

# **SPHERE Ukraine**

# **Project Report**

# 1. Background

The conflict in Ukraine is causing hardship for people trapped or otherwise remaining in the country, and mass displacement, mostly of women and children. Those leaving Ukraine as refugees are being assisted in neighbouring countries by civil protection actors and volunteers as well as humanitarian NGOs. Humanitarian actors on the ground – in reception centres and other shelters – have identified a need for training in basic humanitarian principles and standards for civil protection actors, volunteers and other humanitarian and non-humanitarian actors involved in the response.

RedR UK has been commissioned by Sphere to design an online learning programme on Sphere Handbook in Ukrainian.

## 2. Project results

The table below shows results against the deliverables as agreed with Sphere.

| Deliverables   | Results   |
|--|---|
| Design and deliver a series of online Sphere<br>workshops for Ukraine. | An online training course on 'How to use<br>SPHERE Handbook in Ukraine' was designed by<br>RedR UK in collaboration with the SPHERE<br>team. The training course consists of two<br>online facilitated modules of up to two hours'<br>duration each. Training materials were<br>designed and tested in English. Minor<br>adjustments were incorporated after the pilot<br>run based on feedback from participants.<br>Changes have been discussed and agreed with<br>the Sphere team.<br>In total, 10 online training sessions were<br>delivered to five cohorts of learners.<br>In total, 114 persons were trained within the<br>framework of the project. |

#### Table 1 Sphere project results



| Develop an e-learning module on Sphere<br>standards | RedR UK designed one e-learning module on<br>'How to use SPHERE Handbook in Ukraine' in<br>English and Ukrainian. The module was<br>configured as a SCORM package, and<br>transferred to SPHERE. At the time of the report |
|---|--|
|   | writing, in total, 95 persons had completed the self-paced module.   |

**Selection and onboarding of participants**: RedR UK created an eventbrite platform for registration and advertised the online webinars through social media and other channels. Registration for the training was free and open for people responding to the humanitarian crisis in Ukraine. Priority was given to Ukrainian nationals. Completion of the self-paced module was a prerequisite for attending the facilitated training sessions. However, given the time constraints RedR also admitted individuals who had accessed an online platform, started the module but had not yet completed it.

Table 2 below shows the number of people who have completed an online self-paced module per language. Of 235 people found eligible to attend the training, only 95 (40 per cent) completed the self-paced module. 19 people (i.e., 17 per cent of those who attended facilitated sessions had not yet completed the self-paced at the time of the report writing).

| Module                              | Status | Language  | Number<br>of<br>people<br>register-<br>red | Invited to<br>access<br>self-<br>paced<br>modules | Acces-<br>sed<br>platform | Comple-<br>ted self–<br>paced<br>module | Comple-<br>tion rate<br>vs<br>registra-<br>tions | Comple-<br>tion rate<br>vs invited |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-----------|--|---|---------------------------|---|--|------------------------------------|
| Self-paced<br>module -<br>ENGLISH   | Active | English   | 60   | 35  | 35                        | 14                                      | 23%  | 40%                                |
| Self-paced<br>module -<br>UKRAINIAN | Active | Ukrainian | 251  | 200   | 183                       | 81                                      | 32%  | 41%                                |
| TOTAL                               |        |           | 311  | 235   | 218                       | 95                                      | 31%  | 40%                                |

 Table 2 Self-paced module completion per language

Table 3 below shows the number of participants of facilitated sessions per cohort.

Table 3 Number of participants of facilitated training sessions per cohort

| Cohorts     | Dates       | Language  | Status    | Registered | Attended<br>facilitated<br>sessions | Attendance Rate<br>(percentage of<br>registrations) |
|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1st (pilot) | 14-16 March | English   | Completed | 60         | 11                                  | 18%   |
| 2nd         | 10-12 April | Ukrainian | Completed | 75         | 28                                  | 37%   |
| 3rd         | 11-13 April | Ukrainian | Completed | 72         | 20                                  | 28%   |



| 4th   | 18-20 April | Ukrainian | Completed | 77  | 39  | 51% |
|-------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|
| 5th   | 25-27 April | Ukrainian | Completed | 27  | 16  | 59% |
| TOTAL |             |           |           | 311 | 114 | 37% |

**Participants profile**: 50 per cent of participants identified themselves as working for National Non-Governmental Organizations (NNGOs), as Managers (29.8 per cent) and Officers/Administrators (25.4 per cent) across sectors. 28.1 per cent said they work in protection. 84 per cent said they are a national staff working in their home country Ukraine. 59 per cent identified themselves as women or non-binary.

Table 4 Participants profile based on the type of the organization

| Organization type                                  | Number of<br>Participants | Percentage of participants |
|--|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| International Non-Governmental Organisation (INGO) | 47                        | 41%                        |
| National Non-Governmental Organisation (NNGO)      | 57                        | 50%                        |
| United Nations Agency                              | 1                         | 1%                         |
| Other  | 9                         | 8%                         |
| TOTAL  | 114                       | 100%                       |

Table 5 Participants' sector of work

| Sector                                    | Number<br>participants | of Percentage of<br>participants |
|---|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Across sectors                            | 14                     | 12.3%                            |
| Protection                                | 32                     | 28.1%                            |
| Health                                    | 2                      | 1.8%                             |
| Logistics                                 | 1                      | 0.9%                             |
| WASH                                      | 4                      | 3.5%                             |
| Livelihoods                               | 3                      | 2.6%                             |
| Education                                 | 3                      | 2.6%                             |
| Shelter                                   | 9                      | 7.9%                             |
| Food Security/Nutrition                   | 1                      | 0.9%                             |
| Security                                  | 1                      | 0.9%                             |
| N/A or not working in humanitarian sector | 44                     | 38.6%                            |
| TOTAL                                     | 114                    | 100%                             |



Table 6 Participants' role at the organization they work at

| Role                       | Number o<br>participants | f Percentage of<br>participants |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Board Member               | 3                        | 2.6%                            |
| Coordinator                | 12                       | 10.5%                           |
| Manager                    | 34                       | 29.8%                           |
| Officer or Administrator   | 29                       | 25.4%                           |
| Senior Manager             | 4                        | 3.5%                            |
| Support Staff, i.e. driver | 2                        | 1.8%                            |
| Volunteer/Intern           | 5                        | 4.4%                            |
| N/A                        | 25                       | 21.9%                           |
| TOTAL                      | 114                      | 100%                            |

#### Table 7 Participants per gender

| Gender            | Number of<br>Participants | Percentage of participants |
|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Female            | 67                        | 59%                        |
| Male              | 44                        | 39%                        |
| Non-Binary        | 0                         | 0%                         |
| prefer not to say | 3                         | 3%                         |
| TOTAL             | 114                       | 100%                       |

#### Table 8 Participants' age

| Age range         | Number of<br>Participants | Percentage of participants |
|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Under 26          | 15                        | 13%                        |
| 26 - 40           | 61                        | 54%                        |
| 41 - 55           | 18                        | 16%                        |
| Over 55           | 3                         | 3%                         |
| prefer not to say | 17                        | 15%                        |
| TOTAL             | 114                       | 100%                       |



### 2. Monitoring and evaluation

RedR UK used training evaluation forms to collect **quantitative and qualitative feedback from participants** immediately following each session and at the end of the self-paced modules to evaluate the training on level 1<sup>1[1]</sup> and level 2<sup>2</sup>.

**Facilitated sessions learners' evaluations**: on average 91 per cent of people who have completed learner evaluations rated the learning programme as 'excellent' or 'good'. 94 per cent of people trained by RedR UK rated improvement in knowledge and skills as 'excellent' or 'good'. Facilitation was rated as 'excellent' or 'good' by 92 per cent respondents.

**Self-paced module learners' evaluations:** 100 per cent of people who have completed RedR UK learner evaluations rated the learning module as 'excellent' or 'good'. 100 per cent of people rated improvement in knowledge and skills as 'excellent' or 'good'. Online experience was rated as 'excellent' or 'good' by 100 per cent of respondents.

**Feedback from learners** has been overwhelmingly positive. They highlight content, accessibility, practical elements and relevance of the training as best aspects.

Below is a selection of testimonials:

"Detailed, understandable explanations of various standards and practical work in groups with further "examinations" of the proposed solutions"

"дуже якісно і доступно викладено як якісно і швидко користуватись посібником" [2]

"as for introductory SPHERE training, I think it served well the purposes. Self-paced module and 1st training part covered on the whole same things (would be good to cover something extra and use time more efficiently)"

"The course was very useful for understanding how in practice our organization already applies SPHERE standards and how you can use your own example to show partners, including local authorities, that humanitarian standards not only exist, but also work "

**Trainer feedback** has been overwhelmingly positive as well. Majority of comments were about effective interaction with and between participants, highlighting contextualization of training

<sup>[1]</sup> Level 1 = reaction; the degree to which participants find the training favourable, engaging, and relevant to their jobs. Level 2 = Learning; the degree to which participants acquire the intended knowledge, skills, attitude, confidence, and commitment based on their participation in the training. Level 3= Behaviour; the degree to which participants apply what they learned during training when they are back on the job.

<sup>[2]</sup> Translation of the quote from Ukrainian: "It is explained very clearly and accessibly how to use the Handbook in an efficient and quick way"



materials as a strength. Here are illustrative comments from trainers: "all participants were from the humanitarian organizations", "practical tasks were effective and most productive", "Case study and examples very relevant to participants who are all working in Ukraine", and "Good interaction between participants who were able to discuss in Ukrainian".

# **3. Lessons for future training**

Feedback from trainers, participants, and project team on the training content was overwhelmingly positive. In particular, trainers reported, *"Case study and examples (are) very relevant to participants who are all working in Ukraine."* Over time, however, case studies may need updating.

Feedback also points at an added value of the online self-paced module as a prerequisite for attending facilitated sessions. "It definitely helped that all participants had completed the online self-paced module", reported our trainer. We would, therefore, recommend retaining it as a prerequisite. However, considering challenges people in Ukraine continue to face, if the project were to continue in the short and medium terms, we would recommend to:

- 1. allow longer time for completion of a self-paced module.
- continue keeping the maximum ceiling for participant registration per course at 60 assuming only about 40 per cent will succeed in completing the self-paced module, of which about 80% only might be able to attend facilitated sessions.

Annex 1 SPHERE training data analysis

