

NARYSEC STUDENT AND FACILITATOR FEEDBACK REPORT

20 July 2017

Conducted by:

The University of the Free State

On the NARYSEC Training Programme

Department of Rural Development and Land Reform



**INTERNATIONAL
AGRICULTURAL
ACADEMY
FOR AFRICA**



**rural development
& land reform**

Department:
Rural Development and Land Reform
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Executive Summary

This project was considered by both the students and the facilitators a success. Each and every topic that was discussed had an overall positive reaction. However, there were numerous challenges that challenged the students and the facilitators. It should also be noted that both the students and the facilitators claimed that the project ended well. In fact, by the end of the project, all parties were very satisfied with how things turned out.

About the course content, all the groups were very satisfied, except Fruit Packing & Grading group, which claimed that they wanted to learn more than just citrus fruits. Another issue that sometimes occurred with study materials was that they were not always on time. Both the students and the facilitators made comments about that.

The students in general liked and respected the facilitators.

The students claimed that they had a very good experience with their studies. When queried about their experience with the UFS, some claimed that they were not associated with the UFS since they did not have class there.

Most of the students are extremely happy with their practicals, some students were unhappy that they only got to observe and not take part. Fruit Packing & Grading's group was consistently unhappy with the practice that they received, claiming that the quality of the facilities they visited was focused on vegetable packing and that they studied fruit packing and grading.

The accommodation was not thoroughly tested for the students, and thus not much data can be gleaned. Only the distance to class was queried, and it seems that the students were overall happy with the distance, in some cases the distance was definitely too far where students had to walk distances upwards of 10km to get to class.

The facilitators were generally very happy with their given accommodation, only the Fruit Packing & Grading group was less happy than the others.

The students were satisfied with their classrooms, more so when they moved to the University of the Free State. The Agric Sales and Services group was unhappy about their classroom up until the end.

Most of the students knew about the medical assistance service and claimed that it was good, furthermore, 15 students made use of it. In Meat Processing Grp 2, a student reported sick and claimed that no assistance was given to that student and thus the group responded in a negative manner due to this incident.

The facilitators gave very few comments on the administration issues. Only stating that everything was good, and one comment that claimed that the administration of the POE's could use some improvement.

Both the students and the facilitators were satisfied with communication overall, the facilitators more so than the students. Three groups said that communication was not very good for them. That is Fruit Packing & Grading group, Meat Processing Grp 2 and Plant Production Grp 2. The first two groups were accentuated by previous problems while no clear reason can be deducted from Plant Production Grp 2 except that communication was slow and delayed.

Regarding communication, the comments cover a wide range of topics, most of the comments came from the Fruit Packing & Grading group, unsurprisingly, and most were about bad communication followed by bad practical and bad content. In that section, it also becomes clear that some of the

students struggled with unsafe accommodation. Thus, it makes total sense that the Fruit Packing & Grading group had so many issues to deal with and the struggle with communication amplified these problems. It must however be mentioned that this group who attended the Fruit Grading and Packing course, were exposed to the highest level of academic and audio-visual material, especially accredited by the Citrus Industry for the training of the specific module.

Following bad communication, the next biggest challenge students encountered was a bad teaching method or bad teaching environment. The Agric Sales & Services group reiterate here that their classroom was not up to standard. Plant Production Grp 2's student actually claimed that the work was too easy and should be presented in a different way. Plant Production Grp 4's students claimed that they had difficulty finding a place to study.

The facilitators' greatest concern is that they would recommend that the materials and paperwork be ready on time. The second biggest recommendation is related to the first in that the project be ready in all of its aspects before the project starts which include accommodation and POE's. Following these, the facilitators recommend that the classes be up to standard and that the program has prepared for interruptions. Following these, two facilitators claim that the interests of the students be looked after, that communication should be improved and that facilitators get either cars or better transportation. Lastly, it was recommended that accommodation be closer to the classrooms.

Given this entire report, which purpose was to find the student's and the facilitator's sentiments on this project, it can be without a doubt concluded that this project was successful. Identifying the problems allows the facilitation team to streamline the process going forward. Thus the problems that were identified in this report should not be seen as deal-breaking conditions but instead as opportunities for improvement. In fact, most of the issues can very easily be resolved and were resolved by the end of the project.

This report was concluded by the International Agricultural Academy for Africa as the leading training partner for this project.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	i
Introduction	1
Questionnaires.....	1
Student Questionnaire.....	1
Facilitator Questionnaire	2
Section A	2
Section B	2
Section C.....	2
Section D	2
Section E.....	2
Section F.....	2
Section G	2
Section H	3
Results and Discussion	4
0. Groups.....	4
1. Course Content and Academic programme.....	5
2. Students' experience of the Facilitators	13
3. Student Experience	14
4. Practicals	18
5. Accommodation.....	22
6. Training Facilities	24
7. Social Support Programmes.....	26
8. Administration	30
9. Communication.....	32
10. Students' challenges	34
11. Recommendations	36
Conclusion.....	38

Introduction

In conclusion of the NARYSEC project, questionnaires were prepared and issued to both the students and the facilitators of the project, to determine their experience with the project and each of the projects facets.

This document will start by outlining the questionnaires and its questions, then the results will be given for each element of the project that was handled in the questionnaire. This may cause some of the questions to be dealt with out of order, but this way of organization will allow the reader to understand the whole of the project in terms of its topics. This also allows the facilitators questionnaire to be more gracefully integrated with the students questionnaires results.

Questionnaires

Both the students' questionnaire and the facilitators' questionnaire is attached in Appendix A and B respectively.

Student Questionnaire

The student questionnaire has 5 question, which broadly define a few sections.

Questions 1 and 2 starts by asking the student for the qualification and then its facilitator's name, this will allow that the students' responses can be compared to the facilitators' responses.

The next section which is question 3 are about the academic programme. 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 asks the student about the knowledge and quality of theoretical training they have received.

Question 3.4 asks the student about their experience of the facilitator.

The next 2 questions 3.4 and 3.5 are about the students' academic expectations and whether they would recommend the University of the Free State to offer similar academic programmes.

Questions 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8 asks the student about their experience of the practical they received.

Questions 3.9 queries the student about the distance from the classroom their accommodation and about the quality of the classroom.

Question 4 starts a new section about social support programmes.

Question 4.1 asks the student if they have received assistance with sick reporting and question 4.2 asks if they received transport to medical facilities, and question 4.3 asks the student if they have received any other support during the programme.

Question 4.4 asks the student about their experience with communication with PMI and the UFS.

Question 4.5 tries to identify the challenges the students may have encountered during the program.

The last section question 5 are about general recommendations.

Question 5.1 asks the student about their personal experience in general, while question 5.2 asks the student for recommendations for future programmes.

The questionnaire ends by asking the student for their name and signature, which this report will keep anonymous to protect the students.

Facilitator Questionnaire

The facilitator questionnaire is divided into 8 sections.

- a. Personal information
- b. Accommodation
- c. Personal knowledge of Qualification
- d. Quality of content of qualification
- e. Perceived student experience of qualification
- f. Quality of facilities
- g. Administration
- h. Other

Section A

Questions 1 and 2 asks the name of the facilitator and the qualification he/she facilitated.

Section B

Question 3 asks the facilitator about their experience of their accommodation if it was arranged by the facilitation team.

Section C

Question 4 and 5 asks the facilitator to indicate their personal knowledge on the subject matter they presented.

Section D

Question 6 asks about the quality of the content of the course, while question 7 asks about the quality of the study materials provided. Questions 8 asks whether the materials was provided on time.

Section E

Question 10 asks the facilitator to indicate how they think the students experienced the training programme. Question 11 asks the facilitator to indicate how the students experienced the facilitator and questions 12 asks the facilitator to indicate the students' attitude toward the learning program in general.

Questions 13 and 14 asks the facilitator to list some of the positive and negative experiences they had with the students and what their main challenges were from day to day.

Section F

Question 16 asks how well the teaching facilities were equipped and question 17 asks how conducive of training the training environment was.

Section G

The questions in this section ask the facilitator how well the administration was conducted with regard to the following topics:

1. Students
2. Learning materials
3. POE's
4. Practical
5. Other Administration

Question 24 asks the facilitator how well they were kept up to date and question 25 asks how well the facilitator were able to share and deal with challenges.

Section H

Question 27 and 28 asks how well the communication were with PMI and the UFS respectively.

Question 28 asks about the communication with other providers where applicable.

Question 31 concludes the questionnaire by asking for some recommendations from the facilitators.

The avid reader will notice that a few questions has been skipped, these are questions 5, 9, 15, 18, 26, and 30. These questions simply end the section by asking the facilitator to elaborate on any of the questions of that particular section.

Results and Discussion

0. Groups

For ease of reading the results the students answers were grouped according to the facilitators in which class they were grouped.

Table 0.1 Facilitators with number of students that filled the questionnaires

Facilitator	# of students
Agric Sales & Services	23
Animal Production Grp 1	22
Animal Production Grp 2	21
Animal Production Grp 3	25
Fruit Packing & Grading	19
Meat Processing Grp 1	21
Meat Processing Grp 2	19
Plant Production Grp 1	13
Plant Production Grp 2	20
Plant Production Grp 3	25
Plant Production Grp 4	17
Group	225

It should be noted that this number was counted for the number of students that answered question 3.1, but not all students completed the questionnaire, and thus may not always represent the number of students that answered any particular question.

1. Course Content and Academic programme

Questions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 from the students' questionnaire dealt with course content while section C and D dealt with course content from the facilitators' questionnaire.

Table 1.1 Theoretical Knowledge up to Standard

Facilitator	Yes %
Agric Sales & Services	91.30%
Animal Production Grp 1	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 2	95.24%
Animal Production Grp 3	100.00%
Fruit Packing & Grading	94.74%
Meat Processing Grp 1	85.71%
Meat Processing Grp 2	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 1	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 2	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 3	96.00%
Plant Production Grp 4	82.35%
Group	95.54%

Table 1.1 shows the percentage of students that answered yes to question 3.1 which asks whether the theoretical knowledge of the programme was up to standard. The data was grouped to each facilitator, since these classes more or less functioned independently.

It is clear that the group average of 95.54% indicate that the students in general were satisfied with the quality of the content. Only Meat Processing Grp 1 and Plant Production Grp 4 were less satisfied but they still scored over 80% with satisfaction.

Table 1.2 Comments on quality of training materials

	Stationary bad	Materials bad	Materials good	Binding	More Practicals	Wrong content	Wanted laptop	Need more content
Agric Sales & Services	3	10	16					
Animal Production Grp 1	1		11					
Animal Production Grp 2			10	1	1			
Animal Production Grp 3			18					
Fruit Packing & Grading	1	5	5			2		
Meat Processing Grp 1			6					
Meat Processing Grp 2	12							
Plant Production Grp 1			5				1	
Plant Production Grp 2	5		9					
Plant Production Grp 3	13	2	11					
Plant Production Grp 4	1	1	7			1		2
Group	36	18	98	1	1	3	1	2

The written responses of the students were analysed and broken into different topics. Thus from the table 1.2 above it can be seen that overwhelmingly the students were satisfied with the study materials provided. However, a significant amount of unhappiness was caused due to lacking stationary. The third highest group was students that simply claimed that the materials was poor, most of which did not go into any details. Other minor issues was that some students wanted more practical outings, the study material was bound in a substandard way that caused it to fall apart, some claimed that the content from the materials did not coincide with the course layout. One student wanted laptops and 2 students said that they wanted more content in the course.

Table 1.3 Question 3.3; will use training manuals in future

Facilitator	Yes %
Agric Sales & Services	95.65%
Animal Production Grp 1	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 2	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 3	100.00%
Fruit Packing & Grading	77.78%
Meat Processing Grp 1	100.00%
Meat Processing Grp 2	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 1	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 2	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 3	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 4	88.24%
Group	96.86%

Table 1.3 shows the percentage of positive responses on whether the student will use the training manuals again. Again it is clear that there is an overwhelming positive response with only 2 groups out of the norm. Later it will be seen that the Fruit Packing & Grading group were generally the most negative group, but this will be investigated in detail.

Question 4 of the facilitators' questionnaire asks the facilitator how comfortable he/she was with the content.

Table 1.4 Facilitators' confidence with the course content.

Facilitator	Score
Agric Sales & Services	4
Animal Production Grp 1	5
Animal Production Grp 2	5
Animal Production Grp 3	5
Fruit Packing & Grading	5
Meat Processing Grp 1	4
Meat Processing Grp 2	5
Plant Production Grp 1	3
Plant Production Grp 2	5
Plant Production Grp 3	5
Plant Production Grp 4	5
Animal Production Grp 4	5
Animal Production Grp 5	5
Group Average	4.69

Table 1.4 shows the facilitators' confidence with the course content, and all is very comfortable with the content except for Plant Production Grp 1.

Table 1.5 Facilitators elaborate on the questions of that section

	Good content	Content hard or bad	Accommodation bad	Materials late
Agric Sales & Services	1			
Animal Production Grp 1				
Animal Production Grp 2		1		
Animal Production Grp 3				
Fruit Packing & Grading			1	
Meat Processing Grp 1				
Meat Processing Grp 2				
Plant Production Grp 1		1		
Plant Production Grp 2	1			1
Plant Production Grp 3				
Plant Production Grp 4				
Animal Production Grp 4				
Animal Production Grp 5				

From table 1.5 it can be seen that two of the facilitators thought the content was too hard or not right, while two other facilitators were happy with the quality of the content. One of the facilitators commented that the content was late.

Table 1.6 shows the answers from section D which deals with the quality of content from the facilitators' perspective.

Facilitator	Course content quality	Standard of study materials	Training materials on time
Agric Sales & Services	4	4	4
Animal Production Grp 1	3	4	2
Animal Production Grp 2	5	4	3
Animal Production Grp 3	5	5	4
Fruit Packing & Grading	4	5	5
Meat Processing Grp 1	4	5	4
Meat Processing Grp 2	5	5	4
Plant Production Grp 1	3	3	4
Plant Production Grp 2	5	5	3
Plant Production Grp 3	4	4	3
Plant Production Grp 4	4	4	3
Animal Production Grp 4	5	5	4
Animal Production Grp 5	5	5	3
Group Average	4.31	4.46	3.54

From the table above it can be seen that the facilitators are generally positive about the course content and about the study material. They are generally less positive about the materials being delivered on time.

Table 1.7 facilitator responses on section D

	Materials late	Content too easy	Binding	Additional learning materials needed
Agric Sales & Services	1			
Animal Production Grp 1	1	1		
Animal Production Grp 2			1	
Plant Production Grp 1	1			
Plant Production Grp 2	1			
Plant Production Grp 4				1

From the table above it becomes clear that the facilitators were unhappy that the materials were late sometimes. One facilitator claims the content is too easy, another says that the binding needs to be improved (as seen already), and lastly one of the facilitators asked that additional learning material be provided to the students such as overhead projections.

Questions 3.4 and 3.5 in the students questionnaire ends this section by asking the students whether their academic expectations was met and would they recommend the UFS academic programmes.

Table 1.8 Yes % for if students' academic expectations was met.

Facilitator	Yes %
Agric Sales & Services	91.30%
Animal Production Grp 1	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 2	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 3	100.00%
Fruit Packing & Grading	77.78%
Meat Processing Grp 1	95.24%
Meat Processing Grp 2	89.47%
Plant Production Grp 1	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 2	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 3	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 4	76.47%
Group	94.14%

Table 1.8 shows an overwhelming positive response from the students. Again only 2 groups fall significantly below the average which is the Fruit Packing & Grading group and Plant Production Grp 4.

Addition to this question, the students were asked to elaborate on why their expectations were not met.

Table 1.9 Reasons academic expectations were not met.

	Teaching facilities bad	Workplace applicability bad	Incomplete content	Teaching method bad	Too easy	Materials lacking
Agric Sales & Services	1	1				
Animal Production Grp 1						
Animal Production Grp 2						
Animal Production Grp 3						
Fruit Packing & Grading			4			
Meat Processing Grp 1				1		
Meat Processing Grp 2					1	1
Plant Production Grp 1						
Plant Production Grp 2						
Plant Production Grp 3						
Plant Production Grp 4						3
Group	1	1	4	1	1	4

From the table above it can be seen that very few reasons were given, but the Fruit Packing & Grading group clearly are unhappy about the quality of the content while Plant Production Grp 4 complain that they did not receive study materials. These responses from the students are consistent with their previous statements about the quality of the content and the availability of the materials. Even Plant Production Grp 4 claims in table 1.6 that the materials were not always on time. Fruit Packing & Grading however never indicated that the quality of the content is not up to standard as the students claim.

Table 1.10 shows the percentage of students that will recommend the UFS to offer similar academic programmes.

Facilitator	Yes %
Agric Sales & Services	95.65%
Animal Production Grp 1	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 2	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 3	100.00%
Fruit Packing & Grading	88.89%
Meat Processing Grp 1	95.24%
Meat Processing Grp 2	94.74%
Plant Production Grp 1	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 2	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 3	96.00%
Plant Production Grp 4	88.24%
Group	96.38%

Again the responses is overall positive and is consistent with previous sentiment data.

Table 1.11 Reasons for answering no to recommending the UFS to offer similar academic programmes.

	Bad content	Access to further content
Agric Sales & Services		
Animal Production Grp 1		
Animal Production Grp 2		
Animal Production Grp 3		
Fruit Packing & Grading	1	
Meat Processing Grp 1		
Meat Processing Grp 2		1
Plant Production Grp 1		
Plant Production Grp 2		
Plant Production Grp 3		
Plant Production Grp 4	2	
Group	3	1

This table's response is exactly in agreement with the results from table 1.9. Thus no new information can be deduced.

From this section it became clear that the students were overall satisfied and happy with the quality of the course content and material. Only two groups were somewhat dissatisfied. The Fruit Packing & Grading group had dissatisfaction with the quality of the content. Some of the comments indicate that the students only learned about one type of fruit that is citrus fruit and no other. Plant Production Grp 4 was somewhat unhappy about the study materials not always being on time. Lastly a significant portion of the complained that they did not receive enough stationary for this course.

The facilitators were generally also positive about the content of the courses but shared the students' irritation that the study materials was not always available on time.

2. Students' experience of the Facilitators

Question 3.4 from the students' questionnaire asked the students about their experience of the facilitators.

Table 2.1 Students perspective on the facilitators

Facilitator	Knowledge	Presentation	Approachability
Agric Sales & Services	3.91	3.83	4.30
Animal Production Grp 1	4.73	4.73	4.68
Animal Production Grp 2	4.52	4.57	4.38
Animal Production Grp 3	4.76	4.68	4.54
Fruit Packing & Grading	4.72	4.78	4.61
Meat Processing Grp 1	4.86	4.33	4.62
Meat Processing Grp 2	4.47	4.58	4.58
Plant Production Grp 1	4.73	4.73	4.64
Plant Production Grp 2	3.95	4.30	4.10
Plant Production Grp 3	4.24	3.96	4.28
Plant Production Grp 4	4.41	4.53	4.65
Group	4.47	4.43	4.48

From the table above it can be seen that the students have a very high opinion of their facilitators, nobody got a negative score, most scores are above 4 which means that they are 'good' or at least close to 'good'

Animal Production Grp 1 was the most liked facilitator, closely followed by Plant Production Grp 1, closely followed by Fruit Packing & Grading. The lowest scoring facilitator was Agric Sales & Services, but still her scores show that the students put her in high regard.

3. Student Experience

Section E of the facilitators questionnaire dealt with this question from the facilitators perspective.

Table 3.1 Student experiences.

Facilitator	Students' general experience	How students experienced you	Students attitude
Agric Sales & Services	4	4	4
Animal Production Grp 1	4	4	4
Animal Production Grp 2	4	4	2
Animal Production Grp 3	5	5	4
Fruit Packing & Grading	4	5	4
Meat Processing Grp 1	5	5	5
Meat Processing Grp 2	5	5	4
Plant Production Grp 1	5	4	3
Plant Production Grp 2	4	4	4
Plant Production Grp 3	4	5	5
Plant Production Grp 4	5	4	3
Animal Production Grp 4	4	5	4
Animal Production Grp 5	4	5	5
Group Average	4.38	4.54	3.92

From the table above it seems that the facilitators is of the opinion that the students like them and that the students enjoyed the experience. However, they are less positive about the students' general attitude. From the previous section it is confirmed that the students have a high opinion of the facilitators.

Question 13 asked the facilitators to highlight some of the positive and negative factors that they experienced.

Table 3.2 Positive and negative factors experienced.

	Positive					Negative			
	Cooperative	Friendly, enjoyed, respectful	Interested	Commitment and Effort	Positive end	Communication challenge	Bad time keeping	Bad discipline, bad attitude	Not interested
Agric Sales & Services	1	2							
Animal Production Grp 1			1			1			
Animal Production Grp 2			1				1	2	
Animal Production Grp 3			1						1
Fruit Packing & Grading	1			1		1	1		
Meat Processing Grp 1	1			1					
Meat Processing Grp 2	1			1	1				1
Plant Production Grp 1		1			1			1	
Plant Production Grp 2					1			1	
Plant Production Grp 3	1							1	
Plant Production Grp 4	1			1			1	1	1
Animal Production Grp 4									
Animal Production Grp 5				1					
Total	6	3	3	5	3	2	3	6	3

From the above table it can be seen that the facilitators had overall more a positive experience with the students than a negative experience. In order it is:

1. Cooperative
2. Committed and has effort
3. Positive end
4. Friendly, enjoyed class and respectful
5. Interested.

The negative factors that the facilitators experienced was:

1. Students indicated that they were attending courses in enterprises where they had no choice to select the discipline to be studied
2. Bad discipline, bad attitude
3. Bad time keeping
4. Not interested
5. Communication challenges

It is interesting that the same elements the students are praised for are the same elements that they struggled with. It is important to note that some of the facilitators claimed that the programme ended well, meaning that the students' attitude and behaviour improved as they got to know the facilitators better, and this explains why the same factor is both positive and negative.

Along with this question, question 14 was asked to the facilitators to highlight some of the challenges they experienced on a day to day basis.

Table 3.3 Main challenges the facilitators experienced on a day to day basis.

	Bad classroom	Bad student time management	Interruptions	Learner attitude sometimes bad/respect toward facilitator
Agric Sales & Services	1			
Animal Production Grp 1		1	1	
Animal Production Grp 2		1	1	2
Animal Production Grp 3				1
Fruit Packing & Grading		2		
Meat Processing Grp 1				
Meat Processing Grp 2		1		
Plant Production Grp 1				1
Plant Production Grp 2				1
Plant Production Grp 3		1	1	
Plant Production Grp 4			1	
Animal Production Grp 4				
Animal Production Grp 5		1		1
Total	1	7	4	6

Table 3.3 highlights the point that students have bad time keeping, since half of the facilitators expressed the problem, furthermore almost half of the facilitators claims that they struggled with learners that had bad attitudes or are disrespectful.

Facilitators also had to deal with interruptions semi regularly. Only one facilitator had a consistent problem with a classroom not being up to standard.

Question 15 allows the facilitators to voice other concerns or comments they may have on this topic.

Table 3.4 Elaboration on perceived student experience of the qualification.

	attitude good	attitude bad sometimes	NARYSEC spoiled students
Agric Sales & Services	1	1	
Animal Production Grp 1	1	1	
Fruit Packing & Grading			1
Plant Production Grp 2	1	1	
Total	3	3	1

These comments from table 3.4 are consistent with those of table 3.3. The only exception is the new comment that states that the NARYSEC students are spoiled by their directors.

Lastly but supposedly the most important is to ask the students themselves how their experience was of the program. Question 5.a of the students question asks the students just that.

Table 3.5 Students perspective on own experience.

	good experience	bad experience	not associated with UFS	good experience %
Agric Sales & Services	20	2		90.91%
Animal Production Grp 1	22	1		95.65%
Animal Production Grp 2	17	3		85.00%
Animal Production Grp 3	24			100.00%
Fruit Packing & Grading	8	7	9	53.33%
Meat Processing Grp 1	18		3	100.00%
Meat Processing Grp 2	18	1		94.74%
Plant Production Grp 1	12			100.00%
Plant Production Grp 2	20			100.00%
Plant Production Grp 3	24	1		96.00%
Plant Production Grp 4	15	1	1	93.75%
Group	198	16	13	92.52%

Table 3.5 shows how many students gave a comment that says they that a good experience or a comment that claims they had a bad experience. From the data it is clear that the students had an overall good experience with a positive answer of 92.52% for the entire group. The group with the worst experience is the Fruit Packing & Grading group with a 53.33% positive experience. That means about half of the students had a positive experience.

Also of importance is to note that since the question asked the students “In looking back at your time and experience as a students at the University of the Free State; how was your experience?” The question focuses how the students experienced their time as a student of the UFS. Because of this some of the students says that they were not students of the UFS, or had no experience that told them they were a student of the UFS. Some of students claimed that they were only once at the UFS and thus they cannot be associated with UFS.

4. Practicals

In the students’ questionnaire questions 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 dealt with practicals that the students attended.

Table 4.1 Percentage of students that claimed they attended practicals.

Facilitator	Yes %
Agric Sales & Services	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 1	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 2	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 3	100.00%
Fruit Packing & Grading	88.89%
Meat Processing Grp 1	100.00%
Meat Processing Grp 2	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 1	60.00%
Plant Production Grp 2	80.00%
Plant Production Grp 3	92.00%
Plant Production Grp 4	70.59%
Group	92.27%

It can be seen that most of the students attended practicals, only two groups have a score of less than 80%. The reasons for not attending practicals are as follows:

Table 4.2 Reasons for not attending a practical

	Wrong produce	Good experience	Bad experience	Only observed	Still waiting
Fruit Packing & Grading	4	1	3	3	
Plant Production Grp 1					1
Plant Production Grp 2				4	
Plant Production Grp 3				1	
Plant Production Grp 4				3	1
Group	4	1	3	11	2

Consistent with table 4.1, only groups that had less than 100% attendance made a comment on why they did not have a practical. The Fruit Packing & Grading group had the most objections with basically one or more comment in all but one of the categories recorded. The most striking was that they claim that the practical that they attended was about the wrong produce. They attended a carrot and beetroot packing house while they are studying fruit packing and grading. They also claimed that quality of the facilities was very bad there. Overall the biggest concern of all the students that claimed that they did not have a practical is that the supposedly practical that they attended was only observation and not hands-on and thus cannot be classified as a practical.

Question 3.7 asked the students where they attended practicals.

Table 4.3 Practicals locations

	Practical
Agric Sales & Services	Senwes + BKB
Animal Production Grp 1	Paradys Experimental Farm
Animal Production Grp 2	Paradys Experimental farm
Animal Production Grp 3	Paradys Experimental farm
Fruit Packing & Grading	Eat JJ's
Meat Processing Grp 1	Rooipoort
Meat Processing Grp 2	Rooipoort
Plant Production Grp 1	Commercial farm
Plant Production Grp 2	Wag 'n Bietjie Farm
Plant Production Grp 3	Wag 'n Bietjie Farm
Plant Production Grp 4	Wag 'n Bietjie Farm

Each qualification went to the same practical, though not at the same time necessarily.

Question 3.8 asked students if the practical improved their understanding.

Table 4.4 Practical training contributed to a better understanding of the learning environment.

Facilitator	Yes %
Agric Sales & Services	95.65%
Animal Production Grp 1	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 2	95.24%
Animal Production Grp 3	100.00%
Fruit Packing & Grading	18.75%
Meat Processing Grp 1	100.00%
Meat Processing Grp 2	78.95%
Plant Production Grp 1	87.50%
Plant Production Grp 2	88.89%
Plant Production Grp 3	95.83%
Plant Production Grp 4	75.00%
Group	87.26%

It can be seen that most of the students felt that their understanding improved. Only a single group scored low on this table, and that is the Fruit Packing & Grading group. It should be noted however, that most students that already claimed that they did not attend a practical also marked 'no' on this question. This means this data set is biased based on the previous data set. Meaning that this data set will inherently be more negative than what it truly should be.

When we remove that bias by only including the answers where the answer to question 3.6 was yes then we have the following data set:

Table 4.5. Refined practical training contributed to a better understanding.

Facilitator	Yes %
Agric Sales & Services	95.65%
Animal Production Grp 1	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 2	95.24%
Animal Production Grp 3	100.00%
Fruit Packing & Grading	20.00%
Meat Processing Grp 1	100.00%
Meat Processing Grp 2	78.95%
Plant Production Grp 1	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 2	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 3	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 4	100.00%
Group	90.95%

We see that there is no change for the groups of Agric Sales & Services, Animal Production Grp 1, Animal Production Grp 2, Animal Production Grp 3, Meat Processing Grp 1, and Meat Processing Grp 2. But these groups were already showing a positive trend. The groups of Plant Production Grp 1, Plant Production Grp 2, Plant Production Grp 3, and Plant Production Grp 4 all have a 100% positive indication after the change, thus the people that did say they attended a practical are all 100% sure that they have improved their understanding on the learning environment. The only group that had only a minor change was the Fruit Packing & Grading group which showed only 1.25% improvement. This means that this group are in general very unhappy with the practical that they have received.

Table 4.6 reasons why students have not learned something from their practical

	Bad experience	Did not learn anything	No practicals
Fruit Packing & Grading	14		
Meat Processing Grp 2		4	
Plant Production Grp 2			2
Plant Production Grp 3			1
Plant Production Grp 4	1		3
Group	15	4	6

This table gives the same picture that we have seen in table 4.2 and throughout this discussion. The Fruit Packing & Grading group had a bad practical experience, some of the students in the other groups says that they did not have a practical and Meat Processing Grp 2's group says that they have not learned anything new. Again most of these comments originates from students that already claimed in question 3.6 that they did not attend a practical. It is only Fruit Packing & Grading's group that consistently exclaim that they had a bad practical experience.

Thus in conclusion, most of the students are extremely happy with their practicals, some students are unhappy that they only got to observe and not take part. The Fruit Packing & Grading group was consistently unhappy with the practical that they have received.

5. Accommodation

In the students questionnaire there was no question that directly asks the students how their accommodation was, only how far it was from the classroom (question 3.9 a)

Table 5.1 Student accommodation distance to classroom.

	Distance good.	Distance too far	Distance good percentage
Agric Sales & Services	21	0	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 1	20	2	90.91%
Animal Production Grp 2	6	12	33.33%
Animal Production Grp 3	16	8	66.67%
Fruit Packing & Grading	9	9	50.00%
Meat Processing Grp 1	19	1	95.00%
Meat Processing Grp 2	18	1	94.74%
Plant Production Grp 1	10	0	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 2	8	11	42.11%
Plant Production Grp 3	22	3	88.00%
Plant Production Grp 4	10	7	58.82%
Group	159	54	74.65%

From table 5.1 it can be seen that 74.65% of students were satisfied with the distance their accommodation was from their classroom. Three groups stand out that are generally unhappy with the distance; Animal Production Grp 2, The Fruit Packing & Grading group and Plant Production Grp 2. In these groups 50% or more of the class expressed that the distance was too far. Some of the students claims of distances upwards of 10km that they had to travel to get to class, which they say contribute to them being late sometimes.

The facilitators also that a question that asked them about their accommodation:

Table 5.2 Facilitators satisfaction with accommodation (where applicable)

Facilitator	Accommodation
Agric Sales & Services	
Animal Production Grp 1	
Animal Production Grp 2	
Animal Production Grp 3	
Fruit Packing & Grading	3
Meat Processing Grp 1	4
Meat Processing Grp 2	5
Plant Production Grp 1	4
Plant Production Grp 2	
Plant Production Grp 3	5
Plant Production Grp 4	4
Animal Production Grp 4	4
Animal Production Grp 5	5
Group Average	4.25

Table 5.2 shows that most of the facilitators that stayed in accommodation that the project arraigned was satisfied with a group average of 4.25. The lowest score was given by the Fruit Packing & Grading facilitator, with a 3 which was 'somewhat satisfied', which is an average score. This was already seen in table 1.5 where the Fruit Packing & Grading facilitator claimed that his accommodation was not up to standard.

In conclusion, all facilitators were satisfied with the given accommodation.

6. Training Facilities

In the students' questionnaire, question 3.9b deals with the standard of the classroom, and section F of the facilitators' questionnaire deals with the same subject.

Table 6.1 standard of the classroom (question 3.9 from students' questionnaire).

	Classroom good	Classroom bad	Students noisy	Cold	Classroom good percentage
Agric Sales & Services	9	17			34.62%
Animal Production Grp 1	15		2		100.00%
Animal Production Grp 2	20				100.00%
Animal Production Grp 3	24			2	100.00%
Fruit Packing & Grading	18				100.00%
Meat Processing Grp 1	20			1	100.00%
Meat Processing Grp 2	19				100.00%
Plant Production Grp 1	12				100.00%
Plant Production Grp 2	20			3	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 3	22			4	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 4	17	1			94.44%
Group	196	18	2	10	91.59%

This tables' data is consistent with the overall student experience, in that 91.59% of the students said that the classroom was good. The Agric Sales & Services group however was not satisfied with their classroom, with a satisfaction rate of 34.62%. This was however, already confirmed by the comments of the facilitator, made earlier as seen in table 3.3 and the discussion following there on.

Of note is that 10 students claimed that their classrooms was cold and that they had trouble concentrating. These same students did, however, said that their classrooms was only in the first week cold, from the second week they had air conditioners that warmed the classes up.

Questions 16 from the facilitators questionnaire asks the facilitators how well the teaching facilities was equipped, and question 17 asks the facilitator how conducive the training environment was for training.

Table 6.2 Facilitators view on training facilities.

Facilitator	how well equipped	training environment
Agric Sales & Services	2	3
Animal Production Grp 1	4	5
Animal Production Grp 2	4	5
Animal Production Grp 3	5	5
Fruit Packing & Grading	5	5
Meat Processing Grp 1	4	4
Meat Processing Grp 2	5	5
Plant Production Grp 1	4	5
Plant Production Grp 2	4	4
Plant Production Grp 3	5	5
Plant Production Grp 4	5	5
Animal Production Grp 4	5	5
Animal Production Grp 5	5	5
Group Average	4.38	4.69

The results of table 6.2 are consistent with the results from table 6.1, which means that the facilitators had the same experience that the students had, including the Agric Sales & Services group. Thus, all the groups, except Agric Sales & Services group, had a very positive experience with the training facilities.

Question 18 of the facilitators' questionnaire asks the facilitators to elaborate a bit to give more in depth information.

Table 6.3 Facilitators elaborate on training facilities.

	Other teaching facilities are bad	UFS well equipped	internet access requested
Agric Sales & Services	1		
Animal Production Grp 1	1	1	
Animal Production Grp 2			1
Animal Production Grp 3	1	1	
Meat Processing Grp 2		1	
Plant Production Grp 2	1	1	
Animal Production Grp 4	1	1	
Animal Production Grp 5		1	
Total	5	6	1

Rows of table 6.3 were removed for facilitators that gave no additional comment.

From the comments it became clear that classes took place in several locations, the last of which was at the University of the Free State. The facilitators claimed that the other training facilities was bad or not up to standard, while the UFS's training facilities are very well equipped. After investigating the students comments the same trend was identified, however, not as clear as what the facilitators can give. A few students commented that *previously* the classrooms were poor, but *now* it is up to standard. Some referred to Thaba Nchu and said that the training environment was bad there.

The last comment from the facilitators was that they would want internet access in class such that students and the facilitator can get additional learning materials to help illustrate certain concepts, that can be better showed with the help of the internet.

In conclusion the students were satisfied with their classes, more so when they moved to the University of the Free State. While the Agric Sales & Services group was unhappy about their classroom up until the end.

7. Social Support Programmes

Questions 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 deals with the social support programmes, more specifically whether students got support for getting to and from a clinic or hospital if they got sick and how the facilitators dealt with it.

The students answered question 4.1 Assistance with sick reporting and question 4.2 Assistance with transport to medical assistance in a very similar fashion, in that sometimes they would write the exact same response, or they would simply continue a sentence in the second question. It was thus decided that these 2 questions will be merged into a single analytical entity. That is the data is considered together.

Table 7.1 Medical assistance.

	Good health	Did not use	Did not know about	Was slow	Was bad	Did use it	Was good	Knew about it	% good	% knew about it
Agric Sales & Services	11	12			1	1	13	21	92.86%	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 1	1	2				2	19	19	100.00%	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 2	4				2	1	16	16	88.89%	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 3	3	11	11			2	19	11	100.00%	50.00%
Fruit Packing & Grading	1			2	2	2	10	13	83.33%	100.00%
Meat Processing Grp 1	5	1	3	3	4	2	9	11	69.23%	78.57%
Meat Processing Grp 2		2	4		9		2	4	18.18%	50.00%
Plant Production Grp 1	3		2				6	5	100.00%	71.43%
Plant Production Grp 2	2	1			3		13	18	81.25%	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 3	1				2	4	16	16	88.89%	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 4	2	1	2		1	1	10	10	90.91%	83.33%
Group	33	30	22	5	24	15	133	144	84.71%	86.75%

Before the data is discussed, it must be highlighted that not all students filled this question in, and that a lot of the answers were very vague, or illegible or difficult to interpret. However, even though the information from the above table is not complete, it is still enough to be statistically correct. That is the correct conclusion can still be made simply because a great enough portion of the data is intact.

Thus 8 categories was identified for this question set. Students that said they were in good health. Students that said they never used it (the assistance). Some students said they did not know about it or did not use it. Those that said it was 'good' or 'excellent' was assumed to know about it. Lastly there were students that clearly indicated that the service was bad and some gave a reason that it was because it was slow.

Thus from table 7.1 84.71% of the students said the assistance was good and 86.75% of the students said that they knew about it. Meat Processing Grp 2 and Animal Production Grp 3 are the exception here in that only half of the students claim that they knew about it, but 100% of Animal Production Grp 3 said that the assistance was good that they overall have experienced. Meat Processing Grp 2, however, was unhappy with the assistance with a percentage of 18.18% that said that the assistance was good. Unfortunately they did not go into any detail on why they experienced the service as bad. It may be that they were not well informed about it, just as Animal Production Grp 3.

Furthermore, 15 students said that they did use the service during the training programme, and about 33 students answered the questions by saying that they did not use it because they were in good health.

A few students that said that the service was bad and expanded to it by stating that it was too slow, and that students had to wait for up to an hour before someone would come and fetch them. Others that said it was bad, said that they had to arrange their own transport to get medical help. All the students that referred to the facilitator in their comments said that the facilitators always took the matter seriously and that they would allow the student to go to a clinic and not mark them absent.

Question 4.3 asks the student if they think the support measures were always in place.

Table 7.2 question 4.3 “did you experience that support measures have always been available in any situation?”

Facilitator	Yes %
Agric Sales & Services	95.65%
Animal Production Grp 1	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 2	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 3	91.67%
Fruit Packing & Grading	66.67%
Meat Processing Grp 1	94.74%
Meat Processing Grp 2	37.50%
Plant Production Grp 1	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 2	80.00%
Plant Production Grp 3	91.30%
Plant Production Grp 4	88.24%
Group	86.73%

The results of this table is mostly consistent from the results of table 7.1. Meat Processing Grp 2 have a low score of 37.5%, meaning that their experience is mostly dominated by the negative experience of not having proper medical assistance. The group overall has a percentage of 86.73% which is very good. The only other group that have a somewhat lower score is Fruit Packing & Grading’s group. This is most likely because of the previously mentioned issues. However, the reasons for answering no to this question will follow in table 7.3.

Table 7.3 Reasons for answering no to question 4.3 in the students' questionnaire.

	Not enough information	Not enough support
Agric Sales & Services	1	
Animal Production Grp 1		
Animal Production Grp 2		1
Animal Production Grp 3		
Fruit Packing & Grading		4
Meat Processing Grp 1		1
Meat Processing Grp 2		9
Plant Production Grp 1		
Plant Production Grp 2		2
Plant Production Grp 3		
Plant Production Grp 4		2
Group	1	19

Unfortunately the students gave very unsupportive answers for this question, which basically claims that they did not receive any support. Upon investigating, the Meat Processing Grp 2 responses was seen that they were unhappy because that after they made a sick report, there was no response and thus nobody helped the sick person. This caused a very negative perception for the entire group. It must however be mentioned that this incident and the circumstances are well now to the student support manager, and that this incident happened during midnight hours, where the provincial ambulance services were called out and they did not respond through feeling that an upset stomach and vomiting was not an emergency for the ambulance to attend too.

In conclusion, most of the students knew about the medical assistance service and claimed that it was good, furthermore, 15 students made use of it.

8. Administration

Section G of the facilitators' questionnaire dealt with administration of the project from the perspective of the facilitators.

Table 8.1 Administration from the perspective of the students.

Facilitator	Students	Learning materials	POE's	Practicals	Other Admin	Changes to program	Sharing of challenges
Agric Sales & Services	5	4	4	5	5	4	5
Animal Production Grp 1	3	3	3	4	4	3	3
Animal Production Grp 2	4	4	3	5	3	4	5
Animal Production Grp 3	4	5	3	5	5	4	5
Fruit Packing & Grading	5	5	4	3	4	3	4
Meat Processing Grp 1	4	4	4	4	4	5	5
Meat Processing Grp 2	4	5	4	3	4	5	5
Plant Production Grp 1	4	4	5	5	4	5	4
Plant Production Grp 2	4	4	4	5	5	5	5
Plant Production Grp 3	4	4	4	5	4	3	4
Plant Production Grp 4	4	4	5	5	4	5	5
Animal Production Grp 4	4	4	4	5	4	5	5
Animal Production Grp 5	4	4	4	5	4	5	5
Group Average	4.08	4.15	3.92	4.54	4.15	4.31	4.62

Table 8.1 shows the facilitators' perspective on administration issues. From the group averages it is clear that the facilitators were in general satisfied with the projects administration. The item with the lowest score is on the POE's, but again this value of 3.92 is very close to 4 which means that the administration was 'good'. Nobody gave any item a score less than 3, thus nobody considered any item as poorly handled. The items that were queried are: administration regarding students (like registration), learning material (like printing and distribution), POE's (filling and returning), practicals (scheduling) other admin, changes that may occur to the program, and sharing of challenges. This last item scored the best, meaning that the facilitators were most satisfied with how social problems were dealt with. The second highest item is practicals and administration surrounding that.

Question 26 asked the facilitators to elaborate on their answers of the above questions.

Table 8.2 facilitators elaborate on administration issues.

	POE's issued earlier	Everything was good
Agric Sales & Services		1
Animal Production Grp 3	1	
Plant Production Grp 2		1
Total	1	2

The facilitators gave very few comments on the administration issues. Only stating that everything was good, and one comment that claimed that the administration of the POE's could use some improvement. This information aligns with that which we gained from table 8.1.

In conclusion, administration on this project was done in an acceptable manner according to the facilitators, and the POE administration could have been a bit better.

9. Communication

Within the students questionnaire question 4.4 asks the students how they experienced the communication situation.

Table 9.1 Students perspective on communication

	communication good	communication bad	delayed	Good communication percentage
Agric Sales & Services	20	2		90.91%
Animal Production Grp 1	21		1	100.00%
Animal Production Grp 2	19	1		95.00%
Animal Production Grp 3	24	1		96.00%
Fruit Packing & Grading	2	17		10.53%
Meat Processing Grp 1	13	2	3	86.67%
Meat Processing Grp 2	16	7	2	69.57%
Plant Production Grp 1	7			100.00%
Plant Production Grp 2	13	5	2	72.22%
Plant Production Grp 3	23	2	1	92.00%
Plant Production Grp 4	14	3		82.35%
Group	172	40	9	81.13%

As can be seen from the table above the students had an 81.13% positive experience with communication. There are three groups that have scored lower than the rest of the pack. These groups are Fruit Packing & Grading, Meat Processing Grp 2 and Plant Production Grp 2. The Fruit Packing & Grading group are understandable since they have issues with the course content and the practicals thus they are inclined to react this way. Meat Processing Grp 2 are also understandable given the situation with the social support programmes as discussed in sub section 7. Considering the answers of the students from Plant Production Grp 2, we see that they have just been general negativity about the communication. Except for the 2 comments on having delayed communication, there is no real reason to be found except that they say it was bad.

The main reason found for bad communication is delayed communication. Some students claim that they had difficulty with communication because they had to wait so long for a reply from the facilitation team.

From the perspective of the facilitators section H deals with communication with the UFS, PMI and other providers.

Table 9.2 Communication as experienced by the facilitators.

Facilitator	PMI	UFS	Other providers
Agric Sales & Services	4	4	4
Animal Production Grp 1	3	4	4
Animal Production Grp 2	4	4	4
Animal Production Grp 3	4	4	4
Fruit Packing & Grading	4	3	3
Meat Processing Grp 1	5	5	5
Meat Processing Grp 2	5	5	5
Plant Production Grp 1	4	4	5
Plant Production Grp 2	5	5	5
Plant Production Grp 3	4	4	4
Plant Production Grp 4	5	5	5
Animal Production Grp 4	5	5	4
Animal Production Grp 5	5	5	
Group Average	4.38	4.38	4.33

From the above table it is apparent that the facilitators had no communication problems with any of the providers.

Question 30 allowed the facilitators to report any comments on this.

Table 9.3 Facilitators comments on communication.

Facilitators	Uncertain who is authority	Communication challenges	Project successful	Communication good
Agric Sales & Services	1			
Animal Production Grp 1		2	1	
Meat Processing Grp 1				1
Plant Production Grp 2				1
Totals	1	2	1	1

Table 9.3 shows that there were not many comments, The Agric Sales & Services facilitator said that she was at times uncertain who was the authority she had to report to. Animal Production Grp 1 made it very clear that she sometimes thought that communication was a challenge both with her authority and the students (hence the score of 2), she also said that the project ended in a success, something the students also said previously. Meat Processing Grp 1 and Plant Production Grp 2 were satisfied with the communication and says so in their comments.

In conclusion both the students and the facilitators were satisfied with communication in overall, the facilitators more so than the students. Three groups said that communication was not very good for them. That is Fruit Packing & Grading, Meat Processing Grp 2 and Plant Production Grp 2. The first two groups were accentuated by previous problems while no clear reason can be deducted from Plant Production Grp 2, except that communication was slow and delayed.

10. Students' challenges

Question 4.5 asked students if they faced any challenges during the training period with regard to their academic outcomes.

Table 10.1 Students academic challenges.

Facilitator	No %
Agric Sales & Services	82.61%
Animal Production Grp 1	95.45%
Animal Production Grp 2	95.24%
Animal Production Grp 3	92.00%
Fruit Packing & Grading	33.33%
Meat Processing Grp 1	100.00%
Meat Processing Grp 2	100.00%
Plant Production Grp 1	91.67%
Plant Production Grp 2	70.00%
Plant Production Grp 3	75.00%
Plant Production Grp 4	76.47%
Group	83.33%

Here again most students answered no, supporting previous conclusions made on the students attitude. The students are on average 83.33% satisfied and had no significant challenges to overcome.

The Fruit Packing & Grading group scored low on this question as expected since this group faced significantly more challenges than any other group.

Table 10.2 Reasons for having challenges.

	Module was hard	Bad teaching method or environment	Too short training time	Noisy students	Studies interrupted	Bad communication	Bad practical	Bad content	Unsafe accommodation
Agric Sales & Services	1	2	1	1					
Animal Production Grp 2			1						
Animal Production Grp 3					2				
Fruit Packing & Grading						5	3	3	2
Plant Production Grp 2		1	1				1		
Plant Production Grp 3						2			
Plant Production Grp 4		1							
Group	1	4	3	1	2	7	4	3	2

The comments cover a wide range, most of the comments come from the Fruit Packing & Grading group unsurprisingly, most about bad communication followed by bad practical and bad content. In this section it also becomes clear that some of the students struggled with unsafe accommodation. Thus it makes totally sense that this groups had so many issues to deal with and with struggles with communication amplified these problems.

Following bad communication the next biggest challenge students encountered was a bad teaching method or bad teaching environment. The Agric Sales & Services group reiterate here that their classroom was not up to standard. Plant Production Grp 2 students claimed that the work was too easy and should be presented in a different way. Plant Production Grp 4 students claimed that they had difficulty finding a place to study.

Following that item, the lack of practicals was the next biggest issue. Which was followed by to short training time, which was followed by the course contents. Only 1 student claimed that the module was too hard for them.

11. Recommendations

Question 5.b asks the students their recommendations to improve this project.

Table 11.1. Students' recommendations

	Agric Sales & Services	Animal Production Grp 1	Animal Production Grp 2	Animal Production Grp 3	Fruit Packing & Grading	Meat Processing Grp 1	Meat Processing Grp 2	Plant Production Grp 1	Plant Production Grp 2	Plant Production Grp 3	Plant Production Grp 4	Group
Carry on	3			3		1	2	2		2		13
No recommendation	8		17	12	10	14	7	5	9	8	8	98
Thank you	2	2	1	2			2				2	11
Change classroom	1											1
Wants to study further	2		1				2			2	1	8
Was useful	1											1
Feels lucky	1			1								2
Improve planning	2					1	3	1	1	1		9
Free Wi-Fi	1										1	2
Was good		3				1	1		2	7		14
Recruitment		2		3			1			1		7
Was bad					7							7
Promotes unemployment					3							3
More practicals						1				1		2
Better accommodation						1						1
Better learning materials									1			1
Better treatment											1	1

This table was inverted to allow all the data to fit into one page.

From this table, we see that the biggest comment made was that the training was good, followed by an encouragement to continue with the program. Thirdly in this list is a thank you the students made to parties involved in this project such as the UFS, their facilitators and Dr Geyer. The fourth item is a claim by the students that this project should improve their planning. This is followed by them claiming they want to continue their studies. The next factor was students expressing concern about recruitment after the project ends and then with the same number of comments saying this project was bad. The rest of the recommendations are minor.

The facilitators had also an opportunity to express their recommendations in question 31 of the facilitators' questionnaire.

Table 11.2 Facilitators' recommendations.

	Learner Interest important	Effective communication required	Classrooms needs to be up to standard	Materials + paperwork on time	Project ready before starting	Prepare for interruptions	accommodations closer to class	facilitators should get cars/transport
Agric Sales & Services	1	1	1					
Animal Production Grp 1				1	1	1		
Animal Production Grp 2					1			
Animal Production Grp 3			1	1			1	
Fruit Packing & Grading	1			1	1			
Meat Processing Grp 1			1		1			
Plant Production Grp 1		1		1		1		1
Plant Production Grp 2				1				
Plant Production Grp 3				1		1		1
Plant Production Grp 4				1	1			
Total	2	2	3	7	5	3	1	2

The facilitators' greatest concern is that they would recommend that the materials and paperwork be ready on time. The second biggest recommendation is related to the first in that the project be ready in all of its aspects before the project starts which include accommodation and POE's. Following these, the facilitators recommend that the classes be up to standard and that the program have prepared for interruptions. Following these, two facilitators claim that the interests of the students must be better looked after, that communication should be improved and that facilitators be assisted with better transportation arrangements. Lastly it was recommended that accommodation be closer to class.

Conclusion

Overall this project was considered by both the students and the facilitators as a success. Each and every topic that was discussed had a positive reaction overall. However, there were numerous challenges experienced by both the students and the facilitators. It should also be noted that both the students and the facilitators claimed that the project ended well. In fact by the end of the project all parties were very satisfied with how things turned out.

About content, all the groups were very satisfied except the Fruit Packing & Grading group, which claimed that they wanted to learn more than just citrus fruits. Another issue that sometimes occurred with study materials was that they were not always on time. Both the students and the facilitators made comments about that.

The students claimed that they had a very good experience with their studies. When queried about their experience with the UFS, some claimed that they were not associated with the UFS since they did not attend class there.

Most of the students are extremely happy with their practicals, some students were unhappy that they only got to observe and not take part. The Fruit Packing & Grading group was consistently unhappy with the practical that they have received, claiming that the quality of the facilities was bad and that they studied fruit packing and grading but attending a vegetable pack house.

Accommodation was not thoroughly tested for the students, and thus not much data can be gleaned. Only the distance to class was queried, and it seems that the students were overall happy with the distance, in some cases the distance was definitely too far where students had to walk distances upwards of 10km to get to class.

The facilitators were generally very happy with their given accommodation.

The students were satisfied with their classrooms, more so when they moved to the University of the Free State. The Agric Sales & Services group was unhappy about their classroom up until the end.

Most of the students knew about the medical assistance service and claimed that it was good, furthermore, 15 students made use of it. In Meat Processing Grp 2, a student reported sick and no assistance was given to that student and thus the group responded in a negative manner due to this incident.

The facilitators gave very few comments on the administration issues. Only stating that everything was good, and one comment that claimed that the administration of the POE's could use some improvement to be delivered in time.

Both the students and the facilitators were satisfied with communication in overall, the facilitators more so than the students. Three groups said that communication was not very good for them. That is the Fruit Packing & Grading group, Meat Processing Grp 2 and Plant Production Grp 2. The first two groups were accentuated by previous problems while no clear reason can be deducted from Plant Production Grp 2, except that communication was slow and delayed.

Regarding communication, the comments cover a wide range of topics, most of the comments come from the Fruit Packing & Grading group, unsurprisingly, most about bad communication followed by bad practical and bad content. In that section it also becomes clear that some of the students struggled with unsafe accommodation. Thus, it makes totally sense that the Fruit Packing & Grading groups had so many issues to deal with and with struggles with communication amplified these problems.

Following bad communication the next biggest challenge students encountered was a bad teaching method or bad teaching environment. The Agric Sales & Services group reiterate here that their classroom was not up to standard. Plant Production Grp 2 students claimed that the work was too easy and should be presented in a different way. Plant Production Grp 4 students claimed that they had difficulty finding a place to study.

Following that item, bad practicals was the next biggest issue. Which was followed by to short training time, which was followed by bad content.

The facilitators' greatest concern is that they would recommend that the materials and paperwork be ready on time. The second biggest recommendation is related to the first in that the project be ready in all of its aspects before the project starts which include accommodation and POE's. Following these the facilitators recommend that the classes be up to standard and that the program must prepare for interruptions. Following these two facilitators claim that the interests of the students must be looked after better, that communication should be improved and that facilitators get better transportation assistance. Lastly it was recommended that accommodation be closer to class.

Given this entire report which purpose was to find the students and the facilitators sentiment on this project, it can be concluded without any doubt that this project was successful. Identifying the problems allows the facilitation team to streamline the process going forward. Thus the problems that was identified in this report should not be seen as deal breaking conditions but instead as opportunities for improvement. In fact, most of the issues can very easily be resolved and were resolved by the end of the project.

