

## **PROJECT ZA 2063**

### **EASTERN CAPE MPA MANAGEMENT INTRODUCTORY TRAINING COURSE**

May 2012

This is the final report for the Eastern Cape Introductory MPA training programme held at Cape Morgan Nature Reserve in May 2012. The course was scheduled as an introductory course and involved five consecutive days of contact sessions between 14 and 18 May. The course has been aligned with the requirements of the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) Unit Standard 253965 "Apply basic conservation management planning" and currently carries a total of four credits at National Qualifications Framework Level 5.

**Project Executant:** P.J. Fielding  
FieldWork  
Tel. 043 7210677  
Cell: 083 777 1958  
fieldwork@mweb.co.za

**Reporting period:** 14<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup> May and includes all contact sessions, all assessment activities undertaken as part of the course, and subsequent moderation by the South African Wildlife College moderator.

#### **Background - Rationale for development and implementation of MPA training course**

The report "State of Marine Protected Area Management in South Africa" (Stephanie Lemm and Colin Attwood, 2003) produced for WWF-SA, identified a number of issues that contributed to a lack of essential pro-active management of MPAs around the South African coast. These included: a lack of capacity within individuals and agencies with responsibility for MPA management; poor collaboration between responsible agencies; lack of resources; relatively low levels of understanding of marine issues and legislation, and a lack of capacity to ensure compliance. The South African MPA Managers Training Course was developed in response to this state of affairs and was intended to enhance the competence of responsible individuals and institutions with respect to their management of MPAs and thereby build capacity for the management of MPAs in South Africa. Thus the key objectives underlying the development of the MPA managers training course were to:

- Strengthen management of MPAs
- Improve co-operation between agencies – help develop long-term relationships between major stakeholders
- Help create an enabling environment within which MPA management can operate effectively
- Facilitate access to information and long-term specialist support for MPA management
- Develop individual and collective management skills
- Raise the profile of MPA management within conservation agencies

Broad course outcomes are listed in Appendix B.

#### **Background to the MPA training course**

The early MPA training courses were run under the auspices of either the Environmental Evaluation Unit of the University of Cape Town or the Environmental Education Unit of Rhodes University. Candidates' competency was assessed on the basis of written assignments that constituted out-of class tasks to be completed at the end of every module. These were assessed by the trainers involved in presenting the course. However, the original intention behind the development of the MPA training course was to get it accredited with SAQA so that candidates who completed the course would achieve credits towards a certificate in a Higher Education and Training Band within the National Qualifications Framework (NQF).

After a long and involved process, the MPA Managers training course was finally approved in 2008 by SAQA under the banner of the Tourism and Hospitality Education and Training sector (THETA) at NQF level 5. Candidates who completed the course would gain 44 credits at this level. Competence was assessed by means of Workbooks related to each module and two Summative Assessments that included an oral presentation and a management planning exercise. The Southern African Wildlife College, as an approved training provider, undertook to administer the course. The assessment process necessarily differed considerably from the original set of written assignments used by the two universities and after the first course run with this format, it was generally felt that the assessment tools needed revision. Several meetings attended variously by staff of the SAWC, the developers and implementers of the training course (Lawrence Sisitka and Peter Fielding) and Peter Chadwick from WWF (principal funders) resulted in a revised training format that incorporated either a 1 x 3 week training block or 2 x 2 week training blocks and which provided 21 Credits at NQF Level 5. A revised set of assessment tools and procedures was developed that would be useful in evaluating competence and at the same time satisfied the requirements of SAQA. It was also recognised that there was a requirement for a shorter MPA training course product that would introduce conservation staff to some of the issues associated with managing the marine environment and serve as a bridge to the longer course. An introductory course had already been implemented for MPA staff in the Eastern Cape in 2006, and a similar course had been provided for the staff of the Namibian Islands MPA IN 2010. With this in mind the process was begun to formalise a short course within the SAQA framework. Because of the limited contact time only 4 credits could be attached to the course and the assessment was designed around the requirements of SETA Unit Standard 253965 "Apply basic conservation management planning". The East Cape Parks and Tourism Agency (ECPTA) indicated that they needed to familiarise new staff with MPA issues and to capacitate community members likely to participate in co-management committees in the various provincial nature reserves that adjoined MPAs. ECPTA felt that the five day introductory MPA training course would be a suitable vehicle to achieve these objectives. This is the first time the course has been implemented in the SAQA approved format.

### **Training course format and content**

The material for the original MPA training course was developed in 2005 by Lawrence Sisitka of uMSenge Conservation, Environment and Development, on behalf of the Rhodes University Environmental Education Unit which was commissioned by WWF-SA to develop the course, with input from a range of specialists in various fields. The material was incorporated in a series of eight manuals that formed the basis of the training for each module. Originally, the time scheduled for the completion of each module was between three and four days, and each module constituted a unique contact session. The original title of the extended training course was *'South African MPA Management Training Course'*. In an attempt to reduce the time MPA staff needed to be away from their work, the format was later modified and to include two modules in each contact session except for the Marine Ecology and Natural Resource Management modules. The modules were taught over periods that ranged from 4 months to 12 months depending on the location, participant competence and the organising MPA management agency. The training material has undergone three major revisions since 2005. The final revision was completed in 2011 and an extra module that addressed the broader coastal zone was included, to meet the demands of the South African ICM Act, and a general move towards a more holistic approach to marine and coastal conservation. The title of the course was changed to reflect this broader focus: *'Management Training for South African MPAs and Critical Coastal Areas'*. The training material that made up the content of the Introductory 5 day course manual was selected largely from the *Management Training for South African MPAs and Critical Coastal Areas*.

The course schedule is provided in **Appendix A** at the end of this report together with a list of the names and organisations of the ECPTA and community participants. A course outline and content is provided in **Appendix B**.

### **Project scope and objectives**

On a broad scale the project objectives are those listed above as key ideas behind the development of the MPA management training course. At a more specific level (ECPTA Introductory MPA training course) the objectives of the project were:

- To complete the five contact sessions for the ECPTA Introductory training course in accordance with the listed schedule (see Appendix A).
- To complete the training, assessment and moderation of all the participants registered for the ECPTA Introductory MPA training course in order to increase their understanding of various aspects of the management of MPAs.
- To provide an opportunity for participants registered for the course to achieve the approved SETA credits at NQF level 5.
- To undertake the project administration associated with the course.
- To ensure that all candidates that have completed the training are accredited by SETA either with a certificate of Attendance or a certificate of Competence.

### **Progress towards the achievement of the objectives**

The training course experienced a number of fundamental problems that need to be addressed in any future training course. These are detailed below in the section on **Problems Constraints and Lessons learned**. However, at the same time there was achievement of both the broad scale and specific objectives. All five scheduled contact sessions have been completed and the associated training has been delivered by the project executant and Judy Mann who acted as the other specialist trainer (see Appendix A). At the start of the first contact session, Julie Wolhuter of the Southern African Wildlife College provided an introduction to the NQF processes and outlined the requirements for achieving the credits associated with the course. She also undertook the moderation of the course in compliance with the requirements for SETA assessments.

Training was based mainly on the manual developed for the course and incorporated lectures delivered by means of Power Point presentations and a variety of participatory adult education practices including group tasks, feedbacks, games and discussions. Participants were also required to complete:

- a) Three formative theoretical assessments and one formative practical assessment. The formative theoretical assessments were undertaken as group exercises which included a verbal presentation of information recorded by the group on flipchart sheets. The formative practical assessment was an individual written exercise.
- b) One summative practical assessment and one summative theoretical assessment, both of which were individual written assessments.

**Formative Assessments:** All participants completed all the formative theoretical assessments because they constituted part of the group work for the course. The formative theoretical group assessments were:

1. Develop a framework for a workable operational plan for your MPA or coastal zone (Theoretical).
2. Select a relevant Biophysical, Socio-economic and Governance goal and objective as they relate to your MPA management. Explain the relevance of each goal and objective. Select a suitable indicator that will track progress towards achieving the objective. Explain how the indicator fits the SMART criteria (Theoretical).
3. Outline the operational requirements to implement a specific management action that might be undertaken in your MPA (Theoretical).

Two out of three formative theoretical assessments were completed reasonably well. The assessment related to monitoring and evaluation (Selecting various management related MPA goals and objectives, deciding on indicators and verbally reporting back to the rest of the participants) was poorly executed by all

groups. Individuals who had completed all other aspects of the course assessments satisfactorily were given an oral interview by the lead assessor to determine whether they had sufficient understanding of the concept of indicators. Problems relating to the formative theoretical assessments are described in the section on Constraints and Lessons Learned.

The formative practical assessment (individual written) required the participants to report on a specific management action and evaluate the outcomes. Achievement in this assignment was heavily dependent on the individual's level of formal education and his/her ability to write in English. Almost all of the MPA personnel passed the assignment but only two out of eight of the community members passed. Mkululi Gingxana, a Field Ranger from East London Coast MPA, chose not to undertake any individual written assessments.

**Summative Assessments:** All participants except Mkululi Gingxana completed the summative practical and theoretical assessments. Considerable extra time was allowed because the assessment was not in a home language. As with the previous written assessment, most of the MPA staff achieved the required mark and the community members mostly did not. The lack of formal education and a lack of familiarity with the English language were clearly the barriers that prevented participants from achieving the necessary marks.

**General Group Tasks and Discussions:** Participation in group discussions and group tasks was generally good, particularly after the first day when participants were feeling more relaxed. For group work, participants broke up into four sub-groups initially related to their individual MPAs but later on the groups were made up in a random fashion to give everyone a chance of working with everyone else. There was a wide range in age, skills, education, and experience in the training group as a whole but the participants generally functioned well in small groups. In plenary sessions much of the trainer-group interaction and discussion was initiated by a small number of the senior males. The female participants were mainly community members from Mkhambathi, Hluleka and Dwesa and their ability to speak English was limited, which greatly impacted on their willingness to contribute to general discussions. However, towards the end of the training course the female participants were more vocal. The group work sessions have always proved very useful because they require contact between individuals from different organisations, of different ages and from different places. This results in an exchange of ideas, the building of relationships and networks between different management agencies, and between management agencies and community groups. This broadens the understanding of the problems experienced by the different groups. Participants indicated verbally to trainers that this aspect of the training was of major benefit. Group discussions and feedbacks for in-class assignments are extremely wide ranging and are in my opinion, of immense value to all (including myself). They are particularly useful for sharing experiences and exchanging information.

**Games and exercises:** The contact sessions also included games and exercises that demonstrated various aspects of the topics under consideration. These included planning exercises, various natural resource use games, the building of a rocky shore ecosystem and a food web. These have been very useful training aids and have been well received by participants.

**Field trips:** Although a field trip was initially planned and a site had been identified, the tides were completely unsuitable. In addition the assessment activities required for the course did not leave enough time to spend half a day in the field. The field trip was replaced by a rocky shore ecosystem building exercise conducted in the classroom and supervised by Judy Mann.

**Attendance:** Apart from one or two absences of an hour or so to attend to urgent site specific matters (e.g. illness, local management matters), all participants attended all the sessions.

**SETA Level 5 Achievement:**

Of the 18 participants, eight were considered to have achieved a level of competence that complied with the requirements of the Level 5 course (See Appendix A; Table 1). Two of these were community members and the rest were MPA staff. One participant did not write the individual assessments.

**Moderation Process:** Moderation has been scheduled for the third week in June 2012 and will be undertaken by Ms Julie Wolhuter latterly of the SAWC. The material necessary for moderation has been posted to her.

**Logistics:** Accommodation and the training venue facilities were provided at the Cape Morgan Nature Reserve. Brian and Erica Church administer the facility as it is part of the Strandloper trail. They did a wonderfully efficient job of organising all the beds into the correct dormitories providing mattresses, chairs, screens and whiteboards and making sure all the necessary catering facilities were present and in working order. It was thus possible to proceed with the conduct of each contact session without problems. Catering was provided by LOATY Trading from Port St Johns. Ms Nokuzola and her team did a great job feeding everyone and there were no complaints about the standard of the food.

**Feedback:** Judy Mann devised a feedback questionnaire which participants completed before they departed. The results are summarised as follows:

Almost everyone attended the course because they hoped to improve their knowledge of the marine environment or because they wanted to learn about managing MPAs. The community members indicated that they were there because the community had selected them. The participants were uniformly complimentary about the trainers and the course met the expectations of everyone and all thought the course would help them with issues related to management of an MPA. The list of issues that the MPA training course would help them with was very varied and ranged from understanding that poaching was a serious issue to being able to think more broadly, helping with community issues and being able to plan better and understanding how to monitor better. All except one participant felt that the course was either too difficult generally or else that parts of it were too difficult. Everyone felt that the time allocated for the course was too short and this was a particular issue for the community members who felt that the written assessments required more time. (Note: participants were actually given a lot more time than was originally scheduled for each written assessment).

Participants indicated that the Marine Ecology and Sustainable Resource use were the most enjoyable topics but the topics that were considered most useful ranged very widely and included Purposes and Benefits of MPAs, Marine Ecology and Sustainable Resource Use, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Enforcement and Compliance. Several participants indicated that they would like to undertake further training.

**Problems, Constraints and Lessons learned**

1. A number of problem issues affected the implementation of the Introductory MPA Training course. The group was a very varied group in terms of formal education levels, skills and experience in the marine or MPA environment, and the ability to communicate in English either verbally or in the written format. For a large proportion of the participant group there was a complete mismatch between the level of the course and the ability of participants to absorb the information presented and to undertake the tasks required. A level 5 course cannot be presented for learners who have at best a rudimentary ability to speak English. In addition, most of the community members had little or no experience of protected areas and the marine

environment and they cannot be expected to cope at Level 5. Even some of the field rangers had difficulty with the course content. The initial motivation for the course was that there were a lot of new MPA staff who had just been appointed and they needed to learn about MPAs and the marine environment. The East Cape Parks and Tourism Agency co-ordinator had been informed well beforehand that this was a diploma level course and it was left to the ECPTA co-ordinator to nominate suitable participants.

The ECPTA has to include community members in any training because they are an integral part of the management structures that they are trying to build in the various reserves. So the organisation tries to include the community members with the MPA staff in order to accomplish both objectives – both staff and community trained. This worked once before when the course was not accredited and the course was run under Rhodes Short Course format. However, when formal time delimited exam situation assessments are required, the level of prior education becomes a critical determinant of the participant “pass” rate.

On reflection I feel I (PJF) should have been a little more alert to the likely level of participant, and I should have offered the course as a non-accredited course only, right from the start. This would have left us free to alter the content and presentation style to suit the learner group.

On day 2 of the training course, Judy and I had a talk to the entire class and said that it was quite clear that many people were struggling and we felt that the approach that would benefit everyone the most was to concentrate on the learning, do as much training as possible and forget about the assessments. However, the class had a long discussion and took a vote. Most of the better educated MPA staff together with some most unlikely individuals voted for continuing with the assessments so we did all the assessments since they were part of the initial TOR. Ultimately most of the senior MPA staff coped reasonably well but the community members and some of the rangers struggled with the individual written assessments. Since we were bound to assess at Level 5 there were inevitably a large number of participants who failed to achieve the necessary standard. Some of them worked extremely hard to achieve a pass and many of them were greatly disappointed when the final marks were handed out. It is de-motivating for trainees to work hard and not achieve and I find it extremely difficult to inform participants who have put in a lot of effort that they have failed.

In future the skills level of the group must be factored into any training programme before it starts and the programme should be structured at a level that allows most of the trainees to “pass” any assessment process. For a group such as the one that has just completed the training, either the course should have been offered without raising accreditation expectations or the course level should have been reduced to NQF level 2 or 3. However, the problem with the SAQA system is that it is entirely inflexible and the content and assessment process cannot be altered to suit the occasion. It should be noted that the way in which information is presented is also very different at a NQF Level 5 compared with say a NQF Level 2 or 3. Unless the learner group has had to pass some sort of selection process which guarantees a certain level of initial competence, a more useful approach to training would be to assess the learner group during the initial stages of training and structure the training content and methods to maximise the learning achieved.

It is not an ideal situation to have a group with such widely divergent skill levels. Management organisations must be made aware up front that such a situation creates training problems that are not easily resolved and if it is absolutely necessary to provide a course for a very disparate group, that training must be scaled to suit the less skilled rather than the more skilled.

2. There are a number of issues with the assessments that need revision for any future training course. The main issues are:

- a) The number of assessments required for a 4 credit course is not reasonable in my (and Judy's) opinion – we did six assessments in total and probably spent about 15 hours doing assessments out of a total of 40 hours available for the course delivery. I had not seen the assessment tools before the course because the course has only very recently been submitted to SETA for approval. I was given to understand that there would be a summative assessment based on the one Lawrence, Julie and I designed for the longer course, and a single formative assessment that might take the form of an oral presentation. Thus to be faced with 6 assessments was something of a surprise and, since SAQA system is so cumbersome, the attendant paperwork is not lightly dismissed.
- b) There are issues that need attention in the assessment tools themselves.
- i) There are problems with some of the marks in the assessments – marks allocated to individual sections do not add up to the indicated totals.
  - ii) The wording/structuring of individual assessments needs some revision because in some cases participants had difficulty understanding what was required of them. The task and wording needs to be simplified in several instances.
  - iii) In some places the mark allocations for specific questions must be changed. There are areas where the relative mark allocations for particular questions of the assessment are not consistent with the requirements of the question.
  - iv) Three out of four of the formative assessments relate to material that is in the Operational Planning Topic. It would be better to spread the assessment requirements over a wider number of topics.
  - v) Doing group assessments with participants with very widely ranging skills and education creates problems because if the presenter for a group cannot communicate well, the whole group receives a poor mark and competent individuals are thus disadvantaged. The reverse is also true – if the group presenter is very good then incompetent individuals are unfairly advantaged. It is not possible to mark the written content which the presenter uses as a guide because the assessor has no idea of how much each member of the group contributed.
3. The training guide is meant primarily as a reference manual and contains far more information than can be imparted in a 5 day training course. It is a mistake to try and cover everything in the manual. This is not a problem if there is room for site specific flexibility in the level and outputs of any particular training course, but the SAQA system inflexibility means that most of the material has to be covered in any training course.
4. If training is to be focused on MPA managers as well as community members, there is a need to add some content and schedule some training time on issues related to working with stakeholders (e.g. identifying stakeholders, communication, conflict resolution).

#### **Future activities**

The assessment process and NQF level rating for this Introductory MPA training course must be discussed with the SAWC and/or Rhodes University Environmental Education Unit.

The time that must be allocated to the assessment of a four credit course must be reduced. This will require a revision of the assessment tools.

The problem of group activity assessments in groups whose members come from widely differing backgrounds and have great differences in their levels of formal education must be addressed as part of the assessment review process

An agreement must be reached before any future course is started that the course may be offered without accreditation if the formal schooling level of prospective participants is such that there is no realistic chance of their achieving a level 5 competence.

Anomalies in all the assessment schedules must be corrected.

### Project's conservation impacts achieved

It is not really possible at this stage to list demonstrable conservation impacts achieved by the project. Participant reviews of the course were very positive, both community members and MPA staff indicated that they had learned a lot and there was much interaction between MPA staff and community members in the course of the group assignments. Participants all have a full set of training manuals that provide a very useful reference guide to many of the problems and issues related to MPAs. These manuals contain considerably more information than was covered in the course itself. It is hoped that the various MPA trainees will take some aspects of the course forward in the management of their respective MPAs.

### Financial Report: Introductory MPA Training Course Cape Morgan East Cape

	Item	Time/km/persons	Cost/unit	Budget (R)	Actual Cost
	Manual Revision P. Fielding	5	R 3 000.00	R 15 000.00	R 15 000.00
1	Lead Instructors: Training				
	Pete Fielding:	5	R 3 000.00	R 15 000.00	R 15 000.00
	Lawrence Sisitka: or AN Other	5	R 3 000.00	R 15 000.00	R 15 000.00
2	Preparation P. Fielding:	3	R 3 000.00	R 9 000.00	R 9 000.00
3	Assessment/Marking/ Course Admin. P. Fielding	3	R 3 000.00	R 9 000.00	R 9 000.00
4	Transportation of lead instructors and specialists				
	L. Sisitka/AN Other	500	R 4.50	R 2 250.00	R 2 305.00
	P. Fielding	120	R 4.50	R 540.00	R 540.00
5	Logistics/Administration				
	Printing of modules 25 copies 100 pages b&w	2 500	R 0.40	R 1 000.00	R 0.00
	Colour pages	25	R 10.00	R 250.00	R 0.00
	Office telephone	1	R 100.00	R 100.00	R 100.00
	Catering 22 persons 5 days	110	R 300.00	R 33 000.00	R 30 830.00
	Hire of facilities - No Charge			R 0.00	R 0.00
6	SAWC				
	Printing of Ass.Plans/tools/Learner plans etc.	22	R 50.00	R 1 100.00	R 0.00
	Moderator flight Hoedspruit return	1	R 5 000.00	R 5 000.00	R 9 000.00
	Moderator Intro. Visit	1	R 1 500.00	R 1 500.00	R 2 000.00
	Moderator final moderation	1	R 1 500.00	R 1 500.00	R 2 000.00
	Administration				R 12 000.00
	<b>Total</b>			<b>R 109 240.00</b>	<b>R 121 775.00</b>
	<b>Discrepancy</b>				<b>-R12 535</b>

Clearly there is a discrepancy between the amount budgeted and the actual costs. The discrepancy arises as a result of the R12000 for administrative costs owing to the SAWC, the moderator charges per day at R2000



rather than R1500, and the travel costs of R9000 as opposed to a budget of R5000. The variance in the budgeted costs for the SAWC and the invoiced costs are the result of an error on my part. I did the original budgeting for this course based on a provisional estimate that I believed was more or less correct and before I asked SAWC to provide me with a costing. They did provide me with a cost breakdown that was in line with the costing above but I did not see that email and the costing remained my provisional estimate. I did not notice this and I have asked SAWC to consider reducing the administration costs but as yet have no feedback on this matter.

### **Equipment Status**

No items of capital equipment were purchased for the project.

### **Conclusion**

The Cape Morgan MPA training course was something of a mixed bag of positives and negatives. I believe that all the participants benefited considerably from attending the course. The participants themselves appeared to enjoy the course, feedback was very positive, and all of them worked hard to complete their allotted tasks. Eight of them achieved the allocated credits and were clearly pleased with their results. Those that did not achieve the required level of competence were disappointed and it is a difficult task as lead trainer to inform participants that they have “failed” the assessments, particularly when one feels that many of them tried very hard. The task is made more difficult when one knows that the assessments should not have been part of the process, because the chances of passing were very slim indeed. The odds were stacked against many of the participants because the major assessments were assignments that had to be written in English.

Although the participants came from widely different backgrounds and organizations, and had widely different levels of skills, the group as a whole functioned fairly well, both socially and in the classroom. There was considerable networking both within the classroom situation and socially.

From the perspective of lead trainer, it was a frustrating course because there was such a wide range in participant capabilities and familiarity with the English language. In a short highly condensed course such as this one, one is always conscious that quite a lot is not understood by participants with limited English. The presentation methods may have been suitable for Level 5 participants but were not really suited to this particular group. Judy helped to rectify this to some degree by introducing more interactive training materials. It was frustrating also to have to go through with the assessment processes when a) clearly they were not suitable for a majority of the group and b) the assignments themselves needed revision. There are certainly some problems that have to be ironed out with regard to the assessment process but I feel that, despite the assessment process, all the participants have a better understanding of many aspects of marine protected areas than they did before the course.

Finally, having led the training on two NQF accredited MPA training courses, I am beginning to wonder whether this is the right route to follow in assessing the understanding that participants have gained from a training programme.

### **Acknowledgements**

The Wildlands Conservation Trust and CEPF through WWF-SA funded the running of this course in terms of financing the training staff and their travel to and from training venues. WWF-SA also enabled the development and printing of all the materials used in the Training course. Peter Chadwick has been particularly supportive in this regard. The Southern African Wildlife College has undertaken the burden of aligning the MPA training course with SAQA, THETA and NQF requirements. SAWC currently administers the programme and has undertaken the printing of all the Training manuals, and the compilation and all the documentation necessary for the SAQA processes. Theresa Sowry and Julie Wolhuter have played major roles in these processes. Theresa Sowry undertook the difficult role of training assessors for the MPA

training course. The East London Museum provided the venue at Cape Morgan, and Brian and Erica Church from the Strandloper trail were very thorough in ensuring that the accommodation and all the facilities were arranged to meet our needs. The catering for all the participants during the contact sessions covered by this report was funded by the Wildlands Conservation Trust and CEPF. Loaty Trading from Port St Johns are owed a big vote of thanks for keeping everyone very happy in the meals department. Judy Mann from uShaka Sea World in Durban provided great support as co-trainer throughout the training programme particularly in dealing with the difficulties occasioned by the disparity in course level and participant capacity. She was also a wonderful help in leading part of training, and assisting in the assessment process and all the administration required for a course of this nature.

P.J. Fielding  
Lead Trainer  
10 June 2012

## Appendix A.

### Marine Protected Area Management Introductory Training Course Schedule Provisional Programme Monday 14 May – Friday 18 May 2012 – Cape Morgan

Participants to arrive at Cape Morgan Training facility Sunday evening 13 May

#### **Monday:**

- Am:- Registration and Background and Introduction to the MPA Training course 20 mins.  
Topic 1 – The Purposes, Roles, Benefits of and Challenges to MPAs
- Pm:- Topic 2 – Criteria for the Selection, Proclamation and Establishment of MPAs to 1700.  
COMPARE activity last 1 hr. Introduction to assessments

#### **Tuesday**

- Am:- Topic 3A – International Agreements, Conventions, and Treaties  
Topic 3B– South African National Policies, Legislation and Institutional arrangements
- Pm:- Topic 4 – Enforcement and Compliance  
Topic 7 – Assessment and Monitoring of MPAs

#### **Wednesday**

- Am:- Topic 5 – Marine Ecology
- Pm:- Ecosystem building exercise
- Reminder of summative assignments**

#### **Thursday**

- Am:- Topic 6 - Fisheries Management
- Pm:- Topic 8 – Basics of Operational Planning

#### **Friday**

Am:- Summative assignments.

1200. Course wrap-up: Evaluation and Feedback – Participants & Trainers

Pm: - Departure

*Note: This was the provisional course outline. The programme was changed somewhat during the course of the training in order to accommodate the very lengthy assessment requirements.*

#### **Trainers**

- *Peter Fielding*      *FieldWork East London*
- *Judy Mann*          *uShaka Sea World Durban*

**Assessors:** Peter Fielding and Judy Mann

**Moderator:** Julie Wolhuter - Southern African Wildlife College

Details of course participants and their affiliations and competence achievements are provided in the table below.

**Table 1. Names and Organisations of Participants on the ECPTA MPA Training course May 2012**

<b>Name and Surname</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Reserve</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Passed</b>
1. Zoliswa Mzantsi	Female	Dwesa-Cwebe	Com. Member	No
2. Zimasa Mbethwa	Female	Dwesa-Cwebe	Com. Member	No
3. Nosihle Pelesi	Female	Mkhambathi	Com. Member	No
4. Ncamisile Mbuthuma	Female	Mkhambathi	Com. Member	No
5. Asina Qondani	Male	Dwesa-Cwebe	Com. Member	Yes
6. Makhosandile Sidelo	Male	Hluleka	Com. Member	No
7. Musa Mdlodlongi	Male	Mkhambathi	Com. Member	No
8. Mandisi Mgebhuzo	Male	Hluleka	Com. Member	Yes
9. Phumzile Yolwa	Male	Dwesa-Cwebe	Field Ranger	No
10. Mzo Mabaso	Male	Dwesa-Cwebe	Reserve manager	Yes
11. Simiselelo Masikane	Male	Dwesa-Cwebe	MPA N. Conservator	Yes
12. Balithafa Madayi	Male	Hluleka	Field Ranger	No
13. Vickson Nompe	Male	Hluleka	Field Ranger	No
14. Mkululi Gingxana	Male	East London Coast	Field Ranger	NA
15. Xolani Nikelo	Male	East London Coast	Reserve manager	Yes
16. Gert Barnart	Male	East London Coast	MPA N. Conservator	Yes
17. Gamakhulu Machane	Male	Mkhambathi	MPA N. Conservator	Yes
18. Nosabelo M��unukelwa	Female	Mkhambathi	Field Ranger	Yes

## Appendix B.

### Broad Course Outcomes:

- *Enhanced management skills within MPA management teams*
- *Developed understanding of the roles and benefits of MPAs*
- *Developed understanding of the national and international legislation relating to MPAs*
- *Developed understanding of the options for enforcement of and compliance with the legislation*
- *Developed understanding of management planning processes, and application of these in context*
- *Developed understanding of the principles of marine ecology, and key components within the local contexts*
- *Developed understanding of natural resources management, including fisheries management*
- *Developed understanding of the assessment of management effectiveness (monitoring and evaluation)*
- *Developed understanding of basic operational planning*

### Focus Groups for whom the Course is intended:

In order to achieve the purposes identified above the training course is intended for core teams of people from different agencies and organisations with particular responsibilities for management of the MPAs, and management of marine and coastal areas in general.

For each MPA these core teams may include:

- MPA Managers
- Other MPA personnel (assistant managers, nature conservators field officers etc.), with management potential
- Key community representatives with specific responsibilities towards the MPAs
- The MCM Compliance and Extension officers with responsibilities for the areas in which the MPAs fall

### Course Details

- NQF Level 5 (Certificate/Diploma level) four credits
- 9 Topics ranging from 1.5 hours to three hours contact time. (Only eight Topics were covered in this course – the Topic on Climate change was left out )
- 5 Contact sessions of one day each over one week
- Outputs in the form of completed formative and summative Assessment tasks. Assessments are marked according to clear criteria, and participants' achievements in the course gauged according to these assessments
- Activities within Topics designed to build towards Assessments
- Core Topic Texts
- Hard copies of some key materials
- Participants to develop 'Portfolios' of evidence through Assessments and in-course Activities.