that too much input from too many people is confusing	Allocate facilitators to certain groups for certain activities.
	Diversity is a strength and challenge. Strength includes diversity of input, experiences.	Different levels of groups leads to diverse levels of input	Although diverse levels of ability, amount of learning is large and individual specific

Firstly, the above analysis demonstrates that the monitoring process was detailed, consistent and responsive. As each debriefing session occurred at the end of the day the opportunity was presented to make changes for the following day, ensure planning processes and concretise strengths from the day. As a methodology, this process was an efficient and formalised part of the monitoring process.

Secondly, the above table outlines the issues raised and discussed during the review sessions in terms of evaluation. The analysis demonstrates that the strengths are characterised by broad issues relating to methodology, organisation and facilitator positive features. Conversely, the weaknesses are characterised by specific issues and suggestions. These strengths and weaknesses have been supported by suggestions on the way forward. While these are by no means concrete, they provide a platform for suggestions and a starting point for future workshops from the viewpoint of facilitators.

Main conclusions from this evaluation process:

- Planning of the workshop was done well with facilitators generally well organised. However, roles and responsibilities need to be clarified for future workshops
- Timing must be precise as the amount of material to cover and the activities that surround these need to be included. This was a strength of the workshop
- Logistical arrangements went smoothly and problems solved quickly. Specific difficulties around the venue and the facilities were noted for consideration for future where possible
- The participatory approach worked exceptionally well and the benefits were obvious
- Positive feedback from participants was noted, with facilitators trying to accommodate as many additional requests as possible (even though these were outside of the expectations of the workshop)
- Facilitators felt they were learning from the process, that they were doing well, but that the role was tiring and time consuming (with a worry around their other deadlines being stressed). A concern was raised that the facilitation needed to be acknowledged from all Mindset colleagues as time consuming and extra to 'normal' deadlines

7.3 Facilitator Interviews

After the workshop had been completed, individual interviews with each facilitator and the logistics planner were conducted. The following section outlines the themes of these interviews, divided by strengths and challenges.

Table 7. Perceived strengths and challenges of the workshop

Strengths of the workshop	Challenges to address
Participants	
The development of participants from day to day was obvious – obvious skills transfer	Diverse abilities (theory, reflection and practical) – is more demanding
The enthusiasm and dedication of participants. All engaged, excited, took feedback well, open to being challenged	Language difficulty of a few participants (in one instance a Mindset staff member could translate and spend time with participants – time investment is large, but benefit large)
Produced good worked and were pleased	
Content	
Sensitised participants to what can be done with multimedia	The amount of content is large and can not cover it all – limit in time and participants' concentration and fatigue. Should view workshop as awareness, can't cover it all.
Discussion and outline of country context beneficial	Beginning sessions need to be made more interactive
Learnt many new things – e.g. how to think as a learner not a teacher, applicable	
Good balance between theory and practical. Content strong	
Methodology	
Programme flexible enough to move things around if need be, or to take longer on some sections	Need more time between sessions – tiring for facilitators
Participatory, hands on approach beneficial	Needed more time for all the content, with perhaps laptops to use at night
Structured well	We overlook the website and needs to be incorporated into presentations, planning
Facilitators	
Worked well together, worked as a team	Exhausting – need breaks between session, or to split the groups, more facilitators possibly
Participatory – all felt like peers with participants.	
Passion, personalities was conveyed and motivated delegates. Showed genuine care for their areas.	
Organisation	
Hotel was close, worked well	Venue could be expanded, more facilitative set up
Organisation liaison was efficient and worked well, with problems being ironed and solved quickly	Computers effective but a bit slow, had to do lots of problem solving around IT
This workshop has provided a 'pilot' or skeleton to improve all future workshops	Need clear planning team, identified roles and responsibilities. However, theme of having greater involvement of other colleagues also noted, more responsibilities could be shared
Should consider tours as part of conference	Need bigger car for transport
	Should have a 'dry run' before the start, to check content,

	planning and IT. Need greater planning period
Yahoo! Groups	
Tanzania has signed up since the workshop – good platform for communication	Took long time to set up and should be used more
Mindset internal themes	
Was fulfilling and interesting to work with participants. Formed relationships.	Workshop not valued by whole organisation as facilitators still expected to complete their normal workload. Would like more recognition and thanks.
	Need full buy-in from organisation, to be completely inclusive of participants

Facilitators were also asked for their opinion on what the benefit to Mindset of the workshop was.

Facilitators' responses could be grouped into the following themes:

- Mindset's "name" is now known internationally, with a good reputation – Mindset is then seen as competent, with good quality and good material
- Mindset's main role is to support other people and this workshop gave the facilitators insight into their role, and the quality of their work
- Partnerships – Mindset now has the opportunity to develop relationships with people in other countries that can be taken forward. Mindset could also offer support within countries' context
- Team work – facilitators noted that it was beneficial to work as a team, and also extended people's capabilities and skills.

7.4 Final Participant evaluation

The following table details the quantitative analysis of the post-workshop evaluation questionnaire.

Table 8. Number and percentage of responses for each evaluation question (negatively phrased questions shaded)

Evaluation question	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
The workshop fulfilled my expectations.	50%	50%	0	0	0
There were things that I think the workshop left out	0	50%	6.3%	6.3%	12.5%
I found the workshop very useful	81.3%	12.5%	0	0	0
Being able to produce my own content was helpful.	56.3%	43.8%	0	0	0
I found seeing how Mindset worked useful	68.8%	31.3%	0	0	0
I would have liked to learn more about content development.	56.3%	31.3%	12.5%	0	0
Being exposed to print media (print, video and interactive lessons) was beneficial to me.	62.5%	37.5%	0	0	0
Being exposed to digital video media was beneficial to me.	62.5%	31.3%	0	0	0
Being exposed to digital interactive lessons was beneficial to me.	56.3%	37.5%	0	0	0
The workshop was well facilitated.	81.3%	18.8%	0	0	0

The facilitators knew what they were talking about.	93.8%	6.3%	0	0	0
Being able to discuss material and the learning process with my colleagues was helpful	56.3%	37.5%	0	0	0
I would recommend this workshop to my colleagues	87.5%	6.3%	0	0	0
The workshop was well organised	75.0%	18.8%	0	0	0

7.4.1 Expectations of the workshop

All participants stated that the workshop fulfilled their expectations. Specifically, participants were asked to list the expectations that were met. An analysis of participants' responses found that the expectations that were met were:

Table 10. Comparison between pre-workshop and post-workshop reported expectations

Pre-workshop expectations	Post-workshop expectations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Digital content material development Multimedia production Video production 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Digital content development (including specific areas of video and multimedia production)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scripting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing for digital content
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creating a cohesive product – video, print and multimedia 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participatory approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mindset as a model of a digital content developer Knowledge sharing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theory and practice of content development – theoretical understanding of the background and the opportunity to apply it An understanding of the context in which ICT may be used
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participatory approach

The above clearly demonstrates that expectations before the workshop aligned with the actual outcomes of the workshop.

While the overall response demonstrated a positive perception of expectations met, the questionnaire also asked whether participants felt certain elements had been left out of the workshop. Only half the participants felt that something had been missing from the workshop. These were:

- One participant mentioned further input into multimedia software (for example, 'flash')
- 2 participants suggested further input into software for graphics
- One participant suggested further input into using PowerPoint
- Information on how to set up a studio
- Audio information
- Video production
- Field trip

These suggestions for improvement and additional content mainly concern extra input into programming in multimedia and video production. However, this is constrained by both time and unrealistic expectations. Requests from certain participants around programming and production input are often learnt in years. The request for information on providing audio equipment is relevant and applicable but does not fall within the frame of work provided by mindset.

Suggestions for a field trip to see how Mindset is applied in context were made. Also, a suggestion for the logistics and costs for setting up studios. This latter suggestion was discussed in the facilitator feedback sessions and decided to be placed in a workshop manual for future workshops, and was generated for video set up and given to participants.

7.4.2 Satisfaction with the workshop

Participants found the workshop exceptionally useful, with all participants agreeing that the workshop, being able to produce content and seeing how Mindset worked were all useful.

Participants' responses on the specific features they found the most useful were:

- Reflection process – participants mentioned that the structure of the workshop which enabled them to be critical of their own work and incorporate feedback was beneficial (*Made me reflect on my job and areas that can improve*)
- Interpersonal – communication and knowledge sharing with one's peers was perceived as useful (*Interaction with other people and getting new ideas*)
- Integration – the manner in which print, multimedia and video are presented in an integrated way (*Producing interlinked material i.e. video, m.m. and print*)
- Participation – the communication and sharing of ideas as well as discussions and brainstorming were found to be useful (*emphasising on hands on work, conducive environment for learning*)
- Facilitation – facilitators were singled out as providing benefit to the participants (*facilitators were very supportive*)
- Specific content – this included the scripting process (*scriptwriting*), video production, editing, observation, scripting (*capacity building in developing digital content, especially in video production*), multimedia (*brainstorming in multimedia*), and print (*print*)
- Quality – certain comments were analysed as indicating a quality perception of the process and product. Participants mentioned that the workshop allowed them to produce better quality products (*production of good education materials with less shortfalls*)
- Model – Mindset as a model and suitable context was identified (*to learn from the experience of Mindset Network*)

In order to establish which specific aspects of the workshop were found to be the most useful, participants were asked to list their perceptions of these. This enables the current portions of the workshop found to

be most beneficial to be cemented, and a discussion around any elements found to be less useful to take place.

Participants found the following elements to be most helpful:

- Methodology of the workshop – participants mentioned that the structure and the theory-practice aspects of the workshop worked well (*systematic approach – preparation script, review, production; identifying subject areas and see how to explain concept in different ways*)
- Evaluation – being able to gain instant feedback from both facilitators and fellow participants in order to improve one's own work was rated positively (*unpacking information as I was delivering*)
- Practical – being able to try new learning, produce one's own work and 'do' the tasks was exceptionally helpful to participants (*practical work; ability to practice doing it as the memory was fresh*)
- Content – video scripting and production (*converting a video script to a video*), print (*making print material*), and multimedia scripting and production (*multimedia production*)
- Interaction of all the materials – seeing the manner in which print, multimedia and video were interconnected was perceived as beneficial (*developing video lessons complemented by print or multimedia*)
- Relevance of material – participants mentioned that they found it most helpful that the material presented was relevant to their own contexts and countries (*pertinent to my field of work at the own country*)

In order to establish priority areas, participants were then asked what areas were found to be least helpful. Most participants either did not answer this question or said that there was nothing that was not helpful. One participant mentioned that the time was limited and he/she would have liked more time. Two participants mentioned print to be least helpful and one mentioned multimedia. This appears to be related to the area that people were working in the most and had identified as areas of learning for them.

Participants were then asked what areas they found the most useful for themselves. This question aimed to tap the specific portions of the workshop that were relevant and applicable to participants. The following themes emerged:

- Mindset as a Model – Mindset as a model was found to be useful (*knowing what people use (equipment) to develop digital content*)
- Facilitators – 14 participants mentioned that the commitment and hard work that Mindset facilitators demonstrated was useful. The hard work, professionalism, and expertise were all mentioned. Four participants specifically mentioned the teamwork that was demonstrated.
- Organisation – many participants also mentioned the organisation of the workshop was useful (*well organised; everything seemed well coordinated, facilitators and the support staff*)
- Content – general digital content was mentioned as useful. Specifically developing content, and organising the production systematically.

Fifteen of the 16 participants said that 'nothing' was least helpful in the workshop. The one comment that was made was that it was hard to observe, but this comment could not be interpreted due to lack of detail.

7.4.3 Learning that has taken place

Participants were asked what learning had taken place from the workshop, what they wanted to learn more about and things they were pleased they learnt. The majority of participants mentioned that they would like to learn more (with only 12.5% neutral on this item). This is possibly a reflection on participants' enthusiasm and increased knowledge in the area they found useful and would like to pursue. This is supported by previous items where the majority of the group found 'nothing' least useful in the workshop. This question on learning identifies priority and need as well as where further training and input could be provided, and the form this could take.

Table 11. Learning that participants were pleased they received and what they would like more input on

I am pleased I learnt:	I would like to have learnt more about:
Multimedia planning, programme development, scripting and production [5]	Using Macro Flash in multimedia, production in multimedia, scripting multimedia [10]
Video scripting, production, editing, studio experience [10]	Video scripting and presenting [5]
Content development, including scripting [4]	The costs of setting up a studio [1]
Integration of video, print and multimedia [2]	Type setting, worksheet layout, drawing graphics [2]
Facilitation excellent [2]	Nothing [2]
Mindset hospitality [1]	

The above table demonstrates that the most beneficial aspects that were learnt by some participants were also those that other participants wanted to know more about (with only one participant falling into both groups). In general, it was different participants that said that they were pleased they learnt about multimedia or video and others that said they wanted to learn more. This reflects the disparity and diverse needs and areas of work of the participants. It may be that participants wanted more input into areas that they wanted to develop, or that they felt that they required more input to develop those skills. The following sections outline the specific aspects of print, multimedia and video that participants felt were beneficial.

Importantly, participants mentioned that the scripting process was a beneficial area to learn, as well as how video, multimedia and print integrate. Positive input into the facilitators and Mindset were also mentioned.

In terms of further learning, one participant wanted to learn what the costs of setting up a studio were, and the facilitators made the suggestion that future workshops consider having a manual with basic

requirements for all levels of digital content provided (but provided the equipment breakdown as requested within the current workshop). An additional area that two participants stated they wanted more learning in was in the area of print (type setting, worksheet layout and graphics).

7.4.4. Specific areas of learning that will be useful

Participants were asked what areas in print, multimedia and video they found the most useful. These questions allow for the evaluation of content and material presented against what the objectives of the workshop and perceptions of the facilitators as important areas to cover. The following tables summarise these findings. Statistical analysis found that all participants (62.5% strongly agree, and 37.5% agree) that print media in the workshop was beneficial. The same pattern was demonstrated for video media and multimedia (56.3% strongly agree, 37.5% agree). [Note: percentages are calculated from the entire group and some participants may have left out a question, thus leading to disparate percentages, or corrected percentages].

Table 12. Helpful aspects of print media and suggested additions to the workshop content on print

Print media that was beneficial	Suggested additions to print media
Preparing an integrated package (print, media and video) [3]	Nothing [10]
Learners will benefit (learner centred, quality material, well linked, use of illustrations and graphics) [4]	Field trip to a "Mindset school" [1]
Benefit to institution, distance learners and as support to other media [5]	More examples of work done [1]
Provides a choice of formats to use [1]	Worksheets for learners [1]
Layout and simplicity [2]	More on graphics [1]

The above table shows that participants found the presentation of how print integrates with other digital media very helpful, and also noted the support and benefit of training to add quality to print materials this workshop would have for them, their institutions and learners. The helpful aspects of the print portions of the workshop are characteristically process and policy oriented with high level benefits being listed. In contrast, the suggested additions are specific and contained to product such as wanted to see examples of work, worksheets and graphics.

Table 13. Helpful aspects of video media and suggested additions to the workshop content on print

Video media that was beneficial	Suggested additions to video media
Presenting in front of a camera [1]	Nothing [10]
Learning and evaluation of own presentation leading to quality of content [4]	More information on how to produce [1]
Will aid distance education [2]	Need more time for real editing [1]
Scripting [3]	How to get prepared for recording [1]
Makes lessons interactive, positive impact on learning [3]	The filing process, including how to do it outside [2]
Method was "hands on" [1]	

Video media was found to be exceptionally helpful from participants' perspectives and the themes that emerged focused on the process of video production such as scripting, camera work and production. One theme on the 'hands on' nature of the area as well as self-evaluation was mentioned. Macro level themes of aiding distance learning and lending quality to the learning process were mentioned. In complement to this, the suggested additions to the programme focused on extending what had been presented demonstrating the enthusiasm and interaction as well as the value participants found in this genre.

Table 14. Helpful aspects of multimedia and suggested additions to the workshop content on print

Multimedia that was beneficial	Suggested additions to multimedia
The process of preparing and planning for multimedia [1]	Nothing [11]
Will benefit learners (interactive, creates dialogue, practice, complements IT) [9]	Production level (programming using PowerPoint) [2]
Benefit institution, create web page [2]	Developing animations [1]
Intrapersonal (motivated to try multimedia) [3]	An example of a complete lesson [1]
	How to integrate multimedia in the classroom [1]

Information on multimedia was similar to that for video media. Participants mentioned the manner in which learning about multimedia was helpful was in the planning of multimedia, but mainly macro level benefits to learners and the institution. Additions were very specific demonstrating an interest in development and the necessity of further training: programming, production, and an example. One participant would have liked some information on how to integrate multimedia into classroom teaching, illustrating the novelty of this area and unique features it adds to the learning process (in addition to little exposure).

7.4.5 The methodology of the workshop

The workshop was prepared based on the methodology of active, participatory learning. Questions were asked of participants to elicit their perceptions of this process. All participants agreed (56.3% strongly agreed) that being able to discuss the material with their colleagues was beneficial. And 87.5% strongly agreed, and 6.3% agreed that they would recommend this workshop to their colleagues. This latter question was used to elicit perceived benefits, methodology and overall usefulness.

Specifically, participants mentioned that being able to discuss material with their colleagues resulted in greater insights and a critical analysis of their own work:

"They helped give me more insights and modifications on my materials"

"Learning from their comments how I could improve my production"

Related to this, the theme of information sharing emerged strongly:

"Share experiences, illustrate difficult area, re-inform learning"

“Through discuss, we were able to learn from each other”

As was the theme of providing alternate perspectives:

“The concepts of organising the material was unveiled quite well, different ways of thinking”

In terms of whether participants would recommend this workshop to their colleagues, all responses were favourable. This question did not provide space for elaboration, but some participants did write comments:

“This is beneficial”

“YES, YES, YES. Its pure training, not holidaying”

When asked if any changes should be made to the workshop, 8 participants said no. Two participants asked that the workshop be followed up:

“I wish that this could be done with each particular country”

Related to this, one participant asked that the content be changed to suit different levels of technological knowledge.

Two participant stated that more time should be allocated to the workshop, demonstrating the positive nature of the workshop. Lastly, one participant asked that the roles and responsibilities of each facilitator and organiser be known at the beginning of the workshop.

7.4.6 Facilitation and organisation

In order to assess Mindset’s organisation, both the facilitation process, facilitators and the overall organisation were surveyed. 81.3 % of participants strongly agreed and 18.8% agreed that the workshop was well facilitated. 93.8% strongly agreed, and 6.3% agreed that the facilitators knew their subject areas.

When asked to comment on the features of the facilitators, participants’ responses fell into the following areas:

- Expertise – *command over the subject*
- Presentation – the manner of presenting and facilitating was positively perceived.
- Facilitation style – sharing knowledge, resources, friendly, interactive, approachable, entertaining, open, motivating, and patient were all mentioned
- Organised – *“well organised and time conscious facilitators”*
- Integration – *“facilitation with integrating theory and practice”*

- Logistics – lunch, learner support, accommodation, transport and entertainment were all mentioned positively

Areas to be improved were also asked, and 12 participants felt nothing should be changed. The comments that were made were positive messages:

“Keep up”

“I have gathered lot of knowledge about computer”

Even the following message regarding time has the positive feature of stating that the workshop is worthwhile and should be expanded.

“more time given to the workshop to ensure that everything is completed on time”

One person reported wanting to visit places of interest in Johannesburg.

Participants were asked to rate a statement on the facilitators' knowledge. No space for comments were left, but participants did make comments stating that facilitators were knowledgeable, managed to achieve their objectives, transferred knowledge in an easy manner, demonstrated large amounts of experience and were approachable. Lastly, 75% strongly agreed and 18.8% agreed that the workshop was well organised.

7.4.7 Value of the content, method of learning workshop

The last three questions asked participants to comment on the value of the content, the methodology of the workshop and the workshop in general. On the area of content, participants mentioned the following areas of benefit:

- Well structured – content was well structured and well planned [6]
- Well integrated – print, multimedia and video integrated [3]
- Video – perceived as most useful [2]
- Follow up – further intervention and training required after the workshop [1]
- Applicable – could be applied and relevant to participants' context [3]
- Print – print mentioned as valuable [1]

On the manner and method of participation in the workshop, the following themes were mentioned:

- Active learning – participants mentioned that the learning was by 'doing', was involved, participatory, was sharing and learning from others [12]. For example: *“developing our materials was a good idea as we were able to practically do it and thus make the content stick”*

- General positive responses – *“friendly and respecting the principles of adult learning”*, good pace, but not enough time.

The last question asked participants to comment on the value of the workshop. The following themes emerged:

- General positive messages – for example, *“Excellent! Feel proud to move up with new technology”*, as well as positive messages concerning the organisation of the workshop and the quality of facilitation were made.
- Partnerships – building partnerships with Mindset and colleagues was valuable *“I hope the workshop is just the beginning of a healthy partnership with the different institutions”*
- A need for further workshops – *“Have a habit of planning more of these”*. On this theme one participant suggested having a newsletter.
- Useful – the workshop was perceived as having benefit and applicability for participants: *“The workshop was very much useful to us, it help us develop quality materials”*. In addition, on the theme of applicability, participants mentioned that the workshop has wide effects in terms of developing education, personal growth, and innovation.

As one participant stated, when asked what the value of the workshop was to him/her: *“to me tremendous. I have been longing for a workshop like this and more for quite a few years now”*.

7.5 Yahoo! Groups evaluation

Analysis of the Yahoo! Groups methodology of creating a platform for communication and interaction was performed. All interactions and postings on the Yahoo! Groups platform were sourced and analysed for content. The following is an evaluation of:

- a) The use of the service
- b) The participants’ evaluations of the service
- c) Reflection from Mindset colleagues on the process, efficacy and effectiveness

Analyses of the postings demonstrate that 17 messages were posted, 8 of these were from 7 participants and the others from Mindset colleagues.

One of the main objectives of the Yahoo! Groups activity was to disseminate information required for the workshop. No mention of this was made from participants. All participants used the groups platform to introduce themselves, give a little background on themselves, where they were working and what their responsibilities were. This was helpful to Mindset organizers in preparing the workshop.

In order to evaluate the perceptions and knowledge of the Yahoo! Groups, the pre-workshop evaluation included questions on this issue. Fourteen out of the 16 participants filled in the pre-evaluation form. Nine participants reported that they logged on, 1 said they did not log on and one said that they tried.

The rest were 'no response' questionnaires. When asked what difficulties were faced, the person who stated they did not log on reported that he/she *"had problems with facilities"*, while the person who said they tried to log on, reported *"could not get introduced to each other before workshop"*, and thus appeared to misunderstand the question. However, this response does demonstrate an awareness of the value the Yahoo! Groups platform offers. All participants stated that they would recommend this type of communication for future workshops, and perceived the value and benefit such a medium would have. In addition, interaction at this level and with this resource extends the learning of the digital realm into another resource participants could develop for themselves. The following themes emerged in the analysis of the benefits of Yahoo! Groups as perceived by the participants:

- Ease of use - *"This process provides ...easy access to information to share among the participants"*
- Time efficient – *"It is prompt that others can receive your message within a short time and they can respond promptly as well"*. Related to this issue of time, one participant stated that if one completed most of the orientation before the workshop, the *"real work"* can start when participants arrive.
- Far reaching - *"Because information given to all people from all over the world"*
- Encourages knowledge and interpersonal sharing and interaction, and development of a sense of being a team - *"It gives participants a chance to know each other before they meet"*
- Pre-preparation - *"This process of communication used is good. Therefore, I suggest to be used again for future workshops because it give the participants enough time to prepare themselves for the workshop"*
- Website – one participant suggested developing a website for future workshops.

It is interesting that only two participants admitted to not being able to register, one for technical reasons and the other not stated. All the other 11 stated they did register. However, from the responses printed from the Yahoo! Groups site, it appears that some did not register, but merely logged on and read the comments. This is a problem as they would then not have had access to resources that were posted on the group. They would have received these resources via other communication channels such as email and fax.

Of those who did register for Yahoo! Groups, the following themes surrounding benefits were mentioned:

- Interpersonal – being able to meet and 'speak' to people online with a common agenda and purpose. For example *"chatting online"*, *"getting to know names of fellow participants so that during the face-to-face workshop, I do not have to have problems memorising their names"*
- Workshop related participant details – participants mentioned the value in knowing their colleagues, their email addresses and organisations. For example: *"information about my colleagues"*.

- Mindset – participants mentioned the benefit in getting to know Mindset before the workshop started. For example, “*accessing information about Mindset*”, “*meeting the facilitators online*”

The above analysis demonstrates that participants thought that the process of having the Yahoo! Groups enabled them to meet one another, get to know one another and develop a sense of coherence as a group before meeting. This is an essential feature of this type of workshop and if the Yahoo! Groups is able to pre-empt this type of interaction, it has demonstrated worth. In addition, one participant noted that using Yahoo! Groups allowed messages to be seen by everyone. This is an essential feature as information and responses, as well as discussions and debates can be viewed by one instead of joint and forwarded emails.

Participants also mentioned that in terms of content, it was a useful way to send reminders, provide resources and allow for pre-preparation. The extent that this occurred is not known, but the area was identified. Lastly, one participant suggested that a website be developed for future workshops.

7.6 COL interview

An interview was conducted with Frances Ferreira concerning the objectives and aims of the workshop from COL’s perspective. This can then be compared to the objectives of both Mindset and the participants and the perceptions of fulfilling these. The interview was structured according to specific themes: purpose, expectations, participant achievements and way forward. The following details an overview of the main features of the interview.

7.6.1 The rationale behind the capacity building workshop’s formulation and the main objectives

This capacity building workshop forms part of Ms Ferreira’s strategy for her three year term, in line with COL’s stated outcome of using ICT to empower and extend learning. The capacity building in digital content was thus defined. Participants were selected from an analysis of the database of open schools that were connected to COL. Those that were identified as being able to benefit from this capacity building strategy were then identified. This was especially true of organisations that had expressed an interest in moving in the direction of digital content and needed to start somewhere. In this manner Ms Ferreira stated that the participants had at least a 50% chance of success as they had the direction and vision but needed some input into strategy and production.

Mindset was chosen as a partner due to previous experience with Mindset and the knowledge that Mindset routinely developed digital content. Ms Ferreira reported that Mindset’s reputation in the area of ICT and digital content development made it an appropriate partner. In addition, this presented a good chance of success: “*when I align with a partner/person I want to make sure there is a 90% chance of success*”. While there is a risk in forming such partnerships, by investigating the partners, this is reduced.

Mindset was perceived to be a 'secure' partner and previous experience of working with the CEO, Mr Vis Naidoo, had demonstrated a principled and disciplined work ethic and Ms Ferreira felt the Mindset team would guarantee success. She also mentioned that this quality is rare and difficult to find in partners.

The objectives of the workshop were the following:

- Learning at a level above mere digital content development (including international travel and negotiation)
- A change in focus and development of content upon the return home
- Demonstrate both direct and indirect learning (through input and also observation of Mindset as a model)
- Be inspired which "*leads to something to accomplish at home*"
- Must improve the quality of education through ICT

7.6.2 Participant selection and benefits

The participants were selected due to their background in education, open schools and secondary education. There was an understanding that the levels of capacity were diverse. Benefits to the participants in the short term were envisaged to be both direct and indirect. The direct benefits were to be gained in the "hands on" learning taking place at Mindset, which is viewed as optimal learning. She commented that it is critical to apply the knowledge, and "*application of knowledge is critical and central to this project for empowerment*". This should lead to the participants being in a position to say "*this is what I will do and can do*". Confidence in the area should be improved and they should take their learning and confidence back to their "chiefs" with a proposal on the way forward for their institutions.

In the long term, the proposal with their "chiefs" should be followed through, and Ms Ferreira will follow this up. The confidence will last long term and the "*skills stay forever*". "*Sometimes you have to take people outside their environment to motivate and boost them*".

In terms of follow up with institutions, Ms Ferreira stated that she would support any participant who took a proposal to their CEO. By providing intervention, she hopes that actions will make long term changes.

Participants are envisaged to use the knowledge, skills and values they have acquired at Mindset in numerous ways:

- Motivation – levels of motivation should be high
- Advocacy – the participants are perceived to be in a position in terms of knowledge and skills to argue ICT development in their institutions
- Knowledge, skills and values. Values are important, Mindset is perceived to "*work as a team*" and this is a value that participants noticed and can take back to their organisations.

- One participant said he/she was going to have a workshop back home to train others (the confidence to do this is important) – they will need some support and training to do this which Ms Ferreira can provide

7.6.3 The way forward

Ms Ferreira stated that the workshop was meant to sensitise people to ICT, which it has achieved. She reports that the next step forward is for participants to drive the process in their institutions and write proposals to their CEOs. Ms Ferreira's vision is that this programme should continue over three years for these participants, following them and supporting them. However, she notes the importance of follow up training to make real impact, which she views as being fully realised in 5 to 6 years time.

Ms Ferreira expects participants to go home and sensitise their institutions to digital content and ICT. More broadly, the material that is developed by these institutions needs to be mainstreamed so that all people have access.

Feedback from participants to Ms Ferreira was overwhelmingly positive, excited, "*worthwhile*", with the workshop perceived to come "*at the right time*". Certain countries have decided to concentrate on certain areas, such as India concentrating on multimedia development. Of concern to some participants was the fact that they did not know how to go back to their countries to set up the infrastructure necessary to produce digital content. One participant reported to Ms Ferreira that they would have liked to be shown how to use 'low technology' as well as 'high technology'. However, this was contrasted with another participant who mentioned that they were shown how to innovate.

7.6.4 Perceptions of Mindset organisation and planning

Ms Ferreira reported being impressed with the planning set out in the proposal which detailed the "*best way to provide best to participants*". She also noted good monitoring of the workshop, excellent organisation around the Yahoo! Groups. On this point, Ms Ferreira reports that this type of communication needs to be centralised and has exceptional value and purpose. Knowledge sharing and preparation before the workshop would result in less anxiety once the workshop starts. However, the issue of access to the internet and emails is a challenge.

In terms of Mindset's planning, Ms Ferreira was impressed with the individual workstations set up among Mindset colleagues for the participants to utilise. She perceived this as good planning and a willingness to accommodate participants.

Ms Ferreira concluded by saying: "[I] commend Mindset Network strongly, as the workshop was not about monetary rewards for you, but was about sharing/giving, shows good values".

Appendix A – Evaluation activities

Evaluation Activity 1 – Facilitator feedback

At the end of each day, a review or de-brief session was run, where the strengths, weaknesses, contingencies, deviations and accomplishments were discussed. This forum was monitored and data collated by the evaluator and facilitators in order to provide an evaluation of the process as well as the content, capabilities of the participants, logistics and so forth. Most days had de-briefing sessions, except the last one. Notes regarding the points raised were made and analysed post-workshop.

Facilitator questions to answer/discuss (see table that follows):

- 1. Successes
- 2. Concerns
- 3. Changes to be made to programme
- 4. Planning for the following day



COL/Workshop Review Template

Successes and strengths of the day	Concerns from the day. Issues to be flagged.
Changes to be made for tomorrow	Changes to be made for the workshop in future



Evaluation Activity 2 – Facilitator interviews

Once the workshop has been completed, an interview with each facilitator was completed. This enabled each facilitator to reflect on the entire workshop and present their overall perceptions, impressions and observations.

The following questions formed the basis for a semi-structured interview:

Please comment on the following as specifically as possible. Where possible focus on the areas that you were involved in or observed.

1. List some of the main successes of the project.
2. Why do you think they were successful?
3. What elements of the project could have been improved? (logistics, organisation, participants, facilitation, participatory approach, results etc)
4. In what ways could things have been improved? If the workshop was run again, what should we do differently?
5. What benefits to Mindset do you think this project produced?
6. In what ways did the participants benefit?
7. Any other comments, suggestions?

Evaluation Activity 3 – Pre-workshop evaluation

Each participant was asked to fill in a brief questionnaire/rating scale regarding the preparations for the project, the organisation of the project, their perceptions of what the workshop will entail and their experience of the Yahoo group contact. The responses were content analysed qualitatively, and frequencies generated (quantitative).



Pre-Workshop Evaluation

Dear participant,

Welcome to South Africa and Mindset. We hope you find these next two weeks to be useful and suitable to your needs.

Please take a moment to fill in the following pre-workshop evaluation **BEFORE YOU ARRIVE ON MONDAY MORNING**. You may leave your name off if you wish to remain anonymous. All responses will be treated confidentially.

Name (voluntary):
Name of country:
1. Arrangements for the workshop
Was the workshop well arranged and organised? YES / NO / TO SOME EXTENT
Describe 1 thing that you found was well organised.
Describe 1 thing that you think could have been improved.
2. Yahoo! Groups
Did you register as a member of the Yahoo! Groups? YES / NO / I TRIED, BUT DID NOT MANAGE
If you did not manage to register, what went wrong?
Did you use the Yahoo group to access the pre-reading, necessary resources, and what to bring to JHB?
If you did register, describe 2 ways that you thought the Yahoo! Groups benefited you. What did you find useful?
Would you suggest we use this process of communication again for future workshops? YES / NO Why? Or Why not?
3. Expectations of the workshop
Did you choose to come to this workshop or were you selected to come?
Why were you chosen to come to this workshop? Or why did you choose to come to this workshop?
Describe 3 ways that you think this workshop will benefit you. (What do you think you will learn?)
How do you hope this workshop will benefit the work you do in your country/organisation?
Please tell us anything else you would like us to know about the workshop.

Once again, we welcome to you to Mindset and thank you for your time and we hope you have an interesting and useful two weeks with us.

Evaluation Activity 4 – Yahoo group input

Input, and interactions with the Yahoo group that was set up before the project, was evaluated after the workshop.

The interactions and history of the Yahoo group will be analysed for the following points:

1. Usage – number of members, number of times a message was posted (quantitative - means)
2. Quality of messages posted, types of questions, comments and suggestions made. This will be analysed through a content analysis.

Evaluation Activity 5 – Final participant evaluation

An evaluation was provided to each participant to gauge their impressions and experiences of the content, facilitators, organisation, participation sessions, usefulness and intended uses of the workshop.



Post-workshop evaluation

Dear participant,

Thank you for all the time and input you have provided over the course of the 2 weeks. We have enjoyed having you with us. Please take a moment to fill in the following questionnaire to enable us to make changes and acknowledge work well done. You may remain anonymous, and all information will be treated confidentially.

Please tick a box and provide details on your answer

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
The workshop fulfilled my expectations. Give two of these expectations that were met:					
There were things that I think the workshop left out List these:					

<p>I found the workshop very useful The 3 things I found the most useful were:</p>					
<p>Being able to produce my own content was helpful. The aspect of this I found the most helpful was: The aspect of this I found the least helpful was:</p>					
<p>I found seeing how Mindset worked useful What 2 aspects do you think were the most useful? What 2 aspects do you think were the least useful?</p>					
<p>I would have liked to learn more about content development. The things I would have liked to learn more about are: 2 Things I am pleased I learned are:</p>					
<p>Being exposed to print media (print, video and interactive lessons) was beneficial to me. Name 1 way it will help you What else would have liked to have seen or been presented with?</p>					
<p>Being exposed to digital video media was beneficial to me. Name 1 way it will help you What else would have liked to have seen or been presented with?</p>					
<p>Being exposed to digital interactive lessons was beneficial to me. Name 1 way it will help you</p>					

What else would have liked to have seen or been presented with?					
The workshop was well facilitated. Name 2 things you found good about the facilitators. Name 2 things you think can have been improved.					
The facilitators knew what they were talking about.					
Being able to discuss material and the learning process with my colleagues was helpful In what way?					
I would recommend this workshop to my colleagues					
The workshop was well organised I would suggest making the following changes:					

Please let us know what you thought of the content of the workshop in general – what was the most useful and least useful?

Please let us know what you thought about the method of learning – being able to participate and develop your own material?

Please give an overall comment of the value of the workshop for you.

Thank you for all your feedback and we hope you enjoyed the workshop.

Evaluation activity 6 – COL representative interview

Frances Ferreira was interviewed in a semi-structured format using the following questions as a guideline:

1. What was the rationale behind offering a capacity building workshop such as this?
2. What are COL's expectations for this workshop?

3. What value was envisaged from using Mindset as a resource? [Is this one ok? – not sure of background]
4. Who is the target audience for this type of workshop?
5. How are they thought to benefit from the workshop in both the short terms and the long term?
6. Is there a mechanism to follow them long term?
7. In what way is it thought that participants will utilize the knowledge, skills and values attained in the workshop when they return to their countries and organisations?
8. Will the workshop be built upon for future and in what ways?
9. What have your perceptions of the organisation of the workshop been thus far? (In terms of planning, time allocation and content).
10. Have you received any feedback from participants that you could share with us?

Appendix B – Time table of workshop

COL Materials Development Workshop - 03 September 2007 - 14 September 2007

Hosted by Mindset Network

Date	Activity	Facilitator/Speaker	Venue
Monday, 03/09/07	I. Welcome, introductions and orientation		Boardroom
08h30 - 09h00	Tea Welcome and Introductions Discussion of Workshop Program	Rochelle Lyner Sue Cohen	
09h00 – 10:00	Evaluation process Housekeeping	Rochelle Lyner	
10:00 – 10:30	Opening address: The digital divide and South Africa Overview of Mindset Network	Vis Naidoo, CEO, Mindset Lusanda Jiya	
10:30 – 11:00	Comfort break The digital divide in other contexts: (4 countries)	Sue Cohen	
11:00 – 11:30	• Sharing of country contexts of ICT's		

<p>11:30 - 12:30</p>	<p>in schooling and elsewhere</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants' institutional role with reference to digital content development <p>Lunch</p> <p>The digital divide in other contexts: (4 countries)</p>		
<p>12:30 – 13:30</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharing of country contexts of ICT's in schooling and elsewhere 	Rochelle Lyner, Colleen Smith	Mindset facilities
<p>13:30 – 14:30</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants' institutional role with reference to digital content development <p>Tour of Mindset Network (in two parts)</p>		Boardroom
<p>14:30 – 15:30</p>	<p>Tea</p> <p>Reflections on the day; agreement on following day's programme</p>	Sue Cohen	
<p>15:30 – 15:45</p>			
<p>15:45 – 16:15</p>			
<p>Tuesday, 04/09/07</p> <p>08:30 – 09:00</p> <p>09:00 – 09:15</p> <p>09:15 - 10:30</p>	<p>II. Broad approaches to (Digital) Content Development</p> <p>Tea</p> <p>Housekeeping</p> <p>Some organising questions and Mindset's responses to these in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schooling Health <p>Comfort break</p>	<p>Rochelle Lyner</p> <p>Sue Cohen, Claire Turnbull - Mindset</p>	<p>Boardroom</p>

<p>10:30 – 10:45</p> <p>10:45 – 12:30</p> <p>12:30 – 13:30</p> <p>13:30 - 17:00</p>	<p>Participants’ responses to the organising questions – sharing country experiences</p> <p>Lunch</p> <p>III. Thinking about teaching and learning resources</p> <p>1. What are teaching and learning resources? 2. What are good teaching and learning resources?</p> <p>a. Focus on video</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengths and weakness of video as a resource • Criteria for a ‘good’ video <p>Reflections on the day; agreement on following day’s programme</p>	<p>All country representatives</p> <p>Sue Cohen (and Colleen Smith, John McBride, Rochelle Lyner)</p>	
<p>Wednesday, 05/09/07</p> <p>08:30 - 09:00</p>	<p>Tea and housekeeping</p> <p>b. Focus on Interactive lessons</p>	<p>Rochelle Lyner</p> <p>Corinne Ossendrywer</p>	

<p>09:00 – 12:30</p>	<p>Developing Multi-Media Content Different types of Multi-Media Developing criteria for selection and use Looking at and critiquing some examples from Learn Health and Cabanga</p> <p>Lunch</p>		<p>Boardroom Various viewing stations</p>
<p>12:30 – 13:30</p>	<p>IV. Producing Digital Learning Resources</p> <p>1. Producing Mindset materials How we make video, multi-media and print materials</p>	<p>Colleen Smith, Corinne Ossendryver and Cary Very</p>	<p>Boardroom</p>
<p>13:30 - 16:00</p>	<p>Implications for content development</p> <p>Mindset Dinner at Moyo's Melrose Arch</p>		
<p>19h30</p>			
<p>Thursday 06/09/07</p> <p>08:30 – 09:00</p> <p>09:00 - 11:00</p> <p>11:00 – 11:15</p>	<p>V. Developing the materials</p> <p>Tea and housekeeping</p> <p>1. Planning the content package</p> <p>a. Mindset's approaches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mindset Schooling way Curriculum mapping; the materials map; the video; multi-media and print mix; series framework; quality assurance • The Mindset Health way <p>Tea</p> <p>b. Participants' Planning Participants' choose a topic and level for</p>	<p>Rochelle Lyner</p> <p>Sue Cohen; John McBride;</p> <p>Claire Turnbull</p> <p>Sue Cohen; John</p>	<p>Boardroom</p> <p>Workstations</p>

<p>11:15 – 12:30</p> <p>12:30 – 13:30</p> <p>13:30 -15:00</p> <p>15:00 – 15:15</p> <p>15:15 - 17:00</p>	<p>their work</p> <p>Lunch</p> <p>Participants' planning cont: Plan the details of the package – content and production concept; curriculum map; material map, etc</p> <p>Tea</p> <p>c. Reports on content package plans</p> <p>Reflections on the day; agreement on following day's programme</p>	<p>McBride</p> <p>Sue Cohen; John McBride; Colleen Smith</p> <p>Sue Cohen</p>	<p>Workstations</p> <p>Boardroom</p>
<p>Friday, 07/09/07</p> <p>08:30 – 09:00</p> <p>09:00 – 09:30</p> <p>09:30 – 12: 30</p> <p>12:30 - 13:30</p> <p>13:30 – 14:00</p>	<p>2. Writing a video script</p> <p>Tea and housekeeping</p> <p>1. Things to consider in writing a video script:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the value of templates <p>2. Practical script writing – framework and 1st draft</p> <p>Lunch</p> <p>3. From script to video script</p> <p>4. Developing the second draft</p>	<p>Rochelle Lyner</p> <p>John Mc Bride; Colleen Smith</p> <p>Sue Cohen;</p> <p>Sue Cohen; John McBride; Colleen Smith</p> <p>Colleen Smith</p> <p>Sue Cohen; John</p>	<p>Boardroom</p> <p>Various work stations</p> <p>Boardroom</p> <p>Various workstations</p>

<p>14:00 – 17:00</p>	<p>Reflections on the day; agreement on following day's programme</p>	<p>McBride; Colleen Smith</p>	
<p>Monday, 10/09/07</p> <p>08:30 – 09:00</p> <p>09:00 - 10:00</p> <p>10: 30 – 13:00</p> <p>13:00 14:00</p> <p>14:00 – 17:00</p>	<p>3. Writing print material</p> <p><i>Tea and housekeeping</i></p> <p>1. Production considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing a template • Preparing for handover <p>2. Writing print support material</p> <p><i>Lunch</i></p> <p>4. Feedback and final revision</p> <p>Presenting scripts and print material to groups</p> <p>Reflections on the day; agreement on following day's programme</p>	<p>Cary Vrey</p> <p>Sue Cohen; John McBride</p> <p>Sue Cohen</p>	<p>Boardroom</p> <p>Various workstations</p>
<p>Tuesday, 11/09/07</p> <p>09:00 – 17:00</p>	<p>VI. Hands on production</p> <p>1 and 2. Video and Multi - media</p> <p>Group 1(4 countries A, B, C, D) – Video Production</p> <p>Group 2 (4 countries E, F, G, H) – Multi - media</p>	<p>Colleen Smith, Corinne Ossendryver</p>	<p>Studios, edit suites</p> <p>Work stations</p>
<p>Wednesday,</p>	<p>Hands on production:</p>		<p>Studios, edit</p>

<p>12/09/07</p> <p>09:00 - 17:00</p>	<p>1 and 2: Video and Multi-Media cont</p> <p>Group 2(E, F, G, H): Video Production Group 1(A, B, C, D): Multi-Media Script</p>	<p>Colleen Smith; Corinne Ossendryver</p>	<p>suites Work stations</p>
<p>Thursday, 13/09/07</p> <p>09:00 - 16:00</p> <p>19:30</p>	<p>Hands on production</p> <p>2. Print</p> <p>Group 1(A, B, C, D): Print production Group 2(E, F, G, H): Print production</p> <p>COL Dinner at The Tuscan Barbecue at Monte Casino</p>	<p>Cary Very</p>	<p>Graphics department</p>
<p>Friday, 14/09/07</p> <p>09:00 - 13:00</p> <p>13:00 – 14:00</p> <p>14:00 - 15:00</p> <p>15:00</p>	<p>VI Materials Review and Evaluation</p> <p>Viewing each country's final products Feedback and discussion</p> <p>Lunch</p> <p>VII. Workshop evaluation</p> <p>VIII. Closure Vote of Thanks</p>	<p>Sue Cohen; Colleen Smith</p> <p>Shafika Isaacs; Kirston Greenop</p> <p>Vis Naidoo, Mindset</p>	<p>Boardroom</p>

Appendix C – List of participants

Bangladesh

Dr. Abdul Karim
Associate Professor – Open School
Bangladesh Open University

Md. Mizanoor Rahman
Assistant Professor – Open School
Bangladesh Open University

India

Mr. Aditi Ranjan Rout
Academic Officer – Academic Department
National Institute of Open Schooling

Mrs. Savita Kaushal
Academic Officer, Department of Vocational Education
National Institute of Open Schooling

Kenya

Mr. Reuben Nthamburi Mugwuku
Kenya Institute of Education

Ms. Gacoka Eunice Wangari
Kenya Institute of Education

Lesotho

Mr. Mcebisi Tyhali
Course Editor
Lesotho Distance Teaching Centre

Ms. Matitireng Fiee
Educational Broadcasting Officer
Lesotho Distance Teaching Centre

Malawi

Mr. Jeliat Nkhoma
Malawi College of Distance Education

Mr. Christopher Laymaman
Principal Tutor (Editorial and Production)
Malawi College of Distance Education

Namibia

Ms. Saraa Mungungu
NAMCOL

Mr. Irving Williams
Manager – Materials Production & Despatch
NAMCOL

Tanzania

Ms. Esther Halla
Mathematics Subject Coordinator in ODL
Institute of Adult Education

Mr. Leonard Katoba
Coordinator in ODL
Institute of Adult Education

Zambia

Mrs. Gladys Sakala Phiri
EBS Senior Producer
Directorate of Distance Education

Mr. Peter Ng'ambi
ZACODE Lecturer

Mindset South Africa (alphabetical listing)

Sue Cohen
Fasiga Farred
Kirston Greenop
Shafika Isaacs
Lusanda Jiya
Rochelle Lyner
John McBride
Vis Naidoo
Corinne Ossendrywer
Colleen Smith
Claire Turnbull
Cary Vrey