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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Coady International Institute is the international extension of St. Francis Xavier University’s (StFX) commitment to social justice. Coady is a centre of excellence in self-directed community-based development, with a worldwide network of over 4,400 graduates and partners in more than 130 countries, in work related to helping under-privileged Southern communities to improve their living conditions.

Coady supports poverty alleviation through education of development professionals, creation and dissemination of knowledge relevant to sustainable livelihoods; building peace and prosperity; and strengthening democratic capacities in civil society as pre-conditions for development. Within the framework of its Education for Democracy Peace and Prosperity (EDPP) program is a five-month Diploma in Community-Based Development. It provides opportunities for experienced, mid- to senior-level managers and development practitioners from Southern countries to share and enhance their knowledge of innovative practices, contemporary issues and trends at micro and macro levels relevant to their communities. There are also various related one-month Certificate programs. Through these programs Coady EDPP facilitates community leaders in learning and strengthening their capacities, leading to stronger organizations that effect change in poverty alleviation.

This Evaluation is intended to assess Coady performance in implementing EDPP, to provide input to CIDA and Coady planning, and to share lessons learned.

Appropriateness of Coady/EDPP Design

EDPP very appropriately serves Coady’s unique role within StFX of exposure to global management issues affecting rural communities, especially in the South. The Program encompasses all of Coady’s objectives, strategies and activities while responding to needs identified by its Southern partners and their communities, and addressing CIDA’s priority of sustainable poverty reduction.

Self-driven development is a strong integrating factor among all Coady programs. It is founded in the early Antigonish cooperative movement, grounded in best practice of adult education, and pervasive in Coady’s education programs at StFX, overseas, and in distance education. It is also a key success factor that has earned prominence in the asset-based community development (ABCD), which enhances self-reliance by focusing on assets/strengths of individuals, communities and organizations, and especially of women in poor communities.

Coady/EDPP Diploma and Certificate programs bring program participants together from various North and South backgrounds, enabling valuable exchanges of ideas and experiences about global international development as well as learning of best practice in community related development.

The design, implementation and relevance of programs could be improved if Coady professionals had more opportunity to understand participants, prior to their arrival, and if there were more systematic use of Southern organizations and professionals.

Some interns placed overseas by Coady under CIDA’s Youth Action Program are said by people met by the Evaluator to have been too inexperienced to be of much help in development projects; some are said to have added some value, some to have been marginalized and some to not have had enough time to learn or contribute very much.

Partnerships

Coady relations with Southern and Canadian partners are noted generally for their openness, flexibility, responsiveness and relevance to Southern partner communities and organizations. More specifically, Coady partnerships are seen to be providing valuable contributions to the conceptualization and
theoretical bases for sustainable asset-based community development, as well as models for action research/learning, and regular monitoring/evaluation. Strengths of Coady relations with Southern partners include revitalization and nurturing of individual, community and organizational self-reliance.

At a very practical level, an important lesson learned is that even people in very poor communities have been able gain a sense of hope and the energy to progress with appropriate facilitation focussed on their using their own strengths of knowledge and experience in planning and implementing action to improve their lives.

Experience with Egypt’s CEOSS suggests that stronger and longer-term results of EDPP in Southern organizations seem likely to be achieved to the extent that more of their managers attend Coady/EDPP.

Relevance of Intended Results
Statements in the Coady proposal (March 2003) of intended outputs, outcomes, and impacts, and in the Program Report (June 2005), of achievements, refer to EDPP accomplishments, which are relevant to priorities of CIDA, Coady/EDPP, and partners in the South. For example, Coady is said to enable program participants, graduates, communities, and organizations to ‘drive’ their own development based on their strengths/assets; to promote inclusiveness in community decision-making; to engender male/female mutual respect and equality; to reduce dependencies on outside resources; and to achieve development targets.

However, the EDPP LFA and June/05 Progress Report, respectively, understate Coady’s intended and achieved results. Statements of output level results in these two documents refer mainly to the numbers of program participants who ‘enhance their knowledge, skills…’ or who complete Coady courses or programs, or the number of courses held, or papers produced, and the like. These are appropriate, relevant and necessary activities or competed activities. However, ‘results’, at the output level, according to CIDA RBM expectations and evaluation guides, would be ‘the consequences’ in improved development capacities, actions or effects of such completed activities. For Coady and partners such consequences would most often be produced in Southern communities as a consequence of Coady graduates or partners applying what they learned with Coady. Reporting of activities and completed activities at or by Coady as output results, rather than as part of operations, completed activities, and products, understates the magnitude of actual development results that Coady, its professionals, programs, graduates and partners were found by this Evaluation to be actually achieving. The recent Coady Tracer Study (Appendix C, especially Section 5) is much more focussed on relevant consequent ‘results’ of Coady/EDPP.

Appropriateness of Resources and their Utilization
Suggestions from Coady senior levels that EDPP programs and professionals need more focus and quality interaction may be related to Coady’s competent dedicated professionals having much to do, sometimes away from their peers and in remote Southern locations. In contrast, program participants and graduates praised Coady executives’ and professionals’ consistent focus on the principles and applications of self-directed individual, community and organizational capacity development. They appreciated Coady professionals’ effective facilitation of their own learning, and application of principles of individual, community and organizational driven development, that is consistent with Coady’s Adult Education, CBRM and ABCD Programs. Self-driven development is a guiding principle found across Coady/EDPP programs and activities, and an integrating concept upon which Coady’s programs and activities either are, or could be, focused.

Coady should continue to focus programs for development practitioners and organizations at the leading edge of best practice in facilitating individual, community and organization driven development for poverty reduction and sustainability. Although Coady should avoid broadening or diversifying too much while maintaining the current appropriate mix of programming, Coady should continue to deepen...
program quality, coherence, appropriateness and responsiveness, including with partners in widely dispersed geographic, cultural and political settings to enable continued strengthening of understanding, and the practice of responsiveness for self-driven asset-based development in widely differing contexts.

Quality of interaction and coherence among Coady professionals and programs is a priority for Coady that might be addressed with a schedule of rotating opportunities for different Coady strategic areas to organize seminars for all Coady professionals for leading edge information sharing. Success of such a schedule would require a coordinated travel schedule that would ensure that all Coady professionals would be available for the seminars.

Coady should continue and accelerate development of tracking, monitoring and evaluation systems, and establish medium-term (five year) strategic plans for deepening and enhancing Coady’s resource base, including more use of resources in the South.

Coady should consult with CIDA on the appropriateness of dedicating some or all of CIDA funding to particular results of EDPP that are deemed most relevant to CIDA priorities, and establishing monitoring processes to report on progress towards and actual achievement of these particular results.

**Adequacy of Informed and Timely Action**

Program participants praise Coady’s provision of educational reference materials relevant to ABCD and CBRM. They also found most visits to Antigonish to be very useful, but thought Coady should get early feedback about them to enable adjusting any that are too short or too few for effective learning. A number of participants thought Coady could do more to understand and reconcile some African participants’ discomfort with some cafeteria food and meals, and to identify and assist a very few participants who needed financial help for personal basic needs and dignity, but were afraid to ask. Coady professionals noted that generally needs more information about program participants before they arrive.

**Achievement of Intended and Unintended Results**

Significant results (outputs outcomes, impacts) are reportedly being achieved as a consequence of Coady graduates who return to the South and apply what they have learned. Generally, the results reflect improved understanding and application in Southern communities of self-reliant asset-based community development that works.

Coady reporting should better distinguish completed EDPP activities (graduates with new knowledge) from their consequent results produced by graduates back in their home communities, or elsewhere in the South. Coady’s recent progress on electronic tracking, monitoring, and evaluation systems is improving significantly its results-based reporting. Improvement should continue, specifically with the significant distinction between completed activities and their developmental consequence or ‘results’.

**Relevance and Cost-Effectiveness of Actual Results**

Coady’s Certificate and Diploma programs are very relevant for Southern communities’ direction of their own capacity development for sustainable poverty reduction, as verified by actual accomplishments of Southern communities in which Coady professionals and graduates have played facilitative roles. The programs are cost-effective compared to other, longer-term programs, often at undergraduate level, which are more expensive and viewed as less practical. However, Coady is capable of greater cost-effectiveness through more delivery of the programs by appropriate Southern professionals in Southern venues. The emphasis of the ABCD approach, and on communities identifying and using their own assets, improves the chances of relevance, cost-effectiveness and sustainability.
Lessons Learned
Coady Program Initiatives:

- Coady EDPP report to CIDA focussed on the consequences of completed EDPP activities, like graduated program participants, in Southern communities would enable CIDA understanding of actual results and cost-effectiveness.
- Some EDPP programs may be too intense to allow adequate reflection.
- Facilitating interaction of program participants and professionals is a key to continued effective learning.
- Using more Southern facilitators and locations to deliver EDPP would be cost-effective and support deserving applicants who are approved by Coady but cannot obtain Canadian entry visas.
- More attention is needed for problems of African youth and children and the false stigma attached to HIV/AIDS widows;
- Coady EDPP reports to CIDA focussed on results in Southern communities would enable CIDA understanding of actual results and cost-effectiveness.

CIDA VSPD should consider clarifying its expectations for its partners’ RBM reporting, including the distinction between completed activities and their consequences, which are ‘results.’

Results in Southern Communities

- Southern partners’ development begins with their ownership and knowledge of the processes.
- ABCD is proving effective and may be sustainable.
- Southern partner communities and people understand their aspirations, problems and constraints and prefer assistance that facilitates their direction and management of their own development.
- Facilitators must respect communities’ capacities and what they believe they need to know.
- Women are empowered by participation in facilitative approaches.
- Changes in communities take time and responsibilities related to abilities and personalities.

Responsiveness in facilitating community driven asset-based development may be enhanced through exposure to widely different geographic, cultural and political contexts.

Recommendations

Coady should continue:

- Exposure for Antigonish communities to global development issues;
- Responsiveness to Southern partner driven priorities for ABCD for sustainable poverty reduction;
- Promotion of individual and community driven development that is
  - Founded in the Antigonish Movement
  - Grounded in adult education,
  - Integrated in all Coady programs,
  - A key success factor in ABCD and CBRM, and
  - Enhanced by focus on assets and on women;
- Avoiding broadening or diversifying its current appropriate mix of programming;
- Developing program appropriateness and responsiveness in widely dispersed contexts to strengthen approaches to individual and community driven asset-based development;
- Enhancing quality interaction among programs by rotating responsibility of Coady centres to organize seminars for leading-edge information sharing;
- Improving information available to Coady management about incoming program participants to enable improved responsiveness to them;
- Establishing medium-term (five year) strategic planning to deepen and enhance Coady’s resource base, including more delivery and use of resources in the South;
- Consulting with CIDA on EDPP appropriateness and include consideration of dedicating some or all of CIDA funding to particular results of EDPP, relevant to CIDA priorities, with monitoring and reporting on their progress and achievements;
- Accelerating development of tracking, monitoring, and evaluation systems;
- Using more Southern venues, facilitators, and other professionals to improve cost-effectiveness;
- Discussion with CIDA about HRDC/CIDA YAP evaluation of strengths and weaknesses relative to Coady interns and their participating host organizations.
INTRODUCTION

The Coady International Institute is the international extension of St. Francis Xavier University’s (StFX) commitment to social justice. Coady has promoted community self-reliance and educated community leaders from around the world since 1959. It is now a centre of excellence in self-directed community-based development, with a worldwide network of over 4,400 graduates and partners in more than 130 countries, working to improve the lives of underprivileged women, men and children.

Coady supports poverty alleviation through sustainable livelihoods; building peace and prosperity; and strengthening democratic capacities in civil society as pre-conditions for development. Coady designs and delivers a range of practical, results-based educational programs; engages in practical action research/learning partnerships in Canada and in countries of the South; produces scholarly and informative publications; coordinates knowledge networks for ‘best practice’ in sustainable development; and remains active in public education in Atlantic Canada. Coady’s 4,700 graduates work with millions of people in over 130 countries to build the fair, prosperous and secure world. They work within their communities and societies to help people find and use opportunities to earn a sustainable living, to enable children to go to school, to prevent the devastating spread of HIV/AIDS and other diseases; to ensure honest and effective government; to utilize natural resources in a sustainable way; and to promote peace – all in keeping with the Millennium Development Goals.

Coady’s ‘flagship’ program is a five-month Diploma in Community-Based Development. It provides opportunities for experienced, mid- to senior-level managers and development practitioners from Southern countries, to share and enhance their knowledge of innovative practices, and contemporary issues and trends at micro and macro levels relevant to their communities. Practioners study core courses, electives and areas of specialization in development work. Coady also has related Certificate programs which each provide in-depth instruction and analyses in an area of specialization.

Coady’s teaching professionals are development practitioners and educators with extensive field experience in North America, Asia, Africa and Latin America. As skilled facilitators, they use participatory adult education methods to draw out the insights and experiences of learners, and to introduce them to new ideas and approaches relevant to their own environments.

Coady has established its place at the leading edge of evolving concepts and practices of forms of capacity development appropriate for Southern communities. A capacity development concept had begun to emerge from donor support in the 1970s and 1980s for professional and technical education and training of individuals to strengthen organizations, institutions and sectors. It became discredited partly as a continuation of the colonial North teaching the South how it should develop, and partly because education of individuals alone was proven inadequate to strengthen the capacities intended for improved development, without attention to strengthening related enabling organizational, institutional, sectoral, and legislative environments. Some support shifted to enable learning from exemplary Southern experiences, through South-South and North-South partnerships, with the North in less proactive and more enabling roles. Coady, for example, began supporting self-driven Southern organizations, like the SEWA Bank in India. From the 1980s to mid-1990s CIDA’s Policy Branch, the UNDP, and others produced papers exploring more comprehensive approaches to organizational, institutional and sectoral capacity development in international development. A breakthrough seems evident in the late 1990s, and well represented in a UNDP paper’s emphasis on self-directed assessment of organizational strengths.

---

1 Annual Report 2004–2004, Coady International Institute, Francis Xavier University, March 31/05
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and weaknesses as an integral part of strategic planning and management for organizational and broader capacity development.

Today, Coady’s approaches to ABCD reflect current best practice in capacity development at community and organizational levels. These approaches add value by replacing a focus on weaknesses or deficits with emphasis on the assets, or strengths of the community, its organizations and its individuals. Coady facilitates communities to identify their development priorities, direct their own development and use their existing strengths to progress towards their priority outcomes.

CIDA’s current priorities for its investments in international development, including through Coady, do not differ substantively in 2006 from what they were in 2003, when support for the current phase of Coady/EDPP was approved. CIDA’s key priorities and expected results remain focussed on sustainable economic and social development that improves living standards of poor women, men, girls and boys within sustainable environmental and democratic governmental development.3

Coady’s Education for Democracy Peace and Prosperity program (EDPP) encompasses virtually all of Coady’s objectives, strategies, activities and accomplishments. CIDA’s contribution ($Cdn3m) to Coady is almost 20% of the EDPP proposed budget (March 2003), but it is not tied to specific elements within Coady or EDPP. It is intended to assist Coady and EDPP, where necessary, to contribute to:

• Improved social economic opportunities and conditions for disadvantage people in communities;
• A stronger role for all people in the governance of their societies; and
• A more peaceful and healthy environment in which to live and raise future generations. 4

CIDA expects this Evaluation to assess Coady performance in implementing the EDPP Program:
• To inform CIDA/CPB/VSP decisions on future requests for EDPP funding;
• To provide input to Coady’s plans for future programming; and
• To share lessons learned with stakeholders.

CIDA’s more specific objectives for this Evaluation coincide with its Framework of Evaluation Results and Key Success Factors,5 which this Evaluation Report addresses in order relative to the life of EDPP, and which form the headings of sections one to nine in this report.

Coady Directors’ and professionals’ priorities for this evaluation were found to include:
• Assessing Coady’s need for improved focus of programs, activities and resources to continue and to improve quality interaction and coherence among programs and staff, considering:
  • Any need to increase focus on principles and programs of Asset Based Community Development (ABCD), micro-financing, peace and advocacy, and/or adult education, research and teaching programs;
  • A caution that increased focus could reduce current valuable interaction among Coady professionals and program participants; and
  • That some observers suggest that Coady/EDPP seems to be too active in too many small communities in different countries in three Southern continents.
• Assessing how well Coady is fulfilling its general mandate of knowledge generation, dissemination, learning, and application by graduates and other clients, especially in the South; and
• Learning from alumni and other partners about the effectiveness and impact of Coady programs

5 Framework of Results and Key Success Factors, CIDA Mar/00, reprinted in CIDA Evaluation Guide, October 2004, p.97
for partner communities and where impact is greatest.

Information collection for this Evaluation included document reviews interviews with StFX and Coady executives, professionals and staff; interviews in Kenya with graduates, and phone conversations and/or e-mail exchanges with some. Most questions posed were ‘open-ended’ to allow respondents to express ideas that were most important to them.

1.0 APPROPRIATENESS OF EDPP DESIGN

1.1 General Strengths and Weaknesses of Coady EDPP

The President of St. Francis Xavier University emphasized that the Coady International Institute serves unique roles for the University in the education of community leaders from Canada and overseas, both on-campus and in the rural context of Nova Scotia. Coady also provides StFX with a window on more global leadership management issues in rural communities of the South. In these roles Coady appropriately encourages and participates in interaction among relevant leaders, managers, and stakeholders at all levels for learning experiences focused on shared objectives for future outcomes.

Actual overall Coady EDPP operations and activities are seen to be appropriately designed, with multiple opportunities for Southern program participants to share knowledge and experience among themselves and Coady professionals. These opportunities involve teaching programs, action research/learning projects, writing and publishing activities, and exposure to exemplary Antigonish communities, as well as visiting speakers and other professionals representing various development contexts relevant to the South.

Such exchanges are seen to enhance reflection and transformation within and among Coady programs, professionals, and especially Southern program participants, who are encouraged to experiment with, and appropriately apply, new relevant knowledge, skills, and approaches in the real context of their Southern communities. Program participants at Coady for a 2nd time to continue their professional development often confirmed that such relevant expertise was indeed being appropriately applied.

Some other related design strengths mentioned were Coady’s:

• Long-term commitment to the right mix of professionals in development education, research and practice;
• Continuous organizational learning, responsiveness, adaptability; and
• Holistic approach to practical facilitation and empowerment of people to change themselves, using their own knowledge and other potential assets.

Many program participants interviewed agreed with a Kenyan graduate’s view that Coady’s approaches to participatory community development helped participants to learn the value to capacity development, peace promotion and conflict resolution, of:

• Increasing/improving individual and community driven identification of priorities;
• Planning throughout the project cycle; and
• Monitoring and evaluating progress towards, and achievement of, objectives.

Other credits to Coady programs from a group of East African women program participants included:
• Empowering individuals to make decisions, especially women who began to feel that ‘they were people’ who had something to offer;
• Emphasis on gender and development with women in ‘high’ positions;
• Approaches to facilitating, enabling, and participating;
• Exposure to varieties of cultures, generations, and development situations beyond scholar’s own experiences;
• Interaction that enabled improved knowledge of one’s self, within a broader context;
• The stark contrast to professors back home; and
• Coady facilitators who would not say what was ‘best’ on some issues.

A group of Zambian female and male program participants in Coady programs and some in StFX as well, supported many of the above ideas and added that:
• Flexibility to choose courses and independent study was appreciated;
• There could be fewer mandatory courses;
• Independent study was ‘great’, for some, difficult for others, and should be optional;
• Some aspects of Coady programs that were most relevant to Zambia were:
  • Micro-enterprise and community development,
  • Interaction among community aid workers,
  • Adult education especially related to effects of globalization,
  • Self-generated gender analyses, and
  • Re-enforcement that ‘we should be masters of our own destinies’.

Coady’s ABCD Program with partners in Kenya, Ethiopia and the Philippines represents some of Coady’s most responsive programming as both Canadian and Southern partners learn to adapt to the Southern partners’ increased and improved decision-making, priority setting initiatives, and management of their own development.
• A co-manager of the ABCD Group thought its strengths are its ample resources, strategic planning, strong partnerships and relevance to intended beneficiaries.
• A manager from OXFAM Canada, Coady’s partner in Ethiopia, noted that the adjustment by committed Canadian and Ethiopian partners to Ethiopian self-direction of their ABCD project was well established in about six months.
• A Kenyan NGO leader involved in ABCD action research/learning described the Coady’s major strengths as facilitating program participants to gain knowledge relevant to practical development to achieve their potentials, and to value participatory approaches.
• A focus group of five women program participants thought Coady program strengths included:
  • ABCD relevance to poor communities’ need to adjust to the reduced consumption of local produce as a result of competitive products of the increasingly globalized economy (like coco-cola replacing local fruit juices);
  • The relevance of ‘leaky bucket’ analyses for identifying assets/losses;
  • Enabling interaction of people from a wide variety of countries;
  • Assistance with independent studies of problems in a scholar’s own community.

The Coady Youth in Partnership Program (YIP) is intended for Canadian men and women university graduates, 19-30 years of age, to get experience and qualifications in sustainable development activities in international settings. YIP is funded through CIDA, separately from EDPP, by the Youth Action Program (YAP) of Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC), which gives similar support to over 40 other Canadian organizations, besides CIDA, for various programs to assist Canadian youth to gain experience in the world of work. Coady’s YIP has
supported almost 100 youth interns in placements with Southern partners, including the Africa Youth Parliament.\textsuperscript{6} Consistent with HRDC’s YAP, CIDA/Coady’s YIP is designed to enhance Canadian graduates’ employability through a one-month training program, followed by a six-month work assignment with Coady’s Southern partners in international development. This experience is intended to help Canadian graduates get some of the two years of international experience usually required to get a job in international development. Feedback from interns about their internships is very positive.

Although YIP funding from HRDC through CIDA is separate from CIDA funding for EDPP, the Evaluation terms of reference refer to the YIP, and so the evaluator was scheduled to meet two YIP interns in Nairobi. One suggested that Coady knowledge and international experience seemed good for most internship positions. Another, posted at the African Youth Parliament in Nairobi, thought the two weeks of training he received at Coady appropriately introduced him to the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) and to ongoing regionalization in Africa, i.e., African Union. A spokesman for the African Youth Parliament noted that the Canadian intern provided manpower to complete a document that was very relevant to African regionalization.

**General Weaknesses of Coady EDPP Design**

A number of current and past program participants contacted remarked that the low bursaries provided to them, with the expectation that they raise the needed additional money for air tickets and personal spending including food, was a hardship for some. It was said to have resulted in some ‘de-humanizing’ experiences for a few program participants, who were said to have found themselves without adequate food while travelling and pocket money generally. This issue was raised by a group of mature program participants, and others who were very concerned that such a hardship was being experienced by a few of their peers.

One Coady professional suggested that a lack of coherence in Coady might be reducing opportunities for organizational learning. Some suggest there may be a need to crystallize how best to improve coherence and ‘integrate team members’ efforts. It was suggested that coherence around Coady’s methodology or approach to individual and community driven education and development might be effective.

The StFX, Coady, and Antigonish environment are said by most program participants interviewed to represent exciting and valuable new experiences for most visiting program participants. However, it was also seen by some to be too different from their own cultures. Variations in language gave some program participants more difficulty than others in understanding relevant links between their experiences at Coady and their own development situations. One suggestion to enable improved understanding and relevance was to have more and longer visits to the Antigonish communities.

The Youth Internship Program could be improved, according to various sources:

- Interns spend only one month at Coady before being placed in a development organization and setting in the South for six months. This does not meet a usual requirement for two years of related employment.

\textsuperscript{6} Coady interns at the African Youth Parliament were initially provided through NEPAD, which is described as a vision and strategic framework provided under a mandate given to the five initiating Heads of African States (Algeria, Egypt, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa) by the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) to develop an integrated socio-economic development framework for Africa.
• Some are placed with NGOs like CREADIS in Kenya, which has a strong relationship with Coady programs. However, many others go to organizations where the relationship with Coady programs and fieldwork is weak.
• Some are very young, inexperienced and travelling out of Canada, as well as learning about developing countries, for the first time. They learn and contribute little. This might be improved if their visits were longer with more structured or focussed opportunities for experience.

A Kenyan graduate suggested that the theoretical base for Coady courses on ABCD could be fortified with an integrated field component to demonstrate and facilitate learning about the principles and actual application of the approach. The Evaluator notes that this is well provided for some graduate program participants who become involved in ABCD action learning/research activities after they return home. Visits to Antigonish communities are intended partly to serve this purpose, but language difficulties and the shortness of visits were impediments. One Coady professional suggested that there is some confusion with the use of the term ‘assets’.

A female Kenyan considered one month for the Certificate Program to be far too short. She thought a minimum of two-to-three months would be just adequate, and should include more attention to monitoring and evaluation.

Some program participants thought:
• Gender Policy Planning and Gender Development courses should be one course;
• Two facilitators are not necessary for a course if one is inactive most of the time;
• Some facilitators were knowledgeable in their subject, but not in facilitating learning;
• Program participants needed and wanted more time to learn about the effects of globalization and approaches they might use for helping their communities reduce its negative impacts;
• Some programs could benefit from use of more facilitators from the South especially in relation to gender equity and development issues.

Some potential Ethiopian program participants applied for study at Coady, were accepted and then found that it was not possible to get a visa from the Canadian Embassy.

1.2 Appropriateness for CIDA

CIDA’s overall priority for results in sustainable poverty reduction in poor communities is consistently addressed throughout EDPP activities and products, with the very necessary emphasis on the people in these communities controlling their own development resources, planning, implementation and results. CIDA considers Coady and its professionals to be valued facilitating partners in these processes. One Coady professional noted that CIDA has increased attention to ‘good governance’, which Coady relates to ‘participatory governance’, and that CIDA and Coady should clarify/articulate any improvements CIDA may expect in this regard.

Coady’s ABCD focus on helping communities strengthen their capacities for their own self-directed development is at the leading edge of current best practice in capacity development for CIDA’s priority of sustainable poverty reduction.

1.3 Appropriateness for Coady

The CIDA support to EDPP assists Coady to remain true to its history of community involvement
through partnerships with Antigonish, Nova Scotia, Canadian and Southern communities and organizations. The Youth Internship Program’s opportunities for young professionals are seen to have helped to open-up Coady’s relations with StFX students, especially females.

1.4 Appropriateness for Southern Partners and Program Participants

Strengths of the Coady Diploma Program design, according to Coady Diploma graduates now back in their Southern home development work, include:

- Female program participants’ exposure to wide varieties of female roles in different cultures;
- Approaches to GAD, which emphasized both male and female roles;
- The program being full-time, in-depth and yet sufficiently broad and well organized;
- Instructors who are flexible, facilitative and responsive to program participants;
- Continuous access to sources of relevant information though e-mail and the Coady web site;
- The emphasis on participation of all relevant stakeholders in capacity development;
- Enabling partners and participants of community work and development:
  - To share and learn from new experiences together,
  - To learn the importance of working with others, collaborating, and building relationships,
  - To avoid directing and telling individuals and communities what they should do in developing their capacities to improve their development, and
  - To learn the values, approaches, and techniques of facilitating, enabling, and encouraging individuals, organizations, and communities:
    - To identify and resolve their own problems,
    - To make decisions on the development they need and how to go about it, i.e., self reliance/self-directed development, and
    - To stimulate each person and community, even the very poor, to understand and believe in their own strengths, abilities, capacities or assets that they can begin to use more in their own development.

The above positive views are verified in the documentation of Coady action research/learning partnerships for poverty reduction, through the asset-based approach to community development, including with OXFAM Canada and communities in Ethiopia, SEARSOLIN for facilitating action research, learning and implementation of ABCD in the Philippines, and similarly SEWA in India for facilitation relevant to community micro-financing.

According to a Coady graduate, now at CREADIS, Kenya, Coady’s facilitation of CREADIS has appropriately enabled that organization’s:

- Strategic planning with a vision of communities empowered for sustainable livelihoods, social justice, gender equality, and human rights,
- Establishing of programs in (1) Sustainable Agriculture and Environmental Management; (2) Research in Gender Equity and Advocacy; (3) Health and Nutrition; (4) Community Savings Mobilization and Credit;
- Hosting of YIP interns, with positive results, and ongoing action research in ABCD;
- Achieving observable results in one to 1.5 years, including improved maize production (from an average of five to ten bags of maize); general food security, storage and diversification; and a pro-active community with government involvement.

Coady professionals believe that the program:

- Appropriately helps Southern communities to improve female roles, relations, opportunities, etc., as evidenced by women being seen generally to have improving equality with men;
• Should continue adapting to remain relevant and appropriate as Southern partners change.

A group of women program participants from India, Nigeria, Bangladesh and Ethiopia considered Coady programs to be very appropriate. They intended to return home to continue their work or to new work that they hoped to do, including supporting:
• Female-headed households and single mothers to improve standards of living, income and health, especially for marginalized women and children in slum areas, and in relation to HIV AIDS, the environment, and generally to improve participation and empowerment of women;
• Small NGOs in training and capacity building, especially in GAD, child care, and women’s income-generation, including training in operating day care centres and in community development; and/or
• Advocacy campaigns for popular education, human resources development, education and research on community needs for education, and partnerships with NGOs.

Weaknesses mentioned by some current program participants and graduates:
• The program was too short, as were some field trips that were also too few to learn adequately about actual practices in some Nova Scotian communities;
• Action research/learning should be mandatory and relevant to priorities at program participants’ communities;
• Forums with 60-80 program participants of very different backgrounds were a problem for some. Program participants suggested having an initial short introductory session for the whole group and then smaller groups of 15-20 for more in-depth presentation/discussion;
• YIP interns’ time in Southern organizations involved in EDPP was long enough for them to make some positive contributions, and to introduce them to new cultural practices, issues etc., but not long enough to enable them to gain related employment;
• Coady should use more Southern professionals as trainers, researchers, managers and authors.

1.5 Appropriate Use of Experimentation, Creativity, and Lessons Learned

Coady professionals are seen to be consistently exploring and experimenting to identify and adjust to lessons learned from their own experiences and those of others in international development.

At the heart of Coady’s ABCD Program approach is the same respect for self-driven development that is at the core of its Adult Education Program. Coady’s Certificate and Diploma programs enable Southern program participants and practitioners to learn best practice in development including in adult-education, micro-finance and ABCD. Action research/learning programs document progress towards and achievement of intended results and lessons learned. In recent months Coady has added to its complement of professionals with a Program Associate Monitoring and Evaluation, who has already developed some of the much needed systems to track and poll graduates to obtain reliable information on how well Coady is achieving intended objectives. Coady is an organization of learners, some of whom suggest that there is room to improve with more systematized responsiveness to the natural inclination of Coady’s Southern partners for driving their own development.

1.6 Conclusions on Appropriateness of Coady/EDPP Design

1. EDPP very appropriately:
   • Serves Coady’s unique role in StFX of exposure to global management issues affecting rural communities, especially in the South;
• Encompasses all of Coady’s objectives, strategies and activities;
• Responds to needs identified by its Southern partners and their communities; and
• Addresses CIDA’s priority of sustainable poverty reduction.

2. Self-driven development is a strong integrating factor among all Coady programs. It is:
• Founded in the Antigonish cooperative movement;
• Grounded in best practice of adult education;
• Pervasive in Coady’s education programs at StFX, overseas, and in distance education;
• A key success factor with deserved prominence in the ABCD concept; and
• Enhanced by the focus on assets/strengths of individuals, communities and organizations;
  and especially on women in poor communities.

3. Coady/EDPP Diploma and Certificate programs bring program participants together from
various North and South backgrounds, enabling valuable exchanges of ideas and experiences
about global international development as well as learning of best practice in community
related development.

4. The CIDA YIP experience for youth is generally far short of the two or more years of such
experience usually required to pay-off in actual related jobs. Some interns placed overseas by
Coady are said to have gained some added value in facilitating the learning of others, in
contrast to others who are said to be marginalized or not have time to learn/contribute much.

5. Some Coady professionals think they should all have a better understanding of Southern
program participants before program participants arrive, to enable improved relevance of
Coady services to the program participants.

6. There is room for improving the effectiveness of large forums by breaking them into small
groups to encourage interaction and learning.

2.0 PARTNERSHIPS

2.1 The Key Partners and Strengths and Weaknesses of Partnerships

Coady is valued very highly at StFX for continuing the university’s supportive relations with
Atlantic Canadian communities, especially for extending those relations through experiences with
program participants from the South. Coady also pursues broad regional public engagement
throughout Atlantic Canada through publishing in the Chronicle Herald, appearing on regional
television, and hosting major events in Halifax.

The involvement of Canadian and Southern partners in Coady programs is seen by Coady
professionals to be enhancing program relevance. International program participants visit small
rural communities in the Antigonish region, especially to learn how these communities exercise
self-driven development in building and maintaining sustainable livelihoods. Generally, the
visiting program participants considered the visits to be useful and interesting. They appreciated
that people in the communities were interested in discussing their experiences with Southern
program participants. However, two short visits were not enough for some program participants
to adequately understand the problems and experiences of the Antigonish communities to draw
relevant lessons for their own communities. Longer visits or four field trips, rather than two short
visits, were suggested to be more effective.

An OXFAM Canada/Coady partnership began in 2003 with a jointly proposed ABCD project
with three Ethiopian partners. OXFAM now assists implementation in Ethiopia, while Coady
supports conceptualization, training and assessment data collection twice a year. A senior
OXFAM manager finds few weaknesses in the partnership with Coady professionals, who are
seen to be open and flexible in learning about and adjusting to particular conditions in Southern communities where Coady had had little or no experience. Coady professionals are seen to be especially interested in people’s own perceptions of their communities’ priority development problems, aspirations and opportunities, and in how best Coady might facilitate communities in directing their own development.

OXFAM funded its Country Representative in Ethiopia to complete a course at Coady. That representative found that the strengths of the Ethiopian partners’ complimented Coady’s facilitation, because the Ethiopians were ready to take initiatives, internalize lessons, and implement their adapted approaches to ABCD in spite of frequent staff turnover.

Increasingly, through field-work and action research/learning, Coady is seen to be improving its understanding of appropriate approaches to facilitating Southern communities in their planning, implementation, assessment, and a adjustment of their own development (see 1.4 above).

2.2 Involvement of Southern Partners in the Programs

Coady’s and OXFAM’s Ethiopian partners include REST, KMG and Hundee, all committed to human dignity, prosperity, and rights-based economic and social development. Together, their facilitation of marginalised communities’ direction of their own development includes ABCD approaches organized around common issues of sustainable livelihoods, as well as revitalisation of proven traditional community-based support systems and institutions. This is no small task, as many communities were becoming more used to donor relief models of development that provide funding to select outside agencies, companies, and/or large international INGOs or local NGOs to implement, and unfortunately often impose, development on people and communities.

Other notable examples of Coady partnerships include a long-term relation with SEWA, India, in a partnership for learning and adapting approaches to teaching and implementing appropriate systems for community based micro-financing; and another with CEOSS, Egypt, where an unprecedented nine of eleven senior managers are Coady graduates

2.3 Conclusions on Partnerships

Coady relations with Southern and Canadian partners are noted generally for their openness, flexibility, responsiveness and relevance to both Southern and Antigonish rural partner communities and organizations.

More specifically, Coady partnerships are seen to be providing valuable contributions to:

- Conceptualization and theoretical bases for sustainable community development;
- Models for action research/learning and regular monitoring; and
- Revitalization and nurturing of self-driven development of Southern partners.

Some possible lessons learned at very practical levels include:

- Even very poor communities, faced with drought, have been able gain a sense of hope and energy to progress when appropriately facilitated to focus on and use their own strengths of knowledge and experience in planning and implementing action for improving their lives (as reported for ABCD in Ethiopia by Canadian and Ethiopian OXFAM workers);
- Stronger and longer-term results of EDPP in Southern organizations may be increased by more of their managers attending EDPP, as in Egypt’s CEOSS.
3.0 RELEVANCE OF INTENDED RESULTS

3.1 Relevance to Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Development in the South

Sustainable poverty reduction in developing countries is CIDA’s overall priority. Coady programs and activities are all relevant to self-directed sustainable capacity development for poverty reduction.

Coady is a champion of reducing the incidence of development decisions made by people and organizations other than by those for whom development for poverty reduction is intended. Coady works to increase the incidence of people and communities in poverty directing of their own decision-making in using the resources and assets that they already have, or are available to them for implementing their own development.

Two Kenyan development practitioners credit Coady with helping them to understand that a priority for reducing poverty and building a better society is to be more inclusive of the society’s members, including not only poor but wealthy and others, in making informed decisions. They also learned the importance of finding ways to change attitudes and values about the equality of males and females. Obstacles to such change include the lack of resources (money and facilities), as well as abilities to conceptualize change in the midst of established rigid historical, cultural, social, and organizational norms.

A Kenyan graduate of Coady, now involved with Save the Children UK’s integrated program for HIV Aids in Africa, recalls that the Coady Director and a particular facilitator were very professional and strong in the delivery of courses in income generation and micro-finance in a manner that helped her to focus on, and understand, her work back home. She thought her visits to communities in Antigonish had helped her to learn how she might improve her work in partnership with poor communities, and to respond to their particular needs and opportunities.

Five women students in a focus group noted that Coady graduates whom they met in their countries, were all very positive about Coady having enabled these alumni to apply what they had learned to later help poor communities to improve and, in some cases, to win awards.

An Ethiopian coordinator of the Coady/OXFAM partnerships in his country thinks that Coady’s most relevant contribution to poverty reduction is its ABCD approach, because it is empowering communities to break free from years of dependency on need based approaches and resources from outside the communities. Through ABCD, these communities, some of them very poor, are now learning to appreciate, utilize, and build on their own assets, however meagre. Their initial ‘buy-in’ and continuing ownership of the processes increase the likelihood of sustainability.

3.2 Relevance to Improving Canadian Understanding of International Development

Coady’s programs are generally referred to as very relevant to improving Canadian understanding of the issues, opportunities and impediments to successful community development in the South. Coady’s involvement in YIP is helping significantly in the Antigonish region, as are interdisciplinary studies on campus for undergraduates, and conferences and speakers’ forums, both on an off campus. However, limited resources are stretched now in assessing and addressing growing, acute poverty in the South. There is seen to be much more that could be done with more professional staff available to be dedicated to improving Canadian understanding of international
development, especially for communities self-detected poverty reduction. Currently, Coady organizes some of this work to be carried out by associates, who, because of other commitments, cannot always be available when needed.

### 3.3 Relevance of Intended Results

Anecdotal information from interviews and analysis of documents indicate that Coady EDPP’s statements of outputs, outcomes and impacts are all very relevant to intended results in strengthened capacities and performance of individuals, organizations and communities in reducing poverty in ways that they can sustain.

However, analysis of EDPP’s LFA (2004-2005) verifies that statements of intended short-term outputs are focussed on *Access to educational opportunities; capacity strengthening of southern development organizations; effective distance education program offered; and action learning partnerships*. These are all activities or accomplishments that Coady has proven to be very capable of providing and in most cases could virtually guarantee.

Consistent with these formulations, the *Annual Report to CIDA–’04–’05, Summary of Achievements by Output* (Appendix 4), lists targets for Output results referring to the numbers of program participants with enhanced knowledge from attendance in Coady education programs, and scholarly activities and products that are necessary for enabling graduates and other Southern partners to produce results.

These are all very relevant to the intended results of strengthened individuals, organizations and communities beginning to reduce their poverty… but these statements represent EDPP operations and products which are not yet ‘results’, according to most analyses of LFAs and RBM, with which this Evaluator is familiar.

Some versions of the original USAID inspired LFA, in the mid-1970s, included a line referred to as ‘manageable interests’, below which were activities and products that project management was confident it could guarantee to deliver within the life of the project. Above this line were the development objectives, today referred to as ‘results’, which were considered to be beyond project management’s control and more under control of Southern graduates, partners and their communities.

A similar distinction, made within CIDA more recently, and currently in use, distinguishes between completed project activities or products and their consequences in developmental results. This has produced a definition of ‘results’ as ‘the consequences of completed activities.’

**Figure 1: A CIDA Distinction between Activities and Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Planning and</td>
<td>Consequences of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Completed Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTIVITY ➔ COMPLETED ACTIVITY ➔ OUTPUTS ➔ OUTCOMES ➔ IMPACTS**


Completed EDPP activities should include completed programs seminars, workshops, publications, and the like, and graduated program participants with new relevant knowledge. These are not yet ‘results’, according to the above, because they are what Coady is delivering and...
could almost guarantee. To report these as ‘results’ would under-represent Coady/EDPP performance. Nevertheless, they are reported as results under ‘achievements by output’ in Coady’s EDPP Program Report of June/05 (see Appendix B). This may well not have been identified as a concern by CIDA, as it occurs often, especially in education projects.

‘Results’ according to the above figure are just beyond what Coady could guarantee. Results depend more on the activities of Southern graduates and partners in their own communities.

Program participants completing programs and graduating should be reported as part of the Coady completed operational activities. CIDA is required by its RBM directives to focus on results – the ‘consequences of completed activities’. Coady’s EDPP program reports to CIDA should focus more on such consequences. Firstly, how many graduates returned to their communities or organizations, and are engaged using what they learned as intended?

Coady’s action research/learning activities in the field with its graduates and partner organizations documenting actual development results, especially in ABCD and CBRM, could and should include collecting verifiable data on indicators of real poverty, its reduction or rise, and sustainability, all of which deserve more prominence in progress reports to CIDA.

3.4 Conclusions about Relevance of Intended Results

Statements in the EDPP LFA\(^7\) of the intended output, outcome and impact level results; and in the Program Report of June/05, refer to EDPP accomplishments, which are:

- Very relevant to priorities of CIDA, Coady/EDPP, and partners in the South; and
- Very appropriately addressed and achieved as intended.

However, the EDPP LFA and the Progress Report (June/05) understate the results that EDPP had achieved by referring to graduates with relevant capacities as ‘results’ at output level. CIDA evaluation and RBM guides noted above refer to such relevant accomplishments as completed activities, which Coady is very capable of producing if not almost guaranteeing. CIDA is most interested in results that are the ‘consequences’ of such Coady completed activities, represented by activities and accomplishments of graduates and competed action research in the field.

4.0 APPROPRIATENESS OF RESOURCES AND THEIR UTILIZATION

4.1 Strengths and Weaknesses of EDPP Management Systems and Reporting

CIDA has suggested a need for Coady to be more focused. The StFX President, the Coady Director and others see a related need for more quality interaction and coherence among the Coady’s professional areas of expertise across different programs and specializations. Some Coady professionals consider individual programs to be strong, but analysis of their inter-relationships is needed to facilitate more strategic planning and a more coherent ‘big-picture’.

The Evaluator noted that Coady professionals, their programs and activities all consistently emphasize approaches and concepts of self-directed individual, community, and organizational development in pursuit of objectives, priorities, and results determined and achieved by Southern partners and beneficiaries. Coady professionals are active in different continents, countries, sectors and organizations, often in small communities. While avoiding unnecessary overlap, they

---

\(^7\) Coady proposal Education for Democracy, Prosperity and Peace: Building Community Capacity for Innovation, Leadership and Sustainable Results, March 13, 2003, LFA p.34
share and integrate (when possible) a wide breadth of experiences that are enriching Coady capacities, programs, and partnerships. Coady professionals are aware and respectful of what their colleagues are achieving. They also seem keenly interested in appropriately integrating relevant key lessons learned by their colleagues into their own educational and action research/learning activities.

A major strength of Coady’s EDPP is widely seen to be the professional quality of its human resources, their hard work and responsiveness to program participants and other partners. At the senior levels in StFX and Coady, it is said that Coady needs to continue strengthening and deepening its human resources, interactions, and relations within its current focus, rather than diversifying.

Coady’s Adult Education Program is maintaining consistent respect for ‘self-determination’ as a guiding principle for individual learning. Although, this term itself is not widely used within Coady, it is well represented in the meaning and applications of terms which are used, like ‘citizen-driven’ and ‘community-driven’. The Evaluator considers self-determined development to be a silent de facto underlying integrating concept throughout Coady activities and programs.

Outside misunderstandings or misrepresentations of key concepts such as capacity development involving only the training of individuals, or partnerships as involving only giving or receiving resources, have been seen as bothersome threats. For example, Coady’s ABCD group leader is aware that the misrepresentation of the term ‘assets’ in community development lead to a threat of diversion of funding of donors and development banks from community-driven development to government and private sector interests in large scale infrastructure ‘assets’, such as roads, or bridges. Coady and its partners are actively and appropriately emphasizing that for most poor communities, the key assets for their development are those that they and their members already have within their control.

Coady’s operating budget is said to be about three to four million dollars per year, much like a small to medium university academic department. However, the current Coady mandate and operations are clearly significantly broader and more complex than most university departments.

Some Canadian and international partners suggest that Coady needs to almost double its budget in the next five years if it is to achieve the critical mass it needs to realize its current objectives. The suggested priorities for achieving this critical mass include Coady’s:

- Deepening its human resource base to enable strengthened preparation of leaders in development and improved contributions through action research and knowledge networks to global knowledge for development;
- Narrowing the systematic and strategic selection of its partners, and
- Enhancing systems for continuous monitoring, evaluation, and feedback to inform strategic planning, decision-making, and management.

---

8 The Declaration on the Right to Development was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1986. In the declaration, the right to development is proclaimed as an inalienable human right by virtue of which every person and all peoples are entitled to participate in, contribute to, and enjoy economic, social, cultural, and political development, in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized. The right to development also implies the full realization of the right of peoples to self-determination, including their inalienable right to exercise full sovereignty over all their natural wealth and resources, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights Geneva, Switzerland, 2002.
Coady and its key partners should determine jointly what ‘deepening’, ‘narrowing’, or ‘enhancing’ would be most appropriate.

Various internet searches by the Evaluator have indicated that Coady is a recognized centre of excellence in the asset-based approach to community development. This supports its consideration of seeking further funding in order to develop into a truly world class Canadian development institution.

Coady’s historical focus at the community level remains very relevant today in Coady’s ABCD education and action research/learning initiatives with communities in Kenya, Ethiopia and elsewhere. Another effective focus, cited within Coady, is the success of CEOSS in Egypt, where nine of eleven senior managers are Coady graduates. This focus at the organizational level is seen to be very appropriate for CEOSS. A focus at the sector level was also suggested by some as appropriate, but others see sectors as far too broad for Coady’s strengths at the levels of education and action research/learning with practitioners, communities and organizations, small or large.

There is support at StFX and Coady senior levels for Coady to focus on what has worked, what is working, and what will work. Coady has developed a good reputation for graduating effective development practitioners, and is supporting reputable partnerships in action research/learning at community and organizational levels that is helping the partners to strengthen their capacities and reputation in education, research and development. It is making progress on establishing tracking, monitoring and evaluation systems that are already beginning to provide verifiable evidence of the results of programs at Coady, as well as action research/learning in the field.

4.2 Strengths and Weaknesses of Financial Management and Reporting

Coady’s financial management is organized as part of StFX overall financial management systems. The University is said to ‘double check’ Coady’s financial management systems and reporting. A senior professional notes that Coady schedules continuous tracking of activities, products and publications, and then consolidates and reports the information obtained.

No questions were raised about quality, prudence or probity of Coady/EDPP financial reporting. However, it was suggested that improvements in timeliness and regularity of financial reports were needed to provide more frequent up-to-date pictures of EDPP financially.

Recently approved support from the Ford Foundation is considered to be a result, not only of Coady’s successful fieldwork and action research/learning on the ABCD approach, but also Coady’s reputation for sound financial management and reporting.

A focus on strategic allocation of resources, including for collaborative action research/learning in Southern communities related to priority issues in actual ABCD projects, contributes not only to the involved communities’ development, but also to Coady curriculum and program development. These program enhancements are considered expensive by some observers. However, most see them as providing invaluable opportunities for interactive learning, research, reflection and transformation among professionals from Coady and the South. They also promote Coady’s and CIDA’s image and reputation.

There may be room for improvement regarding CIDA funding, which is now general support across all of the Coady EDP Program, parts of which receive support from other sources. Given the wide range of EDPP activities, it is difficult to isolate those to which CIDA and or others have
contributed. An option might seem to be for CIDA funding to be more focussed on specified elements of EDPP to enable Coady and CIDA to report on results specifically related to CIDA priorities and expenditures. However, given (1) the CIDA Partnership Branch mandate to strengthen CIDA’s Canadian partner organizations, (2) this Evaluation’s findings of substantial coherence among Coady’s EDP Programs and (3) their effectiveness in strengthening capacities of Southern individuals, organizations and communities, the current funding mode, or Coady’s preferred option of ‘core institutional funding’ deserve consideration by CIDA and Coady.

The Director of CREADIS considers the Coady Diploma program to be very cost-effective, ‘packed’ with learning opportunities relevant to Southern community development, and equivalent to other similar programs that take longer – up to one year.

Most program participants met by the Evaluator noted that Coady’s sharing of costs with program participants was not adequate for some. The amount of money to be raised by program participants for travel and personal expenses was appropriate for some but not for others, especially those from the poorest communities and organizations, who, it could be said, are priorities.

4.3 Conclusions on Appropriateness of Resources and their Utilization

Suggestions from Coady senior levels that EDPP programs and professionals should have more focus and quality interaction may be related to Coady’s competent dedicated professionals having much to do, sometimes away from their peers, and in remote Southern locations. In contrast, program participants and graduates praised Coady executives’ and professionals’ consistent focus on the principles and applications of self-directed individual, community and organizational capacity development. They appreciated Coady professionals’ effective facilitation of their own learning, and application of self-driven development that is:

- Consistent with Coady’s Adult Education and ABCD Programs;
- A guiding principle across Coady/EDPP programs and activities; and
- An integrating concept upon which Coady’s programs and activities are, or could be, focused.

Other Evaluation findings on the appropriate use of resources suggest that Coady should:

1. Continue to focus programs for development practitioners and organizations on strengthening their capacities at the leading edge of best practice in facilitating individual, community, and organizational driven development for poverty reduction and sustainability;
2. Avoid broadening or diversifying beyond the current appropriate mix of programming;
3. Continue developing program appropriateness and responsiveness in widely dispersed geographic, cultural, and political contexts to strengthen understanding and practice of responsiveness for individual, community and organizational driven asset-based development;
4. Increase and enhance the quality of interaction and cooperation among programs by rotating responsibility among Coady centres of specialization for regular leading-edge information sharing;
5. Ensure more complete information is available to Coady management about incoming program participants before they arrive, to enable improved understanding of, and responsiveness to the program participants while at Coady and their performance after they leave;
6. Establish medium-term (five year) strategic plans for deepening and enhancing Coady’s resource base, including more delivery and use of resources in the South;
7. Consult with CIDA on the appropriateness of dedicating some or all of CIDA funding to
particular results of EDPP that are deemed most relevant to CIDA priorities, and establishing monitoring processes to report on progress towards, and actual achievement of results;
8. Continue and accelerate development of tracking, monitoring, and evaluation systems;
9. Make more use of Southern venues, facilitators, and other professionals to improve EDPP cost-effectiveness. With CIDA, propose that the HRDC/CIDA YAP program requires an in-depth evaluation of strengths and weaknesses relative to its objectives for interns and for participating host organizations.

5.0 ADEQUACY OF INFORMED AND TIMELY ACTION BY COADY

5.1 Keeping Informed and Taking Required Action for Participants on Time

Recruitment procedures for program participants, according to some Coady staff, should be adjusted to improve staff knowledge and understanding of diploma and certificate participants before they arrive to assist in preparing program material and experiences relevant to them.

Adequacy of resources for some participants: Some program participants noted that most of them generally had difficulty raising the money needed for airfare/travel to Antigonish. Consequently, a few arrived with very little to spare and lacked adequate pocket money during their stay. No participants met by the Evaluator claimed to have experienced this themselves, but some expressed concern to the Evaluator that this was a serious ‘dehumanizing’ or ‘humiliating’ experience for some other participants. They thought that Coady should be able to identify and take action to alleviate such problems for the very few who are most seriously affected.

A number of program participants noted that Coady provided students with clothing to adjust to the cold and with some books and reference materials that were especially relevant to ABCD. However, they also noted that Coady could have adjusted better to African program participants’ dislike of the cafeteria food by providing more variety, including meals that were more consistent with their customs.

Participants’ interpersonal problems: Generally, the incidence of participants’ interpersonal problems was said to be low. Some Coady personnel thought that responsiveness to such problems, when they arise, could be improved by establishing and maintaining:
• Clearer divisions of responsibilities among Coady management and personnel for responding, when such problems do arise;
• Improved openness and transparency about issues when they arise;
• Systematic mechanisms to enable timeliness of responses; and
• More appropriate documentation of repeated interpersonal problems, which are often well resolved through dialogue.

5.2 Delivery of Program Services

Some Coady professionals consider that Coady responsiveness and adaptability are adequate at the micro level, but there is need for greater attention to overall strategic planning. Others suggest that inadequate resources in the face of too many demands on senior and middle level professionals and their support staff impede monitoring and responding in a timely manner to problems when they arise.

As noted in Section 2.1 above, some program participants found that some visits to Antigonish
Communities were too short or too few for program participants to understand well any lessons relevant to them.

Coady professionals and alumni note that:
- The Diploma Program is practical and relevant to program participants’ needs;
- Additional related studies could be added at higher levels;
- More of the program could be delivered in the South;
- Services provided to program participants/participants are generally good to very good.

Generally, program participants contacted were unanimous in their appreciation of Coady professionals’ responsiveness during delivery of very high quality, relevant learning experiences. A group of East African women program participants praised Coady professionals for paying close attention to program participants and being approachable and helpful. They were impressed that questions asked in class, for which an answer was not available, were often answered the next day, from a web search completed that night. Graduates are able to remain in contact with Coady, which continues to make up-to-date, relevant information available through its web site.

A graduate recalled that following the 911 tragedies there was increased tension in the class. Coady facilitators are said to have responded very well by using appropriate conflict resolution approaches that effectively reduced tensions.

Coady documentation of the conditions that favour strengthened citizen-driven development is said to have been weak in the past. However, documentation of action research/learning activities on ABCD and CBRM accomplishments, plus progress on the monitoring and evaluation systems, are examples of improvement. One Coady professional rates Coady very highly for improving its approaches to participatory design and tracking of progress in capacity development. An Ethiopian field coordinator for Coady/OXFAM partnerships noted that monitoring visits every six months, and regular exchanges of information between Addis and Coady offices, often through teleconferencing, have contributed to successful progress and results.

5.3 Conclusions on the Adequacy of Informed and Timely Action

- More information about program participants before they arrive would enable staff to be better prepared.
- Program participants praise Coady’s classroom presentation and educational materials relevant to ABCD.
- Coady should obtain early feedback from program participants’ visits to Antigonish communities and consider adjusting visits if they are too short or too few to be effective.
- Coady should do more to understand and reconcile:
  - African program participants’ discomfort with some cafeteria food and meals;
  - Inadequate financial circumstances of some participants to meet their basic needs.
- Coady and CIDA should consider in-depth objective analyses of using more Southern venues with more delivery by Southern professionals of Coady’s programs.

6.0 ACHIEVEMENT OF INTENDED AND UNINTENDED RESULTS

6.1 Tracking Results of EDPP Programs, and Other Activities

This section focuses on information collection and reporting on development results that are the
consequences of Coady’s education, training and graduation of program participants from the South (see section 3.2).

Monitoring, evaluation and reporting are considered by Coady’s Director to be priorities for attention of this Evaluation. CIDA considers these management functions as essential for learning how Coady’s alumni and Southern-based action research/learning partners are applying and disseminating, in their Southern communities, the knowledge and experience enabled by Coady/EDPP. Such applications by graduates in their own communities and organizations are the initial consequences, or output results, of their completed learning activities while at Coady (according to the CIDA definition of results (Section 3.3 above). These results, at the output level, are what CIDA usually expects from results based management. Coady’s recently acquired Program Associate Monitoring and Evaluation has already completed preliminary testing of processes for gathering evaluative responses to key questions from Coady alumni, relative to their activities and accomplishments back home, i.e., the initial results of EDPP.

A senior Coady professional thought that more could be done to encourage and facilitate Coady graduates to apply what they learned at Coady after they returned to their homes in the South, and then feed back to Coady information on its effectiveness and consequent results in their communities or organizations.

The Coady/OXFAM partners in Ethiopia track or monitor results using the ‘Most Significant Change’ approach in which participating community members give their accounts of what has happened that is important in their ABCD project, their communities and households. This approach can generate information about both intended and unintended results. Although this approach may lack some rigour in specificity of indicators, it has added value of identifying and understanding what community members consider to be important.

Public Engagement Results
Most of Coady’s tracking of public engagement has been headcounts, i.e., the number of people who have attended events at StFX/Coady, and the number of Coady professionals sent to engagements at other organizations. Some slightly more evaluative activities include:

- A short reaction survey to people who attended the 2005 and 2006 youth forums;
- A clippings service from major Canadian newspapers, especially articles that have a development message, the assumption being that Coady’s efforts are spreading the word;
- Conducting a needs analysis of students at STFX to identify their needs to become engaged in social justice issues and to establish a baseline of sorts for evaluation of Coady.

Monitoring and Evaluating Results
In the past, Coady is said to have not adequately, to its satisfaction, stored, analyzed, reported, and used data in a manner designed to assist decision-making. However, recent initiatives are designed to:

- Compile and analyze all course evaluations (quantitative and qualitative) and write an annual report for teachers and management that is used to make decisions;
- Conduct evaluations for every course, and mid-point and end-term evaluations for the entire Diploma and Certificate programs;
- Reinstate a tracer survey of Diploma graduates, which has been defunct for a number of years (an initial survey yielded a response rate of almost 50%. See Appendix C);
- Develop two free-text databases for the storage and analysis of textual data: information received from graduates, including emails about awards, distinctions, new positions, new projects; notes from staff who meet with graduates when traveling; case studies, and
telephone interviews with select graduates. This growing database allows for coding, searching and cross-referencing of all of the data. There are not many negative stories stored, but it is still quite a powerful tool;

- Better utilize trip reports completed by staff following an overseas visit. A new template has been developed to allow information storage in the database.

6.2 Results from Coady on-Campus and Distance Education Training Programs

Anecdotal evidence and observations from a few communities suggest that Coady is achieving results as intended. However, other causal factors that may be active in the achievement of results are not always well identified, so it is difficult to know to what extent stated improvements could be attributed to Coady. More systematic evaluation processes are being established based on best practice, to improve tracking and reporting on results. Very preliminary feedback data are anecdotal, quantitative and positive. Introduction of a newsletter is also increasing anecdotal feedback from alumni.

A Kenyan female manager of faith-based community support emphasized that her Coady Diploma education enabled her to respond to communities, which ask for help, but not in the ‘old’ ways of ‘telling them what to do’. Instead she is now able to help them to identify problems and figure out their own alternatives to address them. She uses this approach in her training of community members by helping them to:

- Learn for themselves and gain the knowledge and skills they need to identify and analyze their own problems;
- Set their own objectives for improvement; and
- Plan and implement their own solutions to ‘achieve their objectives’.

Training includes using local resources as much as possible and assistance (advice) of nearby polytechnics when needed – for example in trades like masonry, carpentry and small business. Associates and graduated trainees remain involved in the organization. Records of progress are sent to the faith-based organization head office to enable tracking of results for the wider region.

A Kenyan lecturer in community development, for a religious organization, believes that his Coady experiences have enabled him to effectively continue learning and applying principles relevant to peace building, conflict resolution, organizational management and community development. He suggested that the Coady Diploma might be equivalent to some university degrees. It helped to enable him to move from directing a community centre to lecturing at college level and coordinating church-based community development training at the national level – all emphasizing self-directed community empowerment. He sees concrete results of his passing on of lessons from Coady through his nation-wide training of church-based community development organizations. For example:

- The approval rate of Kenyan church-based organizations’ proposals for community development assistance, submitted to the Government of Kenya Constituency Development Fund, has increased from zero to five;
- Five diocese boards improved gender balance from 12 men only to three to seven females;
- Some colleges which were ‘rife with corruption’ are now accountable and self-sustaining;
- One diocese now has a five-year plan to become self-sustainable;
- In the past, smaller churches were obliged to support the regional diocese, now small churches are encouraged to keep their funds for development in their own communities.

A Coady professional noted that distance education programs enable and encouraged participants to implement fieldwork near their homes where it is anticipated that results soon would be
evident and significant. Feedback from the field has already helped to improve the program.

A Zambian graduate is known to have returned home to his family, and applied his newly gained understanding about the lack of gender equity generally in many African families. He changed his own behaviour to be more supportive and appreciative of his wife as his equal. The changes made significant positive differences for all of his family. Coady’s developing monitoring and evaluation and systems appear capable now of exploring the extent to which this may be a general as opposed to what may be seen as inconsequential.

Another Kenyan graduate noted that she was able to use what she learned at Coady to help Somalia communities representing different clans to interact and share ideas, priorities and to plan together for community development. She explained generally how, as a Kenyan working in Somalia, she was thankful for her experiences at Coady which enabled her to work with others of persuasions (ethnic, cultural, religious) different then her own, to help them to learn to make their own decisions and without her feeling any need to impose her own. She valued highly the Coady approach to conflict resolution, which emphasizes that people in conflict need adequate time to reconcile differences. She knew enough to facilitate their development of mutual understanding and compromise on options for resolving their own problems, and how she might make appropriate suggestions, but only when invited.

• A disabled Kenyan female scholar, found herself in the Community Development Leadership Certificate Program for Women. It was her first such learning experience. She is convinced that it resulted in the formation of links among all members of the group, enabling her to develop considerable individual pride and confidence. As a result, partly of Coady and (in the Evaluator’s view) her own newly found confidence to take initiatives and a leadership role, she now maintains relations with various disability organizations for men and women, in Kenya and abroad. She initiates meetings, and works with others who are disabled. She has begun a new NGO for disabled women, which she has registered internationally – now one of only a few. She plans to continue reaching outside Kenya to appropriate organizations, perhaps to Action Aid UK, for program assistance, and one day to apply again to Coady for higher-level studies.

Unexpected results where realized in Ethiopia, when the ‘leaky bucket’ analysis was introduced for communities to assess and understand their economies. Consequently, families began to apply the analysis to stop the ‘leaks’ of assets from their households, reportedly with positive results.

The Coady Graduate Tracer Survey (Jan/06) reports that most of the 67 responding graduates of the Diploma in Community Based Development reported a ‘moderate’ to ‘a lot of’ improvement ‘in all learning areas.’

6.3 Results from the ABCD Program

Some of Coady’s planned/intended initial output level results, as currently designed, describe changes and increases in program participants’ knowledge and self-confidence about self-directed community development that is facilitated by NGOs. Later outcome level results statements include the actual implementation by communities themselves of their own self-directed improvements and development. As suggested above, in Section 3.4, such ‘outputs’ understate Coady’s effectiveness; as such increased knowledge should more appropriately be ‘completed activities’ which Coady has proven capable of guaranteeing for most of its graduates (See Tracer Study, Appendix C). Likewise ‘outcomes’, as presented, are more appropriately ‘intended outputs’.
In Ethiopia, Coady’s partnership with OXFAM Ethiopian development workers and communities (completed activity), is seen to have contributed to a strengthened sense of community ownership, demonstrated mostly by women who are now recognizing the importance of, and beginning to ensure education for girls as well as boys (outputs). An Ethiopian field coordinator sees the partnership as having brought shifts in attitudes and thinking about development among community members. Some communities’ initiatives to increase the birth rates of heifers, includes the provision of a heifer to poor families. Some local NGOs are seen to be changing and beginning to accept and respond to communities’ expressions of their priorities for development. OXFAM and some local NGOs are beginning ABCD initiatives without Coady. These are all good examples of output level results.

6.4 Results Reported by Coady

Coady’s EDPP Program Report April 1, 2004 to March 31, 2002 details EDPP activities, completed activities, and results that are consistent with the CIDA-approved LFA for EDPP.

The Coady Tracer Graduate Study (Jan/26/06 – Appendix C) clearly indicates the effectiveness of Coady programs at the output level by the work and upward mobility of its graduates within their communities. For example:

Most graduates found themselves promoted within their organizations, or given more responsibility within their positions, within four years of graduation.

- In total, 51.6% of graduates had moved on to different jobs or positions either in their home organization or to a new organization within four years of completing the Coady program.
- Of those who had moved positions, 62.9% had moved to a different organization, and 40% remained in their original organization.
- Overall, those who remained in their same position reported having been given a greater degree of responsibility for programming. 85.7% of those who remained in the same job have more responsibility than they did prior to coming to the Coady Institute.
- Respondents stated that 25.8% had been the Director of their Institution prior to coming to the Institute. Respondents to the survey noted that 39.7% were currently Directors.
- There was some degree of gender disparity in career mobility following completing of the Coady program. Women claimed that 75% had more responsibility, as compared with 89.2% of men. This suggests slightly lower returns to education for women within the program.

The same Tracer study documents graduates’ transfer of skills through meetings, workshops and formal presentations.

What is messing, that would herald longer term or deeper outcome and impact level results would be some information on indicators of improved behaviour or conditions of communities or organizations that were a direct results of Coady graduates’ transfer of skills and knowledge. The Evaluator was of the understanding that Coady action ABCD research in some graduates’ communities, if not already generating such information, could certainly do so.

6.5 Conclusions on the Achievement of Results

- Significant results at the output level are reported in terms of graduates returning to their Southern home communities and organizations, and applying what they learned while at Coady. Generally, the results reflect improved understanding and application in Southern communities of what works in development.
• Coady reporting could better distinguish completed EDPP activities (graduates with new knowledge) from their consequent output level results in terms of these graduates’ development activities back in their home communities or elsewhere in the South. It could also begin to collect information on activities and accomplishments by communities and organizations themselves as a consequence of Coady graduates’ improved performance.
• Coady’s recent progress on electronic tracking, monitoring and evaluation systems is likely to improve significantly its results-based reporting, especially if the significant distinction between completed activities and their developmental consequence is established.

7.0 RELEVANCE AND COST EFFECTIVENESS OF ACTUAL RESULTS

7.1 Relevance of Results to Poverty Reduction and Sustainability

Coady professionals and program participants contacted by the Evaluator were unanimously convinced that Coady programs, activities and support to Southern partners have consequences that are extremely effective and relevant to reducing poverty in poor communities of the South. This view is based on the comprehensiveness and sensitivities of Coady approaches to adult education, CBRM and, especially, the ABCD approach to community development, which enable communities to:
• Take ownership of analyses, planning and implementation of their own development;
• Understand better the assets and strengths they already have to improve their development;
• Agree on priorities for improving their health, nutrition, prosperity and peacefulness; and
• Track improvements or changes in performance and results that are relevant to their communities’ priorities for sustainable poverty reduction.

One and a half years after the Founding Director of CREADIS, a Kenyan NGO, attended Coady, CREADIS is reported to have begun to demonstrate observable results in sustainable agriculture and community empowerment (See 1.4 above)

The ABCD approach initially faced problems related to established practices of donor funding going to NGOs to implement development programs for communities. ABCD encourages facilitative technical assistance, and necessary funding to go more directly to communities themselves. Some NGOs re-acted by opting out of these initiatives. Others, though slowly, are now beginning to work more closely in supportive/facilitative roles with communities.

7.2 Reasonableness of EDPP Program Costs in Relation to Results in Southern Countries

Some Coady professionals and program participants suggest that the Coady/EDPP diploma and certificate programs are at a level equivalent to undergraduate programs, but others say they are more similar to graduate or professional programs, as most (85%) of participants are reported to have had prior post secondary education. However, Coady’s different approach to program participants, plus follow-up related action research/learning in the field, EDPP is also generating results roughly like those of some established Canadian international NGOs. EDPP is said to be more practical, less costly, and less theoretical than similar US and European programs. The enthusiasm of program participants wishing to return home to get on with their community development, independent study, literature search, data collection and recommendations for positive action all increase the probability of continuing positive results from EDPP.
Training programs and activities at Coady are considered by an Ethiopian coordinator of ABCD to be cost effective short-term opportunities for sharing experiences among trainees from various Southern countries with very professional facilitators who also have relevant field experience.

Coady effectively integrated six Canadian Youth Interns into OXFAM/Ethiopia ABCD initiatives to work with various local partners. The interns’ selection and contributions are said to have been low cost and very appropriate and effective.

Delivery of Coady’s distance education initiatives is expected, eventually, to be relatively low cost, but it is acknowledged that more work is needed first on systems to assess cost-effectiveness of actual development results related to the learning objectives of that education.

A Kenyan graduate was sure that the costs of her experiences at Coady were very good in relation to the results that her experiences enabled her to actually achieve. Coady program costs were said to be lower than other similar programs and the approaches more ‘customer friendly’.

ABCD is said to be incredibly cost-efficient compared with its observed impact. Its approach requires little or no funding from Coady, OXFAM or other partners. An objective is to anchor ABCD within local organizations and communities. The important resource transfers of this process include the knowledge gained from training, with funding and other resources being provided mainly by community members and local NGOs. In some cases, some preliminary funding to communities might accelerate start-up processes without making communities overly dependent.

7.3 Comparison of Coady/EDPP with Similar Programs in Canada or Elsewhere

- Similar programs in the UK and Philippines are said to cost more.
- A Kenyan graduate of Coady suggests that the same program implemented by Coady in Kenya would have greater relevance, and would train ten times as many program participants at the same costs.
- Another Kenyan graduate noted that she knows others who took similar programs from other agencies, returned home and didn’t seem to know for sure what to do. She contrasted this with Coady graduates whom she knew, who were well able to decide on, and take, very specific actions, especially in terms of facilitating others to make their own decisions about any the assistance they needed to facilitate their own development.

7.4 Conclusions about Relevance and Cost-Effectiveness of Actual Results

1. Coady’s certificate and diploma programs are very:
   a. Relevant for Southern community driven capacity development for sustainable poverty reduction, as verified by actual accomplishments of Southern communities in which Coady professionals and graduates have played facilitative roles;
   b. Cost efficient compared to other more expensive, longer-term programs, often at undergraduate level, which are viewed as less practical; and
   c. Capable of greater cost-effectiveness through more delivery of the programs by appropriate Southern professionals in Southern venues.

2. The emphasis of the ABCD approach, on communities identifying and using their own assets, improves the chances of relevance, cost effectiveness and sustainability.
8.0 SUSTAINABILITY OF RESULTS

8.1 Achievement of Intended EDPP Outcomes and Impacts

Coady’s EDPP LFA appropriately describes medium-term outcomes and long-term impact results in terms of Southern organizations and groups successfully achieving and sustaining results relevant to their own poverty reduction. Such results appropriately represent consequences of Coady graduates returning home and implementing what they learned at Coady. For example, knowledge and skills from Coady are said to be being used, generating more resources, and enabling more investment for sustainability of Anglican churches and communities in Kenya.

EDPP approaches to ABCD and CBRM involve multiple consecutive self-directed activities by communities, which usually achieve expected results. Communities usually expect, respect and respond supportively to such decision-making and results. Therefore, the probability of sustaining intended results with ABCD approaches is said to be very high.

8.2 Contribution of Coady/EDPP to Sustainable Poverty Reduction in the South

One Coady graduate noted that Coady education of community workers from Southern countries, although taking place in Antigonish is very relevant to processes of successful sustainable development in the workers’ Southern communities. Coady’s and its partners’ applications of ABCD, CBRM, and related development approaches in Southern communities are also relevant to, and proving to be contributing to sufficiency for, sustainability. Coady emphasizes that its graduate program participants will usually go back home to work with communities whose members themselves have relevant capacities of knowledge, skills and abilities, as well as natural and physical assets, that they must learn to identify, use, maintain and improve if they are to progress towards sustainability. Coady might emphasize more that communities should consider identifying, using, maintaining their assets and progressing towards their priority objectives before asking for outside assistance. Some Coady program participants suggested that a shared spiritual component might be an additional necessary element for successful development in some communities.

According to one Kenyan graduate, the emphasis in the Coady program on facilitating or enabling communities in their own development actually provides built-in training-of-trainers systems that are likely to increase the probabilities of development progress being sustainable. She noted that the differing levels of abilities among Coady graduates is a challenge, and that Coady would do well to increase and improve its monitoring of actual results in terms of changed appropriate behaviour of graduates, as well as of their communities or organizations.

A number of program participants thought that sustainability would:
• Vary from one program to another; and
• Be dependent on the extent to which enough actual improvements were experienced by communities to encourage their continued commitment.

8.3 Aggregate Impact from the Coady/EDPP in Thematic and/or Geographic Areas

In Kenya, a manager of a Kenyan NGO partner of Coady estimates that four out of six alumni who attended Coady together a couple of years ago are still in Kenya applying what they learned. The two others moved to the USA. Coady’s improved tracking systems may be able to provide
more comprehensive assessment of such losses, in the future.

Where Coady has graduated three to five program participants from the same organization over a few years, the impact is said to have been very significant and positive. Examples are in Egypt and in Ethiopia.

One graduate noted that there is confidence in Coady that positive impact will be realized though:
- Community development based on principles of Coady’s self-directed ABCD and CBRM approaches; and
- People Assessing Their Health (PATH).

Improved Canadian public awareness of international development is also evident, as is Coady’s influence on ABCD theory and practice. A Google search of “ABCD international development” clearly identifies Coady as a leader in the field.

9.0 LESSONS LEARNED

Coady Program Initiatives
- Some EDPP Diploma and Certificate courses or activities are apparently too intense or complex for some participants. Opportunities for all participants to provide evaluative feedback (perhaps anonymously) in the midst of, or immediately after courses or activities, might focussed on perceived strengths, weaknesses and opportunities for improvement to identify opportunities to adjust, re-design, build on strengths and reduce weaknesses as perceived by scholars.
- Coady professionals’ interaction with participants, and facilitation of interaction among them, enables shared learning in relation to the content and the processes of development. Such facilitation and interaction are keys to program participants’ continued effective learning and facilitation of development back home.

Results in Southern Communities
- Development begins with individuals, communities or organizations at their own level. Their ownership and knowledge of the processes are essential for success.
- Appropriate collaboration and partnerships in self-directed asset-based community development are showing potential for enhancing sustainability of poverty reduction.
- Most underprivileged communities and people have good understanding about their own:
  - Development needs and aspirations;
  - Problems and constraints to their achievement;
  - Knowledge, skills and other ‘assets’ to contribute to their development; and
  - Preferences for assistance that enables them to direct and manage their own development.
- It is essential that facilitators from outside learn from and respect communities’ knowledge, aspirations for improvements, and beliefs about what they need to know.
- Women are empowered by participation in facilitative approaches. They learn to believe in themselves and say convincingly: ‘I am capable’.
- The poor have potentials that can be identified and activated through trained facilitation.
- Changes in communities take time, trained facilitative leadership and allocation of responsibilities in relation to abilities and personalities.

Focus of Coady/EDPP for Impact
There is some concern in CIDA for more focus in EDPP, while Coady has expressed concerned for more quality, coherence, integration and interaction. This Evaluator has found that Coady programs and
activities effectively integrate the related concepts and best practice of self-driven or determined learning and development based on individual and community assets, and including monitoring and evaluation of results. There is a lack of focus geographically, with busy Coady professionals often widely disbursed at different times in small communities across three continents, working hard separately to get their jobs done. However, in spite of being in different places at different times, these professionals are seen by the Evaluator to remain focused on responsively facilitating and strengthening individual, community and organizational driven asset-based learning and development.

In the Evaluator’s view, this focus in widely different geographic and cultural settings is adding significant value to understanding and application of the principles of responsiveness in international development and self-driven development that are at the heart of the right to development and its implied right to self-determination (see footnote #1).

Opportunities for more quality interaction among Coady professionals and programs might be improved with annual coordinated scheduling of travel so that there are adequate opportunities at Coady for quality interaction among all executives, professionals and staff together at specified times.

10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

CIDA VSPD Programming
VSPD should articulate clearly for its implementing partners CIDA’s distinction between completed activities and their consequent developmental results that are expected to be identified in RBM reporting.

Coady Programming
1. Coady should give more attention to problems of African youth and children, as outlined in the Pan-African Youth Leadership Summit and platform for millennium development such as the stigma falsely attached to HIV/AIDS widows’ involvement in their communities.
2. Coady EDPP reports to CIDA should shift from a focus on EDPP activities and completed activities, to focus on results in developmental consequences in Southern partner organizations and communities. This would
   a. Enable Coady to incorporate more of its results and lessons learned from Action research in the field into its reports to CIDA,
   b. More accurately and effectively portray the developmental value of EDPP,
   c. Significantly improve understanding of EDPP’s cost effectiveness in development terms,
   d. Enable CIDA to better justify continued programming support to EDPP, and
   e. Demonstrate the developmental value of the practical application of systematic scientific information collection and analyses in tracking progress towards intended community development results.
3. Coady should continue to build on its strengths of responsiveness to the priorities of Southern partner communities for their self-reliant asset-based individual, community and organizational capacity development for sustainable poverty reduction.
4. Coady should be more explicit about actually supporting the right to self-determined development as:
   a. Declared by the UN;
   b. Founded in the Antigonish movement;
   c. Grounded in best practice of adult education;
   d. An integrating factor in all Coady programs at StFX, overseas, and in distance education;
   e. A key success factor in the concepts and practice of ABCD and CBRM;
   f. Enhanced by facilitating individuals, communities - especially on women in poor communities, and organizations, to focus on their assets/strengths.
5. Using more Southern locations with more Southern facilitators to deliver EDPP would be cost-effective and support applicants who are approved by Coady but who cannot obtain a Canadian visa. Perhaps Coady’s key Southern partners, CEOSS, CREADIS, KMG, REST, SEARSOLIN, SEWA, etc., with assistance could host some programs for candidates in their own and other Southern regions.
   a. Coady professionals agree that more training offered overseas may be more cost effective for some participants and plan to conduct more educational programs overseas.
   b. However, these professionals also note that it is not always more cost effective for Coady.
   c. While cost is important, other issues to be considered include:
      • In-country training not requiring a visa to Canada is appropriate for those with commitments who cannot travel to Antigonish;
      • The opportunity to study with an international cohort may be more or less difficult, or desirable, for some candidates in a Southern location.
      • The tracer survey (Appendix C) shows 80% of respondents stated that exchanging experiences with professionals from other countries and regions was the most significant aspect of the Coady experience.

6. StFX and Coady should continue their unique partnership’s provision of quality exposure for Antigonish communities to global development issues of relevance to sustainable poverty reduction in the Southern communities.

7. Coady should continue to:
   a. Focus programs for development practitioners and organizations on strengthening their capacities at the leading edge of best practice in facilitating individual, community, and organizational driven development for poverty reduction and sustainability;
   b. Avoid broadening or diversifying beyond the current appropriate mix of programming;
   c. Develop program appropriateness and responsiveness, including in widely dispersed geographic, cultural, and political contexts, to strengthen understanding, and practice of responsiveness for self-driven asset-based individual, community and organizational development;
   d. Increase and enhance the quality of interaction and cooperation among programs by rotating responsibility among Coady centres of specialization for organizing regular leading-edge information sharing seminars;
   e. Improve the information available to Coady management about incoming program participants, before they arrive, to enable improved understanding of, and responsiveness to, the program participants while at Coady;
   f. Work to establish medium-term (five year) strategic planning for deepening and enhancing Coady’s resource base, including more delivery and use of resources in the South;
   g. Consult with CIDA on the appropriateness of EDPP results and consideration of dedicating some or all of CIDA funding to particular developmental results of EDPP that are agreed to be most relevant to CIDA and Coady priorities. Include consideration of developing systems for tracking, monitoring, evaluation and reporting on progress towards, and actual achievement of such results.
   h. Increase the use of Southern venues, facilitators, and other professionals to improve EDPP cost-effectiveness;
   i. Discuss with CIDA the HRDC/CIDA YAP program, including need for evaluation of strengths and weaknesses relative to objectives for Coady interns and their participating host organizations.
# APPENDIX A: PEOPLE CONTACTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiore Pace</td>
<td>CIDA, Capacity Dev. Div.</td>
<td>Project Officer, Coady Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey Huntington</td>
<td>CIDA, Canada Fund for Africa</td>
<td>Performance Management Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sean Riley</td>
<td>St. Francis Xavier University</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Coyle</td>
<td>St. FX; Director and Coady II</td>
<td>V.P. and Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie McGreer</td>
<td>St. Francis Xavier University</td>
<td>Student, attended some Coady events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Landry</td>
<td>Coady International Institute</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Delaney</td>
<td>Coady International Institute</td>
<td>Program Associate, Monitoring/Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Galbraith</td>
<td>Coady International Institute</td>
<td>Manager, Director Education Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Hamelin</td>
<td>Coady International Institute</td>
<td>Youth Programs Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krista Hall</td>
<td>Coady International Institute</td>
<td>Communications Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gord Cunningham</td>
<td>Coady International Institute</td>
<td>ABCD Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daren Okafu</td>
<td>Coady International Institute</td>
<td>Technology and innovations Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Lee</td>
<td>Coady International Institute</td>
<td>Micro Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Goulet</td>
<td>OXFAM Canada</td>
<td>Program Coordinator - Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Zambians</td>
<td>NGOs and Government</td>
<td>(focus group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Participants</td>
<td>NGOs and Government</td>
<td>India, Bangladesh, Ethiopia &amp; Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Ayoo</td>
<td>Save the Children Kenya/Sudan</td>
<td>Sudan Program manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Nduta</td>
<td>East African Advisory services for Organic Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Otolo</td>
<td>Kenya Christian Fellowship</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys Nabiswa</td>
<td>CREADIS, Kenya</td>
<td>ABCD Action Research Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Zablon Mutongu</td>
<td>Mt. Kenya Anglican Diocese</td>
<td>Manager Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Mpedzisi</td>
<td>African Youth Parliament</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kartick Kumar</td>
<td>Coady YIP Intern</td>
<td>at African Youth Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Kennedy Alumasa</td>
<td>UNICEF Kenya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi Ruth Esiaba</td>
<td>Vihiga, Kenya</td>
<td>Disability Activist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five Zambians (NGOs and Government) (focus group) India, Bangladesh, Ethiopia & Nigeria

Sophia Ayoo (Save the Children Kenya/Sudan) Sudan Program manager

Jane Nduta (ABC Group) East African Advisory services for Organic Agriculture

Joy Otolo (Kenya Christian Fellowship) Manager

Gladys Nabiswa (CREADIS, Kenya) ABCD Action Research Partner

Rev. Zablon Mutongu (Mt. Kenya Anglican Diocese) Manager Community Development

Patrick Mpedzisi (African Youth Parliament) President

Kartick Kumar (Coady YIP Intern) at African Youth Parliament

Johan Kennedy Alumasa (UNICEF Kenya)

Naomi Ruth Esiaba (Vihiga, Kenya) Disability Activist
APPENDIX B: PROGRAM SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Offerings</th>
<th>Diploma Program Participants</th>
<th>Certificate Program Participants</th>
<th>Education Programs With Southern Agencies</th>
<th>Action Learning Partnerships</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Knowledge Networks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset-Based Community Development</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Micro-finance Management</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Resource Management</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace building &amp; Conflict Transformation Community Development Leadership for Women</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Development Organizations</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Up to 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing NGO Resource Centers Advocacy &amp; Networking</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Leadership in Development</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Key Themes: Human Rights, HIV/AIDS and others to be determined
Special focus on democracy, prosperity & peace

Public Engagement Tools: Media – print, radio & television
Electronic media – CD-ROMs, website, videos
Public Events & Speakers Bureau

Key Audiences: Atlantic Canadians, Educational Institutions, and General Public

EVALUATION

Stakeholders: Coady Institute staff, management, alumni & advisory committee; CIDA and other donors; the broader development community

APPENDIX C: ACTUAL ACHIEVEMENTS BY OUTPUT

Following is a summary of the ‘actual achievements by output’ reported by Coady in the *CIDA Annual Report, 2004-2005*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times Mentioned</th>
<th>Achievement by Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Practitioners have enhanced knowledge, skills and attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Youth have enhanced knowledge, skills and attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discussion held about training needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Technical errors being repaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lessons learned report prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bag lunch held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Draft Lessons Learned Draft Report Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>1</em></td>
<td>Case study completed by Egyptian CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Manual produced and published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>1</em></td>
<td>Workers in the South review progress in documenting ABCD lessons learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paper accepted for publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Connections made by Coady with other potential partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Facilitated workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>4</em></td>
<td>Connection made between partners in the South or North/South communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Attended workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participants having enhanced appreciation CBRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>About 500 policy makers, leaders, development workers have increased understanding of ABCD from workshops and conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manuscript prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Articles published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proposals developed and submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discussions held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Technical platform developed for networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>On-going monitoring and updating list of 125 members of CBRM networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support of advocacy groups through electronic list-serve, 49 participants currently active on-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manual produced and piloted (November 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>About 23 HIV/AIDS articles appeared in media due to Coady work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>220 Community members attended Coady public events on HIV/AIDS, community economic development, globalization and civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>550 Community members attended speaking and discussion events and are more aware of development issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ABCD manual is on-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New website completed and on-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ABCD section of website is online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Content analysis complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Final report delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lessons learned from content analysis are being incorporated into Coady teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Graduate tracer survey initiated with 143 graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Draft monitoring and evaluation framework completed and distributed for review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The above is based on a cursory review only. More detailed analyses may very well reveal that more than the three activities marked with an asterisk (*) were actually carried out by program participants or workers in Southern partner NGOs or communities, and therefore also qualify as ‘consequences’ of Coady completed activities.
APPENDIX D: COADY GRADUATE TRACER SURVEY

DRAFT 1

Thursday, January 26, 2006

Introduction

Graduate Profile

The survey form was sent to all graduates of the Coady Institute Diploma in Community-based development from 2001-2003. In total 67 responses were received out of 144 surveys sent, or a response rate of 47%.

The majority of survey respondents (72.3%) were male, as compared with 27.7 percent female. The average age of the respondents was 42 years old. Respondents' countries included: Australia; Bangladesh (4); Cameroon; Canada; Ghana (6); India (21); Kenya; Lebanon; Myanmar; Nepal (14); Nigeria; Palestine; Tanzania (2); Thailand; Uganda (2); Zambia; Zimbabwe (2).

Impressions of changing skills

The survey’s first level of evaluation related to respondents self-assessment improvements of their own knowledge, skills and abilities. These were separated into two categories. The first (section 2.1) reviewed discrete skills and areas of knowledge drawn from the Diploma’s learning goals. The second category (section 2.2) reviewed knowledge and attitudes of a more general nature. The category also included possible indicators for these knowledge and skills being used in their work.

Specific Skills

Skill areas referred to in the survey were drawn from the overall learning goals of the Coady Diploma program. On the whole, participants reported a significant change in their knowledge and skills resulting from their participation. In fact, most participants reported a ‘moderate’ or ‘a lot of’ improvement in all learning areas.

The following table summarizes responses to all of the questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please consider the following skills and abilities. To what extent did your ability in each of these improve while you were at the Coady?</th>
<th>No significant improvement</th>
<th>A little improvement</th>
<th>A moderate improvement</th>
<th>A Lot of improvement</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work effectively with community-based organizations</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>8% (5)</td>
<td>33% (21)</td>
<td>59% (37)</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically analyse a problem or issue</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>6% (4)</td>
<td>39% (25)</td>
<td>55% (35)</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate a planning process at the community level</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>13% (8)</td>
<td>42% (25)</td>
<td>45% (27)</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct participatory monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>3% (2)</td>
<td>14% (9)</td>
<td>37% (23)</td>
<td>46% (29)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research an issue on the internet</td>
<td>14% (9)</td>
<td>29% (18)</td>
<td>30% (19)</td>
<td>27% (17)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze a situation from a gendered perspective</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>16% (10)</td>
<td>33% (21)</td>
<td>51% (32)</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants noted some room for improvement in their responses to open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire. For example, three participants felt that there was a significant amount of introductory information in the Diploma program that they had already learned in previous courses or on the job. They would have preferred that instructors take better account of their prior learning experiences.

## Learning, Attitudes and Follow-up

Participants were also asked to state the degree to which they have changed or been able to apply their skills since returning from the Coady Institute. Once again, participants rated experience as having had a significant impact on them and their work. For example, the Coady Institute’s focus on asset-based development strategies had a strong impact on many participants. 94% of respondents either ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that ‘the Coady experience helped me to appreciate the assets and resources of the community rather than just seeing its problems.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Develop training programs</th>
<th>5% (3)</th>
<th>8% (5)</th>
<th>41% (26)</th>
<th><strong>47% (30)</strong></th>
<th>3.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice management by results</td>
<td>5% (3)</td>
<td>14% (9)</td>
<td>40% (25)</td>
<td><strong>41% (26)</strong></td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use emancipatory adult education methods</td>
<td>8% (5)</td>
<td>11% (7)</td>
<td><strong>41% (26)</strong></td>
<td>40% (25)</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use conflict resolution skills</td>
<td>5% (3)</td>
<td>18% (11)</td>
<td><strong>42% (26)</strong></td>
<td>35% (22)</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate with people from different cultural and class/caste backgrounds</td>
<td>3% (2)</td>
<td>5% (3)</td>
<td>38% (24)</td>
<td><strong>54% (34)</strong></td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a self-directed learner</td>
<td>3% (2)</td>
<td>10% (6)</td>
<td>35% (22)</td>
<td><strong>52% (33)</strong></td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a community economic analysis</td>
<td>13% (8)</td>
<td>10% (6)</td>
<td><strong>47% (29)</strong></td>
<td>31% (19)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use an asset-based community development approach</td>
<td>5% (3)</td>
<td>13% (8)</td>
<td>37% (23)</td>
<td><strong>46% (29)</strong></td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze the impact of development projects/program/policies on the health of the community</td>
<td>8% (5)</td>
<td>22% (13)</td>
<td><strong>40% (24)</strong></td>
<td>30% (18)</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please respond to the following statements regarding your learning at the Coady:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Coady experience caused me to change my view of ‘What is Development’?</td>
<td>39% (24)</td>
<td><strong>48% (30)</strong></td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>11% (7)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the Diploma program, I am more confident of influencing people I work with about the importance of gender equity.</td>
<td><strong>48% (30)</strong></td>
<td>46% (29)</td>
<td>5% (3)</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My experience at Coady did not change my thinking, but it reinforced what I already know.</td>
<td>22% (14)</td>
<td><strong>43% (27)</strong></td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>22% (14)</td>
<td>13% (8)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see my role as someone who makes it easier for people to actively participate in decisions that affect their lives.</td>
<td>44% (27)</td>
<td><strong>50% (31)</strong></td>
<td>6% (4)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since returning home, I have been able to apply what I</td>
<td>32% (20)</td>
<td><strong>56% (35)</strong></td>
<td>11% (7)</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
learned from the independent study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>36% (23)</th>
<th>61% (39)</th>
<th>2% (1)</th>
<th>2% (1)</th>
<th>0% (0)</th>
<th>1.69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of my experience at Coady, I am a better listener.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>29% (18)</th>
<th>51% (32)</th>
<th>16% (10)</th>
<th>5% (3)</th>
<th>0% (0)</th>
<th>1.97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My training at Coady has enabled me to make the connections between macro-economic policy and the situations in the communities where we work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>52% (33)</th>
<th>42% (27)</th>
<th>3% (2)</th>
<th>3% (2)</th>
<th>0% (0)</th>
<th>1.58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Coady experience helped me to appreciate the assets and resources of the community rather than just seeing its problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>56% (34)</th>
<th>30% (18)</th>
<th>10% (6)</th>
<th>3% (2)</th>
<th>2% (1)</th>
<th>1.66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organization has encouraged me to apply what I have learned at Coady.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>67% (42)</th>
<th>29% (18)</th>
<th>5% (3)</th>
<th>0% (0)</th>
<th>0% (0)</th>
<th>1.38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The experience at Coady has given me more confidence in working with people at the community level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>55% (34)</th>
<th>35% (22)</th>
<th>6% (4)</th>
<th>3% (2)</th>
<th>0% (0)</th>
<th>1.58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The experience at Coady has given me more confidence in how I interact with my colleagues at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>65% (40)</th>
<th>34% (21)</th>
<th>2% (1)</th>
<th>0% (0)</th>
<th>0% (0)</th>
<th>1.37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of my participation in the Diploma program, I have a stronger commitment to issues of social and economic justice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>49% (31)</th>
<th>25% (16)</th>
<th>16% (10)</th>
<th>10% (6)</th>
<th>0% (0)</th>
<th>1.86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now that I have the Diploma, I intend to apply for further studies elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In open-ended questions, many graduates focused on the impact that the Institute has had on their view of communities and their ability to interact with them. One graduate responded that: “[the Diploma] has helped me to be more respectful to others. Now I look at other adults as resourceful and capable of responding to development process…So I always look for resources that are available in the community.” Another participant responded that: “I encourage participation more from community people. I now understand…that local people always have an idea where they want to go and what they want to achieve.”

**Most positive aspects of the Coady Experience**

Participants were asked to rate the aspects of the ‘Coady experience’ that had the most positive impact on them. Respondents overwhelmingly indicated that *international nature* of the program had the positive impact on their learning, as evidenced by the high percentage (88.7%) that chose ‘sharing experiences with development practitioners from other countries.’ Following the interaction with other practitioners, participants rated Coady coursework and the independent study as being of significant importance.

Time spent away from home and access to technological resources, such as the internet, was not ranked as being important to their experience.
Career Mobility

One of the key questions asked in this survey was the impact that studying in Coady programs had on the individual career path of the participant. Upward mobility, aside from being an indicator of an impact of Coady programming on the individual’s career, was also taken as an indicator of their enhanced ability to use their skills within their organization and therefore achieve an organizational impact. The survey showed considerable upward mobility for Coady graduates within their organizations, and a lesser degree, a tendency to move organizations.

Upward mobility within their home organizations

Most graduates found themselves to be promoted within their organizations, or given more responsibility within their positions, within four years of graduation.

- In total, 51.6% of graduates had moved on to different jobs or positions either in their home organization or to a new organization within four years of completing the Coady program.
- Of those who had moved positions, 62.9% had moved to a different organization, and 40% remained in their original organization.
- Overall, those who remained in their same position reported having been given a greater degree of responsibility for programming. 85.7% of those who remained in the same job have more responsibility than they did prior to coming to the Coady Institute.
- Respondents stated that 25.8% had been the Director of their Institution prior to coming to the Institute. Respondents to the survey noted that 39.7% were currently Directors.
- There was some degree of gender disparity in career mobility following completing of the Coady program. Women claimed that 75% had more responsibility, as compared with 89.2% of men. This suggests slightly lower returns to education for women within the program.

While most graduates of the Diploma program advanced within their organization, there is a significant minority who switch positions. Overall, 22% of respondents had moved to a different organization within
four years of completion of the program. Once again, there are significant differences by region. For example, only 9% of Indian respondents had moved organizations – perhaps owing to the large number employed by Church-based organizations. On the other hand, 31% of Nepalese had moved to a different organization, perhaps owing to the instability of the country and the development sector. This is an issue that deserves further exploration.

Transfer of skills to home organization and community

Following the impact on the individual participants’ knowledge and career, the next level of evaluation concerns the impact that participants have been able to have on their organization or community. This was the most difficult issue to ascertain in thesurvey, which focused on individual participants rather than their organizations and managers.

Knowledge transfer and training

As the Diploma program is considered to be a train-the-trainers or capacity building exercise, an important part of the program logic is the assumption that participants will train others in their new skills after they return to their organization and community.

Participants were asked to report on methods that they have used to transfer their skills to their organization or community. Methods highlighted in the survey included the following:

- Most (80.6%) participants transferred their skills through informal meetings with other staff in their organization.
- A considerable number (66.1%) had organized workshops in their community to transfer lessons from their Coady experience.
- A smaller number (51.6%) had made formal presentations to their or other organizations.

Open-ended questions elicited a number of other pathways for knowledge transfer. Most of these were informal in nature, including the following:

- Idea sharing with members, staffs and other NGOs
- Discussing with friends
- Networking with other NGO’s. Use seminar and study class to initiate peace building and conflict management
- Formation of an advocacy network through the support of ActionAid Ghana.
- Review of the training manuals
- Assist in policy formulation that takes cognizance of community participation and asset based community development.
- Provide training to other organizations
- Organizing and facilitating workshops for colleagues and some superiors.

Development Action

Respondents were asked to detail actions that they have taken to improve the work of their organization or impact on polices and structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent have you been able to act on the following after returning home:</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Some extent</th>
<th>A great extent</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Experiment with a new approach to including the poor and excluded in development planning, monitoring and evaluation.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve systems for managing projects and programs in your organization.</td>
<td>5% (2)</td>
<td>22% (9)</td>
<td>39% (16)</td>
<td>34% (14)</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for pro-poor policies with government.</td>
<td>15% (9)</td>
<td>27% (17)</td>
<td>37% (23)</td>
<td>21% (13)</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulate a plan to improve the environmental sustainability of your organization's work.</td>
<td>16% (10)</td>
<td>31% (20)</td>
<td>33% (21)</td>
<td>20% (13)</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the barriers faced by women in your organization and community.</td>
<td>5% (3)</td>
<td>11% (7)</td>
<td>52% (33)</td>
<td>32% (20)</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obstacles

The survey attempted to ascertain obstacles that Coady graduates have faced in applying their knowledge. Overall, respondents faced relatively few obstacles in using their new knowledge and skills. 86% of respondents either ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that their ‘organization has encouraged me to apply what I have learned at Coady.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent have the following been obstacles in using your knowledge?</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ideas discussed in the course were not applicable in my country</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>5% (3)</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>52% (33)</td>
<td>41% (26)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methods and models used were not easily implemented in my region/community</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>8% (5)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>66% (42)</td>
<td>25% (16)</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support at higher levels</td>
<td>10% (6)</td>
<td>27% (17)</td>
<td>8% (5)</td>
<td>44% (28)</td>
<td>11% (7)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding to implement</td>
<td>25% (16)</td>
<td>33% (21)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>28% (18)</td>
<td>14% (9)</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient skills in your organization</td>
<td>6% (4)</td>
<td>21% (13)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>52% (33)</td>
<td>21% (13)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was assigned to other duties</td>
<td>5% (3)</td>
<td>22% (14)</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>46% (29)</td>
<td>25% (16)</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance from other agencies or departments whose support was necessary</td>
<td>8% (5)</td>
<td>34% (21)</td>
<td>11% (7)</td>
<td>31% (19)</td>
<td>15% (9)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would have needed more follow-up support from the Coady to tailor proposed approaches to my own circumstances.</td>
<td>21% (13)</td>
<td>32% (20)</td>
<td>11% (7)</td>
<td>24% (15)</td>
<td>13% (8)</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While few responses to open-ended questions referred to obstacles, there were some useful highlights. These included: ‘Since I returned from Coady, I have been promoted in my career but I faced a lot of organizational conflict regarding lack of support on the higher level and different backgrounds, traditional and structured approaches used dealing with community approaches. So as a result of over inspiration from my Coady learning outcomes I started to work as a free lance trainer and community projects consultant. In addition I became freer in providing training to many levels of NGOs and communities.’

Another graduates state that: ‘I have been trying to implement peace building efforts but could not carry out because of the lack of support from the organization since most of them do not understand the concept. Secondly finances were not forthcoming to begin my efforts. My commitment to the poor has strongly remained and I am working by starting a pro poor community college in a job oriented programme and I am evolving ways to involve the community.’