

FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE COADY INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE'S PROGRAM 2007-2012

“Building Leadership, Knowledge and
Capacity for Sustainable Global Impact”

Final Evaluation Report
Submitted to Partnership with Canadians Branch, CIDA

March 30, 2012

Prepared by:
Margot Rothman



**LE GROUPE-CONSEIL
INTERALIA**

Recharge de responsabilité

Les résultats, interprétations et conclusions ici présentées n'engagent que leurs auteurs et ne reflètent pas nécessairement la position de l'ACDI ou du gouvernement du Canada. L'ACDI ne garantit pas l'exactitude des données incluses dans ce travail.

Disclaimer

The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of CIDA or the government of Canada. CIDA does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this work.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This formative evaluation, which is completed less than a year before the end of the Coady International Institute’s contribution agreement with CIDA, is aimed at informing stakeholders of the program’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability with a view to accountability, learning and making more informed decisions about future program support.

In December 2007, Coady signed a contribution agreement with CIDA for its program entitled, "Building Leadership, Knowledge, and Capacity for Sustainable Global Impact". This program was structured around four major components, which included: transformative leadership education; organizational capacity strengthening; knowledge for action; and public engagement in Canada. The total budget for the contribution agreement was \$14,293,851 with an initial contribution from CIDA of \$6,187,500; CIDA’s contribution to this initial agreement represented 39% of the total while Coady contributed 59% or \$8,106,351. CIDA made an additional contribution of \$1,065,660 in February 2011 through contract amendment #2 to support the establishment of the International Women's Leadership Program. The current CIDA contribution is \$7,253,160 and the end date of the agreement has been extended from June 2012 to December 2012 in light of the last contribution agreement amendment.

Findings & Conclusions

The Coady International Institute appears to be a very good development partner to CIDA. Coady’s programming offer is relevant to CIDA’s mission, policies and thematic priorities as well as those of organizational partners and poor communities in the global South. Coady is an institution that has a demonstrated capacity for learning, evolving and constantly adapting to the changing international development context. Coady’s programming appears to be producing results at reasonable cost and within agreed timelines, while contributing significantly to innovation and learning among development actors. The quality and value-added of Coady’s programme is recognized by partners internationally, while providing networks of alumni in countries all over the world who have a connection to Canada. Through an increasing array of Canadian and international development partners, Coady has leveraged significant support from individual Canadians and the private sector to complement CIDA’s program investment since 2007. The level of international recognition and support that Coady has garnered is impressive and brings considerable value-added to CIDA in terms of program visibility, credibility, and performance.

Evaluation Criteria	Findings
Relevance	Coady’s Program was relevant to CIDA priorities of poverty reduction for sustainable development and Strengthened Aid Effectiveness in 2007. It remains relevant today with education content, capacity strengthening, and action-research related to CIDA thematic priorities of economic growth and food security while youth empowerment is taking on added importance in Coady programming. Coady’s asset-based, community-driven development approach brings local ownership and locally-driven development to the fore of development practice. This approach resonates with Canadian and international partners; demand for Coady training and support around this approach exceeds the Institute’s current capacity.

Evaluation Criteria	Findings
Development Results/Effectiveness	<p>Coady is achieving planned results at the output and outcome levels although more could have been done to define and measure results achievement with regard to organizational capacity strengthening. Results achievement has been very significant with regard graduates of Coady training in Canada; over 90% of trainees surveyed report improved skills and knowledge and are applying these in their work. With regard to the community level, there is evidence of positive results related to the ABCD approach; there is evidence that targeted communities have increased savings, improved infrastructure, diversified economic activities, developed more inclusive and effective community organizations, improved relations with local authorities, and enabled greater participation by women in household and community decision-making. At the country level, particularly in Vietnam and South Africa, broad-based networks and communities of practice are emerging around Coady's asset-based, community-driven development (ABCD) while Coady is seen to be facilitating policy dialogue on development approaches across civil society, government and private sector actors.</p>
Sustainability	<p>Sustainability of results is challenging to assess in the context of an evaluation with no site visits and limited availability of respondents from partner organizations in the global South. At the individual trainee level, results appear sustainable with regard to the acquisition and application of new knowledge and skills. At the organizational level, southern partners are integrating ABCD into their program strategies and practices although this can be challenging in the absence of an enabling environment at the country level. At the community level, documented results tend to emphasize improved local ownership, some decrease in donor dependency and improved organizational capacity as a result of ABCD pilot projects. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the nature of results realized by targeted communities – which build on local assets and existing practices as well as increased household savings – tend to augur well for sustainability.</p>
Efficiency	<p>Coady's program is generally proving to be efficiently managed. CIDA's contribution to Coady represented 39% of the overall budget (this increased to 45% with the second contract amendment in 2011) and Coady has been very effective in leveraging external resources. Coady program management and operational costs represent only 10% of CIDA's overall contribution to the program. Coady's human resources are acknowledged as excellent by all partners. Coady program results are generally being delivered on time and within budget. In February 2011, when CIDA increased its contribution to support the establishment of Women's Leadership Program, Coady was able to rapidly readjust plans and resource allocations to accommodate the contract amendment. Despite its efficiency, Coady now finds itself in a challenging situation; it may no longer be eligible for PWCB funding while the rapidity with which CIDA announced its modernization process in 2010 has left Coady with very little lead time to adapt and adjust. While Coady will undoubtedly surmount this challenging situation, it may have to cut programming in the short-term to cover immediate funding gaps.</p>
Appropriateness of Design	<p>Coady's program demonstrates relatively strong internal and external coherence: internally there is strong synergy and learning between program components while externally, Coady is partnering with many of CIDA's NGO partners to improve their aid effectiveness. Where its program design could have been stronger is with regard to a strategy and articulated results related to organizational capacity strengthening as it links to other program components and outcome statements. In the current contribution agreement, strategies and results are most clearly articulated at the level of individual trainees, which makes results reporting at the outcome level challenging. A more intentional strategy at the outset, for Coady interventions at the country and organizational levels, may have facilitated results measurement while increasing impact.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Findings
Partnership	Coady is described as an excellent partner by its southern and Canadian partners, by its private sector funders and by its graduates, both in terms of management efficiency as well as relevance and effectiveness.
Informed and Timely Action	Coady demonstrates significant capacity for ongoing learning, adaptation, and change both in its overall program strategy as well as in the ongoing evolution of its training and research initiatives. Its current RBM framework, monitoring and reporting systems do not appear, however, to be particularly helpful in supporting learning and informed decision-making for either Coady or CIDA. The RBM framework appears to exhibit some limitations in results logic and how it situates Coady accountability, while monitoring and reporting are focused largely at the output level (based on an agreement with CIDA in 2010). It is too late in the contribution agreement to revisit the logic model. In this last year of the contribution agreement, Coady reporting should, however, be focused at intermediate outcome achievements. In future, Coady should reconsider situating its accountability for results achievement at the level of organizational capacity strengthening over individual graduates or targeted communities. This appears to be where the Institute can most effectively demonstrate results and value-added.

Recommendations

This is a challenging time to develop program recommendations for Coady related to its current contribution agreement with CIDA for several reasons. It is unclear the extent to which Coady meets basic eligibility criteria for CIDA support beyond December 2012 and the current contribution agreement has less than a year to completion. Given this unusual context, the recommendations below cannot easily be directed at improvements to the current contribution agreement and they may have little relevance for Coady decision-making in the absence of a future CIDA-Coady funding relationship. The recommendations below are thus divided accordingly: 1) immediate recommended actions for CIDA and Coady up to December 2012; and 2) *suggested recommendations* to Coady on how the Institute might want to revisit its program offer post 2012.

Recommended Actions for CIDA and Coady up to December 2012:

Recommendation 1: CIDA should clarify, as quickly as possible, the nature and scope of its partnership with Coady after the end of the current contribution agreement.

While Coady's contribution agreement with CIDA was extended to December 2012, to accommodate the addition of the International Centre for Women's Leadership Program, all other program components come to an end in June 2012. With less than six months left of funding for its initial program contribution, and with limited eligibility under CIDA's current criteria, Coady may be required to significantly reduce its programming activities in 2012. Discussions on the future of Coady's partnership with CIDA began in 2010 and this evaluation was commissioned to inform CIDA decision-making. Coady needs clarity on CIDA's decision-making in order to adjust quickly and plan accordingly, in collaboration with its partners in Canada and overseas.

Recommendation 2: Coady and CIDA should revisit the focus of progress reporting, to document achievements at the level of both output and outcome results.

As a result of a request by CIDA in 2010, Coady's current progress reporting focuses largely at the output level in order to report against annual workplanning. In the final year of the current contribution agreement, CIDA and Coady should revisit this focus to ensure that progress reporting includes both output and outcome results achievement. Progress and final reports should also focus more appropriately on overall program performance, what has been learned and the extent to which Coady has ensured accountability for outcome results in a timely and cost-effective way.

Suggested Recommendations for Coady Programming Beyond December 2012:

Suggested Recommendation 1: Coady should continue to offer its transformational educational programs to development practitioners internationally based on the Institute's foundational approach to development which aims to promote gender equality, improve local ownership, reduce aid dependency, and ensure more sustainable results at the community level.

Coady's training is perceived, by a multitude of Canadian and international partners, as very relevant and quite unique in its content and approach. There is undoubtedly a need for this type of training given the current and increasing demand for Coady services. How Coady structures and ensures delivery of its training, as well as how it ensures coherence between this training and its other program inputs and strategies, are the subject of several suggested revisions below. Given its relevance, this training should undoubtedly continue.

Suggested Recommendation 2: Coady should revisit its results framework and more appropriately situate its direct support and accountability at the level of organizational capacity strengthening.

Coady's current RBM framework situates accountability at the outcome level in terms of individual and community-level results. Individual capacity strengthening results are, however, very challenging to track and document while change at the community level is generally produced by individuals working through organizations (CBOs or NGOs). Opportunities for enhanced development impact and results sustainability at the community and country levels can also be missed if individual capacity strengthening is not situated within and linked to strengthened organizations and institutions. Coady is well aware of these issues and is actively addressing them within its current strategic planning process. It is not a question of significantly revising Coady program strategies but rather a question of more clearly situating Coady accountability and focus while making the links more intentional and systematic between individual training, organizational capacity strengthening and fostering a national enabling environment.

Suggested Recommendation 3 : **Coady should further develop its on-site training in the global South and concentrate more effort in developing local training capacity in key countries of intervention.**

As Coady's program has evolved since 2007 and lessons have been learned at the country level, there appears a need to further increase training capacity and training delivery in the global South. Coady partners are encouraging the Institute to increase its training offer in-country and to build the capacity of local training organizations in this regard. According to partners, this would then free Coady resources for a greater implication in policy dialogue, research and dissemination, as well as fostering national enabling environments for asset-based, community-driven development approaches. Coady's recent proposal to PWCB is very much in keeping with this vision, while its current strategic planning process could further examine the Institute's role in fostering evidence-based policy dialogue and national enabling environments.

Suggested Recommendation 4: **Coady should develop more comprehensive systems to support the "readiness" and capacity of southern organizations to use the new skills and knowledge acquired by their staff during Coady training and to track organizational change after training.**

In keeping with Suggested Recommendations 1 & 2 above, it appears that Coady's training model is currently quite responsive to individual over organizational needs. To date, employers are asked to sign-off on their employee's training and to cover a part of the training costs. While this demonstrates a level of organizational buy-in, it does not always guarantee that employers have the commitment or capacity to use the new skills and knowledge acquired by Coady trainees upon their return. Coady could adopt a more demand-driven approach to training by further supporting organizational "readiness" for training up-take and by systematically integrating organizational capacity strengthening needs within its processes for trainee selection, preparation and follow-up.

Suggested Recommendation 5: **Coady monitoring and evaluation strategies and systems could be revisited, in light of the current strategic planning process at the Institute, to ensure that Coady is generating information useful for strategic decision-making.**

While Coady is an organization that is constantly learning and adapting, it is not clear that current monitoring systems and progress reporting are really useful in supporting that learning process. They currently appear quite focused on compliance at the output level. While this focus may have satisfied CIDA's progress reporting needs, it does not appear to effectively support Coady's needs for information to support ongoing, strategic decision-making. Monitoring and evaluation strategies should be revisited in light of Coady's strategic planning and the information most useful to ensure ongoing program relevance and performance going forward.

SOMMAIRE EXÉCUTIF

La présente évaluation formative, complétée moins d'un an avant la fin de l'accord de contribution entre le Coady International Institute et l'ACDI, a pour objet de renseigner les diverses parties prenantes sur la pertinence, l'efficacité, l'efficience et la durabilité du programme de Coady, et ce, à des fins d'imputabilité, d'apprentissage et pour permettre une prise de décision éclairée sur un appui futur au programme.

En décembre 2007, Coady a signé un accord de contribution avec l'ACDI portant sur un programme intitulé «*Building Leadership, Knowledge, and Capacity for Sustainable Global Impact* » (Développer le leadership, les connaissances et la capacité pour un impact global durable). Ce programme s'articule autour de quatre grandes composantes : l'éducation au leadership transformationnel, le renforcement des capacités organisationnelles, les connaissances pour l'action ainsi que l'engagement du public au Canada. Le budget total de l'accord de contribution s'élevait à 14 293 851\$. La contribution initiale de l'ACDI était de 6 187 500\$ ce qui représentait 39% du total alors que la contribution de Coady était de 59% du total, soit 8 106 351\$. En février 2011, par l'amendement #2 au contrat, l'ACDI a fait une contribution supplémentaire de 1 065 660\$ pour appuyer la mise sur pied du Programme international de leadership des femmes. La contribution actuelle de l'ACDI est de 7 253 160\$ et, en vertu de ce dernier amendement, la date de fin de l'accord est passée de juin 2012 à décembre 2012.

Constats et conclusions

Pour l'ACDI, le Coady International Institute se révèle être un très bon partenaire pour le développement. Le programme de Coady est pertinent en regard de la mission, des politiques et des priorités thématiques de l'ACDI de même qu'en regard de celles des partenaires organisationnels et communautés pauvres des pays du Sud. Coady est une institution qui a fait la démonstration de sa capacité à apprendre, à évoluer et à s'adapter constamment au contexte changeant du développement international. La programmation de Coady semble produire des résultats à un coût raisonnable et dans des délais convenus tout en contribuant de façon importante à l'innovation et à l'apprentissage parmi les acteurs du développement. La qualité et la valeur ajoutée du programme de Coady sont reconnues par ses partenaires au niveau international, et il fournit des réseaux d'anciens, partout à travers le monde, qui ont des liens avec le Canada. Grâce à un réseau grandissant de partenaires pour le développement au Canada et à l'international, Coady a obtenu un appui important d'individus canadiens et d'acteurs du secteur privé lui permettant de respecter sa part de contribution à l'investissement de l'ACDI depuis 2007. Le niveau de reconnaissance internationale et d'appui que Coady a obtenu est impressionnant et apporte une valeur ajoutée considérable à l'ACDI en termes de visibilité, de crédibilité et de performance de son programme.

Critère d'évaluation	Constat
Pertinence	En 2007, le programme de Coady était pertinent en ce qui a trait aux priorités de l'ACDI relatives à la réduction de la pauvreté pour un développement durable et à l'amélioration de l'efficacité de l'aide. Il demeure pertinent à ce jour avec un contenu en éducation, en renforcement des capacités et en recherche-action et il est en lien avec les priorités thématiques de l'ACDI relatives à la croissance économique et à la sécurité alimentaire, alors que l'autonomisation des jeunes prend plus d'importance dans la programmation de Coady. L'approche de développement communautaire basé sur les atouts (DCBA) adoptée par Coady met de l'avant l'appropriation locale et le développement endogène. Cette approche trouve écho auprès des partenaires canadiens et internationaux, la demande pour la formation et l'appui de Coady selon cette approche dépassant la capacité actuelle de l'Institut.

Critère d'évaluation	Constat
Résultats de développement / Efficacité	<p>Coady atteint les résultats prévus au niveau des extrants et des résultats bien qu'on aurait pu faire plus pour définir et mesurer l'atteinte des résultats en ce qui a trait au renforcement des capacités organisationnelles. Le niveau d'atteinte des résultats a été très important en ce qui concerne les finissants de la formation de Coady au Canada, plus de 90% des participants sondés ayant fait état d'une amélioration de leurs habiletés et connaissances et du fait qu'ils les appliquaient dans leur travail. Pour ce qui est du niveau communautaire, il y a évidence de résultats positifs liés à l'approche DCBA; évidence également du fait que les communautés ciblées ont des niveaux d'épargne plus élevés, des infrastructures améliorées, des activités économiques diversifiées, elles ont développé des organisations communautaires plus inclusives et efficaces, elles ont de meilleures relations avec les autorités locales, et on y remarque une plus grande participation des femmes dans la prise de décision aux niveaux domestique et communautaire. Au niveau national, en particulier au Vietnam et en Afrique du Sud, de large réseaux et communautés de pratique se forment autour de l'approche de développement communautaire basé sur les atouts de Coady et l'Institut est perçu comme facilitant le dialogue entre les acteurs de la société civile, du gouvernement et du secteur privé sur les politiques relatives aux approches développementales.</p>
Durabilité	<p>Évaluer la durabilité des résultats représente un défi dans le contexte d'une évaluation qui ne comprend pas de mission sur le terrain et au cours de laquelle la disponibilité des répondants des organisations partenaires du Sud était limitée. Au niveau des stagiaires individuels, les résultats semblent durables en ce qui a trait à l'acquisition et à l'application de nouvelles connaissances et habiletés. Au niveau organisationnel, les partenaires du Sud intègrent l'approche DCBA dans leurs stratégies et pratiques programmatiques malgré le fait que cela puisse se révéler difficile en l'absence d'un contexte favorable au niveau national. Au niveau communautaire, les résultats documentés tendent à mettre l'accent sur une appropriation locale améliorée, une certaine réduction de la dépendance envers les donateurs et une capacité organisationnelle améliorée résultant des projets pilotes DCBA. La preuve anecdotique suggère que la nature des résultats atteints par les communautés ciblées – qui s'appuient sur les atouts locaux et les pratiques existantes de même qu'une augmentation de l'épargne des ménages – augure bien pour la durabilité.</p>
Efficience	<p>De façon générale, Coady gère son programme avec efficience. La contribution de l'ACDI à Coady représente 39% du budget total (ceci a augmenté à 45% avec le deuxième amendement au contrat en 2011) et Coady a été très efficace dans l'obtention de ressources externes. Les coûts de gestion et d'exécution de programme de Coady représentent seulement 10% de la contribution totale de l'ACDI au programme. Les ressources humaines de Coady sont reconnues comme étant excellentes par tous ses partenaires. Les résultats du programme de Coady sont généralement atteints à temps et dans les limites budgétaires prévues. En février 2011, lorsque l'ACDI a augmenté sa contribution pour appuyer la mise sur pied du Programme de leadership des femmes, Coady a su rapidement réajuster ses plans et l'allocation de ses ressources pour se conformer à cet amendement au contrat. Malgré son efficience, Coady se retrouve maintenant dans une situation délicate : il se peut qu'il ne soit plus éligible au financement de la DGPC, et la rapidité avec laquelle l'ACDI a annoncé en 2010 son processus de modernisation a laissé très peu de temps à Coady pour s'adapter et s'ajuster. Coady saura sans doute surmonter cette situation difficile mais il pourrait devoir couper sa programmation à court terme pour pallier une insuffisance immédiate de financement.</p>

Critère d'évaluation	Constat
Pertinence de la conception	Le programme de Coady fait preuve d'une cohérence interne et externe relativement forte : au niveau interne, la synergie et l'apprentissage entre les composantes du programme sont forts alors que, au niveau externe, Coady s'associe avec plusieurs des ONG partenaires de l'ACDI pour améliorer l'efficacité de leur aide. Là où la conception de son programme aurait pu être renforcée, c'est au niveau d'une stratégie et de résultats articulés en ce qui a trait au renforcement des capacités organisationnelles en lien avec les autres composantes du programme et énoncés de résultats. Dans l'accord de contribution actuel, c'est au niveau des individus formés que les stratégies et les résultats sont le plus clairement articulés, ce qui rend difficile le rapportage au niveau des résultats intermédiaires. Une stratégie plus intentionnelle formulée dès le départ pour les interventions de Coady aux niveaux national et organisationnel aurait pu faciliter la mesure de l'atteinte des résultats tout en augmentant l'impact.
Partenariats	Coady est décrit comme étant un excellent partenaire par ses partenaires du Sud et canadiens, par ses bailleurs de fonds du secteur privé et par ses diplômés, tant en termes d'efficience de sa gestion que de pertinence et d'efficacité.
Action éclairée et en temps opportun	Coady a fait preuve d'une capacité importante d'apprentissage, d'adaptation et de changement continus autant dans sa stratégie globale de programme que dans l'évolution continue de ses initiatives en matière de formation et de recherche. Cependant, son cadre de la GAR ainsi que ses systèmes de suivi et de rapportage actuels ne semblent pas particulièrement utiles pour appuyer l'apprentissage et une prise de décision éclairée à la fois pour Coady et pour l'ACDI. Le cadre de la GAR présente certaines limites en matière de logique des résultats et dans la façon dont il situe l'imputabilité de Coady, alors que le suivi et le rapportage mettent en grande partie l'accent au niveau des extrants (en vertu d'une entente avec l'ACDI en 2010). Il est trop tard pour revoir le modèle logique de l'accord de contribution. Cependant, durant cette dernière année de l'accord, le rapportage de Coady devrait se concentrer sur l'atteinte des résultats intermédiaires. À l'avenir, Coady devrait examiner la possibilité de situer son imputabilité en matière d'atteinte de résultats au niveau du renforcement de la capacité organisationnelle plutôt qu'au niveau des individus formés ou des communautés ciblées. C'est là, semble-t-il, que l'Institut pourrait le mieux démontrer l'atteinte de résultats et une valeur ajoutée.

Recommandations

Il est difficile, dans le contexte actuel, de formuler des recommandations pour le programme de Coady en lien avec son accord de contribution avec l'ACDI, et ce, pour plusieurs raisons. Ainsi, il n'est pas clair dans quelle mesure Coady répond aux critères d'éligibilité de base pour obtenir un appui de l'ACDI après décembre 2012, et il reste moins d'un an avant la fin de l'accord de contribution. Dans ce contexte inhabituel, les recommandations formulées ci-dessous ne peuvent pas vraiment traiter d'améliorations à apporter à l'accord de contribution actuel et elles peuvent s'avérer peu pertinentes à la prise de décision de Coady en l'absence d'une future relation de financement avec l'ACDI. Les recommandations qui suivent sont donc regroupées comme suit : 1) actions immédiates recommandées pour l'ACDI et Coady d'ici décembre 2012 ; et 2) *recommandations suggérées* à Coady sur la façon dont l'Institut pourrait envisager de revoir le programme qu'il offre après 2012.

Actions recommandées à l'ACDI et à Coady jusqu'en décembre 2012 :

Recommandation 1 : **L'ACDI devrait clarifier le plus rapidement possible la nature et la portée de son partenariat avec Coady après la fin de l'accord de contribution actuel.**

Bien que l'accord de contribution de Coady avec l'ACDI ait été prolongé jusqu'en décembre 2012 pour permettre l'ajout du Programme international de leadership des femmes, toutes les autres composantes du programme arrivent à terme en juin 2012. Ne disposant que de moins de six mois de financement de la contribution initiale au programme, et n'ayant qu'une éligibilité limitée en regard des critères actuels de l'ACDI, Coady pourrait se voir forcé de réduire de manière importante ses activités programmatiques en 2012. Des discussions sur l'avenir du partenariat entre Coady et l'ACDI ont été entamées en 2010 et la présente évaluation a été commandée par l'ACDI pour nourrir la prise de décision de l'Agence. Coady a besoin d'être éclairé sur la prise de décision de l'ACDI de façon à s'ajuster rapidement et à planifier en conséquence en collaboration avec ses partenaires au Canada et à l'international.

Recommandation 2 : **Coady et l'ACDI devraient revoir ce sur quoi est mis l'accent dans les rapports d'avancement de façon à documenter les réalisations à la fois au niveau des extraits et des résultats.**

Suite à une demande de l'ACDI en 2010, les rapports d'avancement actuels de Coady portent largement sur les extraits de façon à ce que ces rapports s'alignent sur les plans de travail annuel. Durant la dernière année de l'accord de contribution en cours, l'ACDI et Coady devraient revoir cette pratique afin d'assurer que les rapports traitent de l'atteinte des résultats à la fois au niveau des extraits et des résultats intermédiaires. Les rapports d'avancement et final devraient également, et de façon plus appropriée, mettre l'accent sur le rendement du programme dans son ensemble, les leçons apprises et la mesure dans laquelle Coady a assuré l'imputabilité en matière de résultats atteints en temps opportun et de façon efficiente.

Recommandations suggérées pour la programmation de Coady au-delà de décembre 2012 :

Recommandations suggérées 1 : **Coady devrait continuer à offrir à des praticiens du développement au niveau international ses programmes éducatifs transformationnels basés sur l'approche fondamentale au développement de l'Institut qui vise à promouvoir l'égalité entre les femmes et les hommes, à améliorer l'appropriation locale, à réduire la dépendance envers l'aide et à assurer des résultats plus durables au niveau communautaire.**

La formation offerte par Coady est perçue par une multitude de partenaires canadiens et internationaux comme étant très pertinente et assez unique par son contenu et son approche. Ce type de formation répond indubitablement à un besoin si l'on considère la demande actuelle et grandissante pour les services de Coady. La façon dont Coady structure et assure la livraison de sa formation, de même que la façon dont il assure la cohérence entre cette formation et ses autres intrants et stratégies de programme, font l'objet de plusieurs suggestions de révision ci-dessous. Compte tenu de sa pertinence, cette formation devrait sans l'ombre d'un doute continuer.

**Recommandations
suggérées 2 :**

Coady devrait revoir son cadre de rendement et, de façon plus appropriée, situer son appui direct et son imputabilité au niveau du renforcement des capacités organisationnelles.

Le cadre de la GAR actuel de Coady situe son imputabilité en matière de résultats aux niveaux individuel et communautaire. Les résultats liés au renforcement de la capacité individuelle sont, toutefois, très difficiles à suivre et à documenter alors que le changement au niveau communautaire est généralement le produit d'individus travaillant au sein d'organisations (organisation communautaire ou ONG). Si le renforcement des capacités individuelles n'est pas mis en lien avec des organisations et institutions elles-mêmes renforcées, on peut rater des occasions d'augmenter l'impact développemental et la durabilité des résultats. Coady est bien conscient de ces questions et les examine activement dans son actuel processus de planification stratégique. Il ne s'agit pas de revoir en profondeur les stratégies de programme de Coady mais bien plutôt de mieux situer l'imputabilité et le focus de Coady tout en établissant des liens plus intentionnels et systémiques entre la formation individuelle, le renforcement des capacités organisationnelles et l'établissement d'un environnement national favorable.

**Recommandations
suggérées 3 :**

Coady devrait développer davantage sa formation sur place dans les pays du Sud et consacrer plus d'efforts à développer la capacité locale de formation dans des pays clés d'intervention.

Comme le programme de Coady a évolué depuis 2007 et qu'on a tiré des leçons au niveau national, il semble qu'on ait besoin d'augmenter encore plus la capacité de formation et la livraison de la formation dans les pays du Sud. Les partenaires de Coady encouragent l'Institut à augmenter son offre de formation sur le terrain et à renforcer la capacité des organisations locales de formation à cet effet. Selon les partenaires, ceci dégagerait des ressources de Coady lui permettant une plus grande implication dans le dialogue sur les politiques, la recherche et sa dissémination, de même que dans l'encouragement d'environnements nationaux favorables pour des approches de développement communautaire basé sur les atouts. La récente proposition de Coady à la DGPC s'inscrit très bien dans cette vision et le processus de planification stratégique en cours pourrait pousser la réflexion sur le rôle de l'Institut en matière d'encouragement d'un dialogue sur les politiques fondé sur des données probantes et des environnements nationaux favorables.

**Recommandations
suggérées 4 :**

Coady devrait développer des systèmes plus globaux pour appuyer « l’empressement » (readiness) et la capacité des organisations du Sud à utiliser les nouvelles habiletés et connaissances acquises par leur personnel durant la formation de Coady et à faire le suivi des changements organisationnels après la formation.

En lien avec les recommandations suggérées 1 et 2 ci-dessus, il semble qu’à l’heure actuelle le modèle de formation de Coady soit attentif aux besoins individuels plutôt qu’aux besoins organisationnels. Jusqu’à présent, on demande aux employeurs d’approuver la formation de leurs employés et de payer une partie des coûts de formation. Bien que cela démontre un niveau d’investissement organisationnel, cela ne garantit pas nécessairement que les employeurs aient le niveau d’engagement ou la capacité d’utiliser les nouvelles habiletés et connaissances acquises par les stagiaires de Coady à leur retour. Coady pourrait adopter une approche plus fondée sur la demande en appuyant davantage « l’empressement » organisationnel envers la prise en charge de la formation et en intégrant systématiquement les besoins en matière de renforcement organisationnel dans ses processus de sélection des stagiaires, de préparation et de suivi de la formation.

**Recommandations
suggérées 5 :**

Les stratégies et systèmes de suivi et d’évaluation de Coady pourraient être revus à la lumière du processus de planification stratégique en cours à l’Institut de façon à s’assurer que Coady génère une information qui soit utile à une prise de décision stratégique.

Bien que Coady soit une organisation qui apprend et s’adapte constamment, il n’est pas clairement démontré que les systèmes actuels de suivi et les rapports d’avancement soient véritablement utiles pour appuyer ce processus d’apprentissage. Ceux-ci semblent en effet se concentrer passablement sur la conformité au niveau des extrants. Bien que cette approche semble avoir répondu aux besoins de l’ACDI en matière de rapportage, elle ne semble pas appuyer efficacement les besoins de Coady en ce qui a trait à une information nourrissant une prise de décision continue et stratégique. Les stratégies de suivi et d’évaluation devraient être revues à la lumière de la planification stratégique de Coady et de l’information qui serait la plus utile pour assurer une pertinence continue du programme et un rendement continu.

ACRONYMS

ABCD	Asset-based, community-driven development
ASE	Agri-Service Ethiopia
CCI	Canadian Crossroads International
CEEVN	Centre for International Exchange with Vietnam
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CIKOD	Centre for Indigenous Knowledge and Organizational Development
CUSO/VSO	Cuso International
IDS/Sussex	Institute of Development Studies/University of Sussex
ISMFWN	Indian School of Micro-Finance for Women
KMG	Kembatti Mentti Gezzimma – Tope Ethiopia
LFA	Logical framework Analysis
M/E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-governmental organization
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
Oxfam GB	Oxfam Great Britain
PATH	People Assessing their Health
PWCB	CIDA Partnerships with Canadians Branch
RBM	Results-based management
SAE	Strengthened aid effectiveness
SEWA	Self-employed Women’s Association
StFX	Saint Francis Xavier University
WfC	Women for Change
WUSC	World University Service Canada

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Sommaire Exécutif

Acronyms

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Program Description	1
1.3 Evaluation Purpose, Scope and Focus	3
1.4 Methodology	4
1.5 Limitations	6
2. Evaluation Findings	7
2.1 Relevance	7
2.2 Effectiveness and Achievement of Development Results	11
2.3 Sustainability	24
2.4 Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness	26
2.5 Partnership	28
2.6 Appropriateness of Program Design	29
2.7 Informed and Timely Decision Making	30
3. Lessons Learned	33
3.1 Development Lessons	33
3.2 Management Lessons	33
4. Conclusions and Recommendations	34
4.1 Conclusions	34
4.2 Recommendations	36

TABLES

Table 1.1	Program Purpose and Outcomes	2
Table 2.1	Relevance of Coady Training	8
Table 2.2	Results Achievement at the Outcome Level	11
Table 2.3	Training Results for Individual Trainees	15
Table 4.1	Key Findings Against Evaluation Criteria Summary	34

APPENDICES

Appendix 1:	Evaluation Framework Matrix	39
Appendix 2:	Data Collection Instruments	47
Appendix 3:	List of Respondents and Documents	59
Appendix 4:	Terms of Reference	61

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

This formative evaluation, which is completed less than a year before the end of the Coady International Institute's contribution agreement with CIDA, is aimed at informing stakeholders of the program's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability with a view to accountability, learning and making more informed decisions about future program support.

1.2 Program Description

The Coady International Institute is based in Antigonish, Nova Scotia, on the campus of St. Francis Xavier University (StFX). Created in 1959, Coady is a specialized institution dedicated to the professional education of development leaders. The Coady International Institute grows out of a Canadian-grown approach to community development founded in the Antigonish Cooperative Movement. Coady describes itself as neither an academic institution nor an NGO, but rather a unique hybrid with an ability to invest in research and innovation based on direct application in the field and input from development practitioners across the globe. Over the past five decades, more than 5,500 development leaders from 135 countries have taken part in Coady's campus-based education programs. Coady has been a program partner of CIDA's for over 30 years.

In December 2007, Coady signed a contribution agreement with CIDA for its program entitled, "Building Leadership, Knowledge, and Capacity for Sustainable Global Impact". The total budget for the contribution agreement was \$14,293,851 with an initial contribution from CIDA of \$6,187,500; CIDA's initial contribution represented 39% of the total while Coady contributed 59% or \$8,106,351. CIDA made an additional contribution of \$1,065,660 in February 2011 through contract amendment #2 to support the establishment of the International Women's Leadership Program. The current CIDA contribution is \$7,253,160 and the end date of the agreement has been extended from June 2012 to December 2012 in light of the last contract amendment. To date, CIDA disbursements total \$6,449,102 or 45% of the total planned budget of the original contribution agreement (this exceeds the 39% originally forecast as it includes the second contract amendment and budget increase for the International Women's Leadership Program).

This program was structured around four major components, which included transformative leadership education; organizational capacity strengthening; knowledge for action; and public engagement in Canada. The outcome results and resource allocations by program component are presented in Table 1.1 below. The approach taken by Coady in this contribution agreement represented a departure for the Institute towards a program model that was more focused on organizational capacity strengthening with partners in the global South. In past programming with CIDA, Coady had emphasized the provision of transformative leadership education in Canada for development practitioners, and action-research, which served to improve training content and disseminate learning. While Coady had developed relationships with civil society organizations in the global South for some time, the intention in 2007 was to formalize these relationships for greater organizational collaboration, innovation, and impact. This strategy emerged as a result of Coady's partnership with Oxfam Canada in Ethiopia since 2003, where the Institute was partnering with Oxfam's local partners to pilot test the asset-based, community-driven (ABCD) development approach. This piloting initiative in Ethiopia then extended to collaboration with partners in Kenya, South Africa, and Vietnam after 2005. It was these experiences, which served to inform the new partnership agreement with CIDA in 2007.

The aim of Coady’s program has always been to build visionary, informed, and capable development leaders through the delivery of transformative education programs in Canada, considered a fundamental building block for all other development inputs in the global South. With leadership education in Canada as Coady’s corner stone, the Institute set out in 2007 to test development innovations with southern partners through organizational capacity strengthening at the country level, the results of which would fuel Coady research and then be fed back into Coady training and further innovation. The intention was to influence development leaders, their organizations and the development community as a whole through relevant training and research based on action at the field level.

The program submission to CIDA identified six to eight organizational partners in targeted countries, with which Coady would partner, including CIDA core countries of Ethiopia, Ghana and Vietnam, along with South Africa, Kenya and Zambia. The Coady Institute’s strategy for organizational capacity strengthening with partner organizations involves participation of their staff in Coady’s educational programs, collaborative research in areas of mutual interest, and provision of methodological, informational, and other support in Coady’s fields of expertise (including ABCD, advocacy & citizen engagement, community-based microfinance, livelihoods and markets, community-driven health impact assessment, and many others). Where possible, Coady youth internships are also planned with partners to complement the above activities.

Table 1.1 below presents the original budget appended to the contribution agreement with breakdowns in dollar amounts and percentages by program purpose and outcome statement. Cash contributions in this original budget were not separated for CIDA and Coady; it was agreed only that Coady would contribute 59% while CIDA would contribute 39% and that CIDA’s contribution would be front-loaded and diminish over time. The final column on the right of the table isolates CIDA’s actual contribution to date, representing around 40% of the total contribution agreement budget, as planned. With expenditures including contract amendment #2 and the women’s leadership program, CIDA’s contribution increases to 45%. It is worth noting that the planned contribution to program management and operations is 10% of the total budget, while CIDA’s overall disbursement to this budget line to date, as % of its total contribution, is also 10%.

Table 1.1 Program Purpose and Outcomes

Program Purpose	Expected Outcomes	Planned CIDA/Coady Contribution	% of planned CIDA/Coady contribution
<p>Transformative Leadership Education: To strengthen the capacity of organizational leaders within civil society and government to plan and implement development programs with a special focus on women and youth.</p>	<p>Outcome #1: Civil Society, government and private sector leaders, in particular women and youth, will have enhanced knowledge, skills and capacity to engage citizens in their own development and to plan and implement effective development programs.</p>	<p>\$7,193,004</p>	<p>45%</p>
<p>Organizational Capacity Strengthening: To strengthen the capacity of civil society organizations and governments working to achieve equitable and sustainable development.</p>	<p>Outcome #2: Communities served by the six targeted development organizations will strengthen their capacity to drive their own development, better understand and take advantage of linking micro realities to macro, improve sustainable livelihoods and financial services, strengthen gender equality and accountability and achieve a greater voice in regional and national policymaking.</p>	<p>\$1,863,160</p>	<p>11.5%</p>

Program Purpose	Expected Outcomes	Planned CIDA/Coady Contribution	% of planned CIDA/Coady contribution
Knowledge for Action: To improve the effectiveness of the development sector through knowledge, innovation, and scaleable best practice approaches.	Outcome #3: The international development sector with ties to the Coady will be a key contributor to innovation, best practices, and development models that promote prosperity, and participatory governance.	\$3,167,278	20%
Public Engagement in Canada: To increase awareness and support among Canadians for Canada's leadership role in global development, including its commitment to the MDGs.	Outcome #4: The Canadian public, especially in Atlantic Canada, will be more knowledgeable of the challenges and opportunities faced by citizens of the global South and the good news of development success and will express broader support for Canada's role in international development.	\$622,799	4%
Program Mgmt & Operations		1,179,994	7.5%
International Women's Leadership (amendment 2)		1,250,084	8%
Overhead		775,194	5%
Grand Total		\$15,938,613	

1.3 Evaluation Purpose, Scope and Focus

With the modernization of the Partnerships with Canadians Branch in 2010, project approval shifted to a competitive process and concerns arose around Coady's eligibility under the current criteria. This evaluation was commissioned a year prior to program completion with the aim of providing evidence of the effectiveness of Coady's development results to help guide future programming decisions. More specific objectives of the evaluation include:

- Assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability of the overall program.
- Ascertainment of expected and unexpected development results achieved since the agreement was implemented in December 2007.
- Assessment of the program's ability to address cross-cutting issues related to gender equality, environmental sustainability and governance.
- Identification of success factors and areas to be improved in order for Coady to improve future program performance.
- Provision of recommendations and lessons learned for future design and implementation of similar programming.

Scope & Focus

The proposed evaluation assesses actual achievements of Coady's program from December 2007 up to the present, against its stated results as they appear in its contribution agreement with CIDA (including subsequent amendments 1 & 2 respectively signed in June 2009, and February 2011).

This is a formative evaluation in that it took place a year before the end of the contribution agreement (December 2012). This is a program-focused evaluation in that it addressed performance in relation to Coady's

PWCB program activities (i.e. Outcomes 1, 2, 3 & 4). While it includes an assessment of Coady's Public Engagement, data to support findings is based on self-reporting and information supplied directly by Coady as this was all that was feasible within the scope, timeframe, and resources of this assignment. This evaluation did not include an assessment of Coady's Youth Internship program or any aspects of organizational performance at Coady.

As per the Terms of Reference, the evaluation process was built on the OECD's evaluation framework of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability, combined with CIDA's "Framework of Results and Key Success Factors".

1.4 Methodology

The consultant's approach to the generation of information for this evaluation was to create a reliable and valid picture of the Coady program, from December 2007 to the present, as it related to training, organizational capacity strengthening, and knowledge building and sharing with trainees and strategic partners internationally. In order to fulfill this goal, an evaluation framework matrix was developed (see Appendix 1) to guide data collection and analysis as well as identifying data sources, data collection, and analysis methods. Data collection instruments are found in Appendix 2 and these were adapted as required, as findings and conclusions emerged throughout the course of the data collection process. A list of respondents contacted and documents consulted is included in Appendix 3.

Data Sources

Sources of data for this evaluation included people and documents (see Appendix 3). No site visits were undertaken to the global South, as per the Terms of Reference, although the evaluator undertook a visit of four days to the Coady Institute November 27-30, 2011 to meet with Coady staff and trainees.

Data Collection

The consultant relied on a mixed methodology of quantitative and qualitative methods to ensure that a valid and reliable picture of Coady program performance emerged. Methods included:

- **Semi-structured, key informant interviews** based on pre-determined interview protocols for respondents from CIDA, Coady staff and advisory committee members, senior managers of strategic partners, other donors, and external stakeholders to the program (see Appendix 3 for sample size out of total population of respondent by category). In the case of CIDA and Coady, these interviews were undertaken in person; in the case of other stakeholders, the interviews were undertaken by Skype or phone.
- **On-line survey questionnaires**, using Survey Monkey, were used for data collection with Coady Diploma/Certificate trainees, and strategic partners in five targeted countries. A total of 204 participants or 100% of the total population of graduates from the Diploma program from 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 were surveyed. The response rate was 95 participants or 45%, which is high for this type of survey, particularly given its timing just before the holidays in December. Certificate trainees were surveyed only in those countries benefitting from a case study (Ethiopia, South Africa and Vietnam - that is 40 graduates out of a total population of 320). For certificate participants, the response rate was 18 responses or 40%. To survey all certificate and diploma participants was beyond the scope of this evaluation and it was not felt that the additional information provided from other certificate graduates would be worthwhile from a cost-benefit perspective. Surveying certificate participants in the targeted countries of Ethiopia, South Africa, and Vietnam was considered important and sufficient as these participants tend to be the staff of Coady's strategic partners in the global South and their responses helped provide a more complete picture of Coady results in selected case study countries.

- **Focus groups** were conducted separately for 49 Diploma participants which represents 100% of the population for this cohort of 2011 and 9 Coady teaching staff (out of 11) during the evaluator's site visit to Nova Scotia in November 2011. The survey questionnaire for training participants was also administered to 2011 Diploma participants at that time.
- **Case studies** in three countries of focus (Ethiopia, Vietnam, and South Africa) were undertaken. These countries were selected in collaboration with Coady because they represent contexts where Coady inputs have been most focused since 2007, where Coady has been able to leverage CIDA support with funding from other donors, and consequently where Coady has been able to invest most in monitoring and evaluation. Given the expected synergy and complementarity between Coady's three program components (transformative leadership education, organizational capacity strengthening, knowledge for action) in contributing to results achievement, a case study of results achievement at the country level was deemed an effective means of depicting the Coady program performance. Given the absence of a field mission to validate reported results, these three countries were selected for case studies due to the availability of external evaluation reports commissioned by Coady; the external evaluators were also available for interview by phone or Skype.

Data Analysis

The data analysis was both qualitative and quantitative techniques:

- **Content analysis:** As major themes and issues of the evaluation were identified, the contents of documents were analyzed in terms of these issues. Major and recurrent themes and issues throughout the evaluation included: The link between individual and organizational capacity strengthening and their contribution to the creation of an enabling environment for asset-based community-led development at the country level; and the strengths and challenges of Coady's performance measurement frameworks and systems. Key informant interviews were also structured and evolved along these lines.
- **Case study analysis:** With the country of focus as the unit of analysis, brief case studies were prepared for Ethiopia, South Africa and Vietnam using descriptive analysis to systematically analyze approaches and results, at the level of individual trainees, partner organizations and communities within their contexts, based on multiple sources of data (trainee surveys, interviews with Coady staff, external reviewers, partners, and training participants, as well as the review of evaluation reports). The data was organized into descriptive themes as they emerged, with the aim of contrasting and comparing cases (pattern matching), with a view to gleaning learning. In the end, the country contexts and cases proved too different for any significant pattern matching although attempts were made to compare approaches and glean commonalities in terms of results and future directions.
- **Descriptive statistics:** Using Survey Monkey, survey data was analyzed using frequency distribution and Chi Square analysis for nominal variables as gender, type of organization and year of training.
- **Validity** was ensured to the extent possible through data triangulation and the use of standardized data collection instruments.

Based on the analysis, the consultant identified findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned linked to the key review questions outlined in the evaluation matrix.

Evaluation Management

The CIDA Project Officer oversaw the evaluation and was responsible for accountability and guidance throughout all phases of execution, and approval of all deliverables. Coady provided feedback on evaluation deliverables as well as providing all the necessary support to the evaluator during data collection. Finally, the evaluator (Margot Rothman, Groupe-conseil INTERALIA) was responsible for the collection, interpretation, and

presentation of credible and valid information acquired as a result of this evaluation. CIDA HQ and the Coady Institute conferred on the evaluation TORs. Throughout the evaluation process, the consultant kept in regular contact with Coady and CIDA/PWCB to inform them on evaluation progress and emerging findings. A debrief presentation and discussion was organized on January 16, 2012 with Coady and CIDA/PWCB together in Hull, Quebec to validate findings and conclusions before the draft report was prepared by the consultant.

1.5 Limitations

There were several limitations or constraints to the evaluation, including:

Timing of the Evaluation: Because of the timing of the evaluation and its late start, just before the Christmas holidays, data collection had to begin immediately¹, before an evaluability assessment could effectively be conducted and before evaluation design and planning were finalized. Due to the very short timeline for this evaluation, workplanning and data collection were conducted simultaneously – presenting challenges to evaluability assessment, planning the evaluation, as well as the mitigation of eventual evaluation constraints.

Evaluability: In terms of evaluability, there were some gaps in the internal logic of the RBM framework; performance measurement indicators were lacking at the outcome level and thus had to be inferred through interviews with Coady staff. In addition, monitoring data was stronger for some result areas than for others. In terms of data availability, there was no tracer data on certificate graduates available at Coady while tracer data on Diploma graduates was relatively limited due to the University's ethics code. No tracer data was available for 2008 Diploma graduates. Tracer contact information supplied by Coady did not include the names and addresses of employers so these could not be surveyed to triangulate any data received on the application of skills or benefits to employment organizations. To manage this constraint, it was decided to survey 100% of the diploma graduates, obtain data on certificate participants through a targeted sample as well as through interviews with Coady strategic partners and to complement this with focus groups of 2011 participants in Canada. Data for community level development results existed for Ethiopia but was only anecdotal for Vietnam and South Africa, and little m/e data was available generally for organizational capacity strengthening. In the absence of a site visit overseas, it was therefore difficult to assess results achievement and sustainability at the partner organization or community levels. This constraint was mitigated by triangulating with strategic partners, training participants, Coady staff and Coady evaluators to glean results at the community and partner organization level.

Availability of respondents: There was no field visit organized in the context of this evaluation, as per CIDA's TORs. This constrained the evaluator's ability to collect and triangulate data, particularly with regard to results achievement and sustainability around organizational capacity strengthening of southern partners and community-level development. In addition, as the bulk of data collection had to take place in the three weeks before Christmas, it was challenging to reach respondents. Data collection was delayed as a result and had to be extended well into January 2012. Only two southern partners filled out the survey questionnaire of 10 surveyed. All southern partners in five countries of the global South benefitted from a key informant interview by Skype although the quality of communication was, at times, quite mediocre due to poor telecommunications, presenting another constraint to data collection. To mitigate these constraints, the evaluator triangulated data collected from southern partners with other data sources (Coady staff, graduate surveys, partner surveys, Coady evaluation reports, interviews with Coady evaluators), although it must be acknowledged that the results information available was limited by the parameters of this evaluation.

¹ Data collection with key Coady staff and trainees from the global South had to take place directly following contract signing and before evaluation design or planning in order to profit from their limited and time-specific presence in Canada.

2. EVALUATION FINDINGS

2.1 Relevance

In this section, the evaluation examines the extent to which the Coady International Institute's Program was and continues to be relevant in terms of CIDA's policy context (in 2007 and today), the development needs of key stakeholders and partners in Canada and internationally.

Finding 1: Coady's program was relevant to CIDA's policy priorities in 2007 and continues to be relevant today.

In 2007, the CIDA policy context emphasized poverty reduction, sustainable development, support to the Millennium Development Goals and Strengthened Aid Effectiveness (SAE 2002). Until 2009, Governance was a thematic priority for the Agency while Gender Equality has been a policy priority and cross-cutting theme since 1999. Consistent with these priorities, Coady promotes aid effectiveness principles through its foundational approach of citizen-driven development by fostering communities' articulation of their own development plans and priorities (alignment); strengthening local systems of community organization and mobilizing local resources and assets (harmonization); resulting in improved local ownership for results and sustainability. Gender equality is a foundation of Coady's approach, which examines latent power structures in society and addresses the need to mobilize all community resources and assets as well as to unlock the capacity of all community members to influence decision-making and drive community development. Finally, the Coady approach strengthens governance and democratic development by supporting citizens to influence decision-making and hold authorities to account with regard to their local development priorities and plans.

In 2012, the Coady program appears equally relevant to CIDA policies and priorities. The foundational approach of asset-based, community-driven development remains, has been deepened and further researched since 2007, while this approach underpins education offerings and organizational capacity strengthening in micro-finance, livelihoods and markets, value-chains (Economic Growth) as well as food security, natural resource management, and climate change (Food Security and Environment). In terms of CIDA's other cross-cutting issues of gender equality and governance, Coady offers education on women's leadership, gender and power, good governance and social accountability, advocacy and citizen engagement as well as conflict transformation and peace-building. Its establishment of the International Centre for Women's Leadership and the Indigenous Women's Leadership Program highlight Coady's commitment to the empowerment of women and the full realization of their rights. Finally, Coady is currently developing a youth strategy, which aims to develop the capacity of youth, in Canada and in the global South, to act as effective agents of social change, through participation in training, internships, and community activism. All of these initiatives appear relevant to and in keeping with CIDA's current policies and thematic priorities.

Finding 2: Coady's programme and development approach are necessarily relevant to the local context and the aspirations of partners and communities in the global South.

Coady's transformative leadership education appears to resonate increasingly with partners and participants in the global South. Since 2007, Coady has effectively increased the range of its educational programs offered in Canada while significantly increasing the number of participants coming to Canada each year. Demand for Coady's educational offer exists and has increased as more courses and more spaces are made available; this is particularly true for the three-week certificates as opposed to the 6-month diploma course where numbers have remained relatively stable (ranging from 45 to 57 participants depending on the year). Certificate course participants have increased from 55 in 2008 to a high of 122 (220% increase) in 2010-2011. It should be noted that all participants and their organizations must contribute up to 15% of the cost of training and many

employers pay 100% of travel costs to Canada, emphasizing the motivation and demand for the training by those who participate.

Among participants who studied in Canada on certificate and diploma programs², survey responses presented in the table below demonstrate a high degree of relevance for Coady training to the needs of participants and their employers. Over 90% of trainees surveyed agreed the training they received from Coady was relevant to their work, to their country context, to their personal and professional expectations as well as to the expectations of their employer. A significant majority of respondents (89%) felt the Coady Diploma program was unique and different from other training courses available because it is based in the Antigonish movement of local development in Canada; emphasizes adult, transformative learning approaches, putting the learner at the center of the learning process as contributor and receiver; represents a paradigm shift towards asset-based and community-driven development overseas; combines experienced participants and skilled facilitators who collectively possess years of practical fieldwork; and is enhanced by the warmth and generosity of the surrounding Antigonish community.

Table 2.1 Relevance of Coady Training

Relevance of Coady training received in Canada to participants and employers.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The training content was relevant to my work.	2%	0%	0%	22%	76%
The training content was relevant to my country context.	2%	0%	4%	42%	52%
The training program met my personal and professional expectations.	2%	0%	5%	35%	58%
The training program met the expectations of my employer/organization.	2%	0%	5%	43%	50%
The contribution of other trainees from around the world was an important aspect of my learning experience.	2%	0%	3%	20%	75%
The content of the Coady Diploma program is unique and different from other training courses available.	2%	0%	9%	33%	56%

In terms of on-site training provided by Coady to its partners in the global South, it must be recognized that the demand for this training appears to have exceeded both Coady expectations and its ability to meet that demand. In Coady’s initial contribution agreement with CIDA, it was expected that Coady would provide on-site training to 80-100 participants per year. In fact, the number of participants has ranged from 200-300 per year from 2008-2011 (an increase of approximately 300% over expected outputs) and Coady is refusing requests for on-site training by organizations in the countries where it is most active because demand outweighs its capacity to respond . Distance learning (available only for the community-based micro-finance certificate) has also increased from seven participants in 2009/10 to 34 in 2010/11.

Coady partners in Kenya and Ethiopia felt strongly that Coady should increase its on-site training to provide more opportunities for training at lesser cost for local participants who want to be exposed to the Coady approach but cannot afford to go to Canada. As will be seen in the country case studies below (see section 2.2), the demand for Coady training in ABCD has grown exponentially in South Africa and Vietnam since 2006, with interest in the approach emerging from a variety of stakeholders among government, civil society and the private sector.

² See description of survey sample in section 1.4 above.

All of this evidence appears to highlight the relevance of the transformative learning programs offered by Coady to southern partners, whether these programs are offered in Canada or in the global South.

Finding 3: Coady services are perceived as highly relevant to partners in Canada.

Coady's longest and most elaborate partnership has been with Oxfam Canada. The partnership began in 2003, when Coady was looking for an opportunity to test and document its asset-based, community driven-development approach while Oxfam Canada was interested in deepening its participatory approach and capacity building efforts of southern partners. Oxfam Canada was already familiar with appreciative enquiry but was looking for something beyond its existing participatory techniques; Oxfam saw something innovative in Coady's approach, which emphasized transformative, adult learning combined with innovative tools. Oxfam Canada distinguishes Coady's approach from other participatory and appreciative techniques, the latter being seen to be more "consultative" with communities rather than truly community-driven. Unlike many other participatory approaches, Coady's foundational approach of asset-based, community-driven development helps partners go into communities with few resources and no agendas as to what may result; it is up to the community to articulate and implement their own development plans using their own assets and resources. Oxfam Canada describes Coady's approach as transformative as it helps people change their vision of themselves from asset and capacity-poor to rich. As the organization explains, it has complemented and deepened Oxfam Canada's participatory development approach:

"It is not simply a set of tools or techniques. [Coady's ABCD] approach is a new way of conceiving of development and your role in it. Working with Coady has influenced [Oxfam] in subtle ways, especially in our development discourse. It has influenced the way we work...we are more conscious of the role we play and how we engage with partners and in communities... The tools are so simple. In a few hours you can begin to see changes in perception in communities."

Coady has more recently established educational partnerships with several Canadian NGOs including CUSO-VSO, WUSC and Canadian Crossroads International. In the case of WUSC, CUSO, and CCI, these are relatively recent "educational" partnerships where staff from Canada or from their partner organizations overseas is sent to Canada for certificate and diploma programs at Coady; WUSC sent four participants in 2011, CUSO has sent 14 participants and CCI has sent seven participants since 2010. The costs of training are shared between Coady and the Canadian NGO. All three NGOs feel the training to be very relevant to their programming goals and an important input to their capacity building of partners overseas. As partners explain:

"There are not many learning institutes available in our field. We can't afford private training and Coady is affordable because of its mandate. Coady courses are very focused on specific issues relevant to our partners and the courses are delivered by very skilled facilitators...Coady has a very special niche of providing really tailored certificates that most organizations in development do need..."

"I don't think anything else like Coady exists...a dynamic learning organization, always evolving, it's as relevant now as fifteen years ago. The environment changes and so does Coady."

"Coady is unlike other training institutions. It has an incredible reputation; it's very familiar with development issues. It's very respectful of overseas partners...it offers not just training but learning, sharing, networking."

Educational partnerships are being developed by Coady and several other Canadian NGOs including the Aga Khan Foundation Canada, CARE Canada, and MSF Canada for capacity building of staff and southern partners in either micro-finance, ABCD, or both. These partners are now asking Coady to tailor its educational offer to meet the unique needs of each organization and its partners.

Finally, Coady has also been effective in leveraging CIDA funding and securing additional support from a range of private sector actors. Apart from almost \$18 Million Coady managed to raise in 2007-09 from Canadians for the construction of its new campus, the Coady International Institute and its programming are seen to be relevant by a variety of private foundations (MasterCard, Comart, Imperial Oil). The MasterCard Foundation is providing support to Coady through scholarships in micro-finance; the Foundation identified six institutions of excellence in micro-finance from around the world and Coady was selected for support among them, due to the innovative nature of its course content and the high quality of its facilitators. The Comart Foundation has recently renewed a second five-year program with Coady, to whom it allocates 70% of its available resources. Comart feels Coady

“...needs more investment than we can give. The influence for Canada can be quite significant as it has the potential to touch hundreds of thousands of people. Our goal is to change the development conversation that happens on the ground. Everything I see indicates that [Coady’s approach] is a better way of doing development, based on human nature, based on the power of business. Coady’s work is great for communities and great for Canada.”

Finding 4: Coady’s offer appears to be quite unique according to development actors internationally.

Even before the arrival of the current President of Coady (formerly of IDS/Sussex), research links were forged between Coady and IDS/Sussex. In 2011, a lecturer from IDS co-delivered Coady’s climate change training. From the perspective of this lecturer, Coady’s value-added relative to IDS, lies in its emphasis on community and in-country leadership, social justice and critical thinking. While IDS is seen to help senior managers “become effective development practitioners and technocrats, within the existing development paradigm...” Coady is credited with effectively promoting transformative learning – that is, “...helping people to be more critical, to challenge current development thinking, and step outside of the current doctrine.” Coady is seen to work with a different level of practitioner than IDS, those whose work is rooted in the community and in grassroots development. IDS is interested in deepening its relationship with Coady and is currently exploring the possibility of offering a joint Diploma program offered out of Coady’s campus in Canada with a third party site in Africa. The two institutes are also looking at further opportunities for joint research.

Apart from IDS/Sussex, there are a variety of international NGOs and foundations which are collaborating with Coady. In South Africa, the Ford, Mott and Kellogg Foundations are each collaborating with Coady with regard to value chain development, community philanthropy and more sustainable financing arrangement models. In Vietnam, ABCD training workshops have been delivered in collaboration with and supported in part by the Ford Foundation’s International Fellows Program. International NGOs including Oxfam GB and Spain, Plan International and CARE USA have also contacted Coady recently to enquire about training for their staff and partners. Finally, Coady is currently helping a partner in Haiti establish a Centre for Excellence in Leadership, an initiative promoted by former President Bill Clinton who recently visited Antigonish. Given these international relationships, which appear to be expanding and deepening, it would seem that many significant, international development actors recognize Coady’s programming offer as relevant as well as worthy of support, investment and collaboration. It would also seem that there are few, if any, other Canadian NGOs or universities that can demonstrate the same level of support, recognition, and interest among such a varied array of international development partners.

2.2 Effectiveness and Achievement of Development Results

This section examines the extent to which expected results at the outcome level have been realized.

Finding 5: Considerable progress has been made in the achievement of stated outcome results for the period 2007-2011.

The table below summarizes major outcome results to date. The focus of reported result areas are those that could be confirmed by the evaluator through document review and data collection with program stakeholders.

Table 2.2 Results Achievement at the Outcome Level

Program Outcome Statements and Performance Indicators ³	Summary of Results Achievement
<p>Outcome #1. Civil Society, government and private sector leaders, in particular women and youth, will have enhanced knowledge, skills and capacity to engage citizens in their own development and to plan and implement effective development programs.</p> <p>Performance Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year over year increases in participant enrolment in education programs. • Development of a new initiative for Women's Leadership • 5% of participants are differently-abled • Tracer surveys indicate that graduates are effectively using their knowledge and skills in their home organizations. • At least 90% of participants who study the ABCD approach are using tools, applying concepts and/or taking advantage of networking opportunities. • Coady women graduates have attained higher roles in development organizations. 	<p>Since December 2007, the Coady International Institute has trained 203 Diploma participants (six-month program) and 450 certificate program participants (up to three weeks). In addition, Coady staff has provided on-site training to organizations in the global South, to approximately 1000 participants. While the numbers of Diploma program participants have remained relatively stable over time, the numbers of certificate and on-site training participants have grown significantly since 2008 (over 200% in both cases).</p> <p>Of Certificate and Diploma participants surveyed for this evaluation, 94% agree (41% agree, 53% strongly agree) that they have been able to apply new skills and knowledge gained from Coady training in their work while 90% agree (41% agree, 49% strongly agree) that they have introduced new ideas and practices at work since their training. Finally, 91% of participants surveyed (39% agree, 52% strongly agree) that they have broadened their contacts, networks and linkages with other actors and organizations as a result of their experience at Coady.</p> <p>In February 2011, CIDA amended the contribution agreement to include \$1,065,660 to support the establishment of Coady's Centre for Women's Leadership. In less than a year, Coady has developed and begun delivery of a six-month certificate and mentorship program for emerging women leaders from the global South, prepared a business plan for the development of the Centre (including the establishment of an endowment to ensure the Centre's viability) and is developing case studies of participants. A graduate program in women's leadership is also being developed. The certificate program and the Centre complement Coady's existing program on Indigenous Women's Leadership training to bridge the North-South divide.</p> <p>Finally, with regard to women's advancement, 81% of women participants surveyed, reported that they had gained more responsibility at work as a result of their Coady training while 97% of women surveyed reported they had gained confidence in their professional skills and knowledge as a result of Coady training.</p>

³ These are as stated in the program logic model annexed to the contribution agreement of December 2007. Performance indicators presented in this table are necessarily a mix of both output and outcome indicators as the logic model did not include performance indicators related to each outcome statement.

Program Outcome Statements and Performance Indicators³

Summary of Results Achievement

Outcome #2: Communities served by the six targeted development organizations will strengthen their capacity to drive their own development, better understand and take advantage of linking micro realities to macro, improve sustainable livelihoods and financial services, strengthen gender equality and accountability and achieve a greater voice in regional and national policymaking.

Performance Indicators:

- 6 targeted organizations improve microfinance outreach, improve livelihoods of community members, demonstrate fuller utilization of community-based assets, communities demonstrate less dependence on outside agencies, positive policy/program influence from advocacy activities, and people better served by HIV/AIDS service organizations.

Please see country case studies for development results in the finding below.

Where Coady has undertaken a combined strategy of on-site training, organizational capacity strengthening and action-research with regard to ABCD, additional funding has been secured by Coady to demonstrate development results at the community level through internal and external evaluation efforts. This has primarily happened in Ethiopia (see results as presented in case study below).

All strategic partners interviewed and surveyed for this evaluation process, report that partnership with Coady has transformed and improved their efforts to support asset-based and community-driven development results. All partners report that the role they play in communities has shifted from expert to facilitator and that they provide fewer financial resources to their communities as a result. Partners can provide anecdotal evidence of positive development results at the community level but this has not been the focus of formal monitoring, evaluation or documentation by Coady, with the exception of Ethiopia. Attribution of community development results to Coady inputs is also challenging given that these are communities in which Coady partners' and other development agencies may have been working for some time. Coady's strategic partners do generally support a positive correlation between the provision of Coady training and support, the strengthening of partner field staff capacity and improved community-level organization, savings and livelihoods.

Coady has undertaken tracer surveys of 2009-2010 diploma graduates and these provide many positive anecdotes on results at the organization and community level. Survey results for the purposes of this evaluation also indicate that 75% of respondents indicate that the communities they work with have improved their capacity to define and drive their own development programs (45% agree, 30% strongly agree).

Outcome #3: The international development sector with ties to the Coady will be a key contributor to innovation, best practices and development models that promote prosperity, and participatory governance.

Performance Indicators:

- At least 5 critical breakthroughs in effective development practice focused on livelihoods and governance
- Peer review of outputs indicates high quality and relevant research
- # of document downloads, and requests from development practitioners and others for our materials.

This outcome statement and its indicators remain relatively vague in terms of their intended change or result. Generally, Coady's mission is to innovate, test, and train. In terms of innovation, Coady learns from its participants during training, it tests new approaches and tools with partners at the community level and it undertakes action-research with a variety of partners in fields of relevance to its training offer. The three components of Coady's work are thus mutually reinforcing with regard to ongoing learning. There are many examples of how Coady has revised its training offer in light of practical experience as well as many examples of how Coady has contributed to research and peer learning through publications, conferences, briefs, etc.

From 2008-2011, Coady published or presented more than 55 briefs, journal articles, occasional papers, conference presentations/reports and multimedia resources as well as having collaborated with the following partners on a variety of in-depth research pieces:

- IDRC and the Ford Foundation on member-based organizations
- CARE International on producer collectives and gender TechnoServe on agricultural value-chains
- Ikhala Trust on internalizing ABCD in South Africa
- the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development in Vietnam on case studies in ABCD

In 2009, Coady published a book entitled, *From Clients to Citizens: Communities Changing the Course of their own Development*, which documents 13 case studies of ABCD across the globe. This received very positive reaction through peer review and was personally endorsed by experts in the field including John McKnight and Caroline Moser. More than 150 copies of the book have since been requested by IDRC, Ford Foundation, universities, etc. A second publication entitled, *Reaching the hard to reach: Member-Owned Institutions Providing Financial Services in Remote, Rural Areas* has also been published; this also received very positive endorsement from peers.

Program Outcome Statements and Performance Indicators ³	Summary of Results Achievement
	<p>Coady has just recently begun to track document downloads on Google so that figures are limited. In 2011, however, Coady received over 20 favourable peer reviews and personal endorsements involving two books, one paper, one manual and one education program. Four abstracts were selected for presentation at international conferences. One article published by Coady in 2003 has received 87 citations in the last two years.</p> <p>Finally, Coady has also undertaken and commissioned evaluations of its ABCD work with Oxfam Canada in Ethiopia (2008 internal evaluation and 2011 internal and external evaluation). Based on these processes, Coady has developed publications on evaluating ABCD in the global South. In addition, Coady commissioned external consultants to review the effects of its inputs on ABCD in South Africa and Vietnam since 2006.</p>
<p>Outcome #4: The Canadian public, especially in Atlantic Canada, will be more knowledgeable of the challenges and opportunities faced by citizens of the global South and the good news of development success and will express broader support for Canada's role in international development.</p> <p>Performance Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a 	<p>There were no performance indicators developed for this outcome statement in Coady's LFA. A good indicator of the Canadian public's support for Coady, however, is the Institute's ability to raise almost \$18 Million in private donations to build its new campus - \$4.5 Million of this came from the Antigonish community itself (population 10,000).</p> <p>Coady's primary audience for its public engagement activities includes Canadian university-age youth, as well as influencers and decision-makers. The presence of the Coady Institute on StFX campus provides various opportunities for university students to engage. An example is an international business class assignment that pairs groups of Canadian undergrad students with Coady participants to act as consultants advising on an organizational challenge. Coady organizes speaking engagements by staff and participants for the university community and Coady faculty teach in the development studies program at StFX and provide opportunities for interaction between undergrads and Coady participants.</p> <p>Coady's website registers monthly visits averaging 8,047 and monthly page views averaging 33,455. Coady reports that over 3000 Canadians per year are reached through Coady's media and public events including development symposiums, community events, galas, talks and receptions with opinion leaders and decision-makers across the country, opinion pieces published in local, regional and national media, public exhibitions, public events with Coady youth interns, presentations by youth interns in schools, youth forums, social media communication, etc.</p> <p>In Antigonish, Coady reaches out to the community by showcasing participants in the local newspaper, organizing community tours and home visits for participants, including local communities as case studies in Coady training, organizing speaking engagements by Coady participants in local associations, employers and community groups, etc.</p> <p>Quantitatively, Coady publishes regular articles in campus and local newspapers with collective circulations of over 40,000. Coady has 385 followers on Twitter, 487 friends on Face Book, and there have been 375 downloads of Coady podcasts</p>

Finding 6: Participants in Coady transformative leadership education programs in Canada are unanimously positive with regard to effects of training at the individual level.

According to participants, what sets apart Coady is the origins of the Institute, its training offer and philosophy which : are based in the Antigonish movement, an asset-based approach to promoting local development in Canada; emphasize adult, transformative learning approaches, putting the learner at the center of the learning process as contributor and receiver; represent a paradigm shift towards asset-based and community-driven development overseas; combine experienced participants and skilled facilitators who collectively possess years of practical fieldwork; and are enhanced by the warmth and generosity of the surrounding Antigonish community.

Survey results and testimonials from past participants in Coady training are unanimously positive. Well over 90% of participants in diploma and certificate programs report that their professional confidence levels have increased (due to reports of increased technical and analytical skills), that they have broadened their contacts and networks, that they have been able to apply their new skills and knowledge in their work, and that they have been able to introduce new ideas and practices at work. The following testimonials point to the influence of Coady training:

“You really inspired me and you changed my way of thinking, especially on a national level. Last year we had elections and I decided to contest for a Parliament seat as a member of an opposition party. I did very well. In fact, we won; but as you know, African leaders they use power and corruption, but I am going to use the advocacy strategies to win the next election. Now I am teaching my party advocacy strategies...”

“Organizational learning was the most precious course which was applicable right back home. It has been easy to apply in my organization and other groups I am working with. This course has resolved a problem in my organization at crucial moment than I expected”.

“I have changed my thinking and practice from doing to facilitating in communities, a process of unlearning to learn. I have build strong networks, linkages and contacts that continue to add value to my interventions at grassroots level. I have now given space for others to exercise and experiment their thinking.”

“Coady allowed us to reflect on why development has failed up until now. We can’t keep going into communities as experts. We need to acknowledge indigenous knowledge and skills. It has completely changed my view on my work. Now I go into communities to learn, starting with local knowledge.”

“The most important effects are that now I am able to critically analyse every situation of my work especially when dealing with decisions that relate to human beings. I always try to understand their thoughts, emotions, and intentions. Furthermore, I am able to ensure all the projects we implement there is gender lens, governance lens, sustainability lens, well being lens, culture lens and livelihood lens. These have proved to be important lenses for development leaders.”

“With the diploma program I am the agent of change to my organisation and the country as a whole. I was exposed to different skills and explored much from Coady as well as fellow participants from other countries worldwide through best practice sharing. I am now involved to represent my country in international conferences. My organisation has confidence in me that I am a performer and can deliver.”

“It has enabled me to get a deeper sense of who I am, as a person, leader, and manager. It has located me in different knowledge and action network. It has increased my critical thinking and analysis skills.”

The table below summarizes survey responses with regard to critical questions on the results of Coady training. What is interesting to note, first of all, is that a large majority of respondents (62% and up) agree with each of these statements; of the minority who do not agree, most fall in the neutral category of ‘neither agree nor disagree’.

Table 2.3 Training Results for Individual Trainees

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I have gained confidence in my professional skills and knowledge as a result of my training at Coady.	1.5%	1.5%	1%	36%	60%
I have broadened my contacts, networks and linkages with other actors and organizations as a result of my training at Coady.	1.5%	1.5%	6%	39%	52%
I have been able to apply my new skills and knowledge in my work.	2%	0%	4%	41%	53%
I have introduced new ideas and practices at work since my training.	2%	0%	8%	41%	49%
I have convinced my colleagues to adopt new techniques and approaches as a result of my training.	2%	2%	16%	46%	34%
I have been able to influence my organization to shift from a needs-based to an asset-based and citizen-driven development approach.	3%	3%	22%	40%	22%
My training is sufficient to help my organization shift from a needs-based to an asset-based and citizen-driven approach to development.	3%	6%	23%	42%	26%
Communities I work with have improved their capacity to define and drive their own development programs.	2%	2%	20%	45%	31%

What is also worthy of note in the table above, is that rates of agreement on statements relating to results about individual trainees (the trainee has gained more confidence, the trainee has applied skills to their work, etc) are very high but these rates diminish slightly (down to 60-70% agreement from 80-90%) when the results statements shift to organizational or community-level change (I have been able to influence my organization, my training is sufficient to help my organization shift, communities I have worked with improved their capacity...). This may point to the fact that it is challenging for some participants, in the absence of other support beyond short-term Coady training, to effectively influence organizational or community take-up of an asset-based, community-driven approach to development as promoted by Coady. This appears particularly true in the context of government agencies, where it is difficult for individual trainees to effect change in large bureaucracies that work in a traditional, needs-based framework. As one participant explains:

“Your ability to change your organization depends on the position you hold. We need to convince senior management – if they are not convinced you will be sidelined. They have their own approach to communities. It will take some time to change their attitudes. It is challenging to get them to change.”

Finding 7: While results have been achieved with regard to capacity strengthening of organizational partners in the global South, more effort is needed in articulating and documenting these results by Coady.

In Coady's contribution agreement with CIDA, six to eight organizations were identified as strategic partners and the aim of Coady's partnership with them was to "...strengthen the capacity of civil society organizations and governments working to achieve equitable and sustainable development". It should be noted that, while the stated purpose of Coady's efforts was capacity strengthening of civil society organizations, results statements and performance indicators in the Coady program log frame relate to changes at the individual and community levels only; what organizational capacity strengthening means for Coady and its partner organizations has not been clearly articulated, measured or monitored since 2008. To the extent that Coady does define organizational capacity strengthening, Coady staff are quick to emphasize that it's not about traditional organizational development (i.e. strengthening general program, financial or human resource management) but rather about strengthening the leadership capacity of an organization in adopting, testing and learning from new development approaches and innovations and ensuring their dissemination.

As seen in section 1.1 above, Coady's contribution agreement of 2007 with CIDA represented a shift for the Institute towards a program model that was more focused on organizational capacity strengthening. It was only in the current program submission to CIDA that a modest component was included on organizational capacity strengthening, intended to complement the relationship between training and innovation components while increasing Coady's presence in targeted countries. This shift emerged out of Coady efforts in Ethiopia in 2003 to pilot and disseminate the ABCD approach, which was then extended to Kenya, South Africa, and Vietnam from 2005, through the fostering of partnerships with targeted civil society organizations in those countries and with the support of other donor agencies.

The current contribution agreement saw Coady formalize relationships with local partner organizations in Vietnam, South Africa, Kenya, Ghana and Zambia. For example, in 2008, Coady signed an MOU with CIKOD (Centre for Indigenous Knowledge and Organisational Development) in Ghana which included training at Coady in Canada for two certificate and two diploma participants per year, capacity building for CIKOD through on-site training delivered by Coady staff in Ghana, joint research on case studies related to asset-based community-driven development and joint learning opportunities on indigenous knowledge in development. Coady's relationship with Women for Change in Zambia dates to 2004 when WfC executive director attended Coady's diploma course. Since then, 23 WfC staff and collaborators have attended Coady training in Canada, the WfC Executive Director has co-facilitated courses at Coady, Coady has delivered on-site training in advocacy and citizen engagement with WfC in Zambia and Malawi.

In the case of each of these partners, there is evidence of organizational change as a result of Coady support. New development approaches, practices and tools are being tested and adopted, organizational approaches are being shifted, while the capacity and confidence of staff members have increased. Examples include:

- Ethiopia: Hundee has effectively shifted from a needs-based to an asset-based approach to development and has integrated ABCD into its programming approach, with significant results demonstrated at the community level in terms of increased savings, the strengthening of women's groups, and improved community infrastructure. KMG has shifted its role from expert to facilitator of development, according to observers, and is currently developing a training centre with ABCD as a foundational course.

- Zambia: Women for Change credits Coady with helping develop a cadre of animators who are considered the best in Zambia; helping WfC to shift to an asset-based and community-driven approach to micro-finance over a banking model; developing a stronger network of advocates for social justice in the country; and developing individual staff capacity for leadership and confidence within the organization. WfC has greatly expanded its training capacity since partnering with Coady and is now one of the premiere training organizations for civil society in Zambia.
- Ghana: CIKOD credits Coady for introducing the organization to the PATH process and the development of a community health impact assessment tool. CIKOD has since used the process and tool in gold mining area of Northern Ghana, documented the process and results, and used the evidence for advocacy purposes, generating significant debate in the country. Further training by Coady enabled the PATH process and results to be disseminated to NGOs across Africa.

There are other reported results at the organizational level, although all of these results are challenging to corroborate in the absence of further triangulation and field visits. It does appear that Coady is affecting the capacity of its partners to adopt innovative approaches to development and test their effectiveness at the community level. Organizational capacity strengthening by Coady appears to deepen, unsurprisingly, in direct proportion to the extent of Coady's presence in the field. Where Coady has leveraged additional funding beyond CIDA, Coady has increased its field presence and developed deeper relationships with overseas partners resulting in more reported capacity strengthening.

While results appear to have been achieved, their articulation and measurement has proved challenging because of the lack of performance indicators and m/e data. This component of Coady's programming and logic model would benefit from a more intentional and articulated approach to capacity strengthening with overseas partners including clearer objectives, expected results and performance indicators, and more systematic monitoring and documentation of organizational changes. Defining what is meant by organizational capacity strengthening at Coady and how the Institute's various inputs (training in Canada, on-site, piloting, m/e, research) contribute to it, would enable Coady to demonstrate results, learn and improve its support over time. In keeping with an asset-based approach, Coady could improve its facilitation of organizational change by enabling its partners to better articulate their assets, plans and priorities with the aim of developing a joint strategy to support each partner on its development path.

Finding 8: Coady has been effective in promoting the ABCD approach at an individual, community, organizational and national level in several country contexts of the global South.

As seen previously, there were several targeted countries where Coady's intervention was more pronounced and coordinated with regard to testing, researching and disseminating the asset-based, community-driven development approach over the course of at least five years. These countries were chosen as case studies to explore the combined effects of Coady inputs, including training, organizational strengthening and action-research. In addition to CIDA funding, Coady benefitted from substantial support from the Comart Foundation in Ethiopia and South Africa, whereas in Vietnam the Ford Foundation provided modest support for some scholarships and in-country workshops. Case studies for the three countries follow below.

CASE STUDY: COADY INTERVENTION IN ETHIOPIA 2003-2011

Background: The Coady International Institute partnered with Oxfam Canada in 2003 to initiate an asset-based community development (ABCD) programme in Ethiopia, partnering with three local NGOs (Agri-Service Ethiopia, Hundee and KMG). The initiative has been supported by CIDA (initially through IHA and then Partnership support to both Coady and Oxfam Canada since 2003) and leveraged with resources from the Comart Foundation. The core intention, as outlined in the theory of change, was to test how an external agency can accompany, support and invest in citizen-led development without overwhelming community-led processes with outside resources and expertise and without undermining community control and ownership for locally driven development plans? Documenting and learning about this process has been a central focus of the partnership between Oxfam Canada, its partners and the Coady Institute throughout.

Roles, Responsibilities and Partnership: Oxfam Canada has been developing the capacity of local NGOs in Ethiopia for years and was increasingly interested in appreciative enquiry and the fostering of community-led processes but had few resources to invest in formal training and tool development for partners. Coady had developed its ABCD approach and had been conducting ABCD training in Canada since 2000 but increasingly wanted to test the approach at the community level for ongoing learning, adaptation and refinement. Since 2003, Oxfam Canada has been coordinating the programme and supporting the efforts of local NGO partners to implement ABCD at the community level through broader organizational capacity development, facilitating access to small funds, training, technical support and learning opportunities. Coady's role is focused on the delivery of ABCD training (on-site and in Canada), coaching and mentoring on ABCD, as well as the monitoring, review and constant adaptation of ABCD through evaluation, research, and publications. Oxfam Canada selected three long-standing partners in Ethiopia (KMG, Hundee and ASE), based on their mission, geographical coverage and type of programming.

Coady Inputs: Participating NGOs were introduced to the ABCD approach at several training sessions provided by Oxfam Canada and the Coady Institute in 2003 in Ethiopia. During the initial phase, five communities were selected by NGO partners to test the ABCD approach from 2003-2005. Coady conducted site visits every 6 months to deliver further training to NGO partners, organize review workshops, coach field staff and communities, as well as monitor results, document lessons, constantly review and adapt the approach. In 2006, a second phase began, which aimed to expand the ABCD approach to other NGO partners and communities while testing ways to link community-driven initiatives with government agencies, research institutes and universities. Since 2007 (the period of focus for this evaluation), Coady has trained 34 Ethiopians in Canada, with seven on the Diploma course and 27 on certificates; 10 of these participants have been associated with Ethiopian NGOs testing the ABCD approach in partnership with Oxfam Canada. During this period, Coady has also conducted on-site training in Ethiopia for NGOs on ABCD, Inclusive Value-Chain and Livelihoods and Markets annually as well as undertaking bi-annual review workshops and learning visits of ABCD pilot sites. Mid-term and final evaluations of the ABCD programme in Ethiopia were conducted, in 2008 and 2011 respectively, by Coady in collaboration with Oxfam Canada and partners, with an additional evaluation conducted by an external evaluator in 2011. Research publications and a book have also documented the Ethiopian case for broader dissemination.

Development Results:

- **Communities:** Since 2003, 21 communities in Ethiopia have applied the ABCD approach involving over 11,000 participants. The 2008 evaluation documented that, as a result of ABCD, all communities reported improved physical, social and financial assets including: lengthening three roads; improving 8 bridges; restoring 19 springs; terracing 10 hectares of land; enclosing 95 hectares of land; constructing 7 dams; supplying 65 households with small ponds; and all five communities reported increased savings. The 2011 final evaluations documented significant changes in the capacity of 21 communities to organize and mobilize assets: community associations in all communities have increased their membership, savings, diversity of activities and relationships with external actors. The vast majority of communities demonstrate significant income diversification at both household and community level with income levels significantly increasing in activities which were marginal or non-existent in 2008 (honey, milk, livestock fattening, poultry, khat) while community expenditure is seen to be decreasing in some communities on non-essential items such as alcohol, fertilizer and fodder. The majority of communities assessed in 2008 and 2011, report changes in gender relations including increased involvement by women in economic activities and greater appreciation by men of women's contribution, which is seen to improve household relations and women's influence in household and community decision-making.
- **Partner Organizations:** There was initial affinity between ABCD and the vision, values and approaches of NGO partners; ABCD is seen to have improved, refined and deepened their participatory development approaches by changing their role and bringing the community into the fore as the principal development actor. All partners are seen to have internalized ABCD to varying degrees: Oxfam Canada has adapted ABCD to other programming areas and ABCD was mainstreamed throughout its last program submission to CIDA. At Hundee, ABCD has been effectively mainstreamed in systems and practices to community development throughout the organization although significant staff turnover has required ongoing capacity development inputs. At both KMG and Agri-Service Ethiopia, participatory development was central to their missions before while Coady's approach has now been melded with participatory approaches they were already applying; ABCD is credited with bringing about a profound shift in the way both organizations engage with and position themselves in relation to the community. KMG is currently establishing a training centre and ABCD will be a foundational course. The University of Addis Abeba has produced a survey of organizations in Ethiopia using ABCD and conducted

research on local adaptations to community-led, asset-based approaches. Observers feel current demand for ABCD training and coaching in Ethiopia far outweighs what Coady has the resources to meet.

- **Coady Training Participants:** Four trainees from Ethiopia responded to the evaluator's survey, one from an international NGO and three from local NGOs. Trainees reported the Coady training as relevant to their work and country context. A majority also reported an improvement in their confidence levels with regard to professional skills and knowledge as well as improved technical and analytical capacities. All trainees reported taking more initiative at work, applying their new skills and knowledge as well as introducing new ideas and practices in the workplace since training. Results were more limited with regard to trainees' assessment of their contribution in helping colleagues change their role in development from expert to facilitator, on their organization's shift from a needs-based to an asset-based development approach, or on their communities' improved capacity to define and drive their own development (only one trainee out of four agreed in each case).

CASE STUDY: COADY INTERVENTION IN SOUTH AFRICA 2005-2011

Background: Coady's intervention in South Africa has evolved quite differently from that in Ethiopia. It has included a much broader and more complex range of stakeholders within government, the universities, community foundations, grant-making agencies and NGOs. Coady's involvement in South Africa began in 2005 at the government level, when CIDA support to South Africa's National Development Agency financed 5 staff to attend the Coady ABCD training in Canada and to co-host with Coady a series of one-day workshops on ABCD for more than 250 participants from provincial, local and municipal governments, NGOs, universities and community-based organizations. Coady's presence in the country has come at a particularly important time as a relatively inexperienced government tries to grapple with significant inequality and the realization that a top-down and service-oriented approach to development is not producing the results anticipated. The resonance of ABCD has quickly caught on in South Africa and Coady's reach has rapidly extended to cover four universities which are actively collaborating with Coady in organizing seminars, workshops and research linked to ABCD; various national trusts, community foundations and grant-makers across the country that promote ABCD among their networks of NGOs and are incorporating the approach into their strategic objectives and grant-making practices; government departments including the Department of Social Development and the Department of Trade and Industry who are looking to integrate ABCD into their practices; international development actors such as IDRC and World Vision who are piloting ABCD through their local partners; and international foundations including Ford, Kellogg, and Mott that are building upon ABCD initiatives to learn and innovate further with regard to value chain development, community philanthropy and more sustainable financing arrangement models.

Coady Inputs: Since 2009, Coady has conducted 16 workshops and seminars to grant makers and their networks, universities and government departments in South Africa, ranging in length from 1 to 5 days. From 2009 to 2011, 38 participants attended training at Coady in Canada, the vast majority in certificate programmes. Ongoing coaching and monitoring support was provided to pilots in 12 communities implemented by the Greater Rustenberg Community Foundation. Research has also been conducted and published by Coady on how organizations are integrating ABCD into their community development approaches and how best to stimulate citizen-led development of community integrated development plans.

Development Results:

- **Communities:** While less quantitative data is available on community-level change in South Africa as a result of ABCD, the majority of respondents agree that conversations have shifted significantly amongst development actors and communities in keeping with the ABCD approach. The Greater Rustenberg Community Foundation launched 12 pilot projects applying ABCD in 2009, the biggest experiment with ABCD in the country. According to a board member who was instrumental in implementing the process, "The results surpassed our expectations and were visible virtually immediately... within months communities were articulating their own projects... this unlocked their potential...it was a paradigm shift." The Leaky Bucket tool enabled communities to quantify and calculate the inflows of resources to their community against the outflows, which made them realize they were not poor. From this, they started using the inflows to fund their own development projects. Within a three-day workshop on ABCD, communities would shift from seeing themselves as poverty-stricken to seeing themselves as asset-rich. In one community, villagers analyzed for themselves that they were collectively spending over 200,000 Rand per year on purchasing eggs from outside their community and that this meant they had money! It also meant that the local market was sufficient to support a local business. A previously unemployed villager started a local egg business, secured technical support from government extension workers, and within a year he had started a 32,000 Rand business. He donated his chicken manure to a community farming initiative of 100 people which had begun after the ABCD training. A woman's group used existing government grants to buy livestock for fattening and resale, refusing NGO offers of a loan. After an ABCD workshop in a prison, maximum security inmates secured land to build a half-way house for the social reintegration of former prisoners. All of these results are attributed to three-day ABCD workshops held in these communities, with minimal additional support or resources provided.
- **Partner Organizations:** According to observers, Coady has a unique position in South Africa, with influence cutting across different sectors (which conventionally work in their own 'silos') and various levels and types of development actors (government, donor, NGO and business communities). The ABCD approach is attractive to all because of its emphasis on community autonomy, resilience, entrepreneurship and sustainability. Coady's workshops have provided forums where actors from different sectors come together and

reflect upon/debate key development questions. Observers feel that a nascent ABCD movement is emerging in the country among practitioners, with a critical mass of individuals and organizations exposed to Coady training. A number of examples are cited where individuals who attended a Coady seminar or course returned to their organization to disseminate internally and have managed to shift organizational policy and practice (Ikhala Trust, WCCF and GRFC). It is felt that more effort is needed, however, to bring senior decision-makers in larger development organizations, government departments and donors on-side to support the creation of an enabling environment for ABCD and its institutionalization. Beyond Coady's direct input, there are several initiatives in South Africa to popularize the ABCD approach through workshops, seminars, training and materials development, now organized independently of Coady. There is expanding interest and demand for ABCD in South Africa and several consultants have developed and are delivering their own ABCD training. The national government recently put out a call for proposals for ABCD service providers.

- **Coady Training Participants:** Nine trainees responded to the survey (out of 38 participants), the majority from NGOs, one from a research institute, one from government and two from the private sector. Respondents felt the training to be relevant to their work and their country context but the majority reported that their employers had limited involvement in their decision to attend training at Coady or in planning for how new skills and knowledge would be used in the organization. Respondents also felt there had been significant effects on their confidence levels, professional, technical and analytical skills and the majority agreed that they were able to apply their new skills and knowledge to their work. Results were mixed when it came to the effects of Coady training on their organizations: a third of respondents agreed that they helped colleagues change their role in development from expert to facilitator and half reported that their workplace was responsive to and supportive of new ideas and approaches they put forward. Two thirds of respondents also felt that the communities they worked with had since improved their capacity to define and drive their own development.

CASE STUDY: COADY INTERVENTION IN VIETNAM 2007-2011

Background: The case of Vietnam differs from those of Ethiopia and South Africa in the scale of involvement by government in taking up ABCD, as well as in the emergence of an independent network of ABCD practitioners which has developed organically since 2007. The ABCD approach, as practiced by Coady, was introduced in 2006 by a social worker from Ho Chi Minh City who participated in the Diploma program in Canada. Upon her return, she introduced the ABCD concepts to colleagues at the Centre for International Exchange with Vietnam (CEEVN), a local organization also responsible for administering the Ford Foundation's International Fellowships Program. CEEVN was looking for a means to animate their network of IFP alumni and was drawn to ABCD. In 2007, representatives from CEEVN and the Ford Foundation visited Coady and numerous Vietnamese professionals have since attended Coady training with support from CEEVN, the Ford Foundation and Coady (through CIDA funding). CEEVN is credited with introducing the ABCD approach and Coady to the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (through NIAPP and IPSARD, both research institutes). As a result, the Ministry enlisted Coady's support in piloting projects in 12 rural communes through NIAPP between 2007-2009 while numerous learning events have been organized through the Ministry and the Hanoi University of Agriculture, all financed with the Ministry's own resources. IPSARD has also used ABCD tools in 24 other government research and extension initiatives, has sent 7 staff to Canada for training and has been a strong participant in a number of Coady on-site learning workshops. Apart from support to government actors, Coady is also offering support to individual practitioners, largely from civil society organizations, committed to furthering the promotion and practice of ABCD. A network of practitioners has emerged in Vietnam and, with relatively limited support from Coady, activities organized by the network have included a national workshop on ABCD, a booklet of success stories, ongoing training provided in the context of CEEVN's International Fellowships Program alumni network and the development of a Vietnamese manual on ABCD. With flexible support to the network from CEEVN and the Ford Foundation, the network activities have achieved relatively broad dissemination of the ABCD approach and tools as well providing a unique forum where government and NGOs come together to discuss development issues. Five thematic networks have emerged of ABCD practitioners exploring the application of ABCD to different sectors (environment, health, education, social work, disabilities). The broader network is now exploring how Coady can support it in taking ABCD to another level in Vietnam, through training for trainers and action-research on integrating ABCD into government practice, for example.

Coady Inputs: The Coady Institute has provided training to 26 professionals at the University of An Giang in 2006-07; training to 40 IFP alumni in Vietnam in 2008; supported a national ABCD workshop for practitioners in 2010; provided ongoing coaching to government and NGOs piloting ABCD initiatives; and developed a case study on the application of ABCD in Vietnam since 2006. There have been 17 graduates of Coady certificate and diploma training in Canada since 2008, the majority from government agencies with other representation from universities and NGOs.

Development Results:

- **Communities:** The evaluator had no access to evaluative data with regard to development results at the community level where the ABCD approach had been piloted as a result of Coady support since 2007.
- **Partner Organizations:** The ABCD approach has resonated with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development which has invested its own resources to send 14 staff to Coady on training, to pilot the ABCD approach in various communities across the country and to participate in national learning events and training sessions throughout the country since 2007. Observers feel that, while individuals within government agencies are keen promoters of ABCD in their work, it has been much more challenging and premature to address

the institutionalization of the approach across a vast bureaucracy. Exposure to ABCD has sparked discussion and debate around development approaches with the Ministry and this is perceived as a positive outcome with those exposed to ABCD training demonstrating a shift in their understanding of government's role in supporting community development. Coady has worked primarily at the national level to date, but the perceived need now is to focus at the level of local government and its engagement with communities. ABCD has resonated with a host of academics and NGOs and the strength of the emerging and endogenous network across the country is unique in Vietnam, according to respondents. There are several examples of civil society organizations that have been created or rejuvenated as a result of the work of the thematic groups associated with the ABCD practitioners' network. Learning events supported by Coady are also credited with bringing government and civil society together to address fundamental approaches to development, another rarity in Vietnam according to respondents.

- **Coady Training Participants:** Only two training participants from Vietnam responded to the survey questionnaire. Both are from government agencies and credit Coady training in Canada with an important shift in their perception about their role as development practitioners. They report greater confidence in their technical and analytical capacities and that they have been able to apply their new knowledge and skills acquired at Coady in their work. While one trainee reports having been able to influence ideas, practices and approaches among colleagues and within his organization, the other trainee reported being unable to influence change among colleagues or within his organization.

From the analysis above, it appears that each country case study is unique in terms of Coady's entry points, partnerships and reach. In each case, however, the ABCD approach has resonated with participants from a variety of sectors and the take-up of the ABCD approach has been impressive in a relatively short amount of time. In Ethiopia, Coady has focused primarily on ABCD's application at the community level through collaboration with a small group of Oxfam Canada's partners in the field, with significant efforts made in learning from community experiences and developing processes to document community-level results. In both South Africa and Vietnam, Coady efforts have been focused on disseminating ABCD more broadly at the national level through in-country workshops and training, while more peripherally supporting partners (government and NGO) to pilot their own ABCD community-level initiatives.

In each country, Coady appears to be achieving significant results with its partners, but in different sectors and at different levels of intervention depending on the country context: In Ethiopia, program effects are more concentrated among NGO partners; in Vietnam government partners have been very engaged; while in South Africa results have been spread across civil society, the private sector and government. In each country as well, Coady's efforts invested in documenting results have varied, making it challenging (in the absence of site visits) to determine the full scale of results achieved, particularly at the community level. In Ethiopia, Coady documented significant results at the community level but limited data is available on dissemination or take-up of the ABCD approach beyond Oxfam Canada's three partners. In South Africa and Vietnam, community-level results from pilot ABCD initiatives have not been documented but results have been analyzed to some extent at the organizational, network and policy dialogue levels.

Stakeholders in all three countries are urging Coady to help develop a more robust and intentional strategy in each of these countries and there is a significant degree of overlap in what they are asking: That Coady should develop more local training capacity for ABCD to liberate Coady's time and energy for greater focus on policy dialogue, capacity strengthening of government institutions for ABCD and support for ABCD practitioner networks.

Finding 9: The promotion and achievement of gender equality results are evident throughout Coady's work.

Coady mainstreams gender equality in all its education programs in Canada. The aim is to heighten awareness around gender-related issues and relations of power in participants' societies and to strengthen participants' capacity to address gender inequalities in their organization and in their work. In the mandatory five week foundational course of the Diploma program, gender equality is a central theme in terms of participants' exploration of leadership in their lives and in their country contexts.

Gender equality is also central to Coady's choice of key programmatic areas it focuses on and partnerships it nurtures in the global South. Coady is very active in micro-finance and both its strategic partners (SEWA, ISMFW) and educational programs in this sector examine women's role and the implications of micro-finance for addressing gender inequalities in communities. Coady's focus on community-based natural resource management, conflict resolution, and peace-building are also strategic in their implications for women and their access to and control over resources and decision-making. Coady's long-time partnership with Women for Change in Zambia has brought gender equality to the forefront in its training on policy analysis, advocacy, citizen engagement, and community leadership. Among training participants, it appears Coady is effective in shifting attitudes and behaviours in terms of providing participants with the awareness and skills to systematically analyzing the assets and resources of all members of a given community while ensuring space for their equal participation in development decision-making. At the community level, through Coady's ABCD pilot projects with partners in the global South, there is considerable evidence to suggest the approach is effective in addressing gender inequalities. During the ABCD process, facilitators are careful to highlight the skills and assets of both women and men while ensuring that resulting development plans are as inclusive and participatory as possible. Based on the two evaluations of ABCD in Ethiopia which Coady undertook at the community level, male community members reported that ABCD helped them consider the way that women divided their time to complete so many different tasks and recognize that women could generate income without their help. Women community members in turn explained that ABCD had helped to increase their participation in economic activities and how husbands were now encouraging their wives to partake in activities outside the home after seeing firsthand the women's contribution was in the execution of the group action plans. Five out of the seven communities assessed in Coady's 2008 evaluation reported an increase in women's economic activities while all seven communities reported greater mutual respect between men and women as a result of ABCD.⁴

In Coady's 2011 evaluation of ABCD in Ethiopia, it was interesting to note that men and women emphasized different effects of ABCD on their communities: women focused more on the importance of tangible improvements like road and schools and often stressed their increased participation in economic activities. Men, on the other hand, tended to focus their attention on organizational capacity and attitudinal changes like confidence and appreciation of assets. Both men and women reported being more appreciative of the work of their spouses, which is reported to have improved relationships at the household level.

The following are observations by community members on the effects of ABCD⁵ in Ethiopia:

"In the past, women were not entitled to attend meetings, now they can attend them freely, receive training, and make decisions together with men."

Before ABCD, we were expecting our husbands to provide for the family and we ate from what he brought. Since I have been involved, I have learnt many things. We used to buy a lot from outside, now we grow more vegetables together as a family to decrease expenditure. We are able to save time, learn together, help one another."

My husband was doubting - what kind of change will she bring about? What kind of group is this? Now that he has seen the benefits he is motivating and encouraging me more."

Finally, Coady has recently established its International Centre of Excellence in Women's Leadership with CIDA support. This initiative, beyond any other, demonstrates Coady's commitment to promoting gender equality and women's participation in decision-making at a global level. While women's leadership has been a priority for Coady since 2002 (with the creation of the women's community-development leadership certificate), the recent funding for The International Centre for Women's Leadership has enabled the Institute to reinforce, expand and

⁴ Coady (2008) ABCD Evaluation Summary in Ethiopia.

⁵ Quotes are extracted from *An External Evaluation of the ABCD Initiative in Ethiopia (2003-2011)*, prepared by Ninnette Eliasov for Oxfam Canada, 2011.

grow that initiative. The new certificate course is currently underway for 15 emerging women leaders from the global South. Fifteen female Coady women graduates, who have demonstrated exceptional leadership, are to mentor and nurture these participants during their training and beyond. A network of women leaders from around the world will thus be formed. A graduate degree is also under development. The Centre will integrate Coady's current training for Indigenous women leaders in order to approach women's leadership holistically and to bridge the gap between North and South with regard to gender equality.

Finding 10: Coady is supporting results achievement in CIDA's other cross-cutting issues of governance and the environment.

Coady transformative education in Canada is obviously very supportive of these two cross-cutting themes. Coady offers training in climate change, community-based natural resource management, food security (Environment) as well as conflict transformation and peace-building, advocacy and citizen engagement and ABCD (Governance). Survey results reported above from training participants have demonstrated the relevance and effectiveness of Coady education programs to participants' knowledge, skills, and work.

At the community level, it would appear that the ABCD approach is engendering impressive results in both environmental conservation and more effective natural resource management, its strengthening of internal governance processes as well as community capacity to engage with local authorities. Data at the community level is available only for Ethiopia, although it must be said that ABCD in South Africa and Vietnam appear to be facilitating increased discussion and debate on development issues between civil society, government, and private sector, a significant contribution to governance in both countries.

In terms of environmental conservation, the evaluation of ABCD in Ethiopia demonstrated increased awareness of the need for environmental conservation and the adoption of conservation techniques in all communities assessed, whether it was reforestation, decreasing the use of commercial fertilizer, limiting animal grazing and using organic fertilizer, composting, maximizing rain water usage, etc. Through ABCD, communities come to know the importance of natural assets and their dependence upon natural resources for their livelihoods. Five out of seven of the communities involved in the 2011 external evaluation of ABCD pilots in Ethiopia report being more aware of conservation (having undertaken conservation activities and/or having set up a conservation group) and of improving their community's physical assets as a result of program support.⁶

In terms of governance, Coady's foundational approach of community-driven development is focused on empowering communities with the skills and knowledge to effectively improve their own internal organization in order to more effectively engage with and hold government to account. Coady's recent internal report of the ABCD Ethiopia initiative points to significant governance results at the community level. In every community visited, community associations demonstrated greater diversity in membership, particularly with regard to women's participation. There was also evidence of new leadership emerging in some communities with women reportedly having increased influence. Community associations reported more internal governance capacity demonstrated through their abilities to mobilize increasing amounts of labour and money from among members; share knowledge, ideas and experiences; create relations with more outside actors; and increase members' savings. Several groups were able to significantly increase the amount of support leveraged from outside actors while others were being recognized by local authorities for their organization capabilities and the nature of requests they were making of government. In all cases, this was perceived as a significant change since the previous evaluation in 2008.⁷

⁶ Eliasov, N. An External Evaluation of the ABCD Initiative in Ethiopia (2003-2011). Oxfam Canada, 2011.

⁷ Coady (2011) Final Evaluation Ethiopia – Internal Report.

2.3 Sustainability

The following section examines the sustainability of Coady results achievement at the individual, community, and organizational levels.

Finding 11: Coady’s foundational approach to development aims to improve local ownership, reduce aid dependency and ensure more sustainable development results at the community level; available data points to the potential for increased sustainability.

The asset-based, community-driven approach to development underlies all of Coady’s education programming, innovation, organizational capacity strengthening, and research. As seen previously, this approach emphasizes the identification and mobilization of local capacities and resources towards the implementation of community articulated and driven development plans. Its resonance, take-up and reach in countries like South Africa, Kenya and Vietnam, have been impressive precisely because the approach is seen to remedy some of the key obstacles limiting current needs-based aid approaches.

Consistently, Coady partner organizations explained that their former, needs-based approaches to community development were seen to be limited in terms of local ownership, aid dependency, and results sustainability.

“My job is to rehabilitate degraded lands. Before, we would identify degraded lands with GIS, and then go into a community with a solution. We would provide food for work to communities so they would replant trees and construct fences. We would go back three years later and the situation would be worse than before. Now with ABCD, there is a change in perception at the community level and they are rehabilitating the land because they see it as a valuable asset in their own development plans. The community now has a tree nursery of 5000 seedlings it is running and selling to community members, even NGOs. We don’t need food for work because these are their plans. Water for the nursery was an issue so the community mobilized to dig a dam. Coffee production was recognized during ABCD as an existing capacity and potential asset in the community – it has increased to such an extent since the introduction of ABCD that the government has now promised a coffee roasting factory for the area. ABCD training produced a chain reaction.”

“In the needs-based approach we would sort of consult the community but really we were going in with our own agenda and our own ideas. We used to even call it the “ICRAF project” not the community’s project. The needs-based approach only involved the community during implementation. ABCD is different because it helps communities to strengthen activities they are already doing, helps them to do them better. There are lots of examples of new community initiatives after two years of ABCD. Individuals have come together to buy and sell collectively in the production of sugar cane. The community dug a well and now has water year-round. Land has been set aside by the community to plant grass for collective grazing. A women’s group in the same community started a poultry-raising business and the chicken house was built on top of a dam to feed the fish and help build that activity.”

“Since ABCD, there has been a real shift in attitude of the people. There is now a savings culture and women’s groups are much more active. If you go to the community now, they don’t come with a catalogue of problems. Now they tell you they have planned this, they have raised these resources, and they ask for only a minimum of support. For example, they were building a dam and asked for some cement that wasn’t available on the local market. They are now responsible for generating their own development. We help where they ask us to.”

ABCD appears to be producing significant results at the community level (see finding 8 above and country case studies), although it is difficult to determine their potential for sustainability in the absence of further data, triangulation, or site visits. Anecdotally at least, the degree of local ownership and the nature of activities undertaken by the community (relatively small-scale and incremental, building on existing capacities and requiring few external resources) would point to significant potential for sustainability.

In the case of Ethiopia, community level results have been monitored by Coady since 2003, with two evaluation exercises in 2008 and 2011. The 2011 internal evaluation points to steady increases in household savings levels, access to credit, community income diversification, improvements in physical and natural assets, increased internal contribution to development activities as well as improved ability to leverage external support for development activities among the majority of communities interviewed. This is corroborated to some extent by the external evaluation of 2011 although the latter offers no comparison from a baseline. In any case, these studies demonstrate good potential for sustainability of results in communities where the asset-based community driven development approach has been introduced.

Limits to sustainability at the community level appear to relate to limited external resources, which can block the implementation of community-driven development plans. While ABCD is effective in mobilizing community resources and increasing community linkages with other development actors, resources are necessarily scarce in countries like Ethiopia or Kenya while development challenges can be daunting. Even with a community's commitment and best efforts, resources can be lacking to address key development challenges. This can cause frustration and cynicism at the community level and undermine results achievement or sustainability. One community in Ethiopia wanted to solve its water shortage; it mobilized internal resources, leveraged these with donor resources, mobilized technical capacity from extension agencies but, despite these efforts, the government was not forthcoming with its contribution. Oxfam Canada has developed a Leverage Fund in Ethiopia to provide small injections of capital to communities who have demonstrated their commitment and capacity to an initiative, although this is not always sufficient to solve large infrastructure initiatives.

Finding 12: There is evidence of sustainable results at the individual and organizational levels as a result of Coady's training and support; greater impact might have resulted had Coady made more intentional links between its inputs at the individual, organizational and national levels.

At the individual level, as seen previously (see results of graduate survey as presented in findings 5 & 6 above), the vast majority of Coady graduates report having improved their personal and professional capacities and are applying new knowledge and skills in their work. Several report having changed jobs and/or organizations since Coady training but the majority report that they are continuing to apply their learning in these new contexts. Through focus group discussions and survey comments, a number of graduates report a transformational or paradigm shift in their worldview as a result of their Coady experience. It appears that this level of results is likely sustainable.

At the organizational level, results sustainability is more complex. Among Coady's strategic partners in the global South, it appears that many among them have adopted new approaches, tools, attitudes, and behaviours as a result of training and support from Coady. This is particularly true of those organizations involved in piloting the ABCD approach in Ethiopia, Kenya, South Africa, and Vietnam, where results at the organizational level have been the most documented. It appears, however, that these results can sometimes be compromised by the fragility of civil society and the lack of an enabling environment for asset-based community development in many of these countries. For example, Hundee in Ethiopia has suffered from ongoing staff turnover, limiting sustainable capacity building efforts in ABCD. Agri-Serve Ethiopia has not been able to extend the ABCD approach beyond two existing pilot communities due to lack of funding and lack of donor buy-in to ABCD. It also appears that some organizations in South Africa that benefitted from staff training at Coady have folded and/or their staff who attended Coady has moved on or left community development altogether.

In some cases where for Coady graduates return to their employer, it is sometimes difficult for them to use their skills and knowledge to effect organizational change. Several respondents made the comment that, while individuals had gained skills and shifted attitudes as a result of Coady training, some returned to organizations where senior management did not understand ABCD or was resistant to change. This observation was supported by slightly lower response rates on the survey questionnaire with regard to trainees' ability to shift the practice of their colleagues or employment organization (see finding 6 above with response rates around 66% in

agreement, down from 80-90% agreement on survey questions related to individual shift). The individual trainee may choose to study at Coady but that does not always translate into organizational buy-in or change by colleagues or the employment organization. This is particularly true, according to respondents, for large, government bureaucracies that have a needs-based approach to development.

While this is not a generalized phenomenon at the organizational level, it does raise a few important issues with regard to results sustainability:

- *The supply-driven nature of Coady training* – Coady’s training model is quite responsive and supply-driven – that is, individuals who wish to train at Coady are admitted, provided they meet Coady’s selection criteria. While the applicant’s employer must endorse their training request, this does not mean that employers have necessarily embraced the Coady training, reflected upon or planned how new skills and knowledge might benefit or be integrated into the organization upon the trainee’s return. By ensuring some level of organizational ‘readiness’ to integrate the learning *prior to training*, results sustainability and overall impact at the organizational level could potentially be increased. In the case of Coady partner organizations, this appears all the more crucial in terms of placing the Coady training within a larger discussion and plan for organizational capacity strengthening and change (see finding #7 above).
- *The lack of a national enabling environment for ABCD*, in countries where Coady partners are present. ABCD is often difficult for outside development actors to embrace whether it is donors, government agencies or other NGOs. ABCD does not lend itself to pre-determined outcomes, timelines or disbursement schedules, as it is the communities and not the outside agencies that hold the development reins. As such, Coady partners often meet resistance on the part of donors who want logframes and cash-flow projections, government partners who operate from a needs-based perspective and communities that are used to injections of external funding. In the countries where Coady is most active (see country case studies above) Coady is being called upon, by its partners, to help them disseminate the ABCD approach more broadly, by developing local training capacity, generating national level policy dialogue and strengthen the capacity of key government departments in adopting ABCD. It is felt that these efforts would help partners’ integration of ABCD by contributing to the emergence of a national enabling environment and community of practice for the approach.

2.4 Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness

This section examines the extent to which human and financial resource management was adequate, and the extent to which costs were reasonable in terms of results achieved.

Finding 13: Generally, it appears that Coady is an efficient development partner for CIDA.

Coady’s strengths with regard to efficiency can be summarized as follows:

- *Human Resources*: Coady’s human resources are of excellent quality and appear to be effectively deployed. Participants, partners, and funders greatly appreciate the high calibre of Coady’s facilitators as well as their considerable and ongoing field level experience. The fact that Coady’s teaching staff is made up of highly experienced development practitioners is something that sets Coady apart from other universities and training institutes.
- *Financial Management*: Coady appears to manage its financial resources efficiently and transparently. Coady’s financial management is subject to the standard procedures and controls assured by the University of StFX.

- *Costs appear reasonable* relative to results achieved. Canadian partners agree that the unit cost of training at Coady is relatively low in relation to other training institutions (particularly those in the private sector) and partners overseas readily participate in cost-sharing on Coady training because they perceive value-for-money in Coady's training offer. International partners such as IDS/Sussex point to the low cost structure for Coady services as compared to other international training institutions such as theirs. Coady's program management and operational costs represent less than 10% of its program budget which appears very favourable in comparison to other Canadian NGO programming.
- *Coady contribution*: Coady's initial contribution to this program, in cash and in-kind (before the second contract amendment with CIDA in 2011), represented 59% of the total budget, exceeding that of CIDA at 39%. Coady has used CIDA funding to leverage impressive resources from a broad variety of private donors, both individual and organizational. Scholarships to Coady programs in Canada are leveraged 40% from CIDA support, and 60% from private sources (including 15% from the participant and his/her employer).
- *Adjustments*: When CIDA announced it was making a contract amendment in 2011 to increase its contribution by over \$1 Million to cover the launch of the International Centre for Excellence in Women's Leadership (roughly one year before the end of the contribution agreement), Coady was able to quickly and relatively seamlessly accommodate this considerable adjustment by revising work schedules, human resource deployment and financial resource planning to ensure that it could achieve expected results and disburse funds within the contractual timeframe.

Coady's challenges with regard to efficiency can be summarized as follows:

- *Financial reporting* on the contribution does not appear to include explanations of variance in planned to actual disbursements. This makes it difficult to track disbursements relative to results achievement, and to understand their implications for overall program progress.
- *Narrative reporting* is limited to progress on output achievements and the activities that are undertaken to achieve outputs.⁸ There is limited attempt in current progress reports to address outcome level achievements.

Finding 14: Coady is challenged in the short-term to assure its ongoing programming in 2012.

Like any Canadian, non-governmental organization, it is challenging for Coady to identify donors that provide sufficient flexibility and stability in their funding arrangements, to support the Institute in its efforts to learn, grow, take risks and innovate. CIDA's Partnership Branch has been unique in providing significant stability and flexibility in its funding over many years, and this support has been crucial in building Coady as it is today, with an international reputation and a proven capacity for innovation and learning. At the same time, it must be emphasized that Coady has been very effective in leveraging private sector funding for the expansion of its programming; Coady's program contribution for its 2007-2012 contribution agreement far exceeded that of CIDA's. It would appear that together, Coady and CIDA have built a vibrant partnership of mutual respect and mutual benefit over the last 30 years.

With the modernization of the Partnerships with Canadians Branch of CIDA in 2010, project approval at the Agency shifted to a competitive process and concerns arose around Coady's eligibility under the new criteria. The present evaluation was commissioned by CIDA as a result of these concerns and specifically in order to provide appropriate information on Coady performance to guide CIDA's future program decisions.

⁸ This reporting focus on output-level results was made at the request of CIDA in March 2010 with the understanding that reporting should be against outputs set out in annual workplans and that only in the final progress report prepared by Coady would reporting be made against outcomes.

It must be recognized that, currently, Coady finds itself in a challenging position. With less than six months left of funding in its current contribution agreement with CIDA (minus the resources earmarked specifically for the International Centre of Excellence on Women's Leadership) and with limited eligibility under CIDA's current criteria, the Institute may be required to significantly reduce its program activities in 2012. Coady began discussing the future of its partnership with CIDA in 2010 when the modernization process began in PWCB; various scenarios were discussed, various visits by CIDA staff were made to Antigonish, although little clarity has resulted to date.

In the interim, Coady has been proactive with regard to this situation. It is currently undergoing an internal strategic review and rethinking its business delivery model to include new relationships, new strategies, and new sources of revenue generation. It has increased its efforts in fund-raising with the private sector and is establishing an endowment for its Centre of excellence on Women's Leadership. It has also submitted a proposal under PWCB's university call for proposals.

From this evaluator's perspective, Coady is an institution with an international reputation and a development partner that is constantly expanding, learning, and adapting. Coady will undoubtedly survive this current context. Having said that, the rapidity with which CIDA announced its modernization process has left Coady with very little lead time to adapt and adjust. This is unfortunate and appears likely to necessitate rapid shifts to Coady program planning as well as likely programming cuts, at least in the short-term.

2.5 Partnership

Finding 15: Coady is described as an excellent partner by southern organizations, Canadian NGOs, international organizations and private sector funders alike.

In the course of this evaluation, respondents were nothing but positive about their relations with the Coady International Institute. While many suggestions were made on ways in which Coady could improve its programming, all respondents were unanimously positive with regard to the professionalism, effectiveness, and efficiency of the Institute.

In terms of partnerships at the community level, it must be recognized that Coady is not working directly at the community level but rather through southern partners. These partners described Coady as respectful, effective, and inspirational. They feel their partnerships were characterized by mutual respect and open dialogue – partners are free to adapt Coady resources to their local contexts and practices, while collaboration was felt to be equitable, transparent, and mutually beneficial. Southern partners feel the capacity development and learning works in both directions – while they are building capacity through their pilot experiences at the community level, these projects are also informing Coady and being used by Coady to improve their educational programs and development innovations. Southern partners are also involved in co-facilitating some Coady courses.

Canadian NGO partners described relations with Coady as professional, easy, efficient, and straightforward. Coady was seen to offer something that complemented their programming and arrangements were easily and efficiently executed. Private sector funders who were interviewed for this evaluation were energized by their association with Coady. MasterCard Foundation describes Coady as one of six centres of excellence in micro-finance in the world and has received very positive feedback from the participants it has supported on Coady training to date. The Comart Foundation feels Coady's development philosophy, program strategy and focus on innovation is closely aligned with their mission and vision; Comart participates in Coady monitoring missions and this level of collaboration is greatly appreciated by the Foundation.

Finally, Coady appears to be a very good partner for CIDA. Coady's programming offer is relevant to CIDA's mission, policies, and thematic priorities. Coady's programming appears to be producing results at reasonable cost and within agreed timelines, while contributing significantly to innovation and learning in international

development. Coady's programme appears to be internationally recognized, while providing networks of alumni in developing countries all over the world. Coady has leveraged significant private sector funding to complement CIDA's investment, while Coady is also collaborating with a number of Canadian NGO partners to improve their aid effectiveness.

2.6 Appropriateness of Program Design

This section examines the appropriateness of Coady's program submission to CIDA for 2007-2012 in terms of internal and external coherence, a sound understanding of the local context and the application of learning.

Finding 16: Coady's program design in 2007 was coherent both internally and externally; as the program evolved and lessons have been learned, there is a need to make the program strategy more intentional in its design and expected results with regard to capacity strengthening, networking and policy dialogue.

There is good internal and external coherence in Coady's program design. Coady's contribution agreement of 2007 with CIDA was organized around three major components and the synergy and complementarity that existed between them. Transformative education, organizational capacity strengthening and knowledge for action were to be inter-related and mutually reinforcing, with ongoing learning and the application of this learning being a central theme. In practice, the internal coherence and synergy are high as Coady has used learning from its southern partners and their pilot initiatives to inform revisions to its education programs and research publications; at the same time, action-research has been disseminated to partners and served to improve Coady training. At Coady, there is constant revision and renewal of both the training focus and content, based on input from participants, southern partners, and action-research. As Coady explains, the Institute is not an academic institution and it is not an NGO – it is a unique hybrid with an ability to invest in research and innovation based on direct application in the field and input from practitioners across the globe.

In terms of external coherence, Coady relies on external partnerships – with Canadian NGO and southern partners - to pilot and test its models and tools, as well as to collaborate on action-research and dissemination. Coady is partnering with several Canadian NGOs that are also partners to CIDA, thus contributing to overall coherence and coordination among CIDA investments.

In 2007, an organizational capacity strengthening component was added to Coady's program submission, although it was quite modest in scope relative to the other two, long-standing components (11% for capacity strengthening relative to 45% for transformative education and 20% for action-research). Since 2007, Coady's implication with southern partners and its direct involvement in countries of the global South has deepened and expanded considerably (see country case studies above). Results are emerging at the organizational level, but increasingly Coady is seen to be influencing national debate and policy dialogue around development approaches, particularly in Vietnam and South Africa.

Coady is now being called upon, by southern partners in these and other targeted countries, to increase its involvement in the development of local training capacity, the promotion of policy dialogue around new development approaches, the strengthening of networks among ABCD practitioners, as well as the capacity strengthening of government agencies to integrate ABCD. Coady's funding partners also appear supportive of an increased involvement by Coady in this type of role in countries of the global South.

As Coady has increased and deepened its intervention at the country level since 2007, the relative balance and prioritization (in terms of human and financial resource allocations) between the three key components of Coady programming – transformative education, capacity strengthening and knowledge for action – may need to be revisited going forward. This rebalancing of institutional priorities and strategies has significant implications for the Institute in terms of its delivery model, partnerships, resource allocations, and funding sources. To its credit, Coady is actively exploring these issues through its current strategic planning process.

Finding 17: There has been a need for more clarity around Coady’s definition and approach to organizational capacity strengthening.

As seen in Finding #7 above, Coady’s contribution agreement with CIDA identified six to eight organizations and the aim was to “...strengthen the capacity of civil society organizations and governments working to achieve equitable and sustainable development”. It should be noted that, while a stated purpose of Coady’s efforts was capacity strengthening of civil society organizations and governments, results statements and performance indicators in the Coady program log frame relate to changes at the individual and community levels only; what organizational capacity strengthening means for Coady partner organizations and how partner organizations were expected to evolve as a result of partnering with Coady lacked overall clarity.

To the extent that Coady does define organizational capacity strengthening, Coady staff are quick to emphasize that it’s not about organizational development (program, financial or human resource management for example) but rather about building leadership for innovation, testing and learning from new development approaches and ensuring their broad dissemination. Coady’s approach has remained relatively responsive to requests from partners for training in Canada, on-site training, support for implementing pilots, organizing workshops in-country, etc. While this support does appear to have contributed to strengthened organizational capacity (see finding #7), the impact might have been greater with a more intentional and articulated strategy for capacity strengthening of both partners organizations and individual training participants in relation to their employers. The need for a more intentional strategy and better articulation of results in this area will only increase, as Coady deepens its intervention with partners at the country level in the global South.

2.7 Informed and Timely Decision Making

This section examines the extent to which decision-making structures are appropriate and decision-makers have at their disposal sufficient and timely information for informed decision-making through adequate results-based management, monitoring, evaluation, and risk analysis.

Finding 18: Coady demonstrates significant capacity for ongoing learning and adaptation.

Coady is an organization that learns and applies its learning for ongoing program improvement. In its transformative education programs, the type of courses offered and the related learning content is constantly being updated based on input from participants, pilot testing of innovative approaches in the field, evaluation and action-research. Coady’s course offerings have changed significantly since 2007 with new programs developed in Community-driven Health Impact Assessment, Learning Organizations and Change, Facilitation and Training for Community Change, as well as a re-design of Community-based Natural Resource Management. Newly developed certificates in Communication and Social Media, Good Governance and Social Accountability, and Skills for Social Change are scheduled to begin in the spring 2012. Finally, new content is regularly added to the Diploma Program; recent revisions include content related to climate change, food security, and citizen engagement, to name a few examples.

Training around Coady’s foundational approach of asset-based, community-driven development is constantly being refined and adapted, as new learning emerges from practitioners in the field. As seen in the findings above, Coady is also innovating and evolving significantly with regard to the breadth and scope of its strategic partnerships in targeted countries of the global South. Partners and external stakeholders consistently describe Coady as a dynamic and effective institution that is contributing to global knowledge and innovative practice in international development.

Ongoing learning at Coady is supported by the following processes and systems:

- training course evaluations and focus groups with Coady training participants at regular intervals throughout each education program with feedback directly informing course revisions;

- tracer surveys of Coady graduates, although these efforts have focused only on diploma participants and have not been conducted systematically since 2007;
- annual review workshops with strategic partners of the global South that are involved in pilot testing Coady approaches (largely the ABCD initiative in Ethiopia, Kenya, South Africa although there is regular communication and feedback with key partners in Vietnam, Ghana, Zambia, Bangladesh and India);
- action-research supported by CIDA and other donors, undertaken in collaboration with southern partners, which contributes to training content learning and revision;
- Coady-commissioned internal and external program reviews and evaluations – to date these have largely focused on ABCD dissemination and pilot testing in Ethiopia, Vietnam and South Africa; and,
- formal, strategic planning processes, which appear to take place every three to five years.

Finding 19: The current RBM framework related to Coady’s contribution agreement with CIDA presents certain limitations in terms of results logic and accountability.

The current log frame included in Coady’s contribution agreement with CIDA presents certain limitations related to results logic. A stated purpose of Coady’s program was “to directly strengthen the capacity of civil society and government working to achieve equitable and sustainable development”. This said, there are no outcome results or performance indicators included in the log frame that relate to strengthened organizational capacity. Expected results are articulated for individual capacity strengthening and community capacity strengthening but there is no clarity as to how organizational partners may change and grow in terms of values, mission, goals, practices, systems, linkages, or resources. There seems to be an assumption made in the results chain logic that, by strengthening individual trainee capacity, organizations will necessarily or automatically be strengthened to produce greater impact at the community level.

While there is evidence in the findings above to suggest that Coady has contributed to strengthened capacity in partner organizations, it has also been suggested that this change was much more challenging to achieve in large government bureaucracies than in civil society organizations already adopting a participatory development approach; that some Coady training participants faced resistance and obstacles to effect change in their organizations upon their return from Canada; and that with greater intentionality and focus on change strategies and results articulation at the organizational level, the effects of Coady support may have been greater. This is particularly relevant with regard to government partners, where change appears more difficult and needs-based development approaches appear more entrenched.

In terms of situating Coady accountability for results, these issues raise interesting questions. At the outcome level (intermediate outcome in CIDA’s new RBM policy), at what level of change should Coady ultimately be held to account – individual, organizational or community? The current logframe situates Coady accountability at the level of individual and community results. This evaluator would argue that, because individuals generally work within organizations to support the emergence of development results, Coady’s accountability is most appropriately situated in terms of *organizational* capacity and change. Coady works with and through partner organizations in the global South; regardless of whether Coady’s input is training in Canada, training in-country, pilot projects, workshops or action-research, all of these efforts are destined to improve the capacity of development organizations to support equitable and sustainable development results. Coady does not have the capacity to work directly at the community level and, by working primarily through individual leaders and partner organizations, has limited control over results achievement at the community level. Coady’s theory of change in its ABCD work starts with “the outside organization” supporting change at the community level – that appears to be where Coady’s influence and value-added lie.

The limits of the current log frame are understandable in Coady's case – the contribution agreement represented a considerable shift in programmatic focus for Coady from education in Canada to a more proactive role contributing to development results through partner organizations in the global South. Coady has learned and evolved significantly since 2007. With less than a year left to go in the contribution agreement, it is not worth revisiting the log frame at this point, although it is hoped that the observations above will help Coady (and CIDA) in articulating future results frameworks and logic models that better reflect Coady's value-added.

Finding 20: Coady's monitoring, and progress reporting is timely and informative at the output level.

Coady's progress reporting is clear, timely and informative although largely focused at the output level – participants trained, training courses delivered, on-site training or workshops organized, research published and disseminated. There is relatively limited focus at the outcome level, and where there is, reporting tends to focus on the first outcome statement related to new skills and knowledge acquired and applied by individual graduates of Coady programs.

This limitation in Coady reporting is due, in large part, to some of the limitations raised in the preceding finding with regard to the contribution agreement's log frame. It is also the result of an agreement with CIDA to focus progress reporting on output achievements. Beyond these limitations, however, Coady progress reporting generally tends to be more focused on compliance and *reporting on what Coady has done*, rather than providing a comprehensive analysis of where the program is at in its progress, what has been learned and how Coady will ensure performance is achieved on time and within budget going forward. For example, progress reports tend to include little context or risk analysis, little overview of any variance in planned to actual activities or disbursements, nor do they analyze the implications of these for future program progress and performance. The evaluator wonders to what extent this reporting is providing the right kind of information to help either Coady or CIDA make informed or timely decisions?

Finally, Coady's monitoring and evaluation systems appear to present both strengths and challenges. In terms of challenges, Coady's graduate tracer system has not been undertaken systematically and, because of university ethics policies, tends to produce extensive, qualitative data that is difficult for Coady to manage or use. Coady does not monitor change at the organizational or country level in any systematic way and this is unfortunate because of its program purpose but also because this could be a much easier and more manageable way to track and report on results.

In terms of strengths, however, Coady must be credited with investing in evaluations and reviews. Coady undertook extensive evaluation of its ABCD programming in Ethiopia and the evaluations have been very useful in demonstrating results, identifying lessons and feeding these in to training, partners' interventions at the community level as well as research publications. Coady has also undertaken country reviews of ABCD dissemination, take-up and learning among partners in both Vietnam and South Africa. These have provided interesting insights at the organizational and national levels, with regard to results achievement, gaps and how Coady can position itself going forward. The information coming out of Coady's evaluation efforts appears to be much more useful and relevant to the Institute's decision-making than much of its current monitoring data for CIDA.

Coady produced an m/e strategy to cover 2010-12. This strategy provides a good start in terms of articulating Coady's guiding principles, activities and key evaluation questions. Within Coady's current strategic planning process, it would seem an opportune time to revisit the m/e strategy in light of any changes to its program strategy and delivery model. A useful point of departure in the development of a future m/e strategy is to examine *what information Coady will in fact use*, for what purpose, when and how? After looking carefully at what information is really useful and likely to be used, then Coady can explore monitoring and evaluation principles, activities and systems in light of available human and financial resources to this end.

3. LESSONS LEARNED

3.1 Development Lessons

Lesson 1: The new skills and knowledge resulting from individual training are more effectively taken up when the commitment and capacity of the trainee's employment organization is strengthened to use the training received.

Over the last two decades, and based on development learning, CIDA has shifted its emphasis from a supply-driven approach to training which was traditionally responsive to individual training needs⁹, towards a demand-driven approach where the training of individuals is more directly linked to broader organizational and institutional priorities and capacity development strategies. This approach is seen to enhance both the effectiveness of training and results sustainability. Training is increasingly perceived, not as an end in itself, but rather as one component of more complex, capacity strengthening initiatives. Coady's increasing efforts, since 2007, to link its training offer with the capacity strengthening of its partners in the global South, are in keeping with international development lessons and these efforts should be pursued.

Lesson 2: There are both advantages and disadvantages which must be balanced in decision-making about where to deliver training.

Delivering training in Canada is relatively costly compared to the delivery of on-site or regional training in the global South. At the same time, training in Canada exposes participants to a different training experience, including exposure to a new cultural and institutional context, new practices and processes, a more diverse student body, as well as a more conducive atmosphere away from work and family in which to assimilate learning. On-site or regional training has the advantage of lower cost, potentially reaching more participants, being more contextually relevant and requiring less adaptation on the part of the trainee and his/her employment organization. Both types of training present advantages and disadvantages which must be weighed, in light of the purpose of training, its expected results and available resources. More broad-based, introductory and shorter-term training often lends itself to delivery locally and regionally, while longer-term, more focused and in-depth training might justify greater resource investments and travel to Canada. These are but some of a variety of variables which need to be considered in order to decide on where to locate and how to deliver training.

3.2 Management Lessons

Lesson 3: The validity and reliability of data collection and analysis are enhanced when program evaluations include access to primary sources and field-level beneficiaries.

In the context of program evaluations in international development, it is challenging to base evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations largely upon secondary sources of information, particularly when these sources are commissioned by the organizational partner under review. In terms of primary sources, it is also challenging to base methodology on written surveys and skype/telephone interviews in the context of countries where telecommunications are difficult and literacy rates are low. When field missions for this type of evaluation are not possible, it is important to include sufficient lead time for an appropriate evaluability assessment, in order to ensure that data collection is feasible and that threats to data reliability and validity can effectively be addressed.

⁹ CIDA has progressively phased out of scholarship programs and training-focused initiatives since the 1990s, to support more complex and comprehensive capacity development strategies, as a means to enhance both individual and institutional performance in developing countries.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Conclusions

The Coady International Institute appears to be a very good development partner to CIDA. Coady's programming offer is relevant to CIDA's mission, policies and thematic priorities as well as those of organizational partners and poor communities in the global South. Coady is an institution that has a demonstrated capacity for learning, evolving and constantly adapting to the changing international development context. Coady's programming appears to be producing results at reasonable cost and within agreed timelines, while contributing significantly to innovation and learning among development actors. The quality and value-added of Coady's programme is recognized by partners internationally, while providing networks of alumni in countries all over the world who have a connection to Canada. Through an increasing array of Canadian and international development partners, Coady has leveraged significant support from individual Canadians and the private sector to complement CIDA's program investment since 2007. The level of international recognition and support that Coady has garnered is impressive and brings considerable value-added to CIDA in terms of program visibility, credibility, and performance.

Table 4.1 Key Findings Against Evaluation Criteria Summary

Evaluation Criteria	Findings
Relevance	Coady's Program was relevant to CIDA priorities of poverty reduction for sustainable development and Strengthened Aid Effectiveness in 2007. It remains relevant today with education content, capacity strengthening, and action-research related to CIDA thematic priorities of economic growth and food security while youth empowerment is taking on added importance in Coady programming. Coady's asset-based, community-driven development approach brings local ownership and locally-driven development to the fore of development practice. This approach resonates with Canadian and international partners; demand for Coady training and support around this approach exceeds the Institute's current capacity.
Development Results/Effectiveness	Coady is achieving planned results at the output and outcome levels although more could have been done to define and measure results achievement with regard to organizational capacity strengthening. Results achievement has been very significant with regard graduates of Coady training in Canada; over 90% of trainees surveyed report improved skills and knowledge and are applying these in their work. With regard to the community level, there is evidence of positive results related to the ABCD approach; there is evidence that targeted communities have increased savings, improved infrastructure, diversified economic activities, developed more inclusive and effective community organizations, improved relations with local authorities, and enabled greater participation by women in household and community decision-making. At the country level, particularly in Vietnam and South Africa, broad-based networks and communities of practice are emerging around Coady's asset-based, community-driven development (ABCD) while Coady is seen to be facilitating policy dialogue on development approaches across civil society, government and private sector actors.
Sustainability	Sustainability of results is challenging to assess in the context of an evaluation with no site visits and limited availability of respondents from partner organizations in the global South. At the individual trainee level, results appear sustainable with regard to the acquisition and application of new knowledge and skills. At the organizational level, southern partners are integrating ABCD into their program strategies and practices although this can be challenging in the absence of an enabling environment at the country level. At the community level, documented results tend to emphasize improved local ownership, some decrease in donor dependency and improved organizational capacity as a result of ABCD pilot projects. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the nature of results realized by targeted communities – which build on local assets and existing practices as well as increased household savings – tend to augur well for sustainability.

Evaluation Criteria	Findings
Efficiency	<p>Coady's program is generally proving to be efficiently managed. CIDA's contribution to Coady represented 39% of the overall budget (this increased to 45% with the second contract amendment in 2011) and Coady has been very effective in leveraging external resources. Coady program management and operational costs represent only 10% of CIDA's overall contribution to the program. Coady's human resources are acknowledged as excellent by all partners. Coady program results are generally being delivered on time and within budget. In February 2011, when CIDA increased its contribution to support the establishment of Women's Leadership Program, Coady was able to rapidly readjust plans and resource allocations to accommodate the contract amendment. Despite its efficiency, Coady now finds itself in a challenging situation; it may no longer be eligible for PWCB funding while the rapidity with which CIDA announced its modernization process in 2010 has left Coady with very little lead time to adapt and adjust. While Coady will undoubtedly surmount this challenging situation, it may have to cut programming in the short-term to cover immediate funding gaps.</p>
Appropriateness of Design	<p>Coady's program demonstrates relatively strong internal and external coherence: internally there is strong synergy and learning between program components while externally, Coady is partnering with many of CIDA's NGO partners to improve their aid effectiveness. Where its program design could have been stronger is with regard to a strategy and articulated results related to organizational capacity strengthening as it links to other program components and outcome statements. In the current contribution agreement, strategies and results are most clearly articulated at the level of individual trainees, which makes results reporting at the outcome level challenging. A more intentional strategy at the outset, for Coady interventions at the country and organizational levels, may have facilitated results measurement while increasing impact.</p>
Partnership	<p>Coady is described as an excellent partner by its southern and Canadian partners, by its private sector funders and by its graduates, both in terms of management efficiency as well as relevance and effectiveness.</p>
Informed and Timely Action	<p>Coady demonstrates significant capacity for ongoing learning, adaptation, and change both in its overall program strategy as well as in the ongoing evolution of its training and research initiatives. Its current RBM framework, monitoring and reporting systems do not appear, however, to be particularly helpful in supporting learning and informed decision-making for either Coady or CIDA. The RBM framework appears to exhibit some limitations in results logic and how it situates Coady accountability, while monitoring and reporting are focused largely at the output level (based on an agreement with CIDA in 2010). It is too late in the contribution agreement to revisit the logic model. In this last year of the contribution agreement, Coady reporting should, however, be focused at intermediate outcome achievements. In future, Coady should reconsider situating its accountability for results achievement at the level of organizational capacity strengthening over individual graduates or targeted communities. This appears to be where the Institute can most effectively demonstrate results and value-added.</p>

4.2 Recommendations

This is a challenging time to develop program recommendations for Coady related to its current contribution agreement with CIDA for several reasons. It is unclear the extent to which Coady meets basic eligibility criteria for CIDA support beyond December 2012 and the current contribution agreement has less than a year to completion. Given this unusual context, the recommendations below cannot easily be directed at improvements to the current contribution agreement and they may have little relevance for Coady decision-making in the absence of a future CIDA-Coady funding relationship. The recommendations below are thus divided accordingly: 1) immediate recommended actions for CIDA and Coady up to December 2012; and 2) *suggested recommendations* to Coady on how the Institute might want to revisit its program offer post 2012.

Recommended Actions for CIDA and Coady up to December 2012:

Recommendation 1: CIDA should clarify, as quickly as possible, the nature and scope of its partnership with Coady after the end of the current contribution agreement.

While Coady's contribution agreement with CIDA was extended to December 2012, to accommodate the addition of the International Centre for Women's Leadership Program, all other program components come to an end in June 2012. With less than six months left of funding for its initial program contribution, and with limited eligibility under CIDA's current criteria, Coady may be required to significantly reduce its programming activities in 2012. Discussions on the future of Coady's partnership with CIDA began in 2010 and this evaluation was commissioned to inform CIDA decision-making. Coady needs clarity on CIDA's decision-making in order to adjust quickly and plan accordingly, in collaboration with its partners in Canada and overseas.

Recommendation 2: Coady and CIDA should revisit the focus of progress reporting, to document achievements at the level of both output and outcome results.

As a result of a request by CIDA in 2010, Coady's current progress reporting focuses largely at the output level in order to report against annual workplanning. In the final year of the current contribution agreement, CIDA and Coady should revisit this focus to ensure that progress reporting includes both output and outcome results achievement. Progress and final reports should also focus more appropriately on overall program performance, what has been learned and the extent to which Coady has ensured accountability for outcome results in a timely and cost-effective way.

Suggested Recommendations for Coady Programming Beyond December 2012:

Suggested Recommendation 1: Coady should continue to offer its transformational educational programs to development practitioners internationally based on the Institute's foundational approach to development which aims to promote gender equality, improve local ownership, reduce aid dependency, and ensure more sustainable results at the community level.

Coady's training is perceived, by a multitude of Canadian and international partners, as very relevant and quite unique in its content and approach. There is undoubtedly a need for this type of training given the current and increasing demand for Coady services. How Coady structures and ensures delivery of its training, as well as how it ensures coherence between this training and its other program inputs and strategies, are the subject of several suggested revisions below. Given its relevance, this training should undoubtedly continue.

**Suggested
Recommendation 2:**

Coady should revisit its results framework and more appropriately situate its direct support and accountability at the level of organizational capacity strengthening.

Coady's current RBM framework situates accountability at the outcome level in terms of individual and community-level results. Individual capacity strengthening results are, however, very challenging to track and document while change at the community level is generally produced by individuals working through organizations (CBOs or NGOs). Opportunities for enhanced development impact and results sustainability at the community and country levels can also be missed if individual capacity strengthening is not situated within and linked to strengthened organizations and institutions. Coady is well aware of these issues and is actively addressing them within its current strategic planning process. It is not a question of significantly revising Coady program strategies but rather a question of more clearly situating Coady accountability and focus while making the links more intentional and systematic between individual training, organizational capacity strengthening and fostering a national enabling environment.

**Suggested
Recommendation 3 :**

Coady should further develop its on-site training in the global South and concentrate more effort in developing local training capacity in key countries of intervention.

As Coady's program has evolved since 2007 and lessons have been learned at the country level, there appears a need to further increase training capacity and training delivery in the global South. Coady partners are encouraging the Institute to increase its training offer in-country and to build the capacity of local training organizations in this regard. According to partners, this would then free Coady resources for a greater implication in policy dialogue, research and dissemination, as well as fostering national enabling environments for asset-based, community-driven development approaches. Coady's recent proposal to PWCB is very much in keeping with this vision, while its current strategic planning process could further examine the Institute's role in fostering evidence-based policy dialogue and national enabling environments.

**Suggested
Recommendation 4:**

Coady should develop more comprehensive systems to support the "readiness" and capacity of southern organizations to use the new skills and knowledge acquired by their staff during Coady training and to track organizational change after training.

In keeping with Suggested Recommendations 1 & 2 above, it appears that Coady's training model is currently quite responsive to individual over organizational needs. To date, employers are asked to sign-off on their employee's training and to cover a part of the training costs. While this demonstrates a level of organizational buy-in, it does not always guarantee that employers have the commitment or capacity to use the new skills and knowledge acquired by Coady trainees upon their return. Coady could adopt a more demand-driven approach to training by further supporting organizational "readiness" for training up-take and by systematically integrating organizational capacity strengthening needs within its processes for trainee selection, preparation and follow-up.

**Suggested
Recommendation 5:**

Coady monitoring and evaluation strategies and systems could be revisited, in light of the current strategic planning process at the Institute, to ensure that Coady is generating information useful for strategic decision-making.

While Coady is an organization that is constantly learning and adapting, it is not clear that current monitoring systems and progress reporting are really useful in supporting that learning process. They currently appear quite focused on compliance at the output level. While this focus may have satisfied CIDA's progress reporting needs, it does not appear to effectively support Coady's needs for information to support ongoing, strategic decision-making. Monitoring and evaluation strategies should be revisited in light of Coady's strategic planning and the information most useful to ensure ongoing program relevance and performance going forward.

Appendix 1: Evaluation Framework Matrix

Question	Sub question	Measure or indicator	Baseline data?	Data source	Sample or census	Data collection instrument	Data analysis
RELEVANCE 1. To what extent are program objectives and expected development results relevant?	<p>1.1 To what extent are Coady program objectives and results relevant with regard to CIDA policy objectives and priorities (strengthened aid effectiveness, gender equality, sustainable development)?</p> <p>1.2 To what extent are Coady program objectives and results relevant to the priorities and goals of organizational partners in Canada and in the global south?</p> <p>1.3 To what extent are Coady program objectives and results relevant to the needs and aspirations of training participants?</p> <p>1.4 To what extent is Coady perceived as a centre of excellence with regard to knowledge, innovation, leadership and results in an asset-based, citizen-driven approach to development?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of alignment between Coady program objectives and CIDA policy priorities Extent to which Coady program results address and contribute to CIDA policy objectives # of Canadian and international partners sponsoring # of trainees for Coady training (trends over time) # of organizations in the South sending staff to Coady training programs locally, in Canada Perceptions of stakeholders on value of training in Canada, in the South, to support the mission and goals of their organizations Perceptions of trainees on the value of Coady 	<p>Baseline data exists for # of southern partners and education partners sending/sponsoring # of trainees for 2008-2011</p> <p>No other baseline exists</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CIDA Policy documents COADY program proposal and annual progress reports Coady program evaluation reports and tracer studies Southern partners Educational partners Diploma/Certificate trainees Coady staff Coady Advisory Committee members Coady funders 	<p>Sample of 205 Diploma trainees (100% of population)</p> <p>Sample of 45 Certificate trainees (100% of population in three case study countries of Vietnam, Ethiopia, South Africa – 20% of total population)</p> <p>3 out of 9 Advisory Committee members</p> <p>10 Coady program staff (100%)</p> <p>5 educational partners (100%)</p> <p>5 non-CIDA funders (100%)</p>	<p>Survey questionnaire for Diploma/Certificate trainees and southern partners</p> <p>Interview Protocols for each of the following respondent categories: Advisory Committee; funders; educational partners</p> <p>Case study method for core countries Ethiopia, Vietnam, South Africa</p> <p>Focus group questions for Diploma trainees 2011</p>	<p>Content analysis for documents and the content of key informant interviews</p> <p>Descriptive statistics (frequency distribution, Chi Square) for survey data</p> <p>Case study analysis, comparison/contrast</p> <p>Triangulation</p>

Question	Sub question	Measure or indicator	Baseline data?	Data source	Sample or census	Data collection instrument	Data analysis
		<p>training to their personal and professional development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceptions of external stakeholders (funders, sponsors, partners) on the relevance of Coady's offer, its reputation, credibility and niche 					
<p>DEVELOPMENT RESULTS</p> <p>2. To what extent are expected development results being achieved at the outcome level?</p>	<p>2.1 To what extent have civil society, government and private sector leaders enhanced their knowledge, skills and capacity to engage citizens to plan and implement their own development programs?</p> <p>2.2 To what extent have communities strengthened their capacity to drive their own development, improve sustainable livelihoods and financial services, strengthen gender equality and accountability and achieve a greater voice in regional and national policymaking?</p> <p>2.3 To what extent has Coady, contributed to the development sector through innovation, best practices and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> planned vs. actual results achievement at outcome/output levels degree to which achieved outputs are contributing to outcome results evidence that trainees are effectively applying new knowledge, skills to their work # of examples of Coady partners improving their capacity to participate in local and national policymaking # of citizen-driven, development plans implemented in communities supported by 	<p>Baseline data (eval 2006) on org and community results from 2006 in Ethiopia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> COADY program proposal and annual progress reports Coady program evaluation reports and tracer studies Southern partners Educational partners Diploma/Certificate trainees Coady staff Coady Advisory Committee members Coady funders 	<p>Sample of 205 Diploma trainees (100% of population)</p> <p>Sample of 45 Certificate trainees (100% of population in three case study countries of Vietnam, Ethiopia, South Africa – 20% of total population)</p> <p>3 out of 9 Advisory Committee members</p> <p>10 Coady program staff (100%)</p> <p>5 educational partners (100%)</p> <p>5 non-CIDA funders (100%)</p>	<p>Survey questionnaire for Diploma/Certificate trainees and southern partners</p> <p>Interview Protocols for each of the following respondent categories: Advisory Committee; funders; educational partners</p> <p>Case study method for core countries Ethiopia, Vietnam, South Africa</p> <p>Key informant interviews with partners in Ethiopia, South Africa, Vietnam</p> <p>Focus group questions for Diploma trainees 2011</p>	<p>Content analysis for documents and the content of key informant interviews</p> <p>Descriptive statistics (frequency distribution, Chi Square) for survey data</p> <p>Case study analysis, comparison/contrast</p> <p>Triangulation</p>

Question	Sub question	Measure or indicator	Baseline data?	Data source	Sample or census	Data collection instrument	Data analysis
	<p>development models which promote prosperity and participatory governance? What role will the Women's Leadership Centre play in this area?</p> <p>2.4 To what extent are development results shared equally between women and men? To what extent are Coady programs systematically promoting equality between women and men? How will gender equality on Coady programs be enhanced with the Women's Leadership Centre?</p> <p>2.5 To what extent is the Canadian public in Eastern Canada more knowledgeable of the challenges and opportunities faced by citizens of the global South? How, if at all, has this translated into broader support for Canada's role in international development?</p>	<p>Coady partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of communities with improved assets, income, infrastructure, organization • ratio of women to men trainees • # of Coady female graduates in senior positions, receiving promotions • Stakeholder perceptions are changing influence of women in community decision-making • # of Coady southern partners seen to be improving org performance • perceptions of key development actors on Coady's contribution to innovation in participatory governance • evidence of increasing knowledge of and support for Canadian development aid among in Eastern Canada 					

Question	Sub question	Measure or indicator	Baseline data?	Data source	Sample or census	Data collection instrument	Data analysis
SUSTAINABILITY OF RESULTS 3. To what extent are development results achieved sustainable?	<p>3.1 To what extent are the development goals, strategies, approaches, practices and resources of partners in the South changing as a result of support from Coady?</p> <p>3.2 To what extent are tools, models, materials developed by Coady being taken up by other development actors in countries where Coady is active? Among Canadian and international actors?</p> <p>3.3 To what extent are there observable shifts in attitudes and behaviours with regard to development planning in communities supported by Coady partners?</p> <p>3.4 To what extent are there changes in the participation and influence of women relative to men in communities supported by Coady partners?</p> <p>3.5 To what extent is there evidence that Coady's southern partners and their networks are influencing national, regional policy?</p> <p>3.6 To what extent has Coady developed and implemented sustainability and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of changes in the goals, strategies, approaches, tools, resources, results of Coady southern partners • # of partners and collaborators using Coady materials, applying Coady approaches • # of communities that have implemented citizen-driven development plans • # of communities more effectively engaging with government to implement their development plans • # of communities that have increased access to resources, improved livelihoods and linkages • # of southern partners that have promoted more women into positions of influence • # of instances of influence by women in development planning at 	Evaluation report 2006 provides baseline for 7 communities and partners in Ethiopia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COADY program proposal and annual progress reports • Coady program evaluation reports and tracer studies • Southern partners • Educational partners • Diploma/Certificate trainees • Coady staff 	<p>Sample of 205 Diploma trainees (100% of population)</p> <p>Sample of 45 Certificate trainees (100% of population in three case study countries of Vietnam, Ethiopia, South Africa – 20% of total population)</p> <p>10 Coady program staff (100%)</p> <p>5 educational partners (100%)</p>	<p>Survey questionnaire for Diploma/Certificate trainees and southern partners</p> <p>Interview Protocols for each of the following respondent categories: Advisory Committee; funders; educational partners</p> <p>Case study method for core countries Ethiopia, Vietnam, South Africa</p> <p>Key informant interviews with partners in Ethiopia, South Africa, Vietnam</p> <p>Focus group questions for Diploma trainees 2011</p>	<p>Content analysis for documents and the content of key informant interviews</p> <p>Descriptive statistics (frequency distribution, Chi Square) for survey data</p> <p>Case study analysis, comparison/contrast</p> <p>Triangulation</p>

Question	Sub question	Measure or indicator	Baseline data?	Data source	Sample or census	Data collection instrument	Data analysis
	<p>progressive disengagement strategies for its partners in the South?</p> <p>3.7 To what extent is the viability of the Women's Leadership Centre assured?</p>	<p>community level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of instances southern partners have influenced regional, national policy or work of other development actors Evidence that Coady and its partners jointly plan for disengagement 					
<p>EFFICIENCY</p> <p>4. To what extent is the Coady program proving efficient and cost-effective?</p>	<p>4.1 Have program financial resources been effectively allocated given expected results?</p> <p>4.2 Are program activities and outputs being delivered on time and within budget?</p> <p>4.3 Have appropriate human resources been effectively identified, mobilized and managed, given expected results?</p> <p>4.4 Have there been important variances in planned to actual disbursements? Have they been adequately explained? How, if at all, have these variances influenced progress in results achievement? Could they have been avoided?</p> <p>4.5 How do Coady program costs and admin ratios compare to other</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comparison of planned to actual disbursements and explanations of variance Results per unit cost of training as compared to similar programs Stakeholder perceptions on quality, number and adequacy of human resources deployed to achieve program results Comparison of admin:program ratios with other PWCB programs Adequacy of program financial and human resource management systems 	<p>Benchmark data from other, similar programs – training cost per unit in Canada/in field</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> COADY program proposal and annual progress reports Coady program evaluation reports and tracer studies Southern partners Educational partners Diploma/Certificate trainees Coady staff Coady funders 	<p>10 Coady program staff (100%)</p> <p>5 educational partners (100%)</p> <p>3 out of 9 Advisory Committee members</p> <p>5 non-CIDA funders (100%)</p>	<p>Interview Protocols for each of the following respondent categories: Advisory Committee; funders; educational partners</p>	<p>Content analysis for documents and the content of key informant interviews</p> <p>Triangulation</p>

Question	Sub question	Measure or indicator	Baseline data?	Data source	Sample or census	Data collection instrument	Data analysis
	PWCB programs of comparable scope and size?						
PARTNERSHIP 5. To what extent have effective partnerships been developed which further results achievement?	<p>5.1 To what extent are relationships between Coady and its partners characterized by mutual trust, respect and accountability?</p> <p>5.2 To what extent does the development approach address local needs?</p> <p>5.3 To what extent have Coady partnerships fostered local ownership?</p> <p>5.4 To what extent is communication and coordination effective between Coady and its partners?</p> <p>5.5 To what extent to do partnerships foster participation and the capacity to take informed decisions at the community level?</p> <p>5.6 To what extent is there shared accountability for results between Coady and its partners</p> <p>5.7 To what extent do joint initiatives build upon existing organizations, systems and practices?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions on evolving nature and quality of partnerships with Coady in terms of mutual respect, trust, accountability, coordination, communication, shared decision-making Evidence that local ownership is improving for development planning/ABCD in targeted communities over time (evaluations 2006, 2011) 	N-A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> COADY program proposal and annual progress reports Coady program evaluation reports and tracer studies Southern partners Educational partners Diploma/Certificate trainees Coady staff Coady Advisory Committee members Coady funders 	<p>Sample of 205 Diploma trainees (100% of population)</p> <p>Sample of 45 Certificate trainees (100% of population in three case study countries of Vietnam, Ethiopia, South Africa – 20% of total population)</p> <p>3 out of 9 Advisory Committee members</p> <p>10 Coady program staff (100%)</p> <p>5 educational partners (100%)</p> <p>5 non-CIDA funders (100%)</p>	<p>Survey questionnaire for Diploma/Certificate trainees and southern partners</p> <p>Interview Protocols for each of the following respondent categories: Advisory Committee; funders; educational partners</p> <p>Case study method for core countries Ethiopia, Vietnam, South Africa</p> <p>Key informant interviews with partners in Ethiopia, South Africa, Vietnam</p> <p>Focus group questions for Diploma trainees 2011</p>	<p>Content analysis for documents and the content of key informant interviews</p> <p>Descriptive statistics (frequency distribution, Chi Square) for survey data</p> <p>Case study analysis, comparison/contrast</p> <p>Triangulation</p>

Question	Sub question	Measure or indicator	Baseline data?	Data source	Sample or census	Data collection instrument	Data analysis
<p>APPROPRIATENESS OF DESIGN</p> <p>6. To what extent was program design appropriate?</p>	<p>6.1 To what extent does the program represent a coherent whole by building synergy and complementarity among its diverse components?</p> <p>6.2 To what extent was program design based on previous experience, lessons learned and best practices?</p> <p>6.3 To what extent was partner selection appropriate and effective given Coady program objectives and expected results?</p> <p>6.4 To what extent were appropriate strategies for gender equality and environmental protection developed during program design and are they being effectively implemented?</p> <p>6.5 To what extent is Coady's approach to organizational capacity development coherent from diagnosis to organizational development and monitoring?</p> <p>6.6 To what extent was program design innovative for the local context?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of planned efforts by Coady to build synergy, complementarity, among program activities, components, partners Evidence that Coady proposal 2007-2012 is built on learning and best practices Stakeholder perceptions on appropriateness of program strategies related to trainee/partner selection, organizational capacity development, monitoring, follow-up, networking, disengagement Evidence of effective mainstreaming strategies for cross-cutting themes Stakeholder perceptions on capacity of Coady for innovation, contribution to knowledge-building 	N-A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CIDA Policy documents COADY program proposal and annual progress reports Coady program evaluation reports and tracer studies Southern partners Educational partners Diploma/Certificate trainees Coady staff Coady Advisory Committee members Coady funders 	<p>Sample of 205 Diploma trainees (100% of population)</p> <p>Sample of 45 Certificate trainees (100% of population in three case study countries of Vietnam, Ethiopia, South Africa – 20% of total population)</p> <p>3 out of 9 Advisory Committee members</p> <p>10 Coady program staff (100%)</p> <p>5 non-CIDA funders (100%)</p>	<p>Survey questionnaire for Diploma/Certificate trainees and southern partners</p> <p>Interview Protocols for each of the following respondent categories: Advisory Committee; funders; Case study method for core countries Ethiopia, Vietnam, South Africa</p> <p>Key informant interviews with partners in Ethiopia, South Africa, Vietnam</p> <p>Focus group questions for Diploma trainees 2011</p>	<p>Content analysis for documents and the content of key informant interviews</p> <p>Descriptive statistics (frequency distribution, Chi Square) for survey data</p> <p>Case study analysis, comparison/contrast</p> <p>Triangulation</p>

Question	Sub question	Measure or indicator	Baseline data?	Data source	Sample or census	Data collection instrument	Data analysis
INFORMED AND TIMELY ACTION 7. To what extent was decision-making informed, appropriate and timely?	<p>7.1 To what extent is the Coady program RBM framework clear, coherent, mutually understood and useful?</p> <p>7.2 To what extent is adequate risk analysis and risk management undertaken by Coady?</p> <p>7.3 To what extent are appropriate monitoring/evaluation systems in place?</p> <p>7.4 To what extent do Coady program management structures promote informed, transparent and timely decision-making?</p> <p>7.5 To what extent is m/e information and reporting timely and useful to program decision-makers?</p> <p>7.6 To what extent is monitoring information and program learning used by decision-makers for ongoing program improvement?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that Coady RBM framework meets CIDA standards, possesses internal logic Stakeholder perceptions on clarity, utility of program RBM framework Evidence of adequate and ongoing risk analysis and management (internal, external) Quality and completeness of monitoring systems given RBM framework Quality, clarity, timeliness of reporting in keeping with CIDA RBM standards Evidence that program decision-making is influenced by progress reporting, evaluation, lessons learned 	N-A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CIDA Policy documents COADY program proposal and annual progress reports Coady program evaluation reports and tracer studies Southern partners Educational partners Diploma/Certificate trainees Coady staff Coady Advisory Committee members Coady funders 	<p>Sample of 205 Diploma trainees (100% of population)</p> <p>Sample of 45 Certificate trainees (100% of population in three case study countries of Vietnam, Ethiopia, South Africa – 20% of total population)</p> <p>3 out of 9 Advisory Committee members</p> <p>10 Coady program staff (100%)</p> <p>5 non-CIDA funders (100%)</p>	<p>Survey questionnaire for Diploma/Certificate trainees and southern partners</p> <p>Interview Protocols for each of the following respondent categories: Advisory Committee; funders; Case study method for core countries Ethiopia, Vietnam, South Africa</p> <p>Key informant interviews with partners in Ethiopia, South Africa, Vietnam</p> <p>Focus group questions for Diploma trainees 2011</p>	<p>Content analysis for documents and the content of key informant interviews</p> <p>Descriptive statistics (frequency distribution, Chi Square) for survey data</p> <p>Case study analysis, comparison/contrast</p> <p>Triangulation</p>

Appendix 2: Data Collection Instruments

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DIPLOMA TRAINEES

The Canadian International Development Agency has commissioned an evaluation of the Coady International Institute's Program (2007-2012) as part of its regular accountability assessments. It has engaged Margot Rothman from the Groupe-conseil INTERALIA to undertake this evaluation which will result in an evaluation report due in January 2012. This questionnaire is being distributed to all Coady graduates from the Diploma in Community-based Development from 2008 to the present. All responses to this questionnaire will remain confidential – the content of completed questionnaires will be analyzed by the consultant, the data will be aggregated and no individuals will be identified or quoted directly in the evaluation report.

This questionnaire should take about 20 minutes to complete. It would be greatly appreciated if questionnaires could be completed **no later than December 16, 2011**.

Background Information on the Diploma Graduate

1. Year of Graduation from Coady Diploma Program: 2008 2009 2010 2011

2. Sex: Female Male

3. Country of Residence: (please fill in) _____

4. Type of Employment Organization: (please select one from list below)

NGO based in the global South

Canadian NGO

International NGO

Research Institute

Government Department

Private Sector

5. Has your organization participated with Coady in any other initiatives. Please indicate below:

other staff enrolled in certificate, diploma courses at Coady in Canada

on-site training by Coady in your country

organizational development activities with Coady

action-research with Coady

Survey Questions

1. What is your overall level of satisfaction with the Coady Diploma Program? Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements below.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The training content was relevant to my work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The training content was relevant to my country context.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The training program met my personal and professional expectations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The training program met the expectations of my employer/organization.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The contribution of other trainees from around the world was an important aspect of my learning experience.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The content of the Coady Diploma program is unique and different from other training courses available.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please comment on the key aspects of the training program you most appreciated:

Please comment on aspects of the training program you least appreciated:

2. Why did you enroll in the Coady Diploma Program? Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements below.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I wanted to deepen my knowledge.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I wanted to become better at my job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I wanted a promotion at work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I wanted new job opportunities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My employer was involved in my decision to take the Diploma.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
It was my employer who suggested I take the Diploma.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
This Diploma training was a part of my organization's strategy to improve its results.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Before training, my employer had an idea of how I could apply the training upon return.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please comment on any other reasons which may have motivated you to enroll in the Diploma Program at Coady:

3. What have been the effects of your training in the Diploma Program at Coady, both personally and professionally? Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements by checking the appropriate box below.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I have gained confidence in myself as a person as a result of my training at Coady.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have gained confidence in my professional skills and knowledge as a result of my training at Coady.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have greater professional opportunities as a result of my training at Coady.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People come to me more often for advice and consultation as a result of my training at Coady.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have broadened my contacts, networks and linkages with other actors and organizations as a result of my training at Coady.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have achieved more responsibility at work because of my training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I take more initiative at work as a result of my training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have improved technical skills as a result of my training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have improved analytical skills as a result of my training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have improved interpersonal skills as a result of my training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have changed employment organizations as a result of my Coady Diploma training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please comment on the most important effects of the Diploma training on your personal or professional development:

4. What have been the effects of your Diploma training on your workplace? Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements by checking the appropriate box below.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I have been able to apply my new skills and knowledge in my work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have introduced new ideas, practices at work since my training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have installed new systems at work since my training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have introduced new technologies at work since my training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have convinced other colleagues to adopt new techniques and approaches as a result of my training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have taught my colleagues new skills since my training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am able to influence my organization to shift from a needs-based to an asset-based and citizen-driven development approach.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My workplace has been responsive to and supportive of the new ideas and approaches I have put forward since my training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My Diploma training is sufficient to help my organization shift from a needs-based to an asset-based and citizen-driven approach to development.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please comment on the major ways in which your employer has benefitted from your training in Coady's Diploma Program:

5. In your view, how could Coady improve its Diploma training program to ensure that it was as relevant as possible to both its trainees AND the organizations they work for? Please comment on your recommendations to Coady for training improvement:

Thank you for your collaboration!

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS

The Canadian International Development Agency has commissioned an evaluation of the Coady International Institute's Program (2007-2012) as part of its regular accountability assessments. It has engaged Margot Rothman from the Groupe-conseil INTERALIA to undertake this evaluation which will result in an evaluation report due in January 2012. This questionnaire is being distributed to Coady partner organizations in an effort to glean how they view the relevance and effectiveness of Coady training, capacity strengthening and action-research. All responses to this questionnaire will remain confidential – the content of completed questionnaires will be analyzed by the consultant, the data will be aggregated and no individuals will be identified or quoted directly in the evaluation report.

This questionnaire should take 20-30 minutes to complete. It would be greatly appreciated if questionnaires could be completed **no later than December 16, 2011**.

Background Information on the Partner Organization

1. Your organization is: (please select one from list below)

- NGO based in the global South
- Canadian NGO
- International NGO
- Research Institute
- Government Department
- Private Sector
- Other: Please specify _____

2. Country of residence of your organization:

3. What is the nature of your collaboration with Coady? Please check all boxes below which are relevant to your partnership with Coady:

- Sending staff on diploma, certificate courses at Coady in Canada
- Sponsoring training participants
- Participating in on-site training given by Coady in your country
- Participating in capacity strengthening activities with Coady
- Participating in action-research with Coady

Survey Questions

1. How would you describe your partnership with Coady? Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements below.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Our partnership with Coady is one based on mutual trust and respect.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coady understands and is responsive to the needs of our organization.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Communication with Coady is open and transparent.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We can count on Coady to do what it says it will do.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coady always delivers on time.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our partnership with Coady compares favourably with those we have with other development organizations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
What Coady offers us is very relevant to the mission and goals of our organization.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please comment on the key aspects of the partnership with Coady you most appreciated:

Please comment on aspects of the partnership with Coady you least appreciated:

2. What aspects of Coady’s work do you feel have been most important to your organization? Please indicate which of the following aspects of Coady’s work your organization values most, using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the most important.

	By order of importance from 1 to 5
The certificate and diploma training programs offered by Coady in Canada.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The on-site training programs offered by Coady in your country.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The action-research or pilot testing of new development models with your organization, including Coady coaching, field missions and monitoring/evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coady’s research products and publications.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The combination of support provided by Coady including training, on-site training and action-research.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please comment on the aspects of Coady’s work which your organization has most valued and why:

3. What have been the effects of Coady training (diploma, certificate in Canada) on the trainees that have been sent by your organization? Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements by checking the appropriate box below.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Trainees returned with more confidence in themselves after training at Coady.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trainees gained confidence in their professional skills and knowledge as a result of training at Coady.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trainees achieved more responsibility at work because of Coady training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trainees improved their technical skills as a result of Coady training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trainees improved their analytical skills as a result of Coady training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trainees improved their interpersonal skills as a result of Coady training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Trainees introduced new ideas, practices, systems at work after Coady training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trainees convinced other colleagues to adopt new techniques and approaches as a result of Coady training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trainees taught colleagues new skills after Coady training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trainees left our organization for other job opportunities after Coady Diploma training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. What have been the effects on your organization of collaboration with Coady (be it training or capacity strengthening or action-research)? Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements by checking the appropriate box below.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Our program staff have improved their knowledge and skills on asset-based community-led development.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We are actively applying Coady tools, best practices and models to our programming.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The attitudes and behaviours of our program staff are changing with regard to their role as facilitators of community development.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our program staff have changed their techniques and approaches in keeping with Coady best practices.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The ABCD approach is effectively reflected in our programming strategies, activities, expected results and reporting.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our development results at the community level have improved with the integration of ABCD and CBRM.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Women have increased their participation and influence, both within our organization and within the communities we support, as a result of our collaboration with Coady.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We are more effective as an organization in policy dialogue at local and national levels as a result of our collaboration with Coady.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The support we have received from Coady is sufficient to enable an organization-wide shift from needs-based to asset-based, citizen-driven development.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide examples of the most important changes you perceive in your organization which can be attributed to your collaboration with Coady:

5. In your opinion, what are the most important challenges that your organization is facing with regard to shifting from a needs-based to an asset-based, citizen-driven approach to development? Please rank the challenges below in order of importance to your organization (using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the most important).

	By order of importance from 1 to 5
Human resources – finding and maintaining good staff, trained staff	<input type="checkbox"/>
Financial resources – finding stable and diversified funding to support organizational change	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resistance to change – by staff	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resistance to change – by communities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Different donors, different development priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. In your view, how could Coady improve its partnerships and the services it offers its partners in the global South? Please comment on your recommendations to Coady for partnership improvement:

Thank you for your collaboration!

Interview Protocol: Advisory Committee Members to Coady

1. Please describe the history of your relationship with the Coady International Institute. How did you hear about Coady and how/why did you decide to become an Advisory Committee member?
2. In your view, what is distinctive about Coady? How would you describe its niche and what, if anything sets it apart from other training institutions? What are Coady's strengths?
3. How would you describe Coady's performance? To what extent has Coady met your expectations with regard to effectiveness and efficiency? How successfully does Coady demonstrate results achievement?
4. In your view, what are Coady's current challenges? How well is Coady addressing these challenges? How can Coady remain relevant going forward?
5. Any other comments or questions?

Thank you very much for your time and insight.

Interview Protocol: Education Partners/ Strategic Partners to Coady

1. Please describe the history and nature of the relationship between your organization and the Coady International Institute.
2. Why is Coady important to your organization and to what extent does Coady support your programming goals?
3. What changes, if any, do you see in the participants sent by your organization to Coady upon their return from training? What changes, if any, have you seen in your organization (or in your partner organizations) as a result of training and support received from Coady?
4. In your view, what is distinctive about Coady and what sets it apart from other training institutions?
5. From your perspective, how could Coady improve the quality of its services or the types of services it offers its partners?
6. Any other comments or questions?

Thank you very much for your time and insight.

Interview Protocol: Funding Partners to Coady

1. Please describe the history of the relationship between your organization and the Coady International Institute. How did you hear about Coady and how/why did you decide to support the Institute? How does Coady's work support your mission and goals?
2. How would you describe Coady's performance to date? To what extent has Coady met the expectations of your organization with regard to effectiveness and efficiency? How successfully has Coady demonstrated results achievement?
3. In your view, what is distinctive about Coady? What sets it apart from other training institutions? How does Coady remain relevant?
4. From your perspective, how could Coady improve the quality of its services or the types of services it offers its partners? How could Coady improve its relationship with you?
5. Any other comments or questions?

Thank you very much for your time and insight.

Appendix 3: List of Respondents and Documents

Stakeholder Group	Respondent
CIDA/PWCB	Kate Reekie, Manager, Education Section Janet Lam, International Development Officer Annick Levesque, International Development Officer
Coady staff - 9 out of 11 teaching staff participated in focus group	Dr. Sean Riley, President StFX John Gaventa, Director Coady Mary Coyle (former Director) Gord Cunningham, Assistant Director Shelagh Savage Brienne Peters David Fletcher Alison Mathie Linda Jones Pauline Achola Behrang Foroughi Yogesh Kumar Ghore Olga Gladkikh Anuj Jain Erika Gunn Richard Perry Lori Ward Anton Struchkov
Coady Advisory Board - 2 out of 9 Board members interviewed	Bill Young Susan Crocker
Diploma and Certificate graduates	204 Diploma graduates surveyed (100% of cohort for 2008-2010) 49 Diploma participants participated in focus group discussion in Nova Scotia (100% of cohort for 2011) 40 certificate graduates surveyed from Ethiopia, South Africa, Vietnam (out of total population of 246 for 2008-2010)

Stakeholder Group	Respondent
Strategic Partners-one representative from all partners in place as of 2010 – partners from 2011 not contacted as too recent to provide relevant data)	Lucie Goulet, Oxfam Canada, Ottawa Solomon Legesse, Oxfam Canada in Ethiopia Amanuel Assefa, ASE, Ethiopia Zegeye Assafa, Hundee, Ethiopia Bernie Dolley, Ikhala Trust, South Africa Sebastian Mathews, GRCF, South Africa Minh Kauffman, CEEVN, Vietnam Emily Sikazwe, Women for Change, Zambia Bern Guri, CIKOD, Ghana Walter Adongo, ICRAF, Kenya Joash Mango, Consultative Group on International Agricultural research, Kenya
Education partners (sponsors of training) - 3 out 3 major education partners in Canada	Doug Graham, WUSC Joanne Owen, CUSO/VSO Helene Duquette, Canadian Crossroads International
Other funders, sponsors	David Martin, Comart Foundation Sumaiya, Sajjad, Master Card Foundation
Other external stakeholders	Blane Harvey, IDS/Sussex
Coady external evaluators	Ninnette Eliasov, South Africa Jim Delaney, Sri Lanka

Documents

CIDA Policy Documents (Strengthened Aid Effectiveness, Gender Equality, Sustainable Development, etc)

Coady Proposal & Contribution Agreement with CIDA/PWCB (December 2007 – December 2012)

CIDA Amendments 1 & 2 for Coady Contribution Agreement (June 2009, February 2011)

Coady Annual Workplans 2008, 2009, 2010

Coady Annual Reports 2009, 2010

Coady Annual narrative and financial progress reports 2008/09, 2009/10, 2010/11

External evaluation reports/reviews for Ethiopia, Vietnam, South Africa

Partnership profile reviews

Coady e-mail trainee tracer data for 2009, 2010 Diploma graduates

Training evaluations for Diploma participants 2009 & 2010

Coady M & E strategy

Coady Application to CIDA/PWCB on Women's Leadership Training 2011

Coady (2008) From Clients to Citizens: Communities Changing the Course of their Own development.

Coady Focus Notes on Member-Owned Institutions

Coady Occasional Paper Series, No. 9 & No. 10

Coady Indigenous Women in Community Leadership Case Studies

Course content – Coady Diploma Program

Articles, press clippings, reports, anecdotal evidence, temoignages on Public Engagement

Appendix 4: Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference for the Program Summative Evaluation of the Building Leadership, Knowledge and Capacity for Sustainable Global Impact, Project Number: S-063403, November 2011

1. Rationale, purpose and objectives of the evaluation

1.1 Rationale and purpose of the evaluation

The findings and lessons learned from the evaluation of **Building Leadership, Knowledge and Capacity for Sustainable Global Impact Program** (the Program) will benefit development organizations, practitioners and government officials in the partner countries through the improvement of training and support offered by the Coady International Institute (Coady). The assessment on the progress of the Program will also allow CIDA management to make an informed decision on future programming.

With the modernization of the Partnerships for Canadians Branch in 2010, project approval has shifted to a competitive process and concerns have arisen around Coady's eligibility under the current criteria. This evaluation will therefore provide evidence of the effectiveness of Coady's development results to help guide future programming decisions.

1.2 Specific objectives of the evaluation

- Ascertainment of expected and unexpected development results achieved since the agreement was implemented in December 2007.
- Assessing the program ability to address cross-cutting issues related to gender equality, environmental sustainability and governance.
- Assessment on the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability of the overall program.
- Identification of success factors and areas to be improved in order for Coady to offer better training and support to development organizations, practitioners and government officials in the partner countries in its last year of this agreement.
- Provision of recommendations and lessons learned for future design and implementation of similar programming.

2. Evaluation Object and Scope

2.1 Development Context

The Program aims to build leadership, knowledge and capacity in the development sector so that citizens are engaged in driving the development of their communities and nations. Enhanced capacity of development partners will contribute to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Canada's other global development targets.

2.2 Program Profile

A \$6,187,500 contribution agreement was signed in December 2007 and an amendment was made in February 2011 for a budget increase of \$1,065,660 for the Women's Leadership Program. The current budget is \$7,253,160 and the end date of the agreement is December 31st, 2012. To date, \$5,503,843 has been disbursed.

Four sets of activities form the program and allow Coady to play a bridging role between knowledge and action: (1) Transformative Leadership Education Programs (includes the Women's Leadership Centre); (2) Strengthening Organizational Capacity; (3) Knowledge for Action and (4) Public Engagement in Canada.

These activities fall under three thematic programming areas: Poverty, Human Security and Civil Society. The emphasis in each of the area is on building leadership among development practitioners, developing capacity of Southern development agencies, developing and disseminating new knowledge in several fields of innovative development practice and initiating knowledge networks to achieve widespread impact and learning.

The sector of focus is Democratic governance. Countries covered by the Program include India, Ethiopia, Zambia, Kenya, Ghana, South Africa and other countries. The geographic scope largely depends on the success recruitment of trainees.

2.3 Implementing Organization (IO) and key partners

2.3.1 The Coady International Institute

Coady is based in Antigonish, Nova Scotia, on the campus of St. Francis Xavier University (StFX). Created in 1959, Coady is a specialized institution dedicated to the professional education of development leaders. Over the past five decades, more than 5,500 development professionals from 135 countries have taken part in the Coady's campus-based programs.

Coady currently has 2 projects funded by CIDA through Partnerships with Canadians Branch (PWCB): International Internships 2009-2012 (S064800, \$900,000) and "Building Leadership, Knowledge and Capacity for Sustainable Global Impact" (S063403, 7,253,160).

2.3.2 Key Partners

Coady has been engaging in more targeted intensive training and advisory roles to build the core competencies, leadership, and program capacity of development organizations/networks including Oxfam Ethiopia, IPSARD/MARD (Vietnam), CIKOD/COMPAS (Ghana), Women For Change (Zambia), ISMFW/SEWA (India), Ikhala Trust (South Africa) and CARE Bangladesh.

The Coady Institute's strategy for capacity strengthening work with partner organizations follows an integrated approach that involves participation of their staff in Coady's educational programs, collaborative research in the areas of mutual interest, and provision of methodological, informational, and other support in Coady's fields of expertise (including Asset Based Community Development (ABCD), advocacy & citizen engagement, community-based microfinance, livelihoods and markets, community-driven health impact assessment, and many others). Where possible, Coady youth internships are also planned with partners to complement the above activities.

2.4 Logic: Expected outcomes of the Program (pre 2008 RBM Policy)

2.4.1 Expected Outcomes:

- 1) Civil Society, government and private sector leaders, in particular women and youth, will have enhanced knowledge, skills and capacity to engage citizens in their own development and to plan and implement effective development programs.
- 2) Communities served by the six targeted development organizations will strengthen their capacity to drive their own development, better understand and take advantage of linking micro realities to macro, improve sustainable livelihoods and financial services, strengthen gender equality and accountability and achieve a greater voice in regional and national policymaking.
- 3) The international development sector with ties to the Coady will be a key contributor to innovation, best practices and development models that promote prosperity, and participatory governance.
- 4) The Canadian public, especially in Atlantic Canada, will be more knowledgeable of the challenges and opportunities faced by citizens of the global South and the good news of development success and will express broader support for Canada's role in international development.

Expected Outcomes: Specific to Women's Leadership Program

(Post February 2011 Contribution Agreement amendment)

- 1) The Coady Institute will be well positioned to implement an expanded cadre of activities through a high-profile Centre with a strong international reputation.
- 2) Emerging women leaders in civil society, government and private sector organizations will have enhanced knowledge, skills and capacity to engage citizens in their own development and to plan and implement effective development programs.
- 3) Communities in Coady-focus countries will strengthen their capacity to drive their own development, improve sustainable livelihoods and financial services, ensure accountability and achieve a greater voice in regional and national policymaking, including National Development Plans and PRSPs.

Coady's complete Program planning Table can be found in Annex 3.

3. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

3.1 Evaluation Criteria

CIDA's "Framework of Results and Key Success Factors" will provide the primary evaluation criteria:

A. Development Results¹⁰ In addition, to being guided by the aforementioned framework, the consultant will also identify lessons learned, and provide recommendations for guiding future program initiatives.

1. Effectiveness
2. Efficiency
3. Relevance
4. Sustainability

B. Quality of Partnership

5. Local Ownership, Harmonization and Alignment
6. Shared Accountability for Results

C. Success Factors

7. Appropriateness of Design
8. Appropriateness of Resource Utilization
9. Informed and Timely Action

Finally, the evaluation will assess factors related to crosscutting themes of gender equality, environmental sustainability and governance (if applicable).

3.2 Evaluation Questions

3.2.1 Development Results

Effectiveness

- Has the program achieved the expected outputs and outcomes (including specific gender results) and progress towards impact?
- Has the investment influenced development practitioners/partner organizations in:
 - advancing equal participation between men and women as decision-makers?
 - promoting the rights of women and girls?
 - increasing women's access to and control over development resources and benefits?
- Describe unintended results – positive and/or negative.

Efficiency

- Is the relationship between costs and results reasonable? Based on comparisons with relevant benchmarks, resources (financial and human) are leveraged efficiently to achieve results.

¹⁰ The following criteria have precedence over the *OECD-DAC (2010) Evaluation Quality Standards Section 2.8 Evaluation criteria*

Relevance

- Does the program design suit local conditions and the individual needs of trainees/partner organizations?
- Is the program contributing to CIDA's priorities (as stated at the time the proposal was approved)?

Sustainability

- Is local partner institutional capacity being adequately developed to ensure the sustainability of the results?
- Will results/benefits continue after CIDA's involvement ends?
 - Sufficient financial and human resources are committed to maintain benefits and results.
 - External environment is conducive to maintenance of results.
 - Gender equality results are likely to endure after CIDA involvement in the investment ends.

3.2.2 Quality of Partnership

Local Ownership, Harmonization and Alignment

- Does the development approach address locally accessed needs and are local stakeholders fully committed and supportive of the project?
- How strong and effective are the partnerships between Coady and development partner organizations?
 - The project planning and design phases were inclusive of local stakeholder needs.
 - The development approach aligns with local systems and practices and does not operate in parallel to existing initiatives.
 - Coady identifies other partnerships with local organizations and/or other donors to enhance the development impact.

Shared Accountability for Results

- Is there shared responsibility and accountability for results?
 - Active participation (within a country) of local partners, recipients and beneficiaries (including women) in program design, implementation and monitoring/evaluation.
 - Developing country counterparts have the authority and tools they need to make decisions and take action.
- How effective is the communication, coordination and cooperation among the program partners/trainees?

3.2.3 Success Factors

Appropriateness of Design

- Is the design based on sound understanding of local context? How were innovative and creative ideas and approaches explored to achieve results?
- Do the program components complement each other and work together as a consistent whole?
- Are lessons from development experience being applied, and lessons learned from innovations recorded, reported and disseminated?
- Are staff capacity, expertise and resources appropriate and sufficient for successful project implementation?

Informed and Timely Action

- Does the organization quickly respond to risks and take appropriate actions?
 - Systems are in place to monitor, report, and manage program risks.
 - Organization responds to gender equality, environmental and governance challenges and risks efficiently and effectively.

3.2.4 Challenges and Lessons Learned

- What have been the key challenges, constraints and risks/threats facing the program?
- How has the program dealt with these challenges?
- What are the key lessons learned?

4. Evaluation Process

The evaluation will be carried out in conformity with the “*OECD-DAC (2010) Evaluation Quality Standards*” and evaluation best practices.

Coady representatives will be involved throughout the evaluation and consulted at important milestones during the process. It is intended that all logistical decisions will be made in consultation with Coady. The latter will be asked to comments on the proposed ToRs. Early on, consultations will clarify the commitments, responsibilities and expectations of CIDA, Coady, appropriate Local Counterparts and the Consultant. Coady will be given an opportunity to comment the draft work plan and draft findings before they are put in final form of the report. CIDA will approve the evaluation work plan and the final report.

4.1 Preparation of Work plan

The Consultant(s) will prepare a work plan that will operationalize and direct the evaluation. The work plan shall follow the outline provided in Annex 1. Once approved by CIDA’s Project Officer, the work plan will serve as the agreement between parties on how the evaluation is carried out.

The work plan will refine and elaborate on the information presented in these ToRs to bring greater precision to the planning and design of the evaluation. It shall be based on a preliminary review of the documentation, discussions with key stakeholders (CIDA, Coady, Partners in the field, etc.), literature review, etc.

The work plan will include an evaluability assessment¹¹. The main objective is to find out to what extent the proposed evaluation questions can be answered. This assessment often leads to modifications of the evaluation design¹². Some evaluation questions will then be withdrawn as impossible, overly difficult and other questions will have to be further elaborated. In addition, the Consultant shall examine the following key factors that determine evaluability: the specificity of intervention¹³; logic¹⁴; the existence and quality of data (ex. unsuitable baseline data); the availability of key informants; and the timing of the evaluation. Furthermore, evaluators must explain and note any factors that compromise the

¹¹ Evaluability assessment: an assessment preparatory step to a full-fledged evaluation to establish whether a programme or intervention can be evaluated and what might be the barriers to its effective and useful evaluation. It enables CIDA and stakeholders to know whether the intervention or programme is ready to be evaluated i.e. if an evaluation can provide meaningful information on progress towards expected results. It requires a review of the coherence and logic of a programme, clarification of data availability, an assessment of the extent to which managers or stakeholders are likely to use evaluation findings given their interests and the timing of any evaluation vis-à-vis future programme or policy decisions. It may also identifies if key stakeholders want to have their programme evaluated – the level of resistance to evaluation and its reasons. As such, it prevents the unnecessary use of human and financial resources on evaluations that are not useful.

¹² For example, suppose there are no performance data available (poor PMF, no baseline, etc.) – that may mean a need to change the evaluation methods from traditional document review/interviews/focus groups and propose other methods/tools such as beneficiary surveys (HH or FG) or other participatory methods (Flannel boards, Open-ended stories, Unserialized posters, Community case studies, Historical mapping, Community meetings, direct observation, Mini-surveys, wealth mapping, Transect walks, LQAS, etc. etc).

¹³ Particularities of the intervention – for example, thematic, regions, fragile states, etc. that may have an impact on the resources and competences/experience of the team to execute the evaluation.

¹⁴ The task here is to judge the extent to which the design, strategy, resources and implementation mechanisms are appropriate given the intervention logic; (i.e. the logic model). This may have an impact on the evaluation design. For example, sometimes, LFAs (now logic model) that are “not exactly logic”... so difficult to evaluate. That is why it is important for the evaluator to understand and assess the logic and potential problem that may arise in the interpretation of misaligned results or other logic problems.

independence of the evaluations and address possible conflicts of interest openly and honestly. Note: the Consultant may recommend that the evaluation should not be executed.

The methodology section will describe and explain the evaluation method and processes and discuss how they will ensure the reliability and validity of findings. It will detail the methods and techniques used for data and information collection and processing. The choices (tools and methods) are justified and potential limitations and shortcomings are explained (limitations must be identified and appropriately mitigated). A solid narrative explanation is required in the methodology section. The Consultant will also provide an Evaluation Matrix that must follow the template provided in Annex 2. Note: it is not sufficient to only refer to the evaluation matrix¹⁵ (that must be attached in the appendix).

Given that no fieldwork is planned, extensive use of online interviews and surveys with a defined sample of stakeholders is strongly suggested. The survey questionnaire should be included in the workplan.

Finally, the work plan will propose a solid Sampling framework (purpose, universe, sampling criteria, proposed sample and sample analysis). Note: stakeholder participation is fundamental to CIDA evaluations. Stakeholder consultation is to be an integral component of evaluation planning; information collection; the development of findings; evaluation reporting; and results dissemination. The work plan shall indicate the stakeholders to be consulted, the criteria for their selection. If less than the full range of stakeholders is not to be consulted, the methods and reasons for selection of particular stakeholders shall be described.

4.2 Data Collection

Data collection will be executed according to the approved (by CIDA) work plan which includes the evaluation matrix along with the sampling framework (i.e. the approved sample) identifying clearly sites/projects/sub-projects to be documented (using methods defined in work plan), data to be collected by which stakeholders, documents to be gathered, etc..

Stakeholder participation is fundamental to this assessment. The evaluation will provide for active and meaningful involvement of key stakeholders as appropriate (e.g. beneficiaries, government representatives, local civil society). Evaluators will disseminate findings with local country partners to build capacity and improve mutual accountability.

Data collection will take place in Canada. Interviews with development practitioners/organizations will be conducted via electronic media, including but not limited to telephones, emails, web camera, and Skype.

¹⁵ The Evaluation Matrix systemizes the methodology, identifying the key issues to be addressed, sub-questions to provide elaboration, matters to be considered, sources of information and methods of information collection. The matrix shall be used to demonstrate how questions are triangulated.

4.3 Preparation of Draft and Final Evaluation Report

The Consultant will prepare an evaluation report that describes the evaluation and puts forward findings¹⁶, results and lessons learned. The Consultant is entirely responsible for the quality of the final report and shall follow *OECD-DAC (2010) Evaluation Quality Standards*¹⁷. The Consultant is responsible for accurately representing and consolidating the inputs of the team members, stakeholders and CIDA field staff (if applicable) in the final report.

Note: as per the OECD DAC Standards, “Relevant stakeholders are given the opportunity to comment on the draft report. The final evaluation report reflects these comments and acknowledges any substantive disagreements. In disputes about facts that can be verified, the evaluators investigate and change the draft where necessary. In the case of opinion or interpretation, stakeholders’ comments are reproduced verbatim, in an annex or footnote, to the extent that this does not conflict with the rights and welfare of participants.”

4.4 Management Response

Both CIDA and Coady will prepare a management response to the evaluation report that documents their response to the recommendations and establishes how each organization will (or will not) follow-up on the recommendations. Note: the Consultant is not responsible for this part of the process.

¹⁶ The report shall present the finding disaggregated by sex whenever possible.

¹⁷ CIDA wishes to remind the Consultant of its legal obligations with regard to the *OECD-DAC (2010) Evaluation Quality Standards*. The latter are an integral part of the present contract through the Standing Offer Agreement they signed.

5. ROLES & Responsibilities

5.1 CIDA

The CIDA Project Officer will oversee the evaluation and be responsible for accountability and guidance throughout all phases of execution, and approval of all deliverables. The CIDA Project Officer is responsible to:

- Prepare the Terms of Reference (CIDA HQ in consultation with Coady);
- Launch and coordinate the evaluator selection and contracting process;
- Engage and manage the contract of the Consultant,
- Act as the main contact person for the Consultant
- Provide guidance throughout all phases of execution, approve all deliverables and facilitate access to any documentation (or any person) deemed relevant to the evaluation process
- Share deliverables with the geographic programs at CIDA HQ, CIDA field offices, in particular the countries which benefited from site visits as well as CIDA's Evaluation Directorate of Strategic Policy & Performance Branch for knowledge sharing and dissemination purposes.
- Perform quality control, in collaboration with CIDA's Evaluation Directorate at the Strategic Policy & Performance Branch – as well as sector and thematic specialists as required, of all deliverables.

5.2 The Coady International Institute

Overall Coady will provide necessary support to ensure successful collection of information for the evaluation. Coady's responsibility will include:

- providing comment/feedback to validating the evaluation mandate, especially its scope, objectives, proposed management structure, suggested timeline, and the roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholders,
- provide assistance with logistical arrangements for field visits to projects identified for review in the field;
- to act as resource persons for the consultants (to facilitate access to documentation, to plan travel itineraries or interviews in the field),
- to review and comment on analyses and reports submitted by the consultants; and
- preparing a management response and action/implementation plan for the recommendations of the evaluation

5.3 Consultant(s)

To facilitate the collection, interpretation and presentation of the information acquired as a result of this evaluation, a team of consultants (composed of a combination of senior and junior evaluators) will be selected and then undertake the mandate, with the support of a local consultant(s) if required.

The team leader will report to the CIDA Project Officer. In general, the team leader will have overall responsibility for:

- Reviewing and commenting on the Terms of Reference
- Preparing and presenting the evaluation Work Plan;
- Conducting the evaluation according to the approved work plan;
- The day-to-day management of operations;
- Collecting credible, valid information, (i.e. cross-validates and critically assesses the information sources used and the validity of the data using a variety of methods and sources of information) following the work plan.
- Conducting wrap-up meetings (presentation of preliminary findings and validation) with all stakeholders, identified by CIDA.
- Regular progress reporting to CIDA Project Officer;
- The development of findings¹⁸, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned;
- The production of deliverables in accordance with contractual requirements and following OECD-DAC (2010) Evaluation Quality Standards;

The Junior Evaluator will:

- be a team member and will be responsible for supporting the team leader) in the development and execution of the activities assigned to him/her. These assignments will be defined in the work plan.

¹⁸ disaggregated by gender as much as possible

6. Profile of Consultant(s)

The senior consultant must be an Evaluator with over **10 years** of international development experience of which at least **5 years** is in evaluation. The individual must have substantial developing country experience and a demonstrated ability to conceptualize the overall approach to work assignments and to plan, manage and lead complex evaluations. The individual has demonstrated experience of supervising day-to-day activities of multi-disciplinary evaluation teams of experts. He/she is able to develop appropriate evaluation tools/methods, to ensure the accuracy, adequacy and reliability of the evaluation findings and recommendations, to make recommendations to senior government officials, to produce analytical reports, and to recommend appropriate CIDA action.

In addition, the team leader will also have the following experience/knowledge/competence:

- 1) Fully acquainted with CIDA's results-based management orientation and practices;
- 2) Experience with donor-funded projects related to education/university programming;
- 3) Experience with online interviews and electronic surveys
- 4) Knowledge of the education/training sector (in particular research)
- 5) Knowledge of Database software
- 6) Fluent in English– writing AND reading AND oral expression.
- 7) University degree or an acceptable combination of education (post-secondary diploma), training or experience.

The junior level consultant has more than 2 years of experience of which at least half is in evaluation, and a degree in a related field at least at the undergraduate level and preferably at the graduate level. The junior level individual provides services under the direct guidance of more senior level personnel. Individuals at this level are tasked to perform activities such as file searches, literature reviews, assisting with questionnaire designs, etc.

In addition, the team leader will also have the following experience/knowledge/competence:

- 1) Knowledge of Database software
- 2) Fluent in English– writing AND reading AND oral expression.
- 3) University degree or an acceptable combination of education (post-secondary diploma), training or experience.
- 4) Experience with online interviews and electronic surveys
- 5) Knowledge of the education/training sector (in particular research)

7. Deliverables and Milestones, Schedule

7.1 Deliverables

The Consultant will:

- 1) Prepare a draft work plan following the outline provided in Annex 1 of the TORs, to be revised by CIDA
- 2) Provide a Final work plan to be approved by CIDA Project Officer.
- 3) Perform a debriefing/validation workshop to present preliminary data to stakeholders in Antigonish for discussion/validation. Perform a post-mission debriefing/validation session to CIDA Project Officer.
- 4) Prepare a draft evaluation report (in conformity with the OECD-DAC (2010) *Evaluation Quality Standards*), to be reviewed by CIDA.
- 5) Provide a Final Report to be approved by CIDA.

These deliverables (except for Final Report) are to be prepared in English, and submitted in electronic formats (in Microsoft Word and PDF formats) to the CIDA Project Officer.

The Final Report is to be prepared in English, and submitted in both hard copy (3 copies) and electronic formats (in Microsoft Word and PDF formats) to CIDA to the Project Officer. The executive summary (only) of the evaluation report will be in both official languages.

Expected length of report: up to 50 pages (excluding appendices).

7.2 Milestones

7.2.1 Draft Work plan

The Consultant is to submit a draft work plan to the CIDA Project Officer and Coady representative within two weeks of the signing of the contract. The Consultant shall follow the proposed outline (see Annex 1 of the TORs).

7.2.2 Final Work plan

Within one week of receiving comments, the Consultant will produce a final work plan to be approved by CIDA.

7.2.3 Debriefing/Validation sessions

Perform a mission debrief/validation workshop one day before departure from Antigonish.

Perform a post-mission debriefing/validation session to CIDA Project Officer the week following the mission to Antigonish.

7.2.4 Draft Evaluation Report

The Consultant is to submit a draft Evaluation report to the CIDA Project Officer and the Coady representative for review within two weeks of returning from mission.

7.2.5 Final Evaluation Report

Within one week of receiving comments, the Consultant will submit a final evaluation report (including an executive summary). Note: CIDA will add to the Report, before publication, the Management Responses and Stakeholders' comments (if applicable).

7.3 Schedule

This evaluation is expected to be carried out from the date of signature of the Requisition to February 11, 2012. The final evaluation report must be submitted to CIDA before **Dec 23rd, 2011**. The timeline below identifies the key phases of the evaluation and provides suggested target dates for the completion of each phase:

Preliminary document analysis and consultations

Oct 10, 2011

- 1) Submission of draft work plan for revision
Oct 14, 2011
- 2) Submission of final work plan for approval by CIDA
Oct 24, 2011
- 3) Data collection – Canada
Nov 18, 2011
- 4) Evaluation debriefing and validation
Nov 22, 2011
- 5) Submission of preliminary report for review
Dec 5, 2011
- 6) Stakeholders' comments on the preliminary report
Dec 16, 2011
- 7) Submission of final report for approbation by CIDA
Dec 23, 2011
- 8) Complete Final report with Management responses (and item 8¹⁹)
Feb 11, 2012

The selected Consultant(s) must specify in the work plan when each activity will start and end, using the above timeline as an indicative guideline. Once validated by the coordinating committee, the work plan and the timeline included therein will constitute the key reference document for tracking the progress of this evaluation.

¹⁹ If applicable as per section 3.4: Stakeholders' comments may be reproduced verbatim.

8. Level of Efforts and ESTIMATED BUDGET

The basis for payment and payment scheduling will be determined during contract negotiations.

8.1 Level of Efforts

CIDA's projections for the "level of effort" required for this evaluation and the anticipated "consultant(s)-related costs" for carrying out this project are set out below:

Note: CIDA may judge (from the work plan findings) that it is not cost-effective to execute the full evaluation at this point in time and terminate the evaluation mandate. The mandate would therefore be of only 6 days.

Table 2: Projected level of effort (LOE)

Tasks	LOE (days) Consultant
A) Preliminary document analysis and consultation with CIDA and Coady	4
B) Draft Work plan preparation	5
C) Revision and final Work plan revision	1
D) Data collection and analysis	
in Canada	17
travel time in Canada	3
E) Report preparation	
Draft Evaluation Report	7
Revision and Final Evaluation Report	2
F) Presentation workshop (optional)	1
Total	40

8.2 Budget

The total budget to complete the evaluation is estimated at \$41,355.00 (plus GST). This figure includes all fees, travel, expenses and incidentals.

Annex 1: EVALUATION WORK PLAN OUTLINE

1. Rationale, purpose and specific objectives of the evaluation
2. Evaluation Object and Scope
 - 2.1. Project description
 - 2.2. Intervention logic
3. Preliminary issues and potential impact on evaluation
 - 3.1. Findings and recommendations from previous and/or other evaluations (if applicable)
 - 3.2. Evaluability assessment
 - Review of the coherence and logic of a intervention;
 - Review of the evaluation questions.
 - Clarification of data availability and quality and of key informants availability;
 - Level of resistance to evaluation and its reasons;
 - Factors that may compromise the independence of the evaluation;
 - Address possible conflicts of interest
4. Evaluation Criteria and key questions
(Criteria and updated questions)
5. Evaluation Approach and Methodology
 - 5.1. Evaluation Approach
 - 5.2. Evaluation Methodology (taking into consideration budget, time, data and political constraints)
 - specification and justification of the proposed design
 - specification and justification of the proposed techniques for data collection;
 - specification of proposed the data sources;
 - specification and justification of the proposed data analysis;
 - narrative explanation the evaluation matrix (the Matrix is to be include as an Annexe)
 - 5.3. Sampling

For each sampling (e.g. stakeholders selection, country/region/sites selection, etc.) specify:
Purpose, Universe, Sampling criteria, Proposed sample, Sample analysis (i.e. limitations).
6. Reporting
 - 6.1. Debriefing-validation and draft rapport (how it will be done)
 - 6.2. Table of content of the final report
7. Evaluation Management
 - 7.1. Evaluation Team Members
 - 7.2. Roles and Responsibilities
 - 7.3. Risks and risk Mitigation
8. Key Deliverables, Timelines and Resources
 - 8.1. Deliverables and Milestones, Schedule
 - 8.2. Level of Effort and budget (update if necessary)

Annexes

- Evaluation Matrix
- Sampling Framework
- Bibliography (used for the work plan design)
- List of individuals (consulted for the work plan design).
- LFA or PMF
- ToRs

Annex 2: Design matrix template

Question	Sub question	Type of sub question	Measure or indicator	Target or standard (normative)	Baseline data?	Data source	Design	Sample or census	Data collection instrument	Data analysis	Comments

Source: Morra-Imas, Linda G. And Ray C. Rist. (2009) The Road to Results: Designing and Conducting Effective Development Evaluations, World Bank, Washington D.C., pp.243.

Annex 3: Program Planning Table

VOLUNTARY SECTOR PROGRAM PLANNING TABLE

(Results-Based Management Performance Framework Planning Grid)

Program Title: “Building Leadership, Knowledge and Capacity for Sustainable Global Impact” Organization: Coady International Institute

<p>START: December 1, 2007 END: May 31, 2012 (4.5 years)</p>	<p>CIDA PRIORITIES (%)*: 95% PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT (%) : 5%</p>	<p>COUNTRY(IES) (%): 25% of Coady activity will be in 6 of CIDA's 25 priority countries. 5 of these are in sub-Saharan Africa (Ghana, Zambia, Rwanda, Ethiopia and Kenya) and 1 is in Asia (Vietnam). 75% of Coady activity will target other CIDA priority countries or CIDA-VSP funding-eligible countries, including South Africa, India, Afghanistan and countries in the Americas.</p>	
<p>Total Budget (cash / in kind): \$17,123,167 Organization Contribution (cash / in kind) \$10,935,667 CIDA Contribution: \$6,187,500</p>		<p>PURPOSE(S):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To strengthen the capacity of organizational leaders within civil society and government to plan and implement development programs with special focus on women and youth. 2. To directly strengthen the capacity of civil society organizations and governments working to achieve equitable and sustainable development. 3. To improve the effectiveness of the development sector through knowledge, innovation and scaleable best practice approaches. 4. To increase awareness and support among Canadians for Canada's leadership role in global development, including its commitment to the MDG's. 	<p>GOAL(S):</p> <p>To build leadership, knowledge and capacity in the development sector so that citizens are deeply and widely engaged in driving the development of their communities and nations.</p> <p>To ensure that the development sector is working effectively to achieve the MDG's and Canada's other global development targets while creating sustainable impacts in terms of economic prosperity and good governance.</p>

	EXPECTED RESULTS		
<p>ACTIVITIES</p> <p>1. Coady will offer transformative leadership education programs to development organization leaders in a variety of highly relevant fields that integrate the cross-cutting themes of gender, health and environment.</p> <p>2. Coady will engage in more intensive training and advisory roles to build the core competencies, leadership and program capacity of at least six development organizations.</p> <p>3. Coady will identify and assist in generating development innovations that are applied locally, will be shared widely through Web-based and other means, and can be scaled to have regional, national, and potentially global impact.</p> <p>4. Coady will engage Canadian opinion-leaders, influencers and decision-makers as well as youth, through the media, our Web site, public events in Canada, overseas learning opportunities and the development of new print, video and electronic resources.</p>	<p>OUTPUTS**</p> <p>1. Building from 125 students in 2007 to more than 250 in 2012, 1000 men and women, including youth leaders, will graduate from Coady's campus-based programs, on-site programs in the global South and technology-mediated distance education programs.</p> <p>2. Targeted organizations will improve their own capacity and their capacity to assist other groups and communities operate effective microfinance programs, create peaceful societies, improve access to markets and livelihood, build upon community-based assets, make the fundamental shift to citizen driven community development, the advocate for policy change and strengthen gender equity.</p> <p>3. Research for Action partnerships and Knowledge Exchange initiatives, will have developed innovative and effective approaches in the areas outlined in Output 2 and have shared these widely.</p> <p>4. Targeted groups of Canadians will gain knowledge, understanding and support for Canada's role in the world.</p>	<p>OUTCOMES*</p> <p>1. Civil Society, government and private sector leaders, in particular women and youth, will have enhanced knowledge, skills and capacity to engage citizens in their own development and to plan and implement effective development programs.</p> <p>2. Communities in Coady-focus countries will strengthen their capacity to drive their own development, better understand and take advantage of linking micro realities to macro, improve sustainable livelihoods and financial services; ensure accountability and achieve a greater voice in regional and national policymaking, including National Development Plans and PRSPs.</p> <p>3. The international development sector with ties to the Coady will be a key contributor to innovation, best practices and development models that promote prosperity, good governance and peace.</p> <p>4. The Canadian public, especially in Atlantic Canada, will be more knowledgeable of the challenges and opportunities faced by citizens of the global South and the good news of development success and will express broader support for Canada's role in attaining the MDGs.</p>	<p>IMPACT(S)*</p> <p>b) An engaged and in-charge citizenry in Coady focus countries that are driving their own development at the community level, the organizational level and in their societies and nations.</p> <p>b) More self-reliant communities, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, which have achieved significant poverty reduction, health improvement, equality among men and women and opportunities for women and youth.</p> <p>c) A development sector that has shifted its approach to a more effective, citizen-driven model and is better able to exchange lessons, learn from experiences and impact government policy.</p> <p>d) An informed Canadian public whose concept of global citizenry is seen in support for Canada's involvement in best development practices in Afghanistan and the global South.</p>

	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS		
	<p>OUTPUTS</p> <p>1.1 Year-over-year increases in participant enrolment in programs.</p> <p>1.2 Development and launch of a new International Centre for Women's Leadership</p> <p>2.1 At least 5 critical breakthroughs in effective development practice focussed on livelihoods and governance</p> <p>3.1 Peer review of outputs indicates high quality and relevant research.</p> <p>3.2 Number of document downloads from Web site and requests from development practitioners and others for our materials</p>	<p>3.3 Number of Coady alumni included in our electronic database</p> <p>4.1 Number of young Canadian men and women and opinion-leaders of both genders participating in Coady public engagement activities</p> <p>OUTCOMES</p> <p>1.1 Tracer surveys indicate that graduates are effectively using their new knowledge and skills in their home organizations.</p> <p>1.2 Coady women graduates have attained higher roles in development organizations</p>	<p>2.1 Partners actively take part in policy-making fora in their countries and regions</p> <p>3.1 Document reviews and interviews show how all community members, especially women, are leading development, not seen as passive beneficiaries.</p> <p>4.1 Canada's reputation as a global leader in development thought, practice and education is enhanced.</p>
	REACH (number and type of beneficiaries, sex-disaggregated if applicable)		
	1000 leaders (women, men & youth from development organizations, government agencies and private sector) will take part in in-depth leadership programs on-campus, on-site in the global South or through distance learning, indirectly benefiting millions of community members in developing countries.	6 high-impact Global Partnerships will be responsible for developing and implementing innovations for the direct benefit of hundreds of communities in the global South	Research for Action partnerships as well as dynamic Knowledge Exchange facilitated in large part by the Coady's Marie Michael Library, will directly inform and educate thousands of Coady associates, will have a deep impact on the development sector and will indirectly assist millions of people in developing countries.
RISKS & ASSUMPTIONS			
<p>Assumptions: There will be substantial buy-in from development leaders and their organizations; Coady can find appropriate venues for action research outputs; Coady partners are able to share and implement innovations in their home countries;</p> <p>Risks: Candidates that are accepted into Coady on-campus programs are not able to obtain visas or overcome other obstacles to attendance; Coady graduates do not stay current in their approach; Coady unable to solicit matching funds for programs; Breakdown in relationships with program partners;</p> <p>Strategies to address challenges/risks: Coady is developing strategies to address prospective students' obstacles to attendance; Stronger alumni networking and knowledge exchange will help to keep our graduates active and current in the development sector; Relationships formed during the recent \$15 million private-sector capital campaign has created positive donor recognition of the Coady and will assist in future fund-raising for programs.</p>			

Women's Centre RBM Framework Planning Grid (from proposal submitted Nov 30 2009)

Purpose:

- 1) To create a world class centre for excellence in women's leadership that positions Canada as making a high-profile contribution at the forefront of this area.
- 2) To strengthen the capacity of a cadre of emerging women leaders within civil society and government organizations to plan and implement development programs.
- 3) To strengthen the capacity of civil society organizations and governments working to achieve equitable and sustainable development, with a focused investment in women's leadership.
- 4) To improve the effectiveness of the development sector through knowledge, innovation and scalable best-practice approaches, based on a focused investment in women's leadership.

Expected Outcomes:

- 1) The Coady Institute will be well positioned to implement an expanded cadre of activities through a high-profile Centre with a strong international reputation.
- 2) Emerging women leaders in civil society, government and private sector organizations will have enhanced knowledge, skills and capacity to engage citizens in their own development and to plan and implement effective development programs.
- 3) Communities in Coady-focus countries will strengthen their capacity to drive their own development, improve sustainable livelihoods and financial services, ensure accountability and achieve a greater voice in regional and national policymaking, including National Development Plans and PRSPs.

Expected Outputs:

- 1) Planning, research, case studies, study guides, networking and recruiting activities will lay the groundwork for an internationally recognized centre and educational programs that have a wide outreach and significant impact on large numbers of women, their organizations and communities.
- 2) 15 emerging women leaders and 15 mentors will participate in Coady's pilot program.
- 3) Corresponding partner organizations will improve their own capacity and their capacity to assist other groups and communities operate effective programs, create peaceful societies, improve access to markets and livelihood, build upon community-based assets, advocate for policy change and strengthen gender equity.