development academy of the philippines

Center for Governance
(Center)

[2018] PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT

I. Project Information

Project Code : CMPYM

Project Title : Training on Basic Risk Management

Project Start : July 16, 2018

Project End : August 31, 2018

Project Price : PHP 472,500.00

Client Organization : 7 Agencies (NLAs, GOCCs, Attached Agencies and Private Sector)

II. Project Team

Project Manager : Peter Dan B. Baon

Team Members : Dir. Alvin P. Principe, Dir. Gilbert E. Lumantao, Joebert D. Sayson, Rocio Isabel R. Paloma, Leslie L. Ramos, Maria Teresa M. Operio and Mariz P. Potesdates

Supervising Fellow : Dir. Alvin P. Principe

Consultants/ Resource Persons : N/A

III. Project Details

Project Description : This public offering is a general introduction of Risk Management concepts for public managers. It is designed to allow the participants to appreciate the concept and perspective of RM and practice its tools and methodologies. It covered the following sessions: 1. Understanding Risk; 2. Risk Management Framework Process; 3. Establishing the Context; 4. Risk Assessment; 5. Risk Treatment and 6. Establishing the Risk Management in the Organization.

Project Objective : The training was designed to enhance the participants knowledge and skills on risk management more particularly the participants were expected to:
1. Articulate the value of Risk Management in public organizations
2. Demonstrate application of RM Tools and Techniques
3. Perform an initial risk assessment for their organization

Focus Area : Transformational and Innovation towards performance excellence.

Project Beneficiary : Public Sector

Regional Coverage : Nationwide

[2018] PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORT

IV. Project Accomplishments

Key Activities Implemented	:	- Conduct of 5-day non-residential Training on Basic Risk Management - Preparation and presentation of draft Risk Management Plan and Action Plan to Establish RM in the organization.
Major Outputs	:	One (1) Batch of Training on Basic Risk Management
Project Impact	:	The training course provided the 21 participants from seven (7) agencies with the necessary/practical knowledge on risk management. In addition, this intervention also resulted in drafting an Action Plan on establishing RM in their respective organizations.
Lessons Learned	:	*see attached One-point Lesson*

V.   Attachments

- Summary of Evaluation for Course and Resource Person (for training program)

Prepared by:

LESLIE L. RAMOS
Project Assistant

Noted / Approved by:

IMELDA C. CALUEN
Managing Director, Center for Governance

Notes:
1. Project details on Section I-III can be generated thru PMIS based on PMs Inputs.
2. Project Managers are required to accomplish Section IV & provide Section V to reflect results of project implementation
3. Project Managers can update/adjust the pre-filled sections(I-III) based on actual data

ONE-POINT LESSON

Project	Training on Basic Risk Management
Prepared by	Leslie L. Ramos
Noted by	Imelda C. Caluen, Center Head, CFG
Center	Center for Governance
Date Prepared:	24 August 2018
File number	

Subject/Activity: Presentation of participants' outputs for critiquing

What happened? (State the problem and what was done)	What should have been done? (Recommended corrective and preventive action)
Mindanao State University nominated participants were not able to attend the training despite statement from nominating head that they will send replacements.	The Center should include in the cancellation and refund policy the following statement: *"No show or non-attendance of nominated personnel will be charged payment of full registration fee."*

Instructions:

Fill-out all items briefly and completely. Please refer to guidelines for further information.
Limit to 1 to 5 sentences. Illustrations can be used.
One template = One Lesson
Submit One-Point Lesson to osvpp@dap.edu.ph

ONE-POINT LESSON

Project	Training on Basic Risk Management
Prepared by	Leslie L. Ramos
Noted by	Imelda C. Caluen, Center Head, CFG
Center	Center for Governance
Date Prepared:	24 August 2018
File number	

Subject/Activity: Presentation of participants' outputs for critiquing

What happened? (State the problem and what was done)	**What should have been done?** (Recommended corrective and preventive action)
This project was transferred to the assigned Project Manager last 09 July 2018. The almost 3 weeks preparation before the training implementation was not enough which resulted to the following: - Late conduct of faculty meeting - Late finalization of the topics and late reproduction of training kits/materials - Overlapping topics as observed by the participants - Lack of available panelist	- Project Manager should have been given at least two months preparation prior to the training implementation. - Encourage the faculty to discuss and present their topics and ppt materials during the faculty meeting to be able to avoid redundancy. - The Project Team should have prepared and identified a pool of panelists/experts on Risk within and outside the Center.

Instructions:

Fill-out all items briefly and completely. Please refer to guidelines for further information.
Limit to 1 to 5 sentences. Illustrations can be used.
One template = One Lesson
Submit One-Point Lesson to osvpp@dap.edu.ph

development academy of the philippines

Summary of RP Evaluation

Course Title   :   **Training on Basic Risk Management**

Session 3   :   **Establishing the Context**

Date   **August 6-7, 2018**

Name of Speaker :   **Mr. Peter Dan B. Baon**

PART I. SUBJECT MATTER

ATTRIBUTES	LOW (1)	SATISFACTORY (2)	VERY GOOD (3)
1. Level of Content	0	2	18
2. Appropriateness	0	1	19
3. Applicability	0	1	19
	INCOMPLETE	ADEQUATELY COVERED	COMPLETE
4. Level of Coverage	0	3	15

PART II. SPEAKER

SCALE: 1) Poor; 2) Fair; 3) Good 4) Very Good; 5) Excellent

INDICATORS	1	2	3	4	5	Ave
A. Achievement of Session Objectives	0	0	0	9	12	4.57
B. Mastery of Subject Matter						
1. Ability to exhibit knowledge of subject matter	0	0	0	7	13	4.65
2. Ability to answer participants' questions on subject matter	0	0	1	6	13	4.60
3. Ability to inject current developments relevant to the topic	0	0	0	7	13	4.65
4. Ability to balance principles/theories with practical applications	0	0	1	7	12	4.55
C. Presentation of Subject Matter						
1. Preparedness of speaker	0	0	0	7	13	4.65
2. Ability to organize materials for clarity and presicion	0	0	2	7	11	4.45
3. Ability to arouse interest	0	0	1	7	12	4.55
4. Ability to use appropriate instructional	0	0	1	8	11	4.50
D. Teacher-Related Personality Traits	0	0	0	0	0	
1. Ability to establish rapport	0	0	1	4	15	4.70
2. Considerateness	0	0	0	6	14	4.70
E. Acceptability of Speaker as Resource Person	0	0	0	5	15	4.75
Average Rating						4.61

Part III. COMMENTS

A. In general, can you say that speaker was effective? Why or why not?
- He is knowledgeable, with expertise in the topic
- Yes because everyone is engaged to the exercises/workshops
- Yes he was able to explain salient points
- Very much effective because he was able to convey the topic very well to beginner
- Yes Sir Baon has provided us the concept & application of RM
- Yes because not only did he clearly discuss the subject matter but he also assisted the participants during their workshops
- He is effective since he can explain simply the difficult topics. He is approachable
- Yes, he explains very well the subject matter
- Yes as he guides the participants and checks outputs consistently for better learning
- Yes, he has the mastery of the subject matter
- Yes, very practical
- Yes he has developed mastery of his craft
- Yes, effective because he can discuss the subject accordingly
- He is an effective speaker and knows the topic subject matter
- The speaker was effective he was able to reach to the participants
- Yes has practical knowledge on each of the session, subtopic, appreciated how he explained the topic
- Yes he is effective, he was able to answer questions with clarity. This facilitated our understanding in topics
- Yes, very much so!. He exhibited wide and deep knowledge on the topic and his examples are very helpful!

B. What is the best thing you can say about him?
- He is recommendable speaker
- Hives insights on how we can improve
- He tries to reach out to the participants

- ➤ Very much approachable and eager for the participants to learn well the subject matter
- ➤ He knows the topic very well and is able to invite participants to engage in the discussion
- ➤ He is approachable, smart and understanding
- ➤ He also offer suggestions for improvement of the assigned task
- ➤ Very helpful in assisting the participants, interactive
- ➤ He's approachable and answer questions readily
- ➤ Patiently answer questions from participants, generously shares his experience related to the subject matter
- ➤ Explanations are very simple and easy to understand
- ➤ He has a style in his presentation that would require us to do our share
- ➤ He is engaging
- ➤ He can deliver the presentation actively and gain the interest of the participants
- ➤ Explains topic in a clear manner and understand by participants
- ➤ Accomodating
- ➤ Has extensive knowledge on risk management in public sector has a lot of examples for every session/setting
- ➤ His interaction with participants is very good, very approachable
- ➤ His insights are invaluable =) Thanks, sir sana mainvite ka namin sa agency namin

C. Please suggest ways and means in which he can improve this particular module/topic.
- ➤ More live examples
- ➤ Maybe just inject more icebreaker
- ➤ He is approachable, smart and understanding
- ➤ Continue to develop ways on how to engage the participants
- ➤ Please distribute the complete handouts for easier learning.
- ➤ Shorten the time
- ➤ Provide trainees with all the materials being used during discussion
- ➤ Additional instructional materials
- ➤ He can continue to be a good resource speaker and maintain the active way of presenting the topic
- ➤ Keep it up!
- ➤ Keep up the excellent work
- ➤ More time probably

Summary of RP Evaluation

Course Title :	**Training on Basic Risk Management**
Session 4 :	**Risk Assessment (Identication, Analysis, Evaluation)**
Date :	**8-Aug-18**
Name of Speaker:	**Dir. Gilbert Lumatao**

PART I. SUBJECT MATTER

ATTRIBUTES	LOW (1)	SATISFACTORY (2)	VERY GOOD (3)
1. Level of Content		8	11
2. Appropriateness	0	6	13
3. Applicability		6	13
	INCOMPLETE	ADEQUATELY COVERED	COMPLETE
4. Level of Coverage		10	9

PART II. SPEAKER

SCALE: 1) Poor; 2) Fair; 3) Good 4) Very Good; 5) Excellent

INDICATORS	1	2	3	4	5	Ave
A. Achievement of Session Objectives			5	5	9	4.21
B. Mastery of Subject Matter						
1. Ability to exhibit knowledge of subject matter			3	6	10	4.37
2. Ability to answer participants' questions on subject matter			4	7	8	4.21
3. Ability to inject current developments relevant to the topic			5	6	8	4.16
4. Ability to balance principles/theories with practical applications			4	7	8	4.21
C. Presentation of Subject Matter						
1. Preparedness of speaker			2	7	10	4.42
2. Ability to organize materials for clarity and		0	4	10	5	4.05
3. Ability to arouse interest		1	5	6	7	4.00
4. Ability to use appropriate instructional			3	10	6	4.16
D. Teacher-Related Personality Traits						
1. Ability to establish rapport		1	4	6	8	4.11
2. Considerateness		0	4	7	8	4.21
E. Acceptability of Speaker as Resource Person		0	3	9	7	4.21
Average Rating						**4.19**

Part III. COMMENTS

A. In general, can you say that speaker was effective? Why or why not?

- Effective because he cinvey the topic well.
- Yes, the was effective. He is knowledgeable in his field and able to impart it to the participants.
- The speaker was effective in explaining the topic.
- Yes, able to give good examples.
- Effective especially in providing insights or the workshop outputs. Well rounded on the application of RM in public sector.
- Yes, he is effective. He has shown mastery of his subject matter.
- Yes he is an effective speaker. Knowledgeable in the topic.
- Yes, he was clear I his messages.
- Yes, able to impart useful information on the subject matter.
- Yes, he was very effective and patient in sharing his expertise with participants.
- Yes, he was able to effectively impart knowledge.
- Effective.
- Yes, knowledgeable on the topic.
- The recap was too long, should have focused with Risk Management process, looks concrete examples of the concepts, and somehow repeated Mr. Dan's and Dir. Principe's lecture.
- Effective but needs to improve on establishing rapport.
- Effective, he was able to give menaingful insights on the workshop outputs.

B. What is the best thing you can say about him?

- Considerate.
- Can be a professor or a lecturer on other organization.
- He provides actual experiences and scenario to better undestand the topics.
- Can criticize work effectively without offending the participants.
- He's approachable.
- A recommendable speaker for other participants.
- He was simple in his explanation.
- Able to discuyss the subkect matter in precise manner.
- He had a happy disposition, always smiling, giving a light mood to the trainings.
- Considerate.
- He is knowledgeable of the topic.
- Patient lecturer.

C. Please suggest ways and means in which he can improve this particular module/topic.

- To inject more humor.
- Time management-observe time of lecturer to maximize learning.
- He could provide a more active way of presenting,
- Shorten the time.
- More time to discuss the risk management template, more examples on how to fill it out.
- More energy to engage the participants in the discussions and workshops since the assessment is very crucial on putting up the RM.
- More time allocation.
- More actul examples.
- Add more practical examples.
- n/a He was okay.
- Provide attendees with more materials to guide us in personal learning.
- The speaker focus too much on the definition which was already done in previous sessions. It would be

- Lessen introduction, focus on clearly defining each item in the risk process but with concrete examples and simultaneously assessment; too long sharing; could have required examples from the participants and comment on the same instead of discussing suggestions on the presentations.
- Focus on the crafting/performing the risk assessment.

development academy of the philippines

Summary of RP Evaluation

Course Title	: **Training on Basic Risk Management**
Session 5	: **Risk Treatment**
Date	: **9-Aug-18**
Name of Speaker:	**Mr. Joebert D. Sayson**

PART I. SUBJECT MATTER

ATTRIBUTES	LOW (1)	SATISFACTORY (2)	VERY GOOD (3)
1. Level of Content		9	11
2. Appropriateness	0	9	11
3. Applicability		8	12
	INCOMPLETE	ADEQUATELY COVERED	COMPLETE
4. Level of Coverage		9	11

PART II. SPEAKER

SCALE: 1) Poor; 2) Fair; 3) Good 4) Very Good; 5) Excellent

INDICATORS	1	2	3	4	5	Ave
A. Achievement of Session Objectives			3	10	7	4.42
B. Mastery of Subject Matter						
1. Ability to exhibit knowledge of subject matter			3	10	7	4.42
2. Ability to answer participants' questions on subject matter			5	8	7	4.32
3. Ability to inject current developments relevant to the topic			4	10	6	4.32
4. Ability to balance principles/theories with practical applications			4	9	7	4.37
C. Presentation of Subject Matter						
1. Preparedness of speaker			5	8	7	4.32
2. Ability to organize materials for clarity and		0	3	10	7	4.42
3. Ability to arouse interest		0	4	10	6	4.32
4. Ability to use appropriate instructional			3	11	6	4.37
D. Teacher-Related Personality Traits						
1. Ability to establish rapport		1	4	9	6	4.21
2. Considerateness		0	4	10	6	4.32
E. Acceptability of Speaker as Resource Person		0	3	11	6	4.37
Average Rating						**4.35**

Part III. COMMENTS

A. In general, can you say that speaker was effective? Why or why not?

➢ Effetive but needs to improve on establishing rapport with participatns and injet current development related to the topic.
➢ Effective in conveying the topic.
➢ Yes, the speaker was effective draws attention from participants.
➢ He is effective but tends to be olain in explaining the topic.
➢ Yes, with maturity of the subject matter.
➢ Effective with practical examples on risk treatment priciples.
➢ Yes, very attentive to participant's question and helping the same to understand the tools being introduced.
➢ Yes, he is effective. He can easily establish rapport with the participants.
➢ Yes, he is effective speaker. He has full of ideas.
➢ Yes, because he was able to deliver the message very well.
➢ Yes, able to discuss the subject clearly.
➢ Yes, he was able to answer quereies from participants.
➢ Yes, he was able to deliver his topic well.
➢ Yes, he knows the topic and provided examples.

B. What is the best thing you can say about him?

- Considerate.
- Considerate to participants needs.
- Experiment Resource Speaker.
- He is knowledgeable about the topic.
- Good critic.
- Engage participants by asking questions related ot the topic being discussed.
- he's approachable.
- Recommendable speaker.
- Like the other RPs he is a subject matter expert.
- Active and ensure questions of participants.
- Approachable.
- He is engaging
- He was bale to simplify the topic for the participants.

C. Please suggest ways and means in which he can improve this particular module/topic.

- See item A.
- To put more humor in his presentation to break the ice.
- The session could have been a little longer.
- He can make an active way of presenting the topic.
- Shorter time.
- More time alloted for the workshop session on treatment to allow critique of outputs for all groups.
- More time allocation.
- More examples that is relatable.
- Additional applicable examples.
- n/a he was okay.
- Provide more examples and be clear with the concepts.
- Provide more reading materials.
- The time alloted for him was only two hours could have been better if he was able to push through with the bow tie analysis.

development academy of the philippines

Summary of RP Evaluation

Course Title : **Training on Basic Risk Management**

Session 6 : **Establishing the Risk Management in the Organization**

Date : **9-Aug-18**

Name of Speaker: **Ms. Rocio Isabel R. Paloma**

PART I. SUBJECT MATTER

ATTRIBUTES	LOW (1)	SATISFACTORY (2)	VERY GOOD (3)
1. Level of Content		5	11
2. Appropriateness	3	4	12
3. Applicability		4	12
	INCOMPLETE	ADEQUATELY COVERED	COMPLETE
4. Level of Coverage		5	11

PART II. SPEAKER

SCALE: 1) Poor; 2) Fair; 3) Good 4) Very Good; 5) Excellent

INDICATORS	1	2	3	4	5	Ave
A. Achievement of Session Objectives			3	7	7	3.79
B. Mastery of Subject Matter						
1. Ability to exhibit knowledge of subject matter			0	9	7	3.74
2. Ability to answer participants' questions on subject matter			2	9	5	3.53
3. Ability to inject current developments relevant to the topic			2	11	5	3.95
4. Ability to balance principles/theories with practical applications			1	9	6	3.63
C. Presentation of Subject Matter						
1. Preparedness of speaker			2	8	8	4.11
2. Ability to organize materials for clarity and		2	2	8	6	3.79
3. Ability to arouse interest		2	1	9	6	3.84
4. Ability to use appropriate instructional			1	11	4	3.53
D. Teacher-Related Personality Traits						
1. Ability to establish rapport		0	3	8	7	4.00
2. Considerateness		0	2	9	7	4.05
E. Acceptability of Speaker as Resource Person		2	2	9	6	4.00
Average Rating						**3.83**

Part III. COMMENTS

A. In general, can you say that speaker was effective? Why or why not?

Suggestions: Workshop activities/questions at least shpuld be for all level of RM for participants agencies
- could provide more structure by defining session objectives; ensure consistency of concepts with previous sessions.

- Ineffective, should focus more on relevant samples than the number of samples. Focus on demostration of how tro establish the RM rather than showing samples. More on the what and how to do it.
- Yes, able to discuss the subject matter accordingly.
- Effective speaker and knowledgeable of the topic.
- Yes.
- Yes, she has a well rounded knowledge of her subject matter.
- Yes, she definitely did well in discussing the topic.
- Yes, she was able to explaoin the topic well.
- Yes, Ms. Paloma knows the topic and has provided samples for the applications of the RM concepts and
- Yes, she is effective, she explained well and in an organized manner.
- She is an SME on the topic.
- Yes.
- Yes, very good.
- The speaker was effective due to her knowledge and communication skills.
- Yes, the speaker was very engaging.
- Effective in conveying the topic well.
- Yes, she is an effective speaker. She delivered her topic very well.

B. What is the best thing you can say about him?
- Engaging and clear in discussing.
- Clear and concise presentation confident about the topic.
- Voice is modulated.
- She's good.
- She shows eagerness in showing her expertise.
- She establish rapport and is lively.
- She provided concrete examples of existing RMs.
- She levels her explanation to her students.
- She is thprough and deliberate when explaining the topic.
- Considerate to participants.
- She is a recommendable speaker.
- She provided good examples of RM documents from local and overseas.
- Able to share her experience.
- Considerate.
- Articulate speaker.

C. Please suggest ways and means in which he can improve this particular module/topic.
- Seems that soemof the principles discussed are inconsistent with what has been taught from the previos discussion; session objectives were not laid down at the beginning; workshop session was only applicable to all levels of RM units-should consider workshop to be applicable to all levels of RM in participating agencies; concepts discussed were based on readings, would have appreciated first hand experience/practical knowledge.
- Additional instruct materials.
- She is very effective and continue the good work.
- Maybe by providing us of hard copiesof the reference and sample materials even after the session.
- n/a she is okay.
- More examples that are simpler/easier to understand.
- Maybe ensure if the samples provided are updated.
- More examples.
- Maybe to inject some humor on the topic.
- The intro activity was good. However, the structure of the topic became unclear as we went through the session, and many of the slides are unrelatable/floating. It would probably be better to take off from the three types of establishing RM and give CONCRETE steps on how top put in place/improve the RM unit-and then inject ESSENTIALS throughout. Also it would be better to just lift only the most applicable best practices from the source documents rather than going through it as a whole.
- Perhaps she can also present RM under local setting-status of implementation.
- She is very good now but can be excellent.
- More time needed to maximize learning.