LIBERIA/USAID GOVERNANCE AND ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROJECT (USAID-GEMS)

CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY OF LIBERIA INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (LIPA) TRAINEES

NOVEMBER 2013

This report is made possible by the support of the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents of this report were prepared by IBI International under contract number 669-C-00-11-00050. The views expressed herein are the sole responsibility of IBI International and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

LIBERIA/USAID GOVERNANCE AND ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROJECT (USAID-GEMS)

CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY OF LIBERIA INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (LIPA) TRAINEES

NOVEMBER 2013

This document is available online. Online documents are made available through the Development Experience Clearinghouse (http://dec.usaid.gov). Additional information can be obtained from:

IBI International
2101 Wilson Blvd.
Suite 1110
Arlington VA 22201- USA
Tel: 1-703-525-2277
www.ibi-usa.com

This document was submitted by IBI International to the United States Agency for International Development under USAID Contract No. 669-C-00-11-00050.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY v
I. BACKGROUND 1
Questionnaire Design 1
Sampling 1
II. DATA COLLECTION 3
Data Entry, Cleaning and Analysis 3
III. SURVEY RESULTS 5
Background of Respondents 5
Findings on Trainee Perceptions of LIPA Trainings 8
Supervisor Responses 14
Conclusions and Recommendations 15
Appendix 1. Number and Name of Trainings Included in the Survey 17
Appendix 2. Explanation for Only Slightly or Not At All Use of Training 19
Appendix 3. Explanations for Which Parts of Training Have Been Most Useful in Trainees' Work 21
Appendix 4. Comments and Suggestions of Supervisors 27
Appendix 5. Trainee Survey Instrument 29
Appendix 6. Trainee Supervisor Survey Instrument 31

TABLES

Table 1. Trainee Sample 2
Table 2. Survey Respondents by Group and Sex 5
Table 3. Reported Places of Employment by Trainees 5
Table 4. Reported Titles of Trainees 7
Table 5. Trainee Response to "The Training Met My Expectations" 9
Table 6. Explanations for Lowest Two Ratings for "The Training Met My Expectations" 9
Table 7. Trainees' Response to "I Learned Useful Information During the Training" 10
Table 8. Explanations for Lowest Two Ratings for "I Learned Useful Information During the Training" 11
Table 9. Trainees' Response to "I've Been Able to Use the Training in My Work" 12
Table 10. Trainees' Reasons for Non-use of Training 12
Table 11. Recoded Reasons Why Training Was Not Useful by Sponsorship 13
Table 12. Trainees' Response to "Would You Recommend LIPA Training to Your Colleagues" 13

Table 13. Reasons Why Trainees Would Not Recommend LIPA Training..... 14

Table 14. Supervisor Responses to "I've seen an Improvement in the Work Performance of My Staff that Have Attended LIPA Training..... 14

ACRONYMS

CSA	Civil Service Agency
GEMS	Governance and Economic Management Support Project
GoL	Government of Liberia
LIPA	Liberia Institute of Public Administration
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The USAID Governance and Economic Management Support Project (GEMS), working in partnership with the Liberian Institute of Public Administration (LIPA), conducted a sample survey of attendees of LIPA trainings and a small number of their supervisors in September and October of 2013. The purpose of this survey was to solicit data on the multiple dimensions of trainees' satisfaction with the training that they attended. These data will be used by LIPA to identify potential improvements to their training portfolio.

The dimensions of satisfaction in the survey included the degree to which the training met their expectations, the extent to which they felt the training contained useful information, their reported use of training on the job, and their willingness to recommend LIPA training and qualitative explanations of their responses to the above questions. Supervisors were asked about perceived improvements in employees' performance post-training and their willingness to recommend LIPA training to others. Both sets of respondents were also asked to provide detailed recommendations and suggestions to LIPA for improving training at the institution.

The requirements for inclusion in the survey included completion of a LIPA training within three months but not more than 12 months from the date that LIPA provided training records for a sample selection in August of 2013. Trainees were sampled to allow for comparisons between three groups: Government of Liberia (GoL) sponsored trainees, privately sponsored trainees and self-sponsored trainees. A total of 198 trainees were interviewed along with 29 supervisors. The survey was conducted for four weeks by a team of four data collectors.

Findings from the survey highlight high levels of satisfaction with LIPA training:

- 80% of respondents indicated that the training met their expectation "for the most part" or "very much so".
- 89% of respondents indicated that the training contained useful information "for the most part" or "very much so".
- 66% of respondents provided the same two responses for use of training in their workplace.
- The lowest levels of use in the workplace were reported for self-sponsored trainees, primarily due to the fact that they were either unemployed or were taking trainings unrelated to their current work "in order to better themselves."
- 97% of trainees and all but one of the supervisors responded that they would recommend LIPA training to others.
- Nearly 80% of supervisors reported that they had observed improvements in LIPA-trained staff performance post-training "for the most part" or "very much so".

Recommendations from the survey include three main areas:

1. LIPA should review the extensive and detailed comments from trainees and supervisors regarding recommendations for improvement in order to identify common themes and potential performance improvement initiatives;

2. LIPA should develop a system for sharing the detailed results of the survey, as well as of other training evaluation data, with trainers and their managers in order to identify areas of potential improvement; and

3. LIPA should conduct a comparison of the data in this survey with a previously conducted training evaluation analysis from April of 2012 in order to identify the best means of collecting the different types of data required for effective Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) at the institute.

The USAID-GEMS Training and M&E teams will continue to work closely with their LIPA partners to ensure that LIPA makes the best use of these data and continues to develop and apply up-to-date and cost-effective M&E methodologies required for quality improvement at the institution.

I. BACKGROUND

The purpose of the first phase of the LIPA Client Satisfaction survey is to provide baseline data on the satisfaction of LIPA trainees and their supervisors. This first phase will also serve as a pilot test of the instruments and methodology in order to inform the final design of client satisfaction data collection and reporting in the overall LIPA M&E Plan.

Data from the survey will be utilized by staff and managers of LIPA to identify potential areas of strengths and weaknesses in LIPA training services. It will also be shared with LIPA training stakeholders to help inform them of needed areas of program support and to help track progress in improving the LIPA brand.

Data will also be utilized by the USAID-GEMS project as part of its performance reporting to USAID on project results.

QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The survey was developed by the USAID-GEMS Training and M&E Teams with input from LIPA and the Civil Service Agency (CSA). Survey questions were presented in a Likert-type format with standardized response categories of: "Not at all", "Very little", "Somewhat", "For the most part", and "Very much so." Questions in this format were followed with additional questions asking for explanations for the answer based on the initial response. For example, question 9 of the survey asked respondents "if the training met their expectations." Using skip patterns, respondents that answered the lowest three categories were asked to explain their reasons for the low ratings while those that selected the highest two levels were asked to explain their answers. A final series of questions asked for additional comments and suggestions for LIPA. The instrument was kept quite short – fewer than ten questions – in order to limit interview times to less than 30 minutes.

SAMPLING

The sampling design was intended to allow for (1) statistically representative groups from each training population based on reported sponsorship of course expenses and (2) for sufficient sample power to allow for comparisons between the three groups. The populations were further limited by specifying that the training must have been completed at least three months but not more than 12 months before the survey was conducted. Sample size calculations were conducted using an online sample size calculator[1] with specifications of a 95% confidence level and a confidence interval of 10. Actual sampling of names from the three groups of trainees was completed using SPSS version 19.

To allow for substantial loss to follow-up for trainees, a larger sampled list of names was selected than the minimum calculated sample size. Even with this added number, it was necessary to pull additional samples for GoL and self-sponsored trainees three weeks into the survey. Preferred minimum sample sizes were not achieved in two of the groups by the end of the data collection period. This could have the effect of reducing the ability of the statistical tests to detect differences between groups where they exist. Details on the selected sample and response rates are in Table 1 below.

[1] http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm

Table 1. Trainee Sample				
Sponsorship	**Total Trainees**	**Desired Minimum Sample**	**Total Number Sampled**	**Final Interviewed Sample**
Total	616	193	347	198
GOL	281	72	135	97
Self	209	66	86	51
Private	126	55	126	50

For unknown reasons, response rates varied greatly among the groups. Nearly 90% of self-sponsored trainees and more than 80% of the sampled government-sponsored trainees that interviewers attempted to contact were interviewed while only slightly more than 50% of the private-sponsored sample that were called were interviewed. The large variances in response rates may be simply due to errors in completing the call logs used by interviewers or may have resulted from differing levels of motivation to complete interviews by the data collectors.

An additional group of respondents was targeted by the survey – supervisors of GoL-sponsored trainees. This group was not selected using any additional sampling guidelines. Data collectors were instructed to try to interview as many supervisors as possible at the time of the trainee interview. Using this methodology, a total of 29 supervisors were interviewed.

II. DATA COLLECTION

A total of four interviewers were hired to conduct the interviews over the course of four work weeks in September of 2013. The enumerators received a 4-hour classroom training complemented by supervised fieldwork to pilot test the instrument and interview methodologies.

Subjects were recruited for interviews using their mobile number as provided during training registration. The majority of interviews were conducted face-to-face with trainees. A limited number were conducted via telephone. For a few trainees, emails were sent with the attached instrument where phone contact was not possible. Only one survey instrument was completed via email.

Each respondent was informed that their participation was optional and that their responses would be used by LIPA to help them improve training quality. Respondents were not promised confidentiality.

DATA ENTRY, CLEANING AND ANALYSIS

The data collectors entered data into four Excel spreadsheets. Three of these were identical and were used for the corresponding groups of trainees. These were merged into one file via cut and paste. Data cleaning was conducted in Excel. Data were imported into NCSS v. 9 for analysis. Analyses of the survey data consist of frequencies and cross-tabulations. A few recodes of qualitative responses were conducted as well.

III. SURVEY RESULTS

BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

Gender

An analysis of the available characteristics of the trainees in the sample is useful for several reasons. For one, it is important to make sure that the sample is representative of LIPA trainees overall. In addition, reviewing the details of the training participants in such a random sample can help LIPA better understand their market and, potentially, better understand responses to the survey that may have been influenced by the personal and professional traits of the trainees.

The sample of trainees interviewed for the survey follows the same general gender breakdown as LIPA trainees overall. About three-quarters of the respondents were male (see Table 2). In Liberia, male workers dominate the workforce in nearly all areas and it makes sense that LIPA trainees would reflect this imbalance.

Table 2. Survey Respondents by Group and Sex

Respondent	Female	Male	Total
Trainees	56	142	198
Supervisors	4	25	29
Total	60	167	227

Place of Employment

Attendees at LIPA trainings came from a variety of employers, including government agencies, NGOs, and for-profit companies. The details of entities that were listed by trainees as their employers at the time of the survey are listed below in Table 3. There are some challenges with this data. For one, trainees may have listed their current employer instead of the employer they worked for at the time of training. In addition, there were at least nine trainees who reported in the results detailed below that they had not used information from the trainings in their workplace due to unemployment. However, despite these issues it is likely that the details of employment below are, for the most part, accurate.

Table 3. Reported Places of Employment by Trainees

Institution	Total
Liberia Petroleum Refining Company	9
Global Bank	8
Center for National Documents and Records Agency	7
Liberia Broadcasting System	5
General Services Agency	4
Land Commission	4
Central Bank of Liberia	3
Environmental Protection Agency	3
General Auditing Commission	3

Table 3. Reported Places of Employment by Trainees	
Institution	**Total**
Guaranty Trust Bank	3
AMLIB	2
Access Bank	2
Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization	2
Business Start-Up Center Monrovia	2
China Henan International Cooperation Group	2
Concern Liberia	2
House of Representatives	2
Human Development Foundation	2
ACDIVOCA	1
AGENDA	1
Association of Liberian Universities	1
APM Terminals	1
Alisa Group of Companies	1
Bopolu Central High School	1
Central Bank of Liberia	1
City Parking Management	1
Civil Marketing Inc.	1
EXSECON Security	1
Forestry Development Authority	1
FIB Bank Ltd.	1
Family Planning Association	1
Firestone Liberia	1
Food Agriculture Organization	1
GOL Bomi	1
General Auditing Commission	1
Golden Veroleum	1
International Foundation for Electoral Systems	1
Internal Audit Secretariat	1
International Bank Liberia Ltd.	1
Liberia Anti-Corruption Commission	1
LBDI Bank	1
Liberia Domestic Airport Agency	1
Liberia Macroeconomic Policy Analysis Capacity	1
Liberia Anti-Corruption Commission	1
Total	**198**

The same potential issues discussed above regarding potential data limitations for the place of work apply to the table of trainee job titles below (Table 4). Regardless of these limitations, LIPA trainees clearly come from a wide variety of positions by both level of responsibility and area of expertise.

Table 4. Reported Titles of Trainees

Titles	Total
Administrative Assistant	11
Accountant	5
Auditor	5
Account Assistant	3
Administrative Officer	2
Assistant Director	2
Acting Administrative Assistant	1
Acting Planning Officer	1
Acting Procurement Director	1
Administrative Office Manager	1
Administrator	1
Administrator/Finance officer	1
Administrative Assistant	1
Assistant Banking Officer	1
Assistant Director of Procurement	1
Assistant Logistic and Procurement Manager	1
Assistant Manager	1
Assistant Procurement Director	1
Assistant Procurement Officer	1
Assistant Supervisor	1
Budget Analyst	1
Budget Officer	1
Business Manager	1
CEO	1
Chief of Finance	1
Chief of Office Staff	1
Chief orderly to the Commissioner	1
Communication Assistant	1
Compliance Assistant	1
Construction Advisor	1
Customer Care Agent	1

Table 4. Reported Titles of Trainees	
Titles	**Total**
Customers Officer	1
Customer Service Officer	1
Data Analyst	1
Data Assistant	1
Deputy Chief of Party	1
Deputy Comptroller	1
Deputy Director General for Administration	1
Deputy Director for Business/Marketing	1
Deputy Minister of Administration	1
Director for Administration	1
Director for Consumer Education	1
Director for aid management and coordination	1
Director, Budget and Finance	1
Director, National Fleet Management	1
Total	**198**

Training Topics

The five most listed training titles in the sample included Monitoring and Evaluation, Procurement Management, Human Resource Management, Professional Administration and Management and Internal Audit. A detailed list of all training topics attended by respondents is included in the Appendices.

FINDINGS ON TRAINEE PERCEPTIONS OF LIPA TRAININGS

The Likert-type scales have been converted to numbers in the tables below in order to reduce the size of the tables. A "1" represents the response of "Not at all" while a "5" represents the response "Very much so."

Expectations of Trainees

Trainees were asked to state if the training met their expectations. Overall, respondents were positive in their responses to this question with 80% responding either "for the most part" or "very much so (Table 5). When the groups are compared, a much higher percentage of self- and private sponsored (76% and 63% respectively) trainees responded "very much so" to the question compared with GoL-sponsored respondents (45%). When compared with the combined percentage that responded with "for the most part" and "very much so", the differences are not quite as substantial though they are still impressive (76% for GoL, 84% for Self, and 79% for Private).

Table 5. Trainee Response to "The Training Met My Expectations"							
Q9—THE TRAINING MET MY EXPECTATIONS							
Sponsor		**Not at all**	**Only slightly**	**Somewhat**	**For the most part**	**Very much so**	**Total**
GoL	Count	1	5	14	26	38	84
	% within Row	1%	6%	17%	31%	45%	100%
Self	Count	1	3	8	6	58	76
	% within Row	1%	4%	11%	8%	76%	100%
Private	Count	2	1	5	6	24	38
	% within Row	5%	3%	13%	16%	63%	100%
Total	Count	4	9	27	38	120	198
	% within Row	2%	5%	14%	19%	61%	100%

Trainees who responded with the two most negative response options "not at all" or "only a little" were asked a follow-up question to explain their answers. The comments from the 11 individuals that provided a response are listed in Table 6.

Table 6. Explanations for Lowest Two Ratings for "The Training Met My Expectations"			
ID	**Sponsor**	**Rating**	**Explanation for Rating**
G72	GoL	Only slightly	Because the ministry trained me to be employed at the ministry, but unfortunately we were not employed instead we are left on our own.
P34	Private company	Not at all	Because we did do any practical at all, but all their training was focused on writing. The instructor at the time never knew the course well.
G66	GoL	Not at all	Computers were not good; Teacher (TA) could not explain correctly
G64	Self	Only slightly	Instructors were not available. Courses were not delivered; lots of people dropped because of this.
P22	Self	Not at all	LIPA never had the adequate instructors for the courses, and most of the courses were done through assignment. And they had a very bad course outline
G37	GoL	Only slightly	The course was bulky; instructor couldn't cover materials; All the materials were not given; All questions from students were not answered properly.
G88	GoL	Only slightly	The evaluation aspect is dormant because at the ministry focus in mainly on monitoring and implementation.
G60	GoL	Only slightly	The time was short.

Table 6. Explanations for Lowest Two Ratings for "The Training Met My Expectations"			
ID	**Sponsor**	**Rating**	**Explanation for Rating**
G77	Private company	Only slightly	The time was too short to cover entire course.
G90	Self	Only slightly	The training was more theoretical than practical.
G10	Private company	Not at all	Training duration was very short to cover complete course; the instructor mostly spend time discussing issues not relating to the course; the entire curriculum was not covered.

Learned Useful Information

Trainees were asked if, in their view, they learned useful information during the training. As can be seen in Table 7 above, nearly three-quarters of respondents responded "very much so" when asked this question (71%). This reported high level of utility increases to 89% when "for the most part" and "very much so" are combined. Clearly, the majority of LIPA trainees feel that they receive valuable knowledge during the trainings that they attended.

Table 7. Trainees' Response to "I Learned Useful Information During the Training"							
Q11—I LEARNED USEFUL INFORMATION DURING THE TRAINING							
Sponsor		**Not at all**	**Only slightly**	**Somewhat**	**For the most part**	**Very much so**	**Total**
GoL	Count	1	3	4	26	50	84
	% within Row	1%	4%	5%	31%	60%	100%
Self	Count	0	3	4	7	62	76
	% within Row	0%	4%	5%	9%	82%	100%
Private	Count	0	1	7	2	28	38
	% within Row	0%	3%	18%	5%	74%	100%
Total	Count	1	7	15	35	140	198
	% within Row	1%	4%	8%	18%	71%	100%

As in the previous question about expectations, self-sponsored individuals were more likely than their counterparts to report the highest level of agreement that the training included information that they considered to be useful. More than 80% of self-sponsored trainees responded "very much so" compared with 60% of GoL-sponsored trainees and 74% of privately-sponsored respondents.

A total of eight trainees (4%) indicated that they did not learn useful information with a response of "not at all" or "only a little" to the question. The reasons provided by the seven respondents are presented below (Table 8).

Table 8. Explanations for Lowest Two Ratings for "I Learned Useful Information During the Training"			
ID	**Sponsor**	**Rating**	**Explanation for Rating**
G66	GoL	Not at all	Learning materials were given at the end of the course through software.
G36	GoL	Only slightly	Because instructors were not available.
G64	Self	Only slightly	Project management in relation to government entities.
G86	GoL	Only slightly	Not doing procurement presently because my job changed.
P22	Self	Only slightly	The training had a very poor presentation and with that reason I had a very low understanding.
G98	Private company	Only slightly	The Training was only an Introduction to the Course.
G37	GoL	Only slightly	I was only there for the Orientation of the course and later I was called to go for a survey.

Reported Use of Training

Trainees were asked if they had been able to use the training in their work. Such questions are generally used to test if the training imparted knowledge and skills that were relevant to the job responsibilities of the attendees and to gather information to barriers to targeted performance improvements in the workplace. However, such a question is subject to important limitations regarding why the trainees attended the course and/or how they were selected. The responses to this question for the LIPA trainees demonstrate such issues clearly.

As Table 9 below illustrates, LIPA trainees reported high, although not universal, use of training in their workplace. Sixty-six percent of respondents indicated that they had used the training "very much so" or "for the most part" at their work. Another 23% responded at the other end of the scale stating that they had used the training "not at all" or "only a little" since the training. While on first consideration this might indicate that there was a problem with the training quality, additional analysis of the responses explaining the reasons for the low levels of reported usage demonstrates that the main issue had to do with the employment of the trainees and not with the utility of the training.

The pattern of higher ratings for non-GoL trainees changes with reported use of training at work. While private-sponsored trainees reported the highest levels of usage at work with 55% responding "very much so", GoL-sponsored trainees were the second highest users with 43% responding "very much so". Self-sponsored trainees had the lowest level of "very much so" users at 38%. When the two highest responses are combined, the same ranking is observed with 89% of self-sponsored responding "for the most part" or "very much so," and 70% of GoL-sponsored and 50% of self-sponsored for the two categories. The reasons for these differences in usage are explained below in the analysis of responses for low usage.

Table 9. Trainees' Response to "I've Been Able to Use the Training in My Work"							
Q13—I'VE BEEN ABLE TO USE THE TRAINING IN MY WORK							
Sponsor		**Not at all**	**Only slightly**	**Somewhat**	**For the most part**	**Very much so**	**Total**
GoL	Count	5	10	10	23	36	84
	% within Row	6%	12%	12%	27%	43%	100%
Self	Count	22	7	9	9	29	76
	% within Row	29%	9%	12%	12%	38%	100%
Private	Count	1	0	3	13	21	38
	% within Row	3%	0%	8%	34%	55%	100%
Total	Count	28	17	22	45	86	198
	% within Row	14%	9%	11%	23%	43%	100%

The qualitative responses for reported non-use of training were analyzed and recoded for common themes in Table 10 below. Of the 43 respondents that explained why they had low usage levels of training content (two respondents did not provide a response), only two listed reasons related to the training quality or content. Instead nearly 90% of non-users, 37 of the 43, stated that they either did not have a job (nine trainees) or that their current job was not directly related to the training (28 trainees). Detailed responses for these trainees are contained in the Appendices.

Table 10. Trainees' Reasons for Non-use of Training	
Response	**#**
Not employed	9
Not directly related to current job	28
Training quality issue	2
Other	4
Total	43

There is a key reason why the relevance of training to a trainee's job status or responsibilities would be important to pay attention to – when scarce government resources are being expended on the training. Table 11 below contains the results of comparing the source of sponsorship by the reasons for non- or low use of training. About one-quarter of the respondents that reported that the training course was not directly related to or useful in their job were GoL-sponsored. About twice that number, 58%, of self-sponsored trainees indicated either similar reasons for non-use of training or that they were not employed at all. This is to be expected of attendees who selected and paid for a course themselves, perhaps in the hope that it would lead to improved job opportunities.

Table 11. Recoded Reasons Why Training Was Not Useful by Sponsorship					
Sponsor	**Unemployed**	**Job Different from Training**	**Quality Issue**	**Other**	**Total**
GoL	0	11	1	3	15
Self	9	16	1	1	27
Private	1	0	0	0	1
Total	10	27	2	4	43

Furthermore, the table above appears to illustrate why self-sponsored trainees reported the lowest levels of on the job usage – a full 35% (27 of 76) of the self-sponsored trainees were either unemployed or held jobs where the training content was not applicable.

LIPA may want to further explore the issue of unnecessary GOL-funded trainings in order to maximize the return on scare government resources.

LIPA trainees were also asked to provide examples of how they had used the training in their jobs. Analyzing these responses is beyond the scope of this paper. The detailed responses are contained in the appendices and should be shared with LIPA trainers in order to help them better understand what the most useful parts of their course may be.

Would Recommend LIPA Training

Respondents were asked if they would recommend LIPA training to their colleagues, an important indication of training satisfaction. The overwhelming majority – 97% -responded that "yes" they would recommend the training to colleagues (Table 12).

Table 12. Trainees' Response to "Would You Recommend LIPA Training to Your Colleagues"					
Q16—WOULD YOU RECOMMEND LIPA TRAINING TO YOUR COLLEAGUES					
Sponsor		**Yes**	**No**	**Not Sure**	**Total**
GoL	Count	82	1	1	84
	% within Row	98%	1%	1%	100%
Self	Count	73	3	0	76
	% within Row	96%	4%	0%	100%
Private	Count	37	1	0	38
	% within Row	97%	3%	0%	100%
Total	Count	192	5	1	198
	% within Row	97%	3%	1%	100%

Of the small number who reported that they would not recommend LIPA training or that they weren't sure (six trainees), an additional question was asked to solicit the reasons for this response. Detailed comments are contained in Table 13 below. There doesn't appear to be a clear theme or shortcoming that LIPA could address but it may be useful to analyze these results by course title so that instructors can have access to the feedback.

Table 13. Reasons Why Trainees Would Not Recommend LIPA Training	
ID	**Response**
P34	Because the system at LIPA needs to be organized. More qualify instructors have to come.
G66	Because they will not gain knowledge; working tools not in good condition.
G36	Because trainees will not learn.
G64	Because at that time instructors were not regular and LIPA had some deficiencies.
G86	Lack of Commitment from staff and teachers.
P22	Because the training never met my expectation.

Additional Comments/Suggestions

Trainees were asked if they had additional comments or recommendations for LIPA regarding their training and nearly all of them had one or more suggestions for potential improvements. Detailed responses to this question are contained in the Appendices. LIPA should generate reports of these findings by training course and share them with trainers and training managers in order to identify needed changes in training content, venues and other areas.

SUPERVISOR RESPONSES

Supervisor Perceptions of Improved On the Job Performance by LIPA Trainees

Supervisors of GoL-sponsored trainees were asked if they had seen improved on the job performance of their employee that attended LIPA training. Supervisors reported a high level of perceived improvement. More than 75% of supervisors stated that they had seen such improvements for the two highest categories of agreement.

Table 14. Supervisor Responses to "I've seen an Improvement in the Work Performance of My Staff that Have Attended LIPA Training		
Q9 I'VE SEEN AN IMPROVEMENT IN THE WORK PERFORMANCE OF MY STAFF THAT HAVE ATTENDED LIPA TRAINING	**Count**	**Percent**
Not at all	1	3.5%
Only slightly	4	13.8%
Somewhat	1	3.5%
For the most part	11	37.9%
Very much so	12	41.4%
Total	29	100.0%

Of the four supervisors that provided an explanation for why they reported low levels of usage ("not at all" or "only slightly"), three indicated that this was due to a mismatch between the trainee's job and the training content. The other supervisor highlighted a lack of resources in the workplace related to the training content: "Staff doesn't having working tools to practice what they have learned at LIPA."

Supervisor Support of Further LIPA Training

Supervisors were asked two questions related to their support of LIPA for training. The first question asked if they would send other staff to LIPA. All but one of the supervisors responded that yes they would send other staff to LIPA for training. The same response level was observed for the second question, which asked if they would recommend LIPA training to others. Again, supervisors' high levels of support for LIPA was observed with all but one of the supervisors stated that yes, they would recommend LIPA training to others.

The one supervisor that indicated they would not use LIPA training for other staff or recommend it to others explained his or her reluctance to support LIPA training with the statement: "Short-term (training) does not build capacity." This was the same supervisor that reported that their staff did not have the tools required to use the training at work.

Additional Comments/Suggestions

Supervisors were asked if they had additional comments or recommendations for LIPA regarding their training and nearly all of them had one or more suggestions for potential improvements. LIPA should generate reports of these findings by training course and share them with trainers and training managers in order to identify needed changes in training content, venues and other areas.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the LIPA Satisfaction Survey described in this report demonstrate that useful feedback from LIPA trainees months after completion of a training course can be collected with a relatively small investment of resources.

Important differences were observed between the three sample populations. LIPA managers will need to assess the responses in detail to decide if these observed differences merit changes to the implementation of trainings. For USID-GEMS, the important findings regarding differences relate to how the survey should be conducted in the future. The main recommendation would be that the best data on the use of training in the workplace would come from respondents that have taken a training that matches their current employment. LIPA will want to add in additional questions to its training registration processes in order to better identify trainees that have an immediate potential use for the training content as opposed to attendees that are present for other reasons. USAID-GEMS will support LIPA in making the necessary modifications to registration and other documents.

In order to maximize the utility of the survey findings, USAID-GEMS recommends that LIPA identify mechanisms for sharing detailed feedback from trainees included in this survey with the trainers that conduct the courses, as well as with their managers. Where modifications and improvements to training courses are identified and agreed upon by the institution, LIPA should implement a tracking system for monitoring the implementation of these changes. USAID-GEMS will provide support to both of these areas.

Finally, LIPA M&E and training staff should review the findings and costs of this satisfaction survey methodology and compare them to the April 2012 training evaluation report, which was not shared with the USAID-GEMS team during the design phase of the August 2013 study. It is likely that the data collected during the immediate post-training evaluation forms utilized for the 2012 exercise would answer the majority of the M&E data needs of LIPA at a substantially reduced cost. LIPA may then want to identify a more limited methodology for collecting data on training use, which cannot be assessed before trainees have returned to their workplace for a period of time.

APPENDIX 1. NUMBER AND NAME OF TRAININGS INCLUDED IN THE SURVEY

Frequency Distribution of Q6—Name Of Most Recent Training Attended at LIPA		
Training Title	**Count**	**Percent**
Monitoring and Evaluation	40	20.20%
Procurement Management	39	19.70%
Human Resource Management	25	12.63%
Professional Administration and Management	14	7.07%
Internal Audit	11	5.56%
Project Planning and Management	10	5.05%
Internal Control	9	4.55%
Public Sector Finance	7	3.54%
Banking and Finance	6	3.03%
Communication and Report Writing	4	2.02%
Public Procurement	4	2.02%
Record Management	3	1.52%
Administration and Management	2	1.01%
Development Management	2	1.01%
Internal Control System	2	1.01%
Marketing Management	2	1.01%
Project Management	2	1.01%
Public Procurement and Management	2	1.01%
Auditing	1	0.51%
Basic Computer Skills	1	0.51%
Capital Budgeting	1	0.51%
Communication and Records Management	1	0.51%
Computer	1	0.51%
Gender and Development Planning	1	0.51%
Human Resource Management and Professional Administration Management	1	0.51%
Internal Control and Auditing	1	0.51%
Microsoft Access	1	0.51%
Professional Administration	1	0.51%
Project Planning, Management and Public Sector Management	1	0.51%

Frequency Distribution of Q6—Name Of Most Recent Training Attended at LIPA		
Training Title	**Count**	**Percent**
Public Sector Management	1	0.51%
Purchasing and Supply Chain Management	1	0.51%
Supply Chain Management	1	0.51%

APPENDIX 2. EXPLANATION FOR ONLY SLIGHTLY OR NOT AT ALL USE OF TRAINING

CODE	Q14—IF YOU ANSWERED ONLY SLIGHTLY OR NOT AT ALL PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY YOU HAVE HAD DIFFICULTY USING THE TRAINING IN YOUR WORK
G66	The instructor only came to class twice; the class was handled by TA (not qualify); poor excuses; materials not exhausted
G36	Due to my present job description
G64	Because courses were not taught correctly
G88	The ministry is mainly focus on monitoring and implementation, and the evaluation aspect is not fully active.
G10	Because the project got its own focus point and there are people that the unit go to do the work
G111	Presently, my job description doesn't permit me to use procurement.
G3	Because my current position is not directly into procurement area
G43	Not working in the auditing section right now, though the course done was auditing
G48	Because I'm working in the compliance area and there has been no major procurement issues in this department
G55	Haven't had the opportunity to get assignment in HR
G63	Because am not in procurement, am currently occupying M& position and the training was mainly in Procurement and supply chain management
G65	Job description cannot permit me
G73	Because of not being employed with in the M/E sector; currently employed as a customer care agent which does not have much to do with M/E
G82	Because of not being assigned in a computer department area of work
G87	My job is not related to procurement work presently
G97	Not employed in the human resource area
P52	Because my entity has not created the department that will be responsible for what I learned at LIPA and the skill people to work as M&E officers.
P68	Because I am not doing the job as a M& E trained Officer
S1	I have never been fortunate to get an employment since I graduated from LIPA Training.
S11	My job is not involved with procurement
S18	I don't have a job.
S20	I have not yet found a job.
S21	I had not been able to get a job with respect to procurement.
S22	I am not into procurement.
S23	At my office I am like the General Supervisor, sometimes I helps in the Procurement Department.
S24	I am not working I am only doing my advance postgraduate in Procurement.
S25	Not yet employ

CODE	Q14—IF YOU ANSWERED ONLY SLIGHTLY OR NOT AT ALL PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY YOU HAVE HAD DIFFICULTY USING THE TRAINING IN YOUR WORK
S29	My job description can't let me explore my ideas of Monitoring and Evaluation.
S30	I used the training methods in monitoring payment voucher and visiting pay tracks.
S31	I am not working I am only doing my advance postgraduate in Procurement.
S35	I am only an advisor for Construction and I only learned it to upgrade my self.
S4	I am a Manger presently and I'm not into Procurement. I only attended to upgrade my self.
S40	I am not into the field of Monitoring and Education at my office but
S43	I am not into Perfect Management at my present job.
S44	I have not yet found a job with Public Sector Finance to enable me implement what I learned during the training.
S45	It is not part of my job description I only attended to upgrade my self.
S47	I only attend the program to upgrade my self for the future.
S52	My job is not involved with Procurement
S66	I am not involved into procurement. I only went to upgrade my self.
S71	It is not part of my job description.
S83	I didn’t reach in-depth of the training due to the Ministry obligation.
S84	I am only concern with the management of the IT equipment and somehow I use some of the management aspect
S86	I haven't yet found a job since I graduated from the training.

APPENDIX 3. EXPLANATIONS FOR WHICH PARTS OF TRAINING HAVE BEEN MOST USEFUL IN TRAINEES' WORK

CODE	Q15—IF YOU ANSWERED SOMEWHAT FOR THE MOST PART OR VERY MUCH SO WHAT PARTS OF THE TRAINING HAVE BEEN MOST USEFUL IN YOUR WORK
P16	Managing your bosses, Emails ethics, and staff management
P43	Filling and storage of documents, Marketing the products, documents security, and documents life span
G30	Financial audit report, internal control, Policy procedure, Payroll audit, Procurement process.
P22	Analyzing financial Statements, Credit analysis, regulatory requirement for commercial Banks
P30	Legal firm work, Bank and Customers Relationship, Corporate Governance, interpret financial Statement
P36	Customer's management, Bank Regulations, Audit management, and Bosses management
P62	Being able to distinguish between the SWOAT analyses, analysis budget and prepare budget.
P82	Manage Funds out and in, Internal Control and system management.
P55	Credits risk Management, Control and system management. Customer's management
G68	Report formatting
G13	Formulation of government budget
P26	Writing and presenting Memo, Communicating effectively, Training and Customers management.
G18	Report writing
G22	Communication
G83	Reporting, News writing, Presentation, combination of notes
G75	Reports Writing, Refining reports, customers management and communications.
P28	Planning, controlling, Organizing and Staff Management
G116	Gender and development; Payback system; Gender equality in development
G46	Selection and recruitment process; Performance appraisal; creating job description for staff; Relation your boss and colleagues
G1	Leadership capability; recruitment; organization; planning; conflict resolution
G121	Men power training, salary administration, merit-based recruitment process
G123	Personnel management, motivating employees to get needed result for the effectiveness of the office
G19	Job analysis; internship with staff; recruiting process; staff management relationship
G21	Wages structure; confidence in handling administrative issues; clear roles and responsibilities
G28	Workforce plan

CODE	Q15—IF YOU ANSWERED SOMEWHAT FOR THE MOST PART OR VERY MUCH SO WHAT PARTS OF THE TRAINING HAVE BEEN MOST USEFUL IN YOUR WORK
G32	Decision making; merit system
G52	Link between staff and entity; personnel listing; negotiate staff and entity
G6	Supervision Skill
G7	Human Resource Skill and Supervisory role
G8	Human resource management; conflict resolution
G107	Managing your boss/employees; Communication
G102	Employee's performance; Appraisal of performance
S80	Office Management Control of Personnel Monitoring
P64	Human Resource Policy, Recruitment producer, employees' appraisal, and payroll Administration
P8	Employees Benefits, Managing, Insurance, payroll polices, payroll Administration, and planning work plan for meetings.
P14	Preparing job descriptions, Motivations for employees, employee's performance, and payroll analysis
P2	On the Job Training, sustain plan GAP filling and Foundation building
P29	Decision making, types of Management, Training of employees
P73	Performance management, Employees Evaluation, job specifications and recruitment
P94	Staff Management, Employees Motivation and recruitment, job description
P24	System control, Taxes, PPCC Laws, Budgeting
P33	Cash management, procurement control, leave polices, and petty cash system.
G126	Report writing; Compliance issue; Rules and regulations; ability to conduct audit; preparation of work plan
G135	How to conduct yourself; How to maintain integrity; Audit procedures; Verifying vouchers
G14	Compliance of the internal control; ensuring that there is no fraud
G43	Assets management
G53	Planning Audit; Field work; Reporting
G80	Audit; Monitoring and evaluation; Reporting
G81	Analytic skills; procurement audit
G100	Financial reporting; Control system; effective/efficiency of operations
S72	Not really because I am not fully into auditing here. I am into supervising and I used the topic Assessment in my work.
S75	The training helps me in conducting my report and also in preparing me for auditors.
S77	Assessment, Risk Status and Risk minimizing are the most useful part of the training in my day to day work.
P38	Financial Reporting, entity operation, and Financial System

CODE	Q15—IF YOU ANSWERED SOMEWHAT FOR THE MOST PART OR VERY MUCH SO WHAT PARTS OF THE TRAINING HAVE BEEN MOST USEFUL IN YOUR WORK
P39	Financial policies, Cash management system, Formulation of policies, and bosses relations
P78	Audit follow- up, System Management and internal control
P81	System Management, Audit producer and internal management
P88	System Management, internal Control, Budgeting and Financial Statement
P90	System management, Financial Tracking and Audit producer
P76	System order and System management
G104	Internal control systems; Procedures/policies in financial systems
G118	Monitoring aspect; evaluation aspect
G113	Internal control
P44	Staff Management, Research Marketing, Brand Marketing, Bosses Relations.
P11	Identifying targets, suiting products/ services, product design
G101	An M&E unit has not been established within the division yet
G127	Field work; Monitoring projects; making reports; how to evaluate projects
G29	Planning; evaluation aspect
G37	Monitoring aspect
G38	Monitoring and Evaluation
G39	Monitoring and Evaluation
G4	Monitoring is what I'M doing presently.
G70	Data collection, analyzing data, Monitoring
G71	Monitoring and Evaluation
G72	Monitoring and evaluation, Data entry, Data analysis, Event tracking
G79	Monitoring and Evaluation
G86	Monitor accounts and staff; Evaluation of progress on accounts processes
G94	Monitoring and evaluation; Performance of vendors; Evaluation
G2	Work plan; M/E; Log frame; Data Collection
G90	Monitoring and evaluation
G98	Monitoring staff performances; evaluating staff performances after dedication of responsibilities; format of M&E reporting
P34	Only SPSS data entry and some control system
G45	Analyzing the various audits and project
S27	Data Collection process and providing time in it the Gantt Chat is the most part that I use every day in my work.
S28	The logical frame work and Data Analysis

CODE	Q15—IF YOU ANSWERED SOMEWHAT FOR THE MOST PART OR VERY MUCH SO WHAT PARTS OF THE TRAINING HAVE BEEN MOST USEFUL IN YOUR WORK
S32	I use mostly the Data Quality Assessment which has to do with data. It helps me when I am in the field conducting interviews.
S33	Quality Assessment
S46	Data Quality Assessment
S48	Data Collection in proper format
S49	Quality Data Assessment
S50	Logical framework
G115	Monitoring Gov. Vehicle and equipment
G120	Evaluation; Bid opening; various bids; Negotiation
G16	Procurement Plan development, preparing bid documentation
G25	We usually follow-up with respect to material procured by procurement department
G26	How to go about soliciting information from vendors and how to apply PPCC laws
G27	Knowing the PPCC Law
G65	Communication skills; best practice; best value for money; fair practice
P17	Purchasing, system control, Cash management and supply chain
P50	System control, Logistics Management, Purchasing/ supply Chain
P79	Writing bids, Purchase and Supply, Ordering materials and Warehouse Management
G17	Monitoring the expenditure of public resources; Supervision; Budgeting
P41	Bibs preparation, materials and supply chain, contract management
P48	Administrative control, office purchasing and supply and the procurement Law has been used in my office.
P77	Warehouse security, Materials tracking, purchasing and supplying Ordering
S10	Bidding Document Process
S13	Preparation of Utilization of Procurement Method, and the Bidding Process
S14	Bidding Process
S15	The entire Bidding Process how to award Bid.
S17	The Process of the Bidding, how to award Bid?
S19	Process on how to award bid and the preparation of Bid
S53	I usually help in the Procurement Department based on my knowledge I had from LIPA and at the most part of the Bidding Process.
S63	The areas are as follow: How to Award Contract, Bidding Document, and Processes the leads to Bids.
S65	The Utilization of Procurement Method and also the formulation of Bids
S8	The Entire Bidding Process
S9	I did use the Bidding Process during my previous job

CODE	Q15—IF YOU ANSWERED SOMEWHAT FOR THE MOST PART OR VERY MUCH SO WHAT PARTS OF THE TRAINING HAVE BEEN MOST USEFUL IN YOUR WORK
G31	Using time wisely; how to send email
G124	Time management and managing your boss
G125	Documentation, Communication and office management, human relationship with boss and colleague, administrative ethic
G132	Life span of record keeping, maintenance of record, establishing good record system
G133	Word breakdown structure
G134	Project management
G24	Time management and managing your boss
G54	Managing your boss
G59	Managing the boss, time management
G95	Management, Professionalism
G96	Internet emailing, working with a difficult boss
G103	Time management, handling your boss
G44	Planning, ensuring project implementation
G60	Planning and management
P25	Project Circle, budget for project, scheduling for project and management.
P100	Project segment, proposer writing, needs assessment and project circles.
P66	Proposer writing, project segment and circle, duration of projects
P71	Proposer Writing, 5 Phases for project Management, Management System Control Project duration and time
P51	Management of projects, projects interventions, Projects Documents, Projects Proposer
P61	Preparing the work breakdown structure, Resource Planning, project schedule and development
P63	Prosper Writing, Project Segment, training on the job, and project implementation.
P65	Project Writing, Proposer for NGOs, Knowing the time for project and the duration.
G33	Tax calculation, government budgeting, allowances
G34	Procurement procedures and policies in public sector
P32	Purchasing, Filing System and Supply System
G91	Understanding government procurement processes
G114	Report writing; Calculation
G122	Public sector finance; financial documentation; internal and external transaction; voucher payment
G9	Budgeting and accountability, Knowledge on accounting procedures
G93	Budgeting, Procurement
P15	Budgeting, Taxation, Preparing Finance System, and System Management

CODE	Q15—IF YOU ANSWERED SOMEWHAT FOR THE MOST PART OR VERY MUCH SO WHAT PARTS OF THE TRAINING HAVE BEEN MOST USEFUL IN YOUR WORK
G47	Budgeting, government budget cycle, taxation
G77	Record keeping and management
P10	Storage of documents, filling of records and producer of records, labeling files
P21	Documents Storage, Filling System and arrangements
G20	Placing order and requesting, check and balance

APPENDIX 4. COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS OF SUPERVISORS

ID	Supervisors Comments/Suggestions
SU4	To enforce a division in all ministries and agencies based on what they trained employees (M&E).
SU18	LIPA should get budgetary allocation; should be free of charge
SU21	LIPA should diversify into other areas, e.g. Broadcast related.
SU22	LIPA trainings should extend beyond Montserrado and other parts of the country should know about it
SU25	LIPA should go back to basic software like Microsoft; Teachers are not punctual; Teachers teach well, good presentation; additional classes should be provided
SU29	LIPA is doing great and good training
SU30	Teachers should be paid well
SU36	LIPA should call the trainees that have NG to re-sit test.
SU37	LIPA should give test papers or grades; LIPA should make notes available on hard copies instead of internet because all the trainees don't have access to internet
SU43	Courses durations are short; there should be sufficient time to cover the course because it is a big curriculum; government needs to support LIPA in order to reach a level more than a certificate institution.
SU44	LIPA should get competent and knowledgeable about the course before teaching.
SU52	LIPA trainees should be able to other staffs in the entities where they work
SU53	LIPA is doing great
SU54	Impact/performance of staff will always make LIPA to have more students
SU 60	Expand the curriculum to be able to accommodate other short term courses that are relevant to the present society; create more public awareness where more people will know about LIPA
SU63	Training should be customized to suit the Liberian context
SU65	LIPA should increase the length of time spent training
SU66	LIPA should have a big campus to operate from, have boarding school to host other nationalities.
SU68	LIPA should set a time frame to give out certificate/document for those that will complete the training
SU77	LIPA should not limit age range for scholarships to age 45. It should be open to everyone when they are announcing training scholarship.
SU79	LIPA must plan properly and ahead of time before typing.
SU80	Since LIPA is a GoL institution they should consider fees to a minimum amount, so that lot of people will attend to build their capacity.
SU81	Fees can limit the staff that the Institution intends to send, and there should be reduction in the fees since it is s GOL agency.

ID	Supervisors Comments/Suggestions
SU86	Extend gratitude to LIPA for the trainings being offered; LIPA should continue to offer more training to the ministry's staffs.
SU102	LIPA should employ persistent and constant instructors that will put in more time to absorb the entire course contents; LIPA should build collaboration with institutions where trainees can go to provide practical on the job experiences.
SU121	LIPA should upgrade training to that of GIMPA. LIPA should extend to degree level.
SU122	LIPA should expand its facility to accommodate more trainees
SU125	LIPA should extend the duration of training from six months and above.
SU135	LIPA is doing by upgrading staff capacity

APPENDIX 5. TRAINEE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

CODE			

Interviewer should explain to the respondent that:

1. The purpose of the survey is to help LIPA improve the quality of its training
2. All personal information in the form will be kept confidential and will not be shared with anyone
3. Participation in future LIPA trainings will not be affected by the information that they provide
4. There will be no penalties or rewards for participation in the survey
5. Finally, ask them for their permission to begin! If they say no, thank them for their time and move to the next person.

For questions with multiple potential responses, the interviewer should read out the possible responses and ask the respondent for the best answer.

#	question	response	skip
	Last Name of Respondent		
	First Name of Respondent		
	Sex	MALE 1 FEMALE 2	
	Name of entity where you work		
	Position at this entity		
	Name of most recent training attended at LIPA		
	Date of most recent training attended at LIPA		
	Who paid for your most recent training at LIPA?	SELF 1 MAC 2 PRIVATE COMPANY 3 OTHER 8 SPECIFY	

#	question	response	skip
	The training met my expectations	NOT AT ALL 1 ONLY SLIGHTLY 2 SOMEWHAT 3 FOR THE MOST PART 4 VERY MUCH SO 5	 GOTO 11 GOTO 11
	if you answered only slightly or not at all, please explain why the training did not meet your expectations Write all responses		
	I learned useful information during the training	NOT AT ALL 1 ONLY SLIGHTLY 2 SOMEWHAT 3 FOR THE MOST PART 4 VERY MUCH SO 5	 GOTO 13 GOTO 13
	If you answered only slightly or not at all, please explain why the information in the training was not useful. Write all responses		
	I've been able to use the training in my work	NOT AT ALL 1 ONLY SLIGHTLY 2 SOMEWHAT 3 FOR THE MOST PART 4 VERY MUCH SO 5	 GOTO 15 GOTO 15 GOTO 15
	If you answered only slightly or not at all, please explain why you have had difficulty using the training in your work Write all responses		GOTO 16
	If you answered somewhat, for the most part or very much so, what parts of the training have been most useful in your work? Write all responses		
	Would you recommend LIPA training to your colleagues?	YES 1 NO 2	GOTO 18
	If no, why not? Write all responses		
	What other comments or suggestions would you make to improve your satisfaction with LIPA training? Write all responses		

APPENDIX 6. TRAINEE SUPERVISOR SURVEY INSTRUMENT

CODE			

Interviewer should explain to the respondent that:

1. the purpose of the survey is to help LIPA improve the quality of its training
2. all personal information in the form will be kept confidential and will not be shared with anyone
3. participation in future LIPA trainings will not be affected by the information that they provide
4. there will be no penalties or rewards for participation in the survey
5. Finally, ask them for their permission to begin! If they say no, thank them for their time and move to the next person.

For questions with multiple potential responses, the interviewer should read out the possible responses and ask the respondent for the best answer.

#	question	response	skip
	Last Name of Respondent		
	First Name of Respondent		
	Sex	MALE 1 FEMALE 2	
	Name of entity where you work		
	Position at this entity		
	Name of most recent training attended by one of your staff at LIPA		
	Date of most recent training attended by one of your staff at LIPA		
	Who paid for the most recent training your staff attended at LIPA?	SELF 1 MAC 2 PRIVATE COMPANY 3 OTHER 8 SPECIFY	

#	question	response	skip
	I've seen an improvement in the work performance of my staff that have attended LIPA training?	NOT AT ALL 1 ONLY SLIGHTLY 2 SOMEWHAT 3 FOR THE MOST PART 4 VERY MUCH SO 5	 goto 11 goto 11
	If you answered only slightly or not at all, please explain why you believe you have not seen an improvement in the work performance of your staff that attended LIPA training *Write all responses*		
	Would you send other staff that you supervise to LIPA for training?	YES 1 NO 2	 goto 13
	Please explain the main reason that you would send your staff to LIPA for training *Write all responses*		goto 14
	Please explain the main reason that you would not send your staff to LIPA for training *Write all responses*		
	Would you recommend LIPA training to your colleagues?	YES 1 NO 2	goto 16
	If no, why not? *Write all responses*		
	What other comments or suggestions would you make to improve your satisfaction with LIPA training? *Write all responses*		

USAID/Liberia Governance and Economic Management Support (USAID-GEMS)

Coconut Plantation, UN Drive
Adjacent to Atlantis Guest House
Mamba Point,
Monrovia, Liberia
Tel: 231 (0) 88-688-3502
www.gemsliberia.com

IBI International
2101 Wilson Blvd
Suite 1110
Arlington VA 22201- USA
Tel: 1-703-525-2277
www.ibi-usa.com