

Evaluation Report

Evaluation of Competence Sharing Network Project in South-Eastern Africa

December 2013

Commissioned by: PYM Norway



Evaluator: Lena Boberg

Contents

- Acknowledgements 2
- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... 3
 - Background..... 3
 - Key findings 3
 - Recommendations 4
- 1. INTRODUCTION 5
 - 1.1 Introduction to the Competence Sharing Network Project 5
 - 1.2 The evaluation purpose and scope 5
 - 1.3 Methodology and process 6
 - 1.4 Limitations 7
- 2. FINDINGS 8
 - 2.1 Methods and activities 8
 - 2.2 Membership 11
 - 2.3 Organising structure 12
 - 2.4 Results - Value of CSNP 13
 - 2.5 Sustainability 16
- 3. CONCLUSIONS 18
 - 3.1 Quality and Relevance 18
 - 3.2 Effectiveness..... 18
 - 3.3 Efficiency 18
 - 3.4 Impact..... 19
 - 3.5 Sustainability 19
- 4. RECOMMENDATIONS 21
 - Recommendations 21
- Appendix 1 Terms of Reference 23
- Appendix 2 List of projects/organisations represented in CSNP 2013..... 26
- Appendix 3 Respondents..... 27
- Appendix 4 References..... 28
- Appendix 5 Documentation from the evaluation workshop, October 2013 in Mozambique 29

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank all participants in the CSNP Annual Network Meeting in Mozambique, for openly sharing their thoughts and ideas about CSNP, and its impact on their work and their lives.

Thanks also to all those who took time to participate in the online survey, providing valuable feedback about CSNP to the evaluation process.

I also wish to thank Mrs Torild Almnes, Director for Humanitarian and Development Aid at PYM, for her dedicated support in preparing for and carrying out this evaluation; supplying with documents, and giving prompt feedback to questions. Thanks also to Mr Festus Mukoya, Coordinating Chairman of CSNP, and all the Steering Committee members, for giving time to develop the evaluation process and for supporting it throughout with helpful feedback, documentation and information.

Stockholm, December 2013

Lena Boberg

Evaluator

Cover picture: Participants in the Annual Network Meeting, Mozambique, October 2013

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

The Competence Sharing Network Project (CSNP) was first conceived at a financial management seminar in Kenya in December 2004 organised by The Pentecostal Foreign Mission of Norway (PYM), gathering project staff from East and Southern Africa. The participants had appreciated the knowledge and experience of their peers during the seminar, and realised how beneficial it would be to meet regularly to share experience and develop new knowledge. They wanted to continue exploring this possibility. A project proposal was submitted to Digni (then BN - Bistandsnemnda) by PYM for funding for a 3-year period 2006 – 2008. The project was approved and a first annual learning event took place in 2006. The CSNP project was evaluated in 2009 by Dr Rick James. The evaluation showed that CSNP had had a remarkable impact at both individual and organisational level. Some challenges were also identified when it came to sustainability, member engagement and monitoring.

A project proposal for a Phase II for a five year period 2009 – 2013 was submitted to Digni by PYM in 2009 and approved. As the Phase II project period is drawing to a close, this evaluation was launched in order to inform the planning for the future of CSNP.

Key findings

After having experienced an impressive start the first three years in Phase I, CSNP has been able to sustain the quality of the work and continued to develop as a learning network, creating and delivering value to the members and to their projects and organisations. CSNP has shown flexibility and ability to learn as a network. Bonds have been created between members, which has led to continued sharing of resources and experiences. The organising structures that were developed during the evaluation process in 2009 have steadily carried CSNP during Phase II. The challenges CSNP faces are in member engagement, monitoring and some aspects of sustainability.

Quality and Relevance

The theory of change, as it is expressed in the project document for 2009 – 2013, is valid; members learn, members apply learning, change is happening at individual and project level.

The methods used; physical meetings, web based communication and report writing are all relevant to what CSNP wants to achieve. The quality of the Annual Network Meeting is rated as excellent by almost 70% of the respondents, and good by 30%. There are challenges in developing the online communication as a method for learning.

The combination of intentionally building relationships of trust, and providing space for regional exchange and diverse perspectives are strong points.

Effectiveness

The project activities that were planned for included in the project plan have all been executed, and have contributed to professional insights, and improved skills amongst the CSNP members. Members have shared experiences, supported one another's professional development and developed new knowledge when it comes to leadership in value-driven projects and organisations.

The book 'Leading with Courage and Humility', with the members' own experiences on leadership, is a tangible output that has already been used by both members and in a wider circle of people working in and with faith-based organisations. It is striking how the focus on leadership has made an impact on a majority of the members.

CSNP has been less successful in stimulating the members to engage in CSNP as a network between the Annual Network Meetings, and to monitor the network itself.

Efficiency

CSNP has a commendably simple organising model that is functioning reasonably well. The organising structure has been improved as a result of implementing recommendations that were developed by the members in the evaluation 2009. The strength of the Steering Committee is that it consists of members of CSNP from different countries. This composition assures that the members know the realities of working with projects and are in a position to choose relevant activities and themes to focus on.

The monitoring of the network and documentation of network results is not as efficient as it could be. Monitoring the network results is an important part of the continuous development of network methods and activities.

Impact

CSNP has built a community of experienced project leaders, administrators and field workers. The community is a resource in itself, as it continues to exist and stays strong in spite of members leaving and new members coming in. It is like a greenhouse; providing a space where the individual can be nurtured and grow.

The various projects represented in CSNP have gained from this; systems have been improved, policies implemented, networking capacities increased, team work improved, better relationships of trust with communities and government. The book 'Leading with Courage and Humility' is a tangible resource that can be used for years to come in leadership development.

Sustainability

Financing the network. CSNP will need further external support to maintain its function, especially if it is to continue having physical network meetings – which is desirable.

Organising the network. The present organising model is working reasonably well and should be maintained, with the decreased direct involvement of PYM that is now being implemented. The member responsibilities that were identified in 2009 need to be revived, and followed-up upon. The monitoring and documentation systems need addressing, to allow for continued relevant development of CSNP.

Strategising the network. Members in the Annual Network Meeting 2013 proposed that CSNP in future should focus on community building (CSNP community), resource mobilisation and knowledge management.

Recommendations

1. Create communities of practice within CSNP
2. Decide on CSNPs principal functions
3. Be bold – challenge yourselves with the network and within the network
4. Learn how to learn
5. Continue building relationships of trust – with a healthy openness for diversity
6. Connect to organisations
7. Inspire actions that help members engage in CSNP
8. Develop a culture of responding to emails and other communication from fellow CSNP members
9. Increase member ownership
10. Develop the network monitoring

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction to the Competence Sharing Network Project

The Competence Sharing Network Project (CSNP) was first conceived at a financial management seminar in Kenya in December 2004 organised by PYM, gathering project staff from East and Southern Africa. The participants had appreciated the knowledge and experience of their peers during the seminar, and realised how beneficial it would be to meet regularly to share experience and develop new knowledge. They wanted to continue exploring this possibility. A project proposal was submitted to Digni (then BN - Bistandsnemnda) by PYM for funding for a 3-year period 2006 – 2008. The project was approved and a first annual learning event took place in 2006. The CSNP project was evaluated in 2009 by Dr Rick James. The evaluation showed that CSNP had had a remarkable impact at both individual and organisational level. Some challenges were identified when it came to sustainability, member engagement and monitoring.

A project proposal for a Phase II for a five year period 2009 – 2013 was submitted to Digni by PYM in 2009 and approved. The project goal of Phase II is

‘To increase the capacity for organisational development and administration among network members and release existing knowledge and competence and make it available for all members, with the aim of improving effectiveness and competence within the different projects.’

The project outputs are described in the project document as follows:

- a. Exchange ideas and information related to project management.
- b. Share the valuable experiences among projects in different countries with the purpose of learning.
- c. Meet and discuss pertinent matters affecting the management of our projects.
- d. Visit each other to see and learn what others are doing and how they are doing it to increase awareness and competence.
- e. Develop and update the monitoring and evaluation system.

Four principal project activities are mentioned:

- Physical meetings; Network meeting, Country meetings, Smaller network meetings.
- Web- and email-based discussion forums
- Working on monitoring and evaluation system for projects supported by PYM
- Report writing

1.2 The evaluation purpose and scope

The scope of this evaluation is CSNP as a network – with its membership, organisation, methods and approaches - as a method for project management capacity building. The evaluation was commissioned by PYM Norway. The Terms of Reference were developed by PYM and the CSNP Steering Committee.

The evaluation is carried out with the purpose assessing the progress of CSNP and to learn from the experiences of 2009 – 2013 in order to inform the planning for the future of the network.

Key evaluation questions

1. *Quality and relevance* of the chosen methods and activities
2. *Effectiveness*
 - Major achievements of the project to date in relation to its stated objectives and intended results.
3. *Efficiency* of the organising of the project
4. *Impact*
 - CSNPs long term impact on people, projects and organisations
5. *Sustainability*
 - Key factors affecting sustainability of CSNP
 - Recommendations on the key strategic options for the future of the project

1.3 Methodology and process

The evaluation has had a participatory approach in order to support and strengthen the use of evaluation learning and evaluation results. Priority issues within each key evaluation question were developed by the CSNP Steering Committee together with the evaluator in a meeting in Maputo in May 2013.

Methods used

- Document review
- Direct observation of Steering Committee meeting, Mozambique, May 2013
- Preparatory evaluation workshop with Steering Committee, May 2013
- Online survey distributed to all participants of ANMs 2009 – 2012, response rate 38%
- Skype interviews with members of the Steering Committee
- Direct observation of Annual Network Meeting (ANM) in Mozambique, October 2013
- Evaluation workshop; data collection, sense-making and validation of findings, October 2013

Process

The preparatory evaluation workshop with the Steering Committee in Maputo in May included discussions about evaluation stakeholders and evaluation use, identifying key issues of concern for the evaluation and an analysis of the project's theory of change.

The evaluation workshop during the Annual Network Meeting in October included data collection on some issues that could not be covered in the online survey, as well as sense-making and validation of preliminary findings. The participants were invited to reflect on the progress of CSNP in 2009 – 2012 by making a time line. The workshop included sharing of value creation stories linked to CSNP, and illustrating the potential CSNP network reach by drawing your own personal network, that has been touched by the members' participation in CSNP network activities. The workshop participants also developed suggested recommendations for future improvement of CSNP.

The evaluating consultant was able to observe the Steering Committee meeting, and the part of the Annual Network Meeting that was not the evaluation workshop. This added to the evaluation experience as it provided a possibility of seeing how members interacted with one another, and to get a feel of the energy between network members.

Assessing networks

Assessing the results of a learning network is not straight-forward. How can we state that change has actually come about as a direct result of network activities? Proving that change comes from a specific network activity may be difficult, and perhaps not always necessary. Although, by asking

members to contribute examples of specific activities that has contributed to change it is possible to claim a plausible link between CSNP and change.

Social network specialists Wenger, Trayner and de Laat (see Appendix 4 for reference) has suggested a way of reflecting on results of a network in value creation cycles. This is useful, as it helps capture some of the complexity in attempting to track network results:

Value cycle 1: Immediate value: Activities and interactions. The immediate value a member of CSNP gets when participating in a CSNP activity; whatever that may be. Sharing experiences, engaging in dialogue with another member, getting information or some other resource, making a field visit to a project – all this can create immediate value.

Value cycle 2: Potential value: Knowledge capital. Meaning that value can be created through a network activity that is not immediately used or realised. A member can gain knowledge about something but not be in a position to immediately use it, but it is there as a knowledge capital for later use. Knowledge capital can be different things, such as a skill, a connection or access to documents. For example: in the survey 89% of the respondents state that it is useful or very useful to have access to other members in the network.

Value cycle 3: Applied value: Changes in practice. Referring to if and how the potential value is used. Members take resources from the Annual Network Meeting, from the website and through interaction with each other and transfer it into their own environments. For example: Members learn about Logical Framework Approach or leadership in a CSNP workshop and apply it in their own organisations.

Value cycle 4: Realised value: Performance improvement. You can have gained new skills and applied them, but it does not mean that performance automatically is improved – this needs to be monitored, to make sure that application actually generates a desirable result.

1.4 Limitations

Time limitations on the evaluation meant that there has been a focus on the members only, and on CSNP documentation. The changes in competencies of members have not been assessed other than through the personal testimonies and stories provided by the members themselves. This does not mean that the personal stories are not trustworthy or valuable – they of course are. It only means that it has not been possible to also hear perspectives of e.g. co-workers or organisation leaders, that would have provided even more perspectives on CSNP. Because of the wide geographical spread of the CSNP members, it was not possible to visit member projects and organisation to observe or to interact with other project staff.

2. FINDINGS

2.1 Methods and activities

2.1.1 Choice and quality of methods and activities

The project document for 2009 – 2013 lists four activity categories:

- Physical meetings; Network meeting, Country meetings, Smaller network meetings.
- Web- and email-based discussion forums
- Working on monitoring and evaluation system for projects supported by PYM
- Report writing

Annual Network meetings, country meetings and smaller network meetings

As in the previous project period, the core activity has been the five-day Annual Network Meeting (ANM) attended by 25 – 30 members each year.

2009 in Kenya focused on several topics; including partnership and evaluation of the network.

2010 in Uganda focused on project follow-up and planning, as well as LFA

2011 in Swaziland focused on leadership and risk management

2012 in Kenya, where also organisational leaders attended, focused on leadership, the relationship between church and projects, as well as reflection on CSNPs strengths and weaknesses

2013 in Mozambique focused on evaluation of the network and evaluation capacity building

In the online survey 84% of the members rated ANM as very useful, and 16% as useful. 100% of the members rate the quality of the ANM as either excellent or good. The ANMs are considered to be well-planned, have relevant topics and provide a platform for learning, sharing, access to information and for support.

The ANM in 2011 and 2012 focused on a single topic, leadership. Working two years with the same topic allowed the participants to share and reflect in depth on the subject of leadership. A book was produced 'Leading with Courage and Humility' based on the actual leadership experiences of network members. The network opened up to the leadership of their respective organisations in a joint ANM in 2012, which enabled the organisational leaders both to reflect on leadership and to appreciate the value of CSNP as a forum for capacity building. When discussing the impact of CSNP activities on individual members the ANM in Swaziland comes back again and again as an event that challenged the members; it generated insights into leadership as created member bonding.

When asked about the usefulness of the methods used in connection to ANM 94 % of the members rate sharing experiences as very useful. The mixed methods of having external as well as internal facilitators, and making field visits to local projects are appreciated by the members. A majority felt that rotating the ANM to different countries and sites is important, as this provides an opportunity to learn from other environments through exposure to different realities.

Country meetings, smaller network meetings and professional exchange

There have been exchanges between the projects and in smaller networks/mini networks. In particular the projects working with hiv and aids, and projects working with early childhood development have had regular exchange. This exchange has given the CSNP members a chance to learn from each other and has led to improved project management.

There has also been a national network in Kenya for Project Leaders within FPFK. These network meetings have enhanced transparency and accountability in the projects as budgets and financial

reports were openly shared. The Project Leaders have been challenged to develop in their leadership roles.

Networking as a strategy for capacity development and relationship building is thus being multiplied locally through the CSNP members. There is however some unclarity amongst members as to how the mini networks should function within CSNP, but at the same time there is an interest in further expanding this.

Web- and emailbased discussions

CSNP has its own Yahoo webforum where network documents are posted, where members can connect and discuss issues online and where they are expected to post project reports in order to learn from each other. This is not happening to any great extent. A CSNP Facebook group was created as a supplement, as some found the Yahoo site too complicated to use.

The online activity keeps coming back in CSNPs own follow-up as something that is not working the way it was intended to work. In the online evaluation survey 37% of the members rated the Yahoo website as very useful, while 31% say they haven't used it at all. Those using it appreciate it as a forum where they both can share and find useful resources, and connect to members. Reasons for not using Yahoo, or the CSNP Facebook page that also has been created, are linked to habits and lack of experience in using it; that members are not used to using online communication and do not have the motivation to spend time to learn when time is such a precious resource. Surprisingly, technology did not seem to be a hindrance for using online communication, meaning that most of the members have access to the technology. There is however an interest in further exploring online exchange as a network tool, as this is also seen as important for future sustainability of the network.

Strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems

Monitoring and evaluation has been on the agenda in the ANMs; with the evaluation workshop 2009 and 2013, and with special focus in 2010 on developing LFA for CSNP. In the ANM 2012 time was set aside to make an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of CSNP. This was followed up by the Steering Committee in May 2013 and also in the 2013 ANM.

Monitoring the network has been a difficulty, and CSNP is still searching for methods that will suit their needs. The CSNP LFA has been used to structure the monitoring, and there has always been a time slot in the ANMs for monitoring – but somewhat rushed at the end of the ANM. In the ANM in 2013 this was changed, allowing more time for the monitoring.

Reporting

The ANMs have been documented, and the reports have been distributed to all members. In 2011 the report was turned into a book on leadership. The reporting is rated as a very useful or useful activity by 85% of the members in the online survey. There has however been challenges in the reporting; making sure that the reporting is relevant and also capturing the important processes within CSNP.

Reporting is important for monitoring, and also for CSNP sustainability as it provides information to all members on what is happening in the network. This is useful not only to those who were able to attend the ANM, but also for absent members. New members can gain an insight into the CSNP ethos and purpose by reading reports from previous ANMs.

2.1.2 Theory of change

The theory of change of CSNP could be described like this:

We want to make a difference in the communities in which our projects/organisations/churches operate. Our development projects need qualified and dedicated staff and leadership; Project Leaders, Administrators, Senior Field Workers who are able to continuously learn and develop, and keep up with – and also contribute to - emerging changes within social development. As project staff we also need to be able to work within the context of international development cooperation and know how to communicate with donors. The demands on us are high, and we want to make sure we have opportunities to increase our competence and to contribute to capacity building in our projects and organisations.

If we create a forum where Project Leaders, Administrators and Senior Field Workers can share experiences, then we will learn things that are useful for us in our professional roles, and for our projects and organisation.

If we, members of CSNP, apply our learning in our projects and organisations then the quality of the projects, as well as the confidence of the organisation, will increase.

This change will happen because

- *we will be using participatory learning methods; such as sharing of experiences and sharing of knowledge resources*
- *we will consciously be creating a relationship of trust amongst members*
- *we will make sure our membership represents different countries and projects – to provide more than one perspective*
- *we will meet in person, communicate online, and share reports from our projects*
- *members will automatically be inspired to actively engage in network activities*

The choice of activities and methods for CSNP reflects the theory of change; with an emphasis on sharing, creating trust, participation and learning from personal experience.

The Terms of Reference for this evaluation asked whether the theory of change is valid. Are the chosen activities and methods actually contributing to the envisaged change? And yes, based on the results achieved, the theory of change seems to be valid. Members have participated, learned and applied. Positive change has happened for the individual as well as in a project or in the organisation.

But not all assumptions that were made in the theory of change are valid though. For example members do not automatically engage in all the network activities; the lack of activity in the online communication is one such example.

Trust and learning

Development of trust, which is so important for a learning environment, is one of CSNPs strong points. The presence of trusting relationships should not be taken for granted, or be underestimated. Much too often groups of people are pulled together and are expected to trust one another and learn from each other, without any conscious effort being made to create this trust.

In a setting where there is trust I can open up and share more of myself and my experiences, and it is easier for me to ask for feed-back. In a setting where there is little trust, I may want to hide things from others, as I don't know how they will react or what is acceptable.

Members report the relief they have felt as they have realised that their project or organisation is not the only one with a particular challenge, which has facilitated for the individual to reach out to

colleagues to receive feed-back, to get advice and to learn new things. Learning takes both courage and humility.

Learning network as a tool for capacity building

Change processes often go through stages. It can be useful to observe these stages, and try to intentionally move from one stage to the other:

Want - We want to change

Awareness is created about a situation, and that you want/need to change, and you begin to realise that you can actually do something about it

Can - We can change

You strive to arrange it so you can acquire the competence and capacity needed for the desired change

Action - We change

You create the necessary space for change

Sustain change - We continue to work for change

Sustaining the change process

CSNPs continuity of members and meeting places is potentially contributing to change both at individual and project/organisational level by supporting the member to go from awareness about an issue and a realisation that they can do something about it; to gaining competence and capacity; to acting to make a change, and acting to sustain a change process. Meeting the same group of people, and having accountability towards them is a structure that can sustain change. This context of social learning should be more effective than if the members participated in one-off seminars.

2.2 Membership

2.2.1 Membership composition

Members of the CSNP are Project Leaders, Administrators and senior Field Workers in projects and programs in East and Southern Africa funded through PYM. There is some debate within the network as to who should be a member and whether the present membership guidelines are appropriate. Some would like to open the network to other organisations, or to broaden it to include more staff from the present CSNP projects. Other ideas are to include former members whose projects no longer receive PYM-funding, or the member has left the PYM-funded project to work for a different organisation. There are also thoughts on having an organisational perspective rather than just a project perspective when it comes to membership. This would be an advisable development of CSNP.

The reasoning behind wanting to open up CSNP to a broader category of members is to allow for a diversity of perspectives to enter into the group. The membership has however not been static during the eight years of CSNP. There has been a change in participants adding new experiences views, which is healthy.

The gender balance, with almost 50/50 women and men, is very much welcomed by the members, and is something they feel must be maintained.

The multi-country composition is something the members wish to retain, as it has enhanced the learning opportunities by providing diverse perspectives.

2.2.2 Member engagement

Members are actively engaged in the ANM. Even though the ANM is one full week, CSNP members seem to be willing to prioritise attending. There is however some disappointment among the members when it comes to the engagement in CSNP outside of the ANMs, and in particular in relation to the online communication.

In the online survey respondents were asked to rate the performance of the members the last three years, and they rated it as follows:

Excellent: 10,5%

Good: 58%

OK: 31,5%

This response could mean either an uncertainty amongst the members as to what is expected from them, or perhaps that they feel that they would like to/or should engage more in CSNP. The comments provided in the survey pointed out the strong engagement in the ANM, and the weaknesses in the communication and engagement between the ANMs. When asked in the evaluation workshop in Mozambique what they felt was **not** happening between the ANMs, the participants listed the following:

- Not posting reports on the website
- Not responding to emails; from CSNP chairman, from other members, from PYM
- No response when something is posted on the website
- There is a lack of orientation about CSNP for new members and at project level
- There is a perceived lack of commitment to CSNP as a network, it becomes just the ANMs
- The mini networks that have evolved are limited to certain projects or regions only.

There is a sense among the members that there is more to gain from the CSNP than just the value of the ANMs – which is not a minor value - but that they are not quite sure how to go about achieving this. The publishing of their book on leadership, is one example of an activity that generated common interest and action also between ANM.

The members own ideas on how to stimulate more member engagement include; orientation for new members, getting commitment from the members to respond to emails and website postings, delegate responsibilities to members, having clear guidelines on what is expected of a member.

In any network or community of practice there will be different levels of commitment and engagement. It is essential to have a core of members that are committed to the network and can inspire the other members, and to not have too many members that are just passengers and contributing very little. Members who are consistently not contributing to the network could for example be invited to the ANM only at their own expense. But such a rule would need CSNP to have clear membership engagement standards and ways of following up whether the member is complying, to avoid destroying the trust that has been built in the relationship.

2.3 Organising structure

CSNP has a simple organising structure, with a Steering Committee with five members representing the different member countries. One of the SC members is also Coordinating Chairman and is remunerated part-time through the CSNP project to work for the network.

In the evaluation process 2009 the roles and the responsibilities of the Steering Committee as well as CSNP members, were defined in a participatory process. Members are in general satisfied with the

performance of the Steering Committee. There is a risk though that in particular the Chairman is expected – both by CSNP members and fellow committee members - to do too much. So, even if there is clarity on roles and responsibilities, there is still some work to do in interpreting this in practice.

There has been a development in the Steering Committee during Phase II, with more ownership being developed in the committee. Earlier the CSNP budget was managed by PYM in Norway, with limited committee involvement. This has now been changed, moving budget responsibilities to the Steering Committee. PYM has had a representative on the Steering Committee during Phase II; Torild Almnes, Director for Humanitarian and Development Aid at PYM. Torild has played an important part as motivator, advisor and communication link to PYM during this period. This will change from 2014 when PYM will no longer be in the Steering Committee.

As a donor, PYM is not in the same position as the other members of CSNP. But the presence of PYM in CSNP is valuable both for PYM and for the other members, as it provides an opportunity for learning south-north. Through participating in CSNP PYM can learn about development cooperation in a way that is difficult to achieve in any other setting, with the potential of quality improvement also for PYM as a donor/partner.

Any network needs a strong core of individuals to keep it vibrant. With some minor adjustments, to preserve self-governance and member engagement, the present organising model should be appropriate also for the future CSNP.

2.4 Results - Value of CSNP

The theory of change for CSNP is that the members will increase their competence in areas relevant to their projects or organisations; that they will apply their new knowledge in their work and the quality of the work will improve. In the evaluation process CSNP members have shared how they perceive CSNP has contributed to change. 84% of the respondents in the online survey says that learning from CSNP has impacted on the results of their projects significantly or quite a lot.

2.4.1 Results for the individual

Results reported by the members:

- Improved leadership skills; courage to lead, to apply, to take decisions, to listen, to influence, to live according to values, humility.

‘I got the courage to deal with a situation in my school where creativity was totally lacking.’

‘The lessons/sharing on courage in making decisions, and the lesson that ‘courage is not the absence of fear’ gave me the confidence I needed to make that decision at work concerning the path that I really need to follow as opposed to what everyone else wanted me to follow.’

- Capacity for reflection and introspection
- Acquiring technical skills and tools: LFA, Evaluation, stakeholder analysis, facilitation methods

‘The Logical Framework Analysis that we learned in the Kigali workshop made a huge impact in me....I took time to revise it and understand it I made it my tool.’

‘As a Programme Officer skills in M&E changed my performance on developing indicators for activity follow-up, which I competently carry out.’

- Gaining wider perspectives through intercultural interaction; increased self-awareness
- Gender awareness – understanding at a personal level of the value and importance of women and men working together, and of women’s and men’s specific contributions to organisational life.

2.4.2 Results at project or organisation level

As seen in the previous section on results for the individual, CSNP members have learnt new skills that they are using in their projects and organisations. Here are some other examples of results reported at project or organisation level. The quotes are from members’ during the evaluation process’.

- Improved planning skills in the organisation – LFA:
‘This tool helped me so much as a project administrator/accountant while writing the project document together with the Project Leader. The whole team was also helped as we developed a detailed logical frame for our project. Planning and reporting has been simplified as a result.’
- Capacity building on Human Rights Based Approach, HRBA – staff trained in HRBA, with the support of experienced staff in another CSNP project
- Gender - including gender in employment policies and avoiding gender discrimination.
- Leadership and team work – improved relationships with staff and colleagues, resulting in better and smoother cooperation.
- Community development methods:
‘There was a true sense of ownership in the project (Tuinuane project). The idea I took from this was that community mobilisation can yield very good results if the people concerned are involved in building their own ideas and identifying their own goals...I took the ideas from the women in Kenya to other women in my country because they made me believe in what they were doing.’
- Networking and advocacy – improved capacity and confidence.
‘We have involved the local government leadership in our project with the aim of linking the rights holder to the duty bearer and it has borne fruit.’
- Enhanced transparency and accountability within and between projects.

Apart from these results, CSNP has also produced a book on leadership ‘Leading with Courage and Humility’, based on the leadership experiences of the CSNP members shared in the ANM in Swaziland 2011. The book was compiled by Dr Rick James, using stories that had been written up by CSNP members. This book is a resource that is made available to a wider group than just the CSNP members.

The results reported at individual and project/organisation level can be compared to what was stated in the project plan in 2009:

Development Goal:

'The Competence Building Networks should give the participants professional insights, organisational skills and tools to take the main responsibility in purpose to manage and follow up the development activities for the members of the network.'

Programme goal:

'To increase the capacity for organisational development and administration among network members, and to release existing knowledge and competence and make it available for the members, with the aim of improving effectiveness and competence within the different projects.'

2.4.3 Potential value

Referring back to the concept of assessing value creation in network by reflecting on value cycles that was mentioned in 1.3 it is interesting to reflect on the CSNP members' personal networks.

In the evaluation workshop, members were asked to draw a picture of their own networks; groups and individuals that have been and can be influenced by their learning through CSNP. The collective image that emerged from this exercise is that CSNP potentially has a very wide reach – and also that each CSNP individual is exposed to various groups that influence them, adding to the perspectives shared in CSNP.

The groups in the individual networks were:

- Family. Members are mothers, fathers, husbands, wives and more. Personal development through CSNP influences behaviour at family level. Examples given: more attentive, better listener, more able to lead with courage and humility.
- Community. Members are community members, lead community groups, interact with community leaders.
- Friends. Members have social friends and political friends.
- Own organisation. Members are influencing their own organisations by using new skills, behaviours and attitudes. See the section on change at organisational level.
- Own project. Members are Project Leaders, Field Facilitators, members of Project Steering Committees. They interact with leadership and with staff.
- Boards/Committees. Members are board and/or committee members in other organisations, or in their own.
- Sports club. One member is a member of a local sports club.
- College, university, schools. Members have interaction with educational institutions as lecturers, teachers, facilitators, students.
- International organisations; Digni, PYM, the CSNP network. Members interact with organisations outside their own country.
- CSOs. Members interact with local CSOs; at a personal level in their professional capacity, or at an organisational level when partnering with another CSO.
- Church. Members are active members of local churches. They are involved as youth leaders, church leaders, treasurers, choir leaders.
- Government. Members interact with local government.
- Other networks. CSNP members are also members of other networks. For example, one member is in a children's network in Kitale, contributing to capacity building.

Though the CSNP project is focused on the professional life of the members, it is worthwhile to consider the potential added value of CSNPs efforts for social change, when skills and approaches conducive to development can be applied in such a wide range of social settings.

2.5 Sustainability

Financial sustainability

The issue of financial sustainability of CSNP was raised also in the 2009 evaluation, and the situation – or the message – is no different today than what it was then: learning networks need resources to be able to function and stay relevant. It is wishful thinking to believe that CSNP should be able to function without external funding support. Coordinating and arranging activities, stimulating member engagement and managing the network takes time and need financial resources.

CSNP has no means within itself to generate enough funding to be self-sustained. The members do however offer suggestions for how funds could be raised to cover some of the costs:

- Membership fee
- Including CSNP in the project budgets
- CSNP offering consultancies, with % of income to be retained by CSNP
- Selling of materials produced by the CSNP collective, e.g. the book 'Leading with Courage and Humility'

Organisational sustainability

When it comes to organisational sustainability CSNP should be expected to be self-sustained; meaning CSNP should have an organising structure, with competent and dedicated people in place to carry the network. With Phase II ending in 2013, CSNP will enter into a new phase with new members on the Steering Committee. This will be quite a major shift as both the Chairman of eight years, Festus Mukoya, and the PYM representative, Torild Almnes, will be leaving the committee at the same time. A new Steering Committee was elected in the ANM in October 2013, and plans have been made for a transitional phase between the old and the new committee.

The organising needs to be running smoothly, with clear roles and responsibilities, and accountability systems within CSNP. This includes having a monitoring system that supports learning and development of CSNP. The roles and responsibilities that were developed in 2009 are relevant, but they are not sufficiently monitored. The present Steering Committee has had some difficulties in communication, partly due to technical reasons, but partly also at times lack of response within the committee. Members have been slow in responding to emails or other communication from the Steering Committee. It is sometimes difficult to know whether a lack of response to a plea is due to technical problems or that it is just forgotten or ignored. These issues need to be addressed so the organising sustainability is not compromised.

Member engagement

At present, members' engagement in CSNP is a somewhat of a weakness when it comes to sustaining the network. Members need to be made more accountable to the network, not just to their own projects. Members need to know what is expected of them. There is a need to cultivate a sense of CSNP belonging to the members, not to PYM. PYM is not responsible for CSNP, the members are. A stronger online contact was suggested by members as one way of improving sustainability.

CSNP future strategy

During the evaluation workshop members discussed which functions that could be relevant and desirable for CSNP to focus on in the future, using Network Functions Approach (NFA) developed by Simon Hearn and Enrique Mendizabal at ODI (see Appendix 4 for reference) which lists five functions common in networks and communities of practice:

- Knowledge Management: Identify, filter and share important people, events, facts and stories; stimulate learning, mitigate information overload
- Amplification and advocacy: Extending the reach and influence of members, ideas, initiatives

- Community building: Building of social capital through bonding, building relationships of trust; collective learning and action
- Convening: Building social capital through bridging; stimulating discourse
- Resource Mobilisation refers to: Increasing capacity and effectiveness of members, stimulating knowledge creation and innovation

Members felt that Community building and Resource mobilisation are the two most important functions for CSNP in the future, closely followed by Knowledge Management. There was also some interest in the two functions of amplification and of convening.

The members were also asked which of the five options for a future strategy for CSNP that were listed in the ToR they preferred; exit, modification, continuation as is, scale up or scale down. Here, the message was that members want to see modification or scale up – or perhaps a combination of the two.

3. CONCLUSIONS

3.1 Quality and Relevance

The methods used; physical meetings, online communication and report writing are all relevant to what CSNP wants to achieve. The physical meetings; Annual Network Meetings as well as the mini network meetings and professional exchange in person that has taken place have all contributed to increased capacity both for the individual CSNP member in their professional capacity and for the projects and organisations. The quality of the ANM is rated as excellent by almost 70% of the respondents, and good by 30%. There are however still challenges in developing the online communication as a method for learning.

The theory of change, as it is expressed in the project document for 2009 – 2013, is valid; members learn, members apply learning, change is happening at individual and project level.

The combination of intentionally building relationships of trust, and providing space for regional exchange and diverse perspectives are strong points.

3.2 Effectiveness

The project activities that were planned for in the project plan have all been executed, and have contributed to professional insights, and improved skills amongst the CSNP members. Members have shared experiences, supported one another's professional development and developed new knowledge when it comes to leadership in value-driven projects and organisations. The book 'Leading with Courage and Humility' was not included in the project plan, but can be seen as a useful bonus result that many have used.

The project plan does not express in detail what kind of professional insights and organisational and administrative skills that is envisaged; allowing CSNP to adapt to emergent needs and interests of the members. It is striking how the focus on leadership has made an impact on a majority of the members.

There are two areas where CSNP has been less successful, and that is in stimulating the members to connect between the Annual Network Meetings and to monitor the network itself. Reasons for this could be lack of resources. A network cannot develop by itself, it needs people who have time to invest in the network, in particular in areas that are new; such as using online communication as a tool for learning, and also learning in a community of practice.

3.3 Efficiency

CSNP has a commendably simple organising model that is functioning reasonably well. The strength of the Steering Committee is that it consists of members of CSNP from different countries. This composition assures that the members know the realities of working with projects and are in a position to choose relevant activities and themes to focus on.

There are logistical challenges for the Steering Committee to meet, and also to have Skype-meetings, with the internet connection causing the meetings to sometimes be frustrating exercises in patience.

There is a general problem within CSNP of members not responding to emails. This is decreasing the efficiency of both the steering committee and the network as a whole and needs to be addressed.

The monitoring of the network and documentation of network results is not as efficient as it could be. Monitoring the network results is an important part of the continuous development of network methods and activities.

3.4 Impact

CSNP has built a community of experienced project leaders, administrators and field workers. The community is a resource in itself, as it continues to exist and stays strong in spite of members leaving and new members coming in. It is like a greenhouse; providing a space where the individual can be nurtured and grow.

The various projects represented in CSNP have gained from this; systems have been improved, policies implemented, networking capacities increased, team work improved, better relationships of trust with communities and government. The book 'Leading with Courage and Humility' is a tangible resource that can be used for years to come in leadership development.

The focus of CSNP is on the individual and the projects. When projects have terminated, individuals have moved on, taking with them professional and personal development that is put to use in other organisations and settings. This can be seen as a development good, as the individuals are continuing to work for organisations and institutions that are working with development.

Gender awareness

How gender awareness had been addressed by CSNP was discussed with members during the evaluation workshop in 2013. The members' reflection on this was that it had not been so much a specific issue of CSNP, but that CSNP rather had lived gender equality and that this has had an impact on the participants own gender awareness, which in turn impacted on their work. CSNP has featured both female and male leadership in its operations; in the Steering Committee, in the choice of facilitators and lecturers during the ANMs. Men and women continuously interacting during the ANMs has taught members the value of men and women working together. This is no small change, as change experienced at a personal level can deeply impact on the individual's actions and approach in the future.

When CSNP started it was a prerequisite that projects should send both men and women to the annual learning event. Both a man and a woman should be in the network from each project. This was not always possible, as sometimes it was only men employed in the senior posts and sometimes it was only women. But the representation in the network and during the annual learning events has throughout been almost 50/50 men and women, with usually a slight female majority.

3.5 Sustainability

Some key factors affecting sustainability:

Financing the network. CSNP will need further external support to maintain its function, especially if it is continue having physical network meetings – which is desirable. Anchoring CSNP in the various mother-organisations could be one way of getting support also locally for CSNP, i.e. not just from Norad through PYM. Also, CSNP could investigate the possibilities for funding also from other sources than PYM/Norad.

Organising the network. The present organising model is working and should be maintained, with the decreased direct involvement of PYM, that is now being implemented. The member responsibilities

that were identified in 2009 should be revived, and followed-up upon. Also, the monitoring and documentation systems need addressing, to allow for continued relevant development of CSNP.

Member engagement. Membership engagement has to be improved, depending on what purpose and form CSNP decides it want to take for the future. There is such a potential in this group of being a strong force in learning about social development and the management of value-based organisations and projects that it is absolutely worth making a concerted effort in better membership engagement.

Strategising the network. The members want to see changes in CSNP in the future, either scaling up or modification – or a combination of these. Members can see CSNP focusing on community building (CSNP community), resource mobilisation and knowledge management in future.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

CSNP has existed now for eight years. With the end of the project period coming, the network is at a crossroads. The first chairman is leaving, and new leadership comes in. Will they have the same drive and knowledge to lead the network and to inspire? With or without new leadership, the weaknesses in member engagement and member stimulation could turn CSNP into more of an annual partnership conference. This is not necessarily catastrophic, but the potential for more is greater than that!

CSNP has started to build a regional infrastructure for competence sharing and capacity building; relationship-roads are being constructed on which information, innovation and new development knowledge can travel; horizontally, south-south, east-south and even south-north. This is so important and interesting as an endeavour, as for so many decades the supposed knowledge highways when it comes to development thinking has gone from north to south. Supporting the further development of regional learning networks and communities of practice is an act of supporting power transformation in the development cooperation context.

The ToR asked for recommendations for the future of CSNP, providing five possible options: Exit, scale down, scale up, modification, continuation as is. When asked about these options the participants in the ANM 2013 preferred modifications and scaling up. Scaling up and modification can be seen as meaning similar things. Members in the ANM 2013 proposed that CSNP in future should focus on community building (CSNP community), resource mobilisation and knowledge management.

The consultant's view regarding the five options given in the evaluation ToR is that CSNP should continue but modify. How to modify needs careful consideration by those planning CSNPs next step. Members' involvement in this planning process is vital.

A continuation and modification of CSNP would need to include financial and time investments in the development of CSNPs functions; whichever functions that are chosen.

Recommendations

The recommendations are not given in any particular order of importance.

- 1. Create communities of practice within CSNP*
Become even more focused; follow through on learning topics that are relevant for the members. This could mean creating Communities of Practice within CSNP, focusing on specific thematic learning areas; such as hiv/aids, early childhood development or financial administration.
- 2. Decide on CSNPs principal functions*
Decide which principal functions CSNP should have, and stay with that for some time. Use the functions-thinking when developing the theory of change and theory of action for the next phase of CSNP. The choice of principal functions should come from the heart of CSNP; from where there is energy and motivation within the network.
- 3. Be bold – challenge yourselves with the network and within the network*
CSNP has built relationships of trust, which potentially can be a strong basis for learning, knowledge creation and advocacy, that could be even more transformative than it is now.
- 4. Learn how to learn*
Through CSNP members are increasing their capacity to learn; learning how to learn, and developing new strategies for social and organisational learning could be a focus area for CSNP.

5. *Continue building relationships of trust – with a healthy openness for diversity*
The relationships of trust that is somewhat of a hallmark for CSNP is worth protecting and at the same time there is always of risk of becoming too introspective, so the recommendation is just to be on the guard that this does not happen.
6. *Connect to organisations*
Connect CSNP to the member projects' organisations, so that the learning and knowledge creation has a place within the organisation, and to promote organisational ownership of CSNP.
7. *Inspire actions that help members engage in CSNP*
Develop practical actions that help members remember CSNP even though they have very busy schedules. For example: Members could have CSNP focus once a week, or once a month. This way CSNP is given attention, but members don't have to think about it all the time. Following the example of the 'OD and Christian Organisation's Learning Group' (see Appendix 4 for reference) CSNP could have a Thought for the week/method tip for the week, coming through from the members through email.
8. *Develop a culture of responding to emails and other communication from fellow CSNP members*
There is a feeling among members that there is not enough responsibility taken by some of the members. Not answering emails from each other or from the CSNP Steering Committee, and not responding to calls for reports for the network monitoring cause unnecessary frustration, and decreases network efficiency.
9. *Increase member ownership*
Increase CSNP member ownership to avoid that it is taken for granted that CSNP will always be there (because PYM will make sure of that), and that there will always be funding for Annual Network Meetings.
10. *Develop the network monitoring*
Members have suggested that CSNP could develop accountability towards the members' organisations. This is worth exploring.
Collect change stories on a regular basis.
Articulate and talk about common goals for CSNP as a network.
Develop change indicators, not just activity indicators.

Appendix 1 Terms of Reference

Background

PYM works in many different countries and has been running different kind of development-projects in 11 of them. PYM has worked with this project since 2006, and is now completing the second phase in the project. PYM has experiences with running network projects and the phase II in this project is based on the previous experiences.

The phase I proposal to establish a Competence Sharing Network Project (CSNP) was birthed during a joint meeting held in Nairobi in December 2004. The idea was developed among the members who were attending the Accounting and Financial Management seminar organised by PYM. The project was evaluated in 2009 by Dr. Rick James.

The phase II project main activities have been annual meeting and communication through electronic discussion forums. In this phase, there were also smaller competence seminars in different countries/regions, focusing on challenges in the running of a project.

Pym is commissioning this evaluation as the project is in its last year and there is need to review and learn and hopefully from this process and the documentation be able to apply for a new project period.

Financial contributors: Digni and PYM

Project area

The network includes projects where PYM is supporting development projects, and also other related projects that are run by our partner in the South. So far the following countries are/have been involved in the network: Kenya, Uganda, Swaziland, Somaliland, Mozambique and Rwanda.

Project period

The phase II in the project was from 2009 to 2013.

Brief description of project focus

The focus in the network project is to increase the capacity for development work among network members, and to release existing knowledge and competence and make it available for all members. This will in turn result in more efficient management and sustainability of the member projects. The network will be important to access, maintain and refresh knowledge.

Current status of project

Target group

The primary beneficiaries are all projects that have been supported and are currently supported by DIGNI through the Pentecostal Foreign Mission of Norway (PYM). This network is a regional network targeting projects in Africa South of Sahara. The network covers all projects regardless of the field of operation.

The secondary target group are the projects that are supported through other NGO's but are owned by our cooperation partner in the South.

Reason for evaluation

The main reason for the evaluation is to assess the progress of the project and to learn from the experience of the last 5 years (2009-2013) in order to inform the planning for the future of the network.

Focus in the evaluation should mainly be at the following:

Quality and Relevance

Assess the relevance of the chosen methods and activities in the project. This would mean assessing the validity of the theory of change underpinning the project. Particular areas of interest will be identified by the steering committee in the evaluation workshop in May.

Effectiveness

Assess the major achievements of the project to date in relation to its stated objectives and intended results.

- Focus on the individual project leaders (Beneficiaries), the Projects, and Organizational level results.
- Describe any major failures of the project to date, explaining why they have occurred.
- Describe any unforeseen impacts (whether positive or negative).
- Identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted e.g. case-studies, stories, best practice

Efficiency of Planning and Implementation

Assess the efficiency of the organising of the project. Particular areas of interest will be identified by the steering committee in the evaluation workshop in May.

Impact

To what extent is the project contributing to a long-term positive effect on people and respective projects and organizations? How is CSNP making a difference? How is it contributing to gender equality and women empowerment?

Potential for sustainability, replication and magnification

Assess the key factors affecting **sustainability** of the project.

Assess and make recommendations on the key **strategic options** for the possible future of the project i.e. exit strategy, scale down, replication, scale-up, continuation, major modifications to strategy.

Methodology

As this project focuses on learning, the methodology of the evaluation should also have a learning approach. The evaluation framework given in the Terms of Reference should be further explored and focused in together with the project steering group as part of the evaluation process. The evaluation methodology also includes work shopping findings with CSNP before a report is prepared. Apart from this the methods that are thought to be most useful are

- desk studies of relevant documents
- participation at the committee planning meeting and the annual network meeting
- Interview with the steering committee, CSNP members, other staff members in projects represented in CSNP, organisation leaders and PYM.

Evaluation

The evaluation will be carried out by an evaluator with experience in evaluation, learning and networks.

Products (TR, Work plan, preliminary & final report, # copies)

Results and recommendations from the evaluation will be used as a tool for later decision-making. It is important that the report gives clear recommendations on the main areas like the need, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability..

The evaluator is responsible for writing the report. The final evaluation report is to be given to the network participants, PYM and Digni as soft copy.

Accountabilities and Responsibilities

The evaluator should direct the evaluation, and carry responsibility for evaluation design and process – with support from PYM and the steering committee.

Follow up

The evaluation report will be followed up and recommendations will be taken into consideration within 2013, the CSNP committee will write a management report and the PD for applying for a new project period will make full use of the recommendations in cooperation with the network members.

Project name:	Competence sharing network project (CSNP)	
Main activity	Date/deadline/period	Responsible
Draft of Terms of References (ToR)	21 st to 1 st May 2013	PYM and local project coordinator
Final ToR approved by PYM and Digni	5 th of May 2013	PYM
Inception report approved by PYM	6 th to 12 th May	PYM
Consultant working	May to October 2013	PYM
Planning and start of process in joint meeting	May 2013	PYM, and CSNP committee
Annual network meeting/ interactive process, members, Consultant and PYM	September/October 2013	Consultant + CSNP committee
Final report submitted	15 th November 2013	Consultant

Documents Available

1. The Project Document phase I (2006-2008)
2. The Project Document phase II (2009 -2013)
3. Annual Plans, Budget and Report for all years
4. Annual network reports including external evaluation
5. Budgets and financial reports

Appendix 2 List of projects/organisations represented in CSNP 2013

Botswana

- Early childhood development Network - ECD Network

Kenya

- Anti-Female Genital Mutilation – FGM. Linked to Free Pentecostal Fellowship in Kenya – FPFK.
- Karen Christian College Early Childhood Development – ECD.
- Peace and Rights Project. Linked to FPFK.
- HIV and AIDS Project. Linked to FPFK.
- Tuinuane Women Empowerment Project. Linked to FPFK.

Norway

- The Pentecostal Foreign Mission of Norway - PYM

Mozambique

- Centro Juvenil 'Ingrid Chawner' – CJIC (street children rehabilitation)
- Mensageiros de Deus Internacional – MDI (secondary schools)

Somaliland

- Integrated Education and Development Program - IEDP

Swaziland

- Free Evangelical Assemblies Training and Development Centre – FEA (early childhood development)

Uganda

- Women Against Aids - WAA
- Childcare Development Organisation - CDO

Appendix 3 Respondents

Online survey respondents

The survey was distributed to all participants in the Annual Network Meetings 2009 – 2012 to which CSNP had up-to-date email addresses; 50 recipients, of which 19 responded.

Skype interviews

Festus Mukoya, CSNP Coordinating Chairman
Hope Okeny, Acting Steering Committee Member
Torild Almnes, Steering Committee Member

Participants in Steering Committee preparatory workshop in May 2013

Festus Mukoya, Programme Coordinator, FPFK Peace and Rights Programme - Kenya
Hope Okeny, Project Coordinator, CDO - Uganda
Belarmina Graca, Project Coordinator, MDI - Mozambique
Chidunda Kajangu, Project Leader, IEDP - Somaliland
Torild Almnes, Director for Humanitarian and Development Aid, PYM - Norway

Participants in CSNP Annual Network Meeting Evaluation Workshop October 2013

Steering Committee, see above list

And:

Dianafaith Nankabirwa, Administrator, WAA - Uganda
Ronald Welikhe, Training Officer, WAA - Uganda
Patience Musiimenta, Title, CDO-Uganda
Edgar António, Director, CJIC – Mozambique
Celeste Mulanga, Administrator, CJIC – Mozambique
Teodato Uqueio, Accountant, MDI – Mozambique
Sarah Chelimo, Gender/Human Rights Officer, FPFK Peace and Rights Programme – Kenya
Jacob Nkananai, Field Officer, Anti-FGM - Kenya
Alice Sintoiya, Field Officer, FPFK HIV/AIDS - Kenya
Grace Auma, Project Leader, Tuinuane Project - Kenya
Rhoda Mutave, Assistant Project Leader, Tuinuane Project - Kenya
Daniel Ogada, Project Leader, ECD Project, Karen – Kenya
Peter Ndirangu, Accountant, ECD Project, Karen – Kenya
Stella Nguluka, Project Leader, ECD Network – Botswana

Appendix 4 References

CSNP Project documents

- Annual Reports to PYM/Digni
- Reports from Annual Network Meetings
- Annual plans
- Budgets
- Project Document, phase II 2009 - 2013
- CSNP Evaluation by Rick James 2009
- Minutes from Steering Committee meeting

James, R. (2012) *Leading with Courage and Humility*, Digni and PYM, Oslo

Methodological documents

Hearn, S. and Mendizabal, E. *Not everything that connects is a network*, Overseas Development Institute Background Note May 2011. <http://www.odi.org.uk/publications/5137-networks-network-function-approach-rapid>

Wenger, E., Trayner, B. and de Laat, M. *Promoting and assessing value creation in communities and networks: a conceptual framework*, Ruud de Moor Centrum 2011. http://betterevaluation.org/resources/guide/promoting_assessing_value_creation_networks

Websites

OD and Christian Organisations Learning Group website: <http://developingchurches.ning.com/>

Appendix 5 Documentation from the evaluation workshop, October 2013 in Mozambique

During the evaluation workshop in Mozambique, members were invited to discuss and come up with suggestions on how CSNP could be improved in some key areas. The discussions took place in small groups of 4 – 5 members. Each group contributed their own suggestions. The intention was to generate ideas, not to arrive at consensus. There was no process to rank these suggestions, or to try to arrive at consensus. The suggestions generated data that has influenced the evaluation process, and is also a resource for the continued development of CSNP.

This is a compilation of all suggestions generated by the four groups:

Membership composition

- Exceptional cases the steering committee to decide. NB Opinion should be collected on new members.
- Involve top management in the annual meeting. I.e. if the regular member cannot attend, it should be possible for someone else from the organisation's leadership to attend.
- From PYM projects (current)
- Corporate members; members from other organisations
- Associate members whose projects have ended
- Projects/networks supported by PYM/Digni

Member engagement

- Members need to share individual stories on regular basis through the social media
- There should be a format and a timeline for member reporting
- CSNP to be incorporated into project activities
- Orientation on CSNP for new members must be taken seriously
- CSNP leaders (Steering Committee) should ensure that the members are followed-up
- Social media administration should be given to another member
- Members to commit themselves to respond to emails and they should be held responsible
- Clear guidelines and rules for members
- Orientation of new members should be done at project level
- Shared responsibility among delegates

Network monitoring

- Develop monitoring tools.
- Hire a coordinator on an agreed % to monitor the CSNP project
- Self-evaluation
- Web monitoring. Grid monitoring
- Create accountability towards the member's organisation; involve the 'sending' organisations in monitoring of the network

Activities

- Continue with the Annual Network Meetings
- Organise local workshops and trainings
- Organise local annual network conferences/national networks
- Improve the online activity
- Produce publications, newsletters

- Organise joint activities with similar forums/networks
- **Themes**
- Suggesting teams for committee to pick: Gender, education, human rights
- Networking
- Organisational development
- Evaluation
- Should respond to emerging trends
- Leadership training to continue
- Finance department and facilitation activity to be initiated
- Should be demand-driven

Sustainability

- Include CSNP in local project budgets
- Develop and sell books
- CSNP members to offer consultancies
- Develop strong web contact
- Work on resource mobilisation
- Local anchoring and financing of CSNP by organisation
- Registration of network as legal entity
- Selling of materials developed by CSNP
- Contribution from members/membership fee

Organising structure

- Membership representation from countries with projects
- Gender balance sensitivity
- Have a Steering Committee and a legal monitoring system
- Country meeting preceding CSNP committee meetings
- Holding Annual Meetings
- Steering Committee to organise activities
- Co-ordinator to monitor and execute the deliberations of annual meetings
- National networks
- A facilitation for Steering Committee members