Global Education, Public Awareness- Raising and Campaigning on Development Issues

An Overview of Evaluation Practice and Policy

Background Paper prepared for:

Informal Experts' Workshop

**Development Communication, Advocacy and Education:
Tips and Tools for improving evaluation**

Bonn, 19-20 March 2007

Hosted by the German Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ)
and the OECD Development Centre

This paper brings together a number of summaries, project reports and overviews of evaluation and quality enhancement initiatives in the fields of global and development education, public awareness raising and campaigning on development issues. It includes summary reports on specific projects and workshops, on national level initiatives, and on international processes, conferences and commitments.

Compiled and edited

Eddie O'Loughlin
Liam Wegimont

Contents

Introduction

Introduction

This background paper introduces the reader to a broad spectrum of evaluation initiatives in the fields of global and development education, public awareness-raising and campaigning on development issues. Through a review of summary reports on specific projects and workshops, on national level initiatives, and on international processes, conferences and commitments, it highlights good practice, summarises lessons learnt and identifies key outstanding challenges.

The paper begins by outlining the policy context to date in Europe and goes on to present a range of Global Education and Development Education evaluation country case studies. This is followed by a look at a number of initiatives at a European level aimed at strengthening evaluation. Next a number of case studies of evaluation of public communication and awareness-raising are presented.

Section 1
Policy frameworks for enhanced quality in global, development education, public awareness-raising, campaigning, etc. in Europe

1.1 Introduction

As long as there have been efforts to educate people about justice issues, and to relate peoples particular concerns to more universal and global concerns involving humanity as a whole, there have also been concerns about doing it better, about reaching more people, about quality, about improvement, about, in other words, evaluation.

While these efforts have existed, and been reflected on for millennia, the specific efforts of development and global education, of campaigning, information, promotion and awareness-raising of development have a more recent, if not unrelated history. Some would chart these histories to the 1960s and 70s, with the advent of development discourse and critical reflection on development practice.

During the 1980s and 90s, the work of development NGOs and governments began increasingly to focus on development education, information and awareness-raising. Some NGDOs and indeed some governments [1] strongly supported the work of development education, information and awareness-raising. At the same time many involved in these efforts during the 1980s and 1990s – at both NGDO and government levels - would have struggled to ensure that these issues remained visible as pertinent to the development agenda, and would have struggled to ensure adequate budgets and political support. Policy frameworks were weak.

In the mid to late 1990s, work in a number of OECD countries, led in some instances by NGDOs, in others by governments, in some by intermediary agencies [2] or educational institutions, led to increased recognition of the need for strengthened policy frameworks, political commitment and funding for the work. Since the late 1990s, many OECD countries have seen the work of development education, awareness-raising, and information move from the periphery, to a more central role in development discourse, practice, policy and funding.

1.2 Arguments for increased political support and improved policy frameworks

A number of arguments were put forward in support of this centrality. These arguments have elsewhere been characterised in the following different perspectives:

- **Global society citizenry arguments:** the needs of citizens in a global society to understand global processes, and the development and international solidarity agenda within these global processes;
- **Democratic requirement:** public spending on development co-operation requires a public educated in the issues surrounding development co-operation; lack of spending on DE can lead to a democratic deficit.
- **Good sustainable development requirement:** for development to work, it requires ownership – not only by Southern governments and peoples, but also by Northern

---

[1] Most notably countries that actively supported development education with relatively significant budgets included the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Austria and Germany in Europe, and Australia and Canada.
[2] Such as the NCDO in the Netherlands, the NCDE in Ireland, KommEnt in Austria, the Swiss Foundation for Education and Development in Switzerland, etc.

publics. Critical knowledge by Northern publics ensures greater scrutiny and clearer development priorities.

- **Public opinion research:** while there are differing levels of support for development co-operation, and knowledge and awareness of development issues, in different countries; public opinion research suggests that there is in each donor country a gap between deep public support for development co-operation (universally strong) and shallow public knowledge of development issues (universally weak);

- **Human Security Arguments:** since September 11th 2001, there have been increasing calls for greater international solidarity to increase human security in the South, in order to increase public security in the North; and increasingly, a recognition that such solidarity will not be achieved without increased awareness and knowledge in the North of the realities of life, and the underlying causes of inequity, in the South.[3]

More recently, the increased political will in relation to global development afforded by the MDGS has added political impetus to the argument that there can be no achievement of particular development goals without an informed and critically aware public in OECD countries.

Together with this growth in centrality, mainstreaming and policy support frameworks, comes a growing emphasis on quality, on improvement and on evaluation, variously understood. A number of Congresses and Conferences early in this decade made significant strides towards stronger policy frameworks and support for these areas at national and international level, and twinned the need for more and greater development and global education, information and awareness, with the need for better practice, improved quality, and greater visibility of effect. The main achievements in these Conferences and their outcomes in relation to global and development education, public awareness-raising, and information on development issues – particularly in the field of evaluation, is outlined below.

1.3 The Maastricht Congress on Global Education in Europe to 2015

The "European Congress on Global Education to 2015", was convened in November 2002 in Maastricht. It drew on the political impetuses of the need for public support for the Millennium Development Goals, and the possibilities inherent in the World Summit on Sustainable Development and its subsequent Decade of Education for Sustainable Development to focus attention on the potential and promise of global education. Drawing together governments, civil society, parliamentarians and local and regional powers from across Europe, and involving a modest Southern participation, the Congress led to the Maastricht Declaration on Improving and Increasing Global Education in Europe to 2015. This Congress was something of a milestone in the growth of global education in Europe in that it:

- Drew attention to the political necessity of support for global education as a prerequisite for critical public engagement with global development and sustainability issues;

- Focused commitment on European and national strategies, providing space for national actors to begin the process of development of national strategies, including strategies for improvement, quality and evaluation;

---

[3] This analysis was first suggested in Höck, S and Wegimont, L (eds) National Structures for the organisation, Support and Funding of Development Education: A Comparative Analysis KommEnt/North-South Centre, Vienna/Lisbon

- Called for the establishment of a European Peer Review system for global education, and for a target percentage of national Overseas Development Aid commitments to be devoted to global education.

The Maastricht declaration was significant in relation to a policy framework for global and development education in that it firmly embedded the notion of the right to quality global education for all citizens as a benchmark for progress in the achievement of global education. Increased provision was linked to improved provision.

1.4 The Brussels Conference -
European Conference on Awareness-Raising and Development Education for North-South Solidarity

The Brussels Conference took place in May 2005. Bringing together a wide range of national administrations, national and international organisations, and civil society representatives, and building on a previous resolution of the Development Ministers of the European Union, the Conference focused on the fact that, in the words of the final conclusions document of the Conference - *"effective development education and awareness raising are essential conditions to mobilise support to reach'... targets...such as the MDGS and ODA targets"*.

The Conference focused on a number of issues crucial to the increase and improvement of public awareness-raising on development issues, global and development education, including:

- The need for coherent national strategies, and for coherence between national and European strategies;
- The need to integrate these perspectives across policy fields, including education;
- The need to ensure adequate resources for these areas, including target setting.

A key focus of the recommendations of the Conference was the issue of quality and effectiveness in the areas under consideration. The Conference concluded that:

> *As part of the overall need to raise both quality and efficiency, best practices should be actively encouraged and supported, particularly between Member states but also internationally. Ongoing coordination and cooperation, learning from past experiences at the widest possible level is therefore essential to ensure coherence and maximise effectiveness.*

The Brussels Conference participants also agreed that:

> *Building on existing experiences, increased efforts have to be made to improve monitoring and evaluation of development education and awareness raising activities in order to systematically enhance their overall relevance, efficiency and effectiveness.*

1.5 Helsinki

The Helsinki Conference, convened under the auspices of the Finnish presidency of the EU in June 2006, again put development education and awareness-raising at the very centre of the development agenda. It was symbolically important that Finland chose to launch its

presidency in the field of development cooperation with a Conference on development education and awareness-raising. It built on what the final declaration of the Conference described as

> *the growing political commitment and strengthened policy in the field of development education and awareness-raising, at European and national level, inter alia, through the Development Education Resolution of the EU Council of Development Ministers (2001), the Maastricht Declaration (2002), the Palermo Process (2003), the Brussels Conference (2005) and the European Consensus on Development (2005).[4]*

Participants from national ministries, agencies, EU institutions, European civil society, international organizations, local and regional authorities, and research institutes, ensured attention was given to a number of issues considered politically crucial to the fields of global and development education and information. First among them was the issue of quality and effectiveness.

---

[4] Helsinki Conference, Final Declaration, Preamble, paragraph 1

1.6 Summing Up

The early years of this Century have seen a growing recognition of the centrality of global and development education and public awareness-raising of development issues within the development agenda[5]. Starting with the development education resolution of the Committee of Development Ministers of the EU in November 2000, and through the Maastricht Congress, the Palermo process, the Brussels Conference, and the Helsinki Conference, is a red thread of growing political and policy consensus.

The conclusions of these processes – and the growing number of national initiatives and strategies on which they were based and which they reflected - made it clear that issues of global and development education and awareness-raising on development issues had come in from the cold, so to speak. These areas are now recognised as central rather than peripheral to the development agenda – a position that many advocates working in the 1990s might only have dreamt of. Indeed it is no exaggeration to say that there is a recognition that it is impossible to progress a global development agenda without recognising the key importance of an informed and educated public in the developed world.

At the same time, it is also clear that if there is to be universal access to quality global and development education and information, then that requires both *more* and *better*, both *increased* and *improved* provision. Recognition of the need for more adequate resources and stronger political and policy support, goes hand in hand with recognition of the need for more adequate evaluation and quality enhancement.

We now move from the changing policy framework of global and development education and awareness- raising, and the increasing recognition of the need for evaluation and quality within these processes, to look more specifically at some case studies of evaluation of global and development education in a number of European countries. The following section is the work of Helmuth Hartmeyer and Petra Löber, updated by the current editors, with the permission of the original authors.

---

[5] This of course mirrors a similar, and perhaps even more important movement towards the recognition of the importance of issues of global justice to education policy and provision per se, and also to the global financial and economic system, to environment policy, to ethics, etc.

Section 2.

Evaluating Global and Development Education in a number of European countries – some case studies (Helmuth Hartmeyer and Petra Löber)

This section is based on an unpublished study of Helmuth Hartmeyer and Petra Löber "Evaluation in Global and Development Education" - a European study on behalf of GENE (Global Education Network Europe) & BMZ (German Ministry of Economic Co-operation and Development) of September 2003.

2.1.   Introduction

This section has two aims:

1. To identify, stock-take and describe partners, organisations, resource persons and publications within European organisations and networks dealing with evaluation of global and development education (GE/DE). Drawing from conceptual papers, reports and face to face discussions, a number of models, concepts and processes in the evaluation of GE/DE within the selected projects and publications are portrayed. Success and drawbacks, questions of ownership and learning processes as well as the various set-ups are described and reflected upon.

2. To draw first conclusions from these experiences and to formulate questions for further discussion.

2.2   Overview
The implementation of evaluation in European countries - examples and experiences

The main idea of the section is to share experiences and perspectives on issues of quality of global education and development education (GE/DE) and to develop strategies on how to ensure that evaluation and quality improvement become part of our practice.

The following overview shows two things:

1. Evaluation in GE and DE is still very young and new, and its future looks very interesting and potentially fruitful;

2. There is a broad variety in concepts and results among organisations and projects in different countries.

It should therefore not be surprising that the basis of the study is also very varied. It relies on evaluation reports, handbooks for evaluation, interim reports and draft papers of lectures.

2.3   Norway: A South Evaluation of the North

RORG-network "A South evaluation of a Northern development-related organisation", Oslo 2002

In Norway development education (DE) is closely linked to development aid projects and has a 50 year old history of 'aid for poor countries' (started in 1953). NORAD (Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation) was founded in 1968 and was also entrusted with the responsibility for official information on issues related to development, including funding agreements with NGOs. Since the 1990s the RORG-network (RORG – acronym in Norwegian for 'framework agreement organisation') has managed to establish itself as the main support structure for DE-NGOs in Norway.[6] Today there is close contact and co-operation between NORAD and the RORG network. Basically the RORG network argues for development education to be given a more prominent role in south policy and for it to be based on 'a comprehensive north/south perspective'.

The 'South evaluation' undertaken by the RORG-network in 2002 represents an external evaluation by the prime stakeholders of development work. Regarding the fact that RORG deals with North-South issues and wishes to promote 'voices from the South' representing southern views and perspectives in Norway as much as possible, the RORG-network decided in 2001 to subject itself to an evaluation from 'the South'.

The RORG network argues that this kind of approach and process should become a fixture in the organisational life of Northern development organisations. The main goal of the evaluation was to prove the usefulness of the Millennium Development Goals as a common reference for DE as viewed from 'the South'.

It was an evaluation of DE-activities of members of the RORG-network and the network itself. The evaluation team consisted of Ms Naty Bernardino from the Philippines, Dr Alejandro Bendaña from Nicaragua and the project co-ordinator Dr Stiaan van der Merwe from South Africa. More participation by partners in the South was made possible through questionnaires, discussions and visits. The terms of reference as well as the outlines for contractual obligations were developed in a bilateral and protracted process of mutual consultation. From April to June 2002 responses to a questionnaire developed by the Southern participants were collected and were finally discussed at an interactive round table of Southern participants with RORG member organisations.

In August 2003 the RORG-network steering group discussed a follow-up reflection process in order to ensure that the outcomes from the evaluation remained vibrant and decided to work out three joint documents: 1) the understanding of the concept of DE by the member organisations, 2) a common understanding of co-operation with the South (Why, with Whom and How) and 3) a revised "vision and mission" for the RORG-network.

There was mutual suspicion from North to South as well as from South to North. DE in 'the North' in general was something to which the participants from 'the South' were not only totally unfamiliar, but also fundamentally suspicious about. In addition to that a language gap existed. High uncertainty and a lack of clarity in the use of various terms had to be removed

---

[6] For further information on RORG see www.rorg.no

first. This situation forced and guided the process to focus on fundamental qualitative issues and questions. The openness towards change, flexibility in management and a "healthy degree of mutual trust" finally carried the project beyond difficulties.

The experiences out of the evaluation raised questions relating to North-South organisational co-operation, e.g. *Who or what represents the 'authentic voice of the South'? To whom is 'the North' accountable to in 'the South'?*

It also raises the question why experts from the South should be in a better position to judge upon work in the North and whether it reverses somehow the old concept of development aid "come and tell us how to do it".

<u>Lessons learned</u>

In the case of South evaluations it is even more necessary to work carefully and cautiously. All participants in the process have to be open for creative changes and not to use an evaluation only to legitimise their own work.

Everyone should be aware that it may be a partly painful process, but "constructive pain". This is true of any evaluation process but within a South evaluation it gains new and unknown importance and relevance.

2.4 United Kingdom: Development Education Association (DEA)[7] / "Measuring effectiveness" London 2001

The Development Education Association's (DEA's) "Measuring Effectiveness in Development Education" project started in 1999 and lasted two years. The results were published in a brochure in September 2001. That publication is the basis for the following summarising description.

The project was an action research project and used a consultative approach including seminars and discussions with key stakeholders involved in DE in the UK. A range of differing pilot projects were identified by DEA members – chosen from different sectors, and also chosen in order to show a range of evaluation approaches, such as formative or summative evaluations. An open-end approach was adopted, in which members of the project team worked as 'critical friends' with the organisations.

"To measure effectiveness is to assess the extent to which shifts have taken place that support our goals" [8]. One of the main goals of the project was to develop the capacities of organisations and practitioners in DE how to plan and evaluate their DE work effectively. The result is nevertheless "no checklist". It should help development educators to improve their practice.

The project proposes tools to assist practitioners in devising ways of measuring the effectiveness of their programmes. Therefore it should help to identify evaluation priorities and enable those involved to be able to recognise and differentiate between key performance areas. The Measuring Effectiveness project proposes to the practitioners to consider the three

---

[7] Further information on the DEA is available at <u>www.dea.org.uk</u>

[8] Measuring Effectiveness in Development Education. DEA, London, 2001. P. 8.

principles of 'WHY', 'WHAT' and 'HOW'. Within this framework, various evaluation questions and types of evaluation need to be recognised. Why is an organisation embarking on a DE-programme; what is the programme trying to achieve; and how are you going to achieve your targets and goals? Asking "why?" encourages thinking regarding the rationale for the initiative, its desired impact, the values, attitudes and actions it wishes to be seen. Considering "what?" helps to decide the focus of the initiative in terms of knowledge, key skills, the learning process and outcomes, and the agendas that form the content of the work. Looking at the "how?" prepares for the implementation of the initiative, and the level of organisational performance that needs to occur.

What is needed in any programme is to ensure that the links and connections with the bigger 'why' of DE are made. Practitioners should recognise that evaluation is by its very nature a political process.

One outcome of the project "Measuring effectiveness" (Sept. 2001) is a , user's guide – an electronic user's pack.[9] From 2002 onwards the DEA has developed an ongoing training programme.

<u>Lessons learned</u>

At the end the authors point out that what is needed now is a project to measure the effectiveness and impact of the proposals on the work of DE practitioners over the next five to ten years.

2.5   BLK-model project "Education 21" – Evaluation report, Berlin 2003[10]

In 1999 the concept of 'Education 21' was officially approved by the German government (Ministry of Education and Science) and 15 federal states (BLK) and equipped with about 12 million Euro for five years. The activities and the structural network are coordinated by the Free University Berlin. The programme should translate both environmental and developmental aspects of the Agenda 21 (International Declaration on Environment and Development, Rio de Janeiro 1992) into action in German schools. The concept of environmental education developed within the framework of universities was transformed into a programme for German school education. In its centre it saw the adoption of the concept of 'shaping development for sustainability'. [11]

The primary educational goal for the participants was "shape their competence for the future". On the other hand the main goal for the programme itself was the integration of education for sustainable development into regular school practice – based on the concept of Agenda 21.

Three different modules were developed to implement the concept in school lessons: the principle of organising knowledge by linking different scientific areas; participatory learning;

---

[9] Guide: "electronic user's pack" - web site is one outcome of the project "Measuring Effectiveness": www.dea.org.uk/info/projects/effectiveness/intro_backg.html

[10] Note a second evaluation took place in 2004, partly based on the 2003 evaluation. For further information on BLK21 see: www.blk21.de

[11] Note, within the framework of the BLK-programme "Education 21" a so called 'summer university' is organised every year for pupils and teachers.

and innovative structures. As for the latter, the programme provides connections with general tendencies in innovative school development.

A first evaluation report on the programme was published in spring 2003, a second in 2004. It documents the whole process, poses questions and answers and draws a first analysis. Teachers in selected schools had been interviewed by questionnaires twice: regarding changes before and after the project. At the programme start in August 1999 and one and a half years later in 2001 a) about 175 schools and b) about 750 teachers were asked for the significance and frequency of certain elements and capacities (e.g. co-operation structures between teacher colleagues, parents and NGOs; teaching methods and topics/contents in lessons). The final evaluation examines the participation of schools (teachers and students) in the whole process and the understanding of students regarding the lessons in sustainability. The question remains open, whether through this methodology the schools and teachers could achieve ownership of the evaluation.

Lessons learned

One significant outcome/result is that the personal commitment and mission of the single teacher has still to be recognised as one of the most important elements for any success in implementing DE in school practice. A second line of investigation concerns the organisational structures which are needed for the reform of school practice.

The BLK programme and its evaluation has led to an intense debate about concepts, theories and quality in German DE, Global Education and campaigning. Although aspects of GE and sustainable development are closely linked, the question of whether the objectives of global education can be incorporated into a concept of sustainable development, is being discussed. There also remains the question of whether there exists unspecified key competences for global education (like shaping your own future) and how they can be evaluated.

2.6   EED (Protestant Development Services)
"Handbook: Evaluation in global and development education"
- Guide for evaluation practice. Bonn 2003

The suggestion for this handbook was given at an evaluation conference in Kassel in November 2002. The ABP (Action for Education and Publication of the Protestant Church in Germany) intended to implement evaluation for all funded projects. A working group 'evaluation' of the ABP started its work with a seminar and finally edited the handbook on behalf of the ABP. Authors are Annette Scheunpflug with the assistance of Claudia Bergmüller and Nikolaus Schröck

NGOs contributed to the writing of the book. Methods and concepts were regularly reflected and tested during periods of 6 months after each step. The results out of this practice were included in the further development of the models and concepts. Such a participatory procedure takes pains and time but the results are positive and worth the effort. It has promoted the success of the book and guarantees the use by groups, schools and NGOs after its publishing.

The book is a systematic overview and useful handbook for evaluation, including a short definition of the different types of evaluation: process-, product evaluation, concept-

(intention), implementation- ('how') and effect (results) evaluation, also: self- and external evaluation.

The handbook contains practical hints and useful examples for NGOs, groups and DE-practitioners. It should encourage them to improve the quality of their educational work and practice by evaluation and to raise awareness about it. Examples for questionnaires, patterns and 'good practice' invite readers to transfer and apply them to their own work and to find appropriate forms of reflection and review. The concept of an 'evaluation circle' is explained, the steps within such a circle and three different examples (self-evaluation of a weekend seminar, an external evaluation of a service- and information centre and the self-evaluation of a partnership travel project) are described in detail.

The last chapter gives useful hints and tips for a successful evaluation, explains different instruments for evaluation and gives examples of mistakes which should be avoided. Furthermore, examples of "good practice" are described and a list of further reading is added for background information.

Lessons learned

GE/DE has a special quality and therefore needs specific instruments for evaluation. GE/DE often takes place in specific working situations which need to be recognised.

2.7 DIPF (German Institute for International Educational Research)/ "Evaluation and quantitative methods in global learning: A contribution from the field of intercultural sensitivity" Frankfurt 2003

The DIPF in Frankfurt documents, describes and analyses educational development in Germany and in other European as well as non-European countries. It supports communication in the field of research and education, it contributes to the further development of theoretical, empirical and methodological educational research by permanent analyses, and it sponsors the work of young academics.

The research project carried out by Hermann-Günter Hesse and Kerstin Göbel (both German Institute for International Educational Research in Frankfurt) is based on two pillars: The developmental model of intercultural sensitivity by Milton Bennett (1993) is brought together with the research work of Alexander Thomas (1998) on critical incidents during intercultural encounters. The model of Bennett outlines six stages along a continuum of intercultural development of which three are ethno-centric (denial, defence, minimization), and the other three are ethno-relative (acceptance, adaptation, integration).

The aim was to transform aspects of global education into observable behaviour. At the beginning of the project there was the challenge to construct situations, which can elicit individual behaviours interpretable as indicators of outcomes of global learning. The task was difficult.

In total 472 students, 9- and 10-graders in German schools in foreign language classes, took part in the investigation in autumn 2002. They were confronted with critical incidents chosen out of a pool of the prototypical intercultural critical encounters. Then they were asked to evaluate the protagonists' cognitions, affects and intentions to act by first answering 3 questions "what happened?", "how do the protagonists feel?" and "how would you react?" and second by rating the probabilities.

The study is scientific work based on both quantitative data and a substantial amount of qualitative work. It works out profiles of people's reactions to critical incidents within intercultural situations; there was no participation by the examinees to the creation and use of the instruments or to the shaping of the research process.

It was discussed to what extend the underlying concept of 'culture learning' is adequate for development education and such forms of testing.

Lessons learned

This study by DIPF is an innovative and emerging approach to testing instruments for global education. It is important to continue to develop such instruments even if it does not immediately translate into everyday practice.

2.8 Netherlands: European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) / Maastricht 2003 "Internalising evaluation results through learning: Complementary perspectives, dilemmas and some lessons learned"

ECDPM, the European Centre for Development Policy Management based in Maastricht, has been working on EU- ACP relations since 1986.[12] With its wealth of knowledge, learning approach and diversity of staff, the Centre continuously adapts to the changing environment.

The paper by Charlotte Carlsson, Dr Paul Engel and Arin van Zee is one outcome of a workshop "How can we learn more from what we do? Evidence-based communication for development" in December 2002. It forms the basis of this analysis. According to evaluations as learning opportunities plus "development understood as learning our way into a sustainable future" the paper focuses on "three progressively more comprehensive perspectives on learning for development": 1. improving feedback to development policy and planning; 2. organisational learning by development partners and 3. learning in society at large.

Within the field of development policy and programming the authors identify *policy innovation networks* as instruments to mobilise Southern partners and stakeholders to engage in existing learning and feedback routes. They point out 3 streams of action: participatory monitoring and evaluation, results-based planning and management and the sharing of experiences.

In organisations and among partners all actors are recognised as players in the same game – "part of a joint learning effort" with a need for critical self-reflection ("from talking to listening") in order "to build in reality checks".

On the level of society at large conflicts of interest are common, consensus is the exception. According to Niels Röling and others from the Communication & Innovation Studies Group of Wageningen University their *knowledge systems approach* poses innovation as an "emergent property of social interaction and learning among multiple stakeholders"; a participatory action-research methodology is proposed.

---

[12] For further information on ECDPM see www.ecdpm.org

Within the second part of the paper questions are asked referring *dilemmas at the evaluation – learning interface.* A number of lessons are drawn from the analysis carried out by the ECDPM-team. "These are not new" – so the authors, who chose and underlined those which seemed to them central to the intentions to enhance learning through evaluation: - to evaluate the actual learning processes instead of measuring which learning processes should have taken place due to the programme objectives - to be responsible for your own learning, not for the learning of others

<u>Lessons learned</u>

In development work North-South exchange is pointed out as "where most can be learned". The last sentence of the paper is: *"Some of the most inspiring collections of reviews of experience span cultural boundaries between countries as well as continents. International cooperation might have a distinct competitive advantage in furthering this field of study."*

2.9   Austria: Learning from External Evaluations

External evaluations carried out by the Austrian authors of the current section, and their discussion with evaluation experts in some other European countries (like Germany, Ireland, Italy, Switzerland or UK) have led to a number of important insights into the nature and working of evaluation, which could be summarised as follows:

➢ Evaluations are an important contribution to the improvement of global education/ development education.

➢ An evaluation is a continuous process of self-reflection, a way of learning and improving the quality of our work. Any evaluation includes the definition of the subject, the formulation of criteria and indicators, the collection and interpretation of data, the communication about the results and the development of consequences.

➢ The methods should be appropriate to the subject. There is not <u>one</u> set of criteria, <u>one</u> set of standards.

➢ Learning for social change is more complex than we usually admit. There are a number of hidden aspects like ideological concerns, individual projections, and pedagogical restraints. It should be recognised that in global education/ development education we have to deal with uncertainty.

➢ Evaluations are about double-loop learning: to take the learners beyond the quest to find the best solution to a problem, but to reconsider the problem. Learning means to start at the questions, not at the answers.

➢ No evaluation will justify education itself, but it can support its legitimacy.

➢ No evaluation exempts us from the normative question, what we consider right. Tools and skills should not be introduced without a context (in our case of justice and global solidarity).

➢ It is not the question whether we believe in progress when we evaluate, but that we believe in change. The results of an evaluation should enable us to plan our activities according to our long-term goals.

➢ By analysing the hard facts, measuring the results and passing judgements, an evaluation may become a most powerful weapon. But it can easily be the case that consequences are never shared, because the actors who are evaluated, are never invited to take over responsibility for the process. However, everybody involved is an important stakeholder of future processes.

➢ The ownership of an evaluation starts before the evaluation. Important steps are the definition of the terms of reference, the discussion of interim reports and the open discussion of the draft final report.

➢ The motivation for an evaluation and the spirit, in which it takes place, is very decisive.

➢ An evaluation is often felt as a threat, which leads to reactions of defence. The attempt to hide away too often means that you also hide away your strengths.

➢ The debate on theory is of great importance to the area of global learning. It will be helpful to use evaluations for this purpose.

2.10   Recommendations

From the variety of evaluations and lessons outlined in this section, the following points are recommended:

➢ To make a difference between the aims of an evaluation and the aims of the process that is being evaluated. It is important to define indicators, when the aims have been agreed upon, but also be aware of the factors around. Evaluators should be aware of the difficulty to define value-criteria and should lay open their decisions about them. Criteria and indicators should depend on the subject, the context and the possibilities of the evaluated.

➢ To recognise that each evaluation follows one or more aims and to choose the methods accordingly. For example participatory learning asks for a participatory methodology. It would be absurd to assume that after a line of top-down information emancipation and independent thinking will be the result at the end of the day.

➢ To introduce methods of self-evaluation into evaluation processes; to initiate participatory learning.

➢ Not to measure the change of consciousness or attitudes, but to define aims around it and to make them operational in order to assess changes in knowledge and skills.

➢ To understand that an evaluation is also about the unshown and the unsaid and to develop tools to assess this.

➢ To be prepared for organisational/ institutional change as the result of an evaluation (change of tasks, of structures, of culture). An evaluation asks for readiness for change.

➤ To assess after one year whether institutional learning has happened and which consequences have been drawn.

➤ To recognise the importance of <u>who</u> evaluates; he/she may win influence, should understand the context, should have pedagogical and methodological competence, should keep professional distance, should be able to work in complementary teams, should be able to work in international teams, need not necessarily be from the South.

➤ To define and see evaluators as "critical friends".

➤ To recognise that external evaluations are also the property of the evaluated. It is important to avoid external control of the results. The evaluated should be included in the whole process of defining the subject, describing value-criteria and indicators and formulating consequences.

➤ To accept the aim of an evaluation as the improvement of the work of the evaluated themselves. It should therefore open up space for curiosity, participation and decision-making.

➤ To recognise that an evaluation asks for resources also on the side of the evaluated (time, money). It is part of the working hours of the evaluated

➤ To recognise the standard of payment in the NGO-sector. NGOs often do GE/DE at a cheap rate, they therefore expect evaluations to be carried out at similar rates. NGOs will ask for funding for evaluations at the same rate as for their own work.

➤ To use existing reports and analyse them; to use them for your purposes.

➤ To build up a databank of tools how to evaluate, of publications and projects; to facilitate the exchange of material.

➤ To train the trainers: to define qualifications and to develop a certificate;
to develop a culture of recognition of competence; to organise workshops for the support of evaluators; to initiate team-visits.

➤ To embark on international evaluation projects (co-operation of two or more evaluators from different countries) and to publish more reports in English to make knowledge and experiences better accessible throughout Europe.

Section 3.

Evaluating Global and Development Education at a European level

In recent years a number of Seminars, Conferences and processes have built on the growing work of evaluation in global and development education at national level, and developed common frameworks or shared national experience in an international framework.

This section summarises the key outcomes and challenges of each of these processes.

3.1 Nurnberg Seminar

In 2001 a number of existing national structures for support, funding and policy-making in the field of global and development education came together to establish GENE – Global Education Network Europe. The purpose of GENE was to share best practice between such structures, and, through networking, to support existing and emerging structures. GENE started with 6 national structures, and was at first facilitated by the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe. GENE has grown to include most existing national structures in Europe, with a significant combined national spend on development and global education and awareness-raising.

At the core of GENE's work is support for sharing good practice in the field of evaluation and promotion of quality in global and development education. That is why in March 2003 an expert seminar was organised, hosted by BMZ, with the support of the DEA (UK) and organised by Friedrich-Alexander-University Erlangen-Nürnberg, focused on issues of quality and evaluation in global education.

One commentator, Doug Bourn, summarised the key questions of this seminar thus:

> The key questions we suggest which need to be addressed are:
>
> *Why Learning for A Global Society Is Important?*
> *For over 20 years there has been some excellent work taking place in many countries under the umbrella of global and development education, but there is little evidence to demonstrate why NGOs and others have stated why they see this area of work as important.*
> *We need to address the question why it is important in this era of globalisation, increasing divisions between the rich and the poor in the world, abuse of human rights, degradation of the planet and global insecurity.*
>
> *What do we mean by Learning for Change?*
> *Definitions of global and development education throughout the world have referred to education linked to social change. What does this mean? Does it suggest there is a causal relationship between this form of education and change or something much more about providing the space for the learner to critically assess their own role in society? To what extent are we talking about political education or education for personal development?*

What are the Skills Required for a Global Society?
Globalisation poses major challenges for educationalists. All too often however the debates have been polarised between a narrow skills for a global economy agenda versus a broader rights and social justice perspective. How can we ensure that there is a convergence of the discussions and debates?

What are the essential components of Good Practice?
Central to good global and development education are participatory learning methodologies and a strong values base as well as knowledge and skills. To what extent must all of these elements be components of good practice? What needs to be developed to encourage greater debate with policy makers and funders that sees good practice as linked to learning?

Why there is a need to address evaluation, measuring effectiveness and impact.
Evaluation and reflection are important components of helping to improve the quality of global education. Without evaluation, how do you know whether what you are doing is any good and any value? How do you know without evaluation how to improve on what you are doing? There is a need to encourage policy-makers and funders as well as practitioners to incorporate reflective practice, develop models and forms of evaluation and tools for measuring effectiveness and impact. How do we encourage greater debate on these matters and secure recognition of the need for resources in this area within programmes and projects?

The Nurnberg seminar identified a paucity of reflection on practice and theory in evaluation in global and development education. While there are a plethora of examples of evaluation practices, there is also evidence of confusion, of importation of inappropriate models of evaluation, and of a lack of adequate theory in the field from which to draw on adequate theoretical framework for evaluation.

As a result of the Nurnberg Conference, the GENE network organised the London Conference "Learning for a Global Society" which had a similar focus on quality and evaluation in global education, but opened up the issue to a wider political, state administration and civil society participation.

3.2 London Conference

This Conference, entitled *Learning for A Global Society: Improving Global Education in Europe, Issues of Evaluation and Quality*, brought together stakeholders from across Europe to consider key issues regarding evaluation and quality.

Situating the issues of quality and evaluation within both the theoretical context of the lack of theory and research in the field – a weakness not unrelated to lack of funding, and the political contexts of the development of national strategies and the challenges and opportunities presented internationally by the MDGs and the decade of Education for Sustainable Development, the Conference drew participants attention to a number of challenges.

A number of key issues, challenges and questions were addressed; the following gives a taste of some fundamental *key questions:*

➢ The need to develop better theory from practice to ground global education – and any evaluation and quality processes we wish to strengthen. **One key question is: what are our ultimate ends, educationally and in terms of social change**.

- ➢ Global education takes place in the context of national educational policies, national and international development polices, and concerns regarding everything from strengthening public awareness of, and support for ODA or the Millennium Development Gaols, to issues of educational relevance and learning for global citizenship. **A second key question: Where do we situate global education and its improvement and evaluation?**

- ➢ **What models of evaluation should we use in global education?** And are they consistent with, and useful to, our overarching (educational and social change) aims?

- ➢ The question of the dual tension – between resistance to evaluation, and the need to innovate and develop new models of evaluation appropriate to global education. On the one hand, there is, in some quarters in which we work, a resistance to evaluation. Perhaps this is born of years of having evaluations foisted on organisations, from inappropriate paradigms. Perhaps, to use a distinction of one Canadian evaluation theorist, Brad Cousins, - that perhaps too much evaluation is about "proving that it works" and not enough evaluation is about "working to improve". But this should not be used, as it sometimes is, as an excuse for inaction. We need transparency, *and we need more and better evaluation if we are to improve global education*. The fact that evaluation in global education has a long way to go, is no excuse for not evaluating. As Elliot Eisner, the curriculum theorist from the US once said, critical educators have been very good at critique, but not so good at positing alternatives – like we can spot the weeds and pull them up, but are not very good at planting flowers.

- ➢ This leads to another Key Question: **How do we improve Evaluation in Global Education? What models and experiences of best practice – at micro (project and programme), meso (national co-ordination) and macro (global reach) levels – should be shared for improvement and innovation?**

The report of the Conference provided papers on a number of issues including

- ➢ The national and international policy contexts for evaluation in global education.
- ➢ The Millennium Development Goals and evaluation in global education
- ➢ Learning contexts for improving global education.
- ➢ Learning through evaluation.
- ➢ Global education, public opinion, public awareness and campaigning.
- ➢ Innovative practices in evaluation in global education.
- ➢ Southern involvement in evaluation of Global Education in Europe.

3.3 The European Global Education Peer Review Process

The European Global Education Peer Review Process is one practical review/evaluation mechanism which has clearly resulted in learning through international peer review and reporting processes. The process was initiated by the partners of the Maastricht Congress on Global Education mentioned above, and the initial secretariat for the process provided by the

North-South Centre of the Council of Europe. GENE[13] (Global Education Network Europe) has played a leading role in this process. This peer review process could be described as something between a review mechanism and an evaluation, with peer organisations or national ministries or agencies participating as the experts for the international peer review teams.

This process arose out of the Europe-wide Maastricht Congress on Global Education held in the Netherlands in 2002, attended by delegates from over 50 states. At this Congress a Declaration on Global Education was adopted calling for a number of initiatives aimed at bringing about improved and more global education in Europe, including for a Peer Review process.

In response and as part of the follow-up to the Maastricht Congress, a Global Education Peer Review feasibility study was carried out in 2003.[14] The study began with a reflection on relevant existing country review processes; key questions and issues were then tested, tried and reflected upon through a pilot review of Cyprus, leading to the first Global Education Peer Review country report; and through the initiation of a Global Education Peer Review process with Finland and the production of an issues paper.

To date four reviews have been completed, on Cyprus, Finland, the Netherlands and Austria. The international Global Education experts have came from the following countries – Austria, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Portugal, Slovakia, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom.

The overall aim of the European Global Education Peer Review Process, is to improve and increase Global Education (GE) in Europe. The purpose of the initiative is to provide a peer support and learning process, resulting in National Global Education Reports developed in partnership with national actors.

Apart from being a national comparative reporting process on Global Education, it became clear in the course of the Feasibility Study, that the Peer Review process can play a useful role in helping key national stakeholders develop national strategies for better and more Global Education. In the case of the Peer Review of Finland, a clear recommendation was made to develop a national strategy. This was acted upon and a comprehensive national strategy for global education has been developed for Finland. In the case of Austria, a national strategy is being developed. There is strong evidence to show, for example, that the process has resulted in greater national coordination, improved funding structures and bilateral learning initiatives in several of the countries reviewed, all contributing to better quality and more GE.

The Process is guided by 3 Principles

1. The process starts with the existing global education situation in each country, affirming good practice and supporting new learning for improving and increasing global education.

---

[13] GENE - Global Education Network Europe - is the European network of Ministries, agencies, etc. with responsibility for funding, policy-making and coordination of development and global education.

[14] The current authors were involved in this process. The Feasibility study was carried out by Eddie O'Loughlin, Global Education Consultant, and outlined how a Europe wide process of Global Education could be developed, and recommended the initiation of the same. He then facilitated the national peer review processes to date - on Austria, Cyprus, Finland and the Netherlands – as Process Coordinator, in cooperation with Liam Wegimont, then Head of Global Education at the NSC.

2. The process also involves bringing international experts in the field of GE to act as "critical friends" to the national process. Bringing comparative experience from other contexts enhances the learning possibilities.[15]

3. Each national peer review reflects the overarching aim of the process (which is to bring about better and more global education in Europe).

The following is a summary of the key steps in a Global Education Peer Review and national Reporting process:

1. Agree practicalities of how the process will be carried out / Terms of Reference, with the main partner(s) in the country to be reviewed, following formal engagement.

2. The lead partner(s) in the country concerned, along with the GE Peer Review Secretariat, gathers background information on GE in the country to be reviewed. This background information will take varied forms depending on the country structure and will provide the basis for a briefing document for the team.

3. The lead partner(s) in the country to be reviewed will assist the GE Peer Review Secretariat in identifying key individuals and organisations for the upcoming international team visit to the country, and with scheduling such meetings (in most cases an initial Peer Review Secretariat visit will be arranged to gather initial information and documentation from organisations, and to develop contacts, in advance of the main international team visit).

4. The material gathered above (background briefing material) is made available to the International Peer Review team who will be participating in the visit to the country under review (the team will usually comprise two or more international GE experts along with the peer review secretariat).

5. The international team visit to the country will involve briefings from key GE actors and stakeholders in the country concerned, along with other relevant actors, and possible visit(s) to see GE in practice.

6. The team visit to a given country could also involve the facilitation of a national process, or hearing, which can inform the country report. Conversely, national actors can use the presence of the International Peer Review Team to hold a national conference in keeping with national priorities. The International Peer Review Team will be available to input into such agreed processes.

7. Following the team visit the draft national report will be further developed based on the findings of the country visit. Relevant sections of this draft will then be sent to the key stakeholders in the country concerned for feedback and comment, before a final draft is prepared for print by the Peer Review Secretariat.

8. Some partners may wish to have an official launch of the report.

9. Agreed follow-up by the secretariat and international peer review team will take place to assist the national partners with their response to the report and recommendations.

---

[15] Our understanding of the notion of critical friends and critical learning is influenced by the literature on Action Research in Education. See Carr, W. and Kemmis, S. (1986) *Becoming Critical: Education, Knowledge and Action Research*, Falmer Press, Basingstoke, Hants.

Lessons Learned

National actors have emphasised that the external GE peer review process is both unique and is needed – producing national reports focused on the state of Global Education in both the formal and non-formal sectors. A number of national actors have indicated their particular interest in having an independent external review being carried out on GE in their country, and in seeing it as a mechanism in assisting them in developing a GE national strategy.

In all cases the review process has acted as a critical external support mechanism, supporting national events and processes for the increase and improvement of GE, as well as reviewing the current GE situation in the country. The process has also provided opportunities for comparative learning, insight, motivation and encouragement for the ongoing and further development of Global Education.

The importance of building up trust and confidence between the key actors in the process – the process coordinator and secretariat, the international peer review team, the key national stakeholders – has been the key to the success of the process to date. As in many other evaluation processes, credibility is crucial.

While the peer review has produced tangible results, and is clearly recognised by peers as being a useful practical tool to help bring about more and better Global Education throughout Europe, it should also be recognised that it is a relatively young process. The process itself is still very much in the learning stages. To date each process has learned heavily from the previous review, making adjustments and improvements after careful reflection by those involved. It is planned that after two to three more national processes, a major review / evaluation of the process itself will be carried out to see what lessons can be learned.

Flexibility of approach has been essential to the success of this process due to such different national situations (and because the process is in an early learning phase), but it is also considered by those who have coordinated the process, in consultation with many of the participating peer review experts, that with further reflection and learning, the methodology of the process can be strengthened so as to enable greater comparability and ultimately learning between each national process and between countries generally. In-depth analysis of how the process may have contributed to tangible results such as – the development of national strategies; increases in funding; and improvement in funding structures, will also be followed up.

While benefits, impacts and outputs have been evident, there have also been a number of challenges for the process. Over the last year and a half three national processes have been delayed or postponed. There are examples of peer review processes that have experienced teething problems and then gone from strength to strength, but there are also examples of peer processes that have faltered after a strong start up phase. [16] However, there is much commitment to ensure that the European Global Education Peer Review process will fall into the former rather than the latter category.

---

[16] See O'Loughlin, E. Feasibility Study Report: Global Education Peer Review and Support Process, NSC, 2003. This Feasibility Study, which launched the peer review process, involved a scoping study of other review processes, and highlighted the importance of issues of capacity and sustainability for such processes.

3.4 Development Education Exchange in Europe (DEEEP) on Evaluation Reports from 2005

Background

DEEEP (Development Education Exchange in Europe) has a training working group whose aim is to devise a European training strategy, promoting training opportunities in Development Education and Development Awareness for NGOs. [17]

This group runs a number of projects including the one described here on evaluation. It focused on exploring concepts and practice around evaluation. What follows are summary outcomes from a number of workshops which were carried out according to a number of separate language groups - English, French and Finnish.

English Language Sub-Group on Evaluation[18]

This sub-group explored the concept of Peer Learning and its role in evaluation. It identified different broad models of engaging in peer learning in evaluation, and identified recurring themes.

A number of recommendations were identified as follows:

- Peer learning is highly recommended as a key component of the toolkit for training and supporting new colleagues in the DE community in evaluation. Peer learning incorporates many of the core values of DE/DA. It is a process that creates opportunities for the DE practitioner, the organisation and the DE community to evaluate personal and organisational practice in a learning context.
- Undertaking an inventory among the DEEEP network for case study examples of peer learning could provide a valuable resource. The group began to identify some examples but there is a need for more practical materials.
- The DEEEP network could support a series of peer evaluations with a specific focus on peer learning. The outcomes would include: case studies for dissemination, increased partnerships among the network, enhanced knowledge and skills in evaluation, and sharing of expertise between organisations.

French Language Sub-Group on Evaluation[19]

A total of 16 people participated in this group - from France, Luxembourg, Portugal and Belgium. It came up with a number of interesting recommendations and conclusions concerning the use of evaluation in DE.

Thierry De Smedt, professor in the Department of Communication (Group of Research on Mediation of Knowledge), Catholic University of Louvain-la-Neuve, made a special contribution.

The workshop report made a number of recommendations under the following headings:

---

[17] For further details see: http://www.deeep.org/english/about_deeep/training/index.php

[18] This description is based on a report compiled by the DEEEP English-speaking group: George Anang'a, Gerard Lommerse, Katy Newell Jones, Lizzy Noone, Astrid Perez Pinan, Phyllis Thompson.

[19] This description is based on the report of the French-speaking workshop organised in Brussels, on 6/7th of October, 2005, on the practices and methods in the evaluation of development education
French speaking workshop organised in Brussels, on 6/7th of October, 2005.

- Alliances and strategies :
  - Better communication with government on evaluation practices
  - Make proposals on evaluation strategies to government
  - Develop North/South educative partnership and show transversality between DE in the North and in the South
  - Get the South to evaluate our DE practices

- A constructive perspective on evaluation
  - Evaluation should be a source of learning for educators
  - Choose an evaluation framework and build it together
  - All the parties who take part in the DE action should be involved in the evaluation process

- Methodological recommendations
  - To facilitate self-evaluation with external expertise
  - Verify coherence and relevance with context and objectives
  - To identify better target groups, intermediary groups and resources

- Necessary resources
  - Time
  - Resources
  - Training
  - Sharing of methods, especially on innovative methods
  - database on evaluation resources
  - Evaluation tools and techniques classified by type of action
  - Build a theoretical framework on limits and assets of evaluation

Finnish Language Sub-Group on Evaluation[20]

A one-day workshop was held in November 2005 for Finnish non-governmental organizations (NGOs) active in the field of global education, organised by DEEEP (Development Education Exchange in Europe), Plan Finland, The Finnish NGDO Platform to the EU - KEHYS ry, and the Service Centre for Development Cooperation – KEPA. This workshop was planned and facilitated by Ms Päivi Korhonen, ISAI Consulting, Finland.

According to the organisers, the purpose of the one-day workshop was to give the participating NGOs an introduction to the key elements required for successful impact assessment of global and development education projects. The participants were also given the opportunity to share their experiences in impact assessment and to identify further needs for improvement and capacity building.

As part of the day the participants worked in groups, in which they analyzed evaluation and impact assessment. The following questions were discussed in the groups:

1. What should be taken into consideration before the beginning of the project?
2. What should be taken into consideration during the implementation of the project?
3. What should be taken into consideration after the project implementation/evaluation?

---

[20] This description is based on the report by Ms Päivi Korhonen, ISAI Consulting, Finland.

The central findings concerning each question were presented as follows:

1. What should be taken into consideration before the beginning of the project?

- successful timing of projects, timely implementation, significance of preliminary evaluation
- more time should be spent on needs analysis, connected with sufficiently extensive and profound expertise
- the main objectives of projects should be more explicitly and realistically defined.
- projects should strive to have a more innovative approach to their working methods (can everything be developed through the method selection of "website, postcard and workshops"?)
- truthfulness on whether or not the organization possesses the required skills in relation to the development methods, the basic project cycle management skills, and the evaluation skills
- realistic resource allocation
- systematic construction of evaluation and monitoring systems
- adoption of an analytical approach as a part of every day activities
- informing the interested/participating parties

2. What should be taken into consideration during the implementation of the project?

- more systematic documentation and monitoring
- more analytical documentation and description of central working processes
- openness and honesty towards donors about the project activities during the whole implementation phase
- continuous focusing of planned activities, prioritization, and evaluation: are the planned activities still possible to implement with these resources and do they lead to the desired final result?
- systematic implementation of planned evaluation interventions

3. What should be taken into consideration after the project implementation/evaluation?

- informing the host organization about project results, as well as, the evaluation results
- honest and reflective reporting to the donors
- real adoption of development targets identified in the evaluation results
- critical examination of used evaluation methods and viewpoints to evoke learning
- integration of good practices created during the project into the host organization's future work, and proper identification and omission of poor practices
- orientation to the post-project activities in the host organization

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made:

- In general, it is of great importance for NGOs to learn the significance of evaluation and impact assessment for the continuous development of the quality of their work.

- Although, evaluation may seem difficult and the level of personal knowledge on evaluation relatively low, it is worthwhile to embark upon the evaluation undauntedly.

- Development of functioning and adequately consistent evaluation methods is not complicated and implementation of the methods will not encumber the project. Instead, through evaluation the project and its host organization can be shepherded to the path of continuous learning and development.

Section 4

Evaluating public communication and awareness-raising at national level – some case studies.

4.1   UK - The Make Poverty History Campaign[21]

The Make Poverty History campaign (2005) was a very significant initiative in development campaigning. It was mainly UK centred where the campaign reached a very high level of public awareness. The campaign was initiated as it was felt that a special opportunity presented itself, with the UK Presidencies of the EU and G8, as well as UN meetings and WTO negotiations, to make progress in the campaign against global poverty. Make Poverty History was composed of a broad coalition which grew to 540 members representing most sections of UK civil society. The objectives of the campaign included: achieving policy change in 2005 in the areas of more and better aid, debt relief and trade justice; creating an unstoppable momentum for change in 2005; and leaving the public committed to further change beyond 2005.

Public mobilisation was considered to be the greatest achievement of the campaign. Nearly everybody in the UK was made aware of the campaign, with a significant proportion inspired to participate.

The Make Poverty History 2005 Campaign Evaluation was commissioned to evaluate the impact of the campaign and the reasons for the impact. It was also intended to draw out next steps for the campaign and lessons for future coalitions.

The terms of reference asked the following three questions:
- What progress did the coalition make against its objectives during 2005.
- What were the strengths and weaknesses of the coalition's approach and setup?
- What lessons can be learned for the future?

The objectives that required evaluation were given as:
- Policy change in 2005
- An unstoppable momentum for change in 2005
- Public committed to further change beyond 2005

The evaluation brought together the views of a broad range of stakeholders and looked at other evaluations already done in this area. It included:

> - a review of documentation;
> - over 70 interviews;
> - questionnaires;
> - incorporating other evaluation work underway;
> - and quantitative and qualitative work done on public perceptions of poverty.

---

[21] This summary is based on the Make Povery History 2005 Campaign Evaluation Report, by Andy Martin, Corolyn Culey and Suzy Evans, Firetail 2005.

Lessons Learned

As they emphasised in their evaluation report, getting a representative sample can be difficult given the constraints of time and budget, and given the scale and diversity of such a large scale campaign.

It was also felt that more detailed evaluation of public awareness was necessary to access the long-term impact, if any, of the campaign in changing attitudes to poverty.

4.2 Canada – Signs of Change

Workshop Report: Signs of Change Assessing our Public Engagement Impacts, April 2003 Ottawa[22]

The Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC) hosted "Signs of Change", a workshop which brought members together to explore the assessment of public engagement, in April 2003. Public engagement for CCIC members involves a broad range of activities, including involving Canadians in volunteering, stimulating public dialogue and policy discussion, creating educational resources, and mobilising public input on issue-based campaigns.

The workshop focused in particular on the planning stages of assessment, letting participants clarify goal definitions so that measures of progress could be named and monitored in ways that were meaningful and achievable for each specific project.

Participants analyzed their own public engagement goals in relation to three broad areas or aims:

- systemic changes;
- social values/ behavioural changes;
- and changes in the organizational support base.

Lynette Shultz of the University of Alberta and co-chair of the Alberta Council for Global Co-operation presented a seven-step process for participatory evaluation.

The workshop report emphasises that:

> *"While the "signs of change", or indicators, generated in the case-study exercises were inherently "raw" given the brief time available, they provide a basis of comparison and source of additional ideas for others planning assessment of their public engagement programs. ….Bear in mind that each initiative is unique and must be assessed in terms tailored to its own specific aims and objectives."*

Naming signs of change in personal and social values

Particular difficulties and challenges were noted by participants, such as:

---

[22] Description based on 2003 CCIC Workshop Report: Signs of Change – Accessing our public engagement impacts. For further information on CCIC see their website - www.ccic.ca

- the difficulties of defining, capturing and monitoring value change in particular;
- it was noted that evaluation in this area is complicated by the fact that value change is long-term, and it is difficult to predict how individuals will manifest their values;
- some participants offered the term "rung on a ladder" to describe the contribution they attribute to their activities in working towards cumulative, long-term social change.
- participants also pointed to a rich body of anecdotal feedback that they have access to, but felt unsure how to validate "anecdotes" as a credible measure of success in changing values or behaviours.

The pressure of reporting requirements

External reporting needs were also identified as complicating evaluations:

- many participating organizations felt driven by external pressure to evaluate primarily to report on results to donors and funders, rather than to learn from and build upon their experience.
- a primary concern shared by those receiving short-term "project" based funding from CIDA was a perception that too much is demanded in terms of identifying long-term outcomes and impacts within an unrealistically short time frame.
- those carrying out public engagement projects within this funding framework did not feel they had either adequate resources (financial and other) or a reasonable time frame for assessing results beyond the most immediate outputs.

Defining impacts

From the group sessions, some suggestions were put forward on defining impact:

- that, in the area of values/ social change, impact-level results (project goals) be defined as ideals that are worked towards, recognizing that ultimate success may be difficult to claim;
- that broad outcomes and impacts should be seen as the product of complementary efforts by many different initiatives, rather than seen as attributable to any one set of planned activities;
- that defining incremental markers of change may be a more realistic goal for project planners—signposts that indicate that project fundamentals are on track, even if ultimate aims are elusive;
- that CIDA and other funders be realistic in the level of assessment they demand from partner organizations, and should specifically clarify reporting requirements so that project evaluations do not "overreach" measurable and attributable outcomes; and
- that CIDA consider dropping or adapting its RBM planning requirements for public engagement programming, in recognition of the essentially qualitative, and non-linear nature of engagement.

The need to build capacity

In the concluding session of the workshop, which focused on outcomes and follow-up, participants clearly identified the need for capacity building in this area and made a number of concrete suggestions:

- participants looked to CIDA and the national and regional councils for international cooperation to provide ongoing opportunities and resources for increasing knowledge on evaluation.
- from the councils, participants would like to see more workshops and learning events; sector-wide sharing of evaluation knowledge; research on and compilation of long-term indicators; and the documenting of evaluation resources.
- from CIDA, groups look for longer term public engagement funding to make possible realistic assessment; consistency between the Agency's own assessment guidelines and the expectations spelled out for public engagement projects; a "help-line" on assessment, and refinements of the RBM planning requirements to better fit the nature of public engagement.

4.3 Germany - Evaluating over a 50 year time-frame - Brot für die Welt (bred for the world)

Brot für die Welt (bred for the world, the German protestant development agency) has decided to start a very ambitious evaluation project. In 2008 they will mark their 50th anniversary and for this event they would like to evaluate their work of the last 50 years.

In three important parts of their work – rural development in the south, women empowerment in the south and their complete work in the north (development education, information and campaigning) – they have engaged evaluation teams to reflect on the long-term outcome of the work during the past 50 years. Overall there are about 45 evaluators working on this evaluation, organised in three groups, assisted by several workshops of experts and involved persons to discuss the whole process. The report is expected in 2008.

This evaluation is very interesting with regard to several aspects:

➢ It will allow reflecting on the long-term impacts of the policy of an agency.
➢ It will give some ideas about the influence between several parts of the work in the north and the south, for example does the development education work in the north influence the development cooperation or vice versa? How are development education, information and campaigning combined in one organisation? Do they influence each other?
➢ Are there any ideas about the long term effects of this work?

The evaluation is very ambitious and it undoubtedly causes some methodological challenges to evaluate such a long time period in such a complex perspective. But nevertheless this evaluation will give the whole field new perspectives on quality and measuring quality over time, space and between different sectors.