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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Introduction

In development situations in both the United States and developing countries, there is a concern with the development of the capacity of people to identify and solve their own problems and to determine their own future (Program Development Ad Hoc Committee, 1974; Bryant and White, 1982). A process approach to development, where implementation is regarded as a learning process and project managers are able to revise their approaches in the light of feedback from the environment, is seen as facilitating the goal of improving capacity.

The Problem

There are many factors affecting project planning and implementation which either facilitate or hinder the successful implementation of development, and more specifically may affect the capacity-building components in rural development projects (Van Sant and Crawford, 1985; Binnendijk, 1989a). Also, although the philosophy of capacity-building is included in program planning for development, it is not so easy to evaluate whether goals to develop human resources have been achieved since indicators of increased capacity are qualitative and not easily measured. Oakley (1986, p. 253) concluded that

The consequences of extension practice are not limited to tangible concrete results. Rural extension can legitimately aim to tackle problems of a structural or institutional nature, and correspondingly, can seek to determine the effect of its efforts in terms of such problems.
The Need for the Study

When factors affecting development projects are inadequately addressed, inappropriate strategies may be implemented and implementation problems may arise (Van Sant and Crawford, 1985). It is therefore essential for those involved in rural development to understand the complexities of the constraints affecting the projects with which they are involved if successful implementation is to be achieved. This necessity is particularly true of the capacity-building components in rural development projects which are difficult to evaluate because their results tend to be qualitative and less easily monitored and measured.

Information related to the analysis of the capacity-building components in rural development projects is of importance to agricultural extension professionals as well as other development workers. Since agriculture is of great importance to the livelihood of rural populations, rural development frequently has agriculture as its central focus (Binnendijk, 1989a). In rural development projects, agricultural extension professionals are actively involved in the process of technology transfer and developing the capacity of individuals and institutions to make use of that technology. It is therefore essential that those involved in agricultural extension in a rural development context are aware of the implications of the strategies that they implement, or of which they are a part.

Purpose

The overall purpose of this study was to develop a framework for evaluating the capacity-building components in rural development projects, to determine which factors contributed to the successful implementation of these components. In the process of achieving this purpose the following steps were taken:
1. The process of planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating selected rural development projects in both the United States and developing countries was described, with particular reference to capacity-building objectives.

2. The practices in the process which facilitated or constrained the building of capacity were identified.

3. Indicators of development of capacity used by the project were identified, and the extent to which they were useful in measuring improved capacity of people or institutions was assessed.

4. Consideration was given as to the extent to which lessons learned from evaluation of extension work in the United States are transferable to selected developing country situations or the lessons learned from evaluation of rural development projects in developing countries are applicable to the United States or other developed country situations.

Operational Definitions

1. Development: With reference to developing countries, Bryant and White (1982) stated that development is a process of increasing the capacity of people to influence their future. Development not only involves a concern with production and growth, but also with the capacity of the nation and community to develop political and social institutions responsible for production of goods and services and allocation of resources. It also involves a concern with increasing the capacity of individuals to care about and shape their own future. In addition, development involves consideration of equity (equal distribution of the benefits of development), empowerment (acquiring leverage for the poor), and sustainability (achieving results that can be maintained in an interdependent world with finite resources). Honadle,
Walker, and Silverman (1985) also saw the goal of development as increasing the ability of people to determine their own living conditions and achieve their own objectives, and stated that this goal requires enhanced institutional and organizational capacity and sustainable results.

2. **Capacity-building**: Capacity is the ability to anticipate and influence change, make informed decisions, attract and absorb resources and manage resources to achieve objectives (Gow and Van Sant, 1985). Capacity-building is the development of the conscious capability of individuals, groups and organizations within a project area, in order to establish a foundation for development which will be self-sustaining after the withdrawal of donor inputs (Conyers, Warren and van Tilburg, 1988).

3. **Blueprint approach**: A strategy for project development that involves the creation of a comprehensive and detailed plan before the implementation of the project, which is passed on to project implementors to be carried out as prescribed (Uphoff, 1986). In the past, the dominant approach to development planning was a "blueprint" approach.

4. **Process approach**: A strategy that views the implementation of development as a learning process, where projects are open to feedback from the environment, and are able to revise their approaches in the light of that feedback.

5. **Evaluation**: A process of providing useful information for decision making (Stufflebeam, 1983).

6. **Formative evaluation**: Evaluation carried out during the course of a program to provide program directors evaluative information to assist in improving the program (Worthen and Sanders, 1987).

7. **Summative evaluation**: Evaluation carried out at the end of a program to provide audiences such as consumers and funding agencies with judgements about a program's worth or merit (Worthen and Sanders, 1987).
8. **Project development process:** The transition of a project through context, input, process, and product stages, described in Chapter II.

9. **Key factors:** Those factors identified through literature review as having a significant effect on development of capacity. The identified factors (overall management, capacity-building, development approach, and external factors) were included in the conceptual framework and matrix described in Chapter II.

**Summary**

In development situations in both the United States and developing countries, there is a concern with the development of the capacity of people to identify and solve their own problems and to determine their own future. Agricultural extension professionals and others involved in development planning and implementation need to be aware of and understand the factors affecting the achievement of capacity-building objectives in order to successfully develop human resources. The purpose of this study was to develop a framework for evaluating the capacity-building components in rural development projects to determine which factors contributed to the successful implementation of these components.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The overall purpose of this study was to develop a framework for evaluating the capacity-building components in rural development projects, to determine which factors contributed to the successful implementation of these components. The literature reviewed in this chapter expands on the concept of development in developing countries and the United States, and establishes a framework for analysis of the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of rural development projects, with particular reference to capacity-building. In addition, it points to problems which are characteristic of such projects and need to be addressed during the analysis.

The review of literature is divided into five parts:

1. Development in developing countries
2. Development in the United States of America
3. The CIPP model as a framework for the evaluation process
4. Features of evaluations of rural development projects
5. Summary

Development in Developing Countries

As stated in Chapter I, Bryant and White (1982) defined development as a process of increasing the capacity of people to influence their future. Development not only involves a concern with production and growth, but also with the capacity of the nation and community to develop political and social institutions responsible for production of goods and services and allocation of resources. It also involves a concern with increasing the capacity of individuals to care about and shape their own future. In addition, development involves consideration of equity (equal distribution of the benefits of development),
empowerment (acquiring leverage for the poor), and sustainability (achieving results that can be maintained in an interdependent world with finite resources). Honadle, Walker, and Silverman (1985) also saw the goal of development as increasing the ability of people to determine their own living conditions and achieve their own objectives, and stated that this goal requires enhanced institutional and organizational capacity and sustainable results.

The definition of development provided by Bryant and White (1982) represents a change in thinking which took place in the early 1970s. In the immediate post World War II period, development was seen primarily in economic terms, and efforts were focused on economic growth. However, it became apparent that social factors would have to be taken into consideration if plans were to be successfully implemented. In addition, planners came to acknowledge that certain social goals, such as improved health services, are important ends in themselves. As a result, development is now viewed as a complex process involving social, political, and environmental, as well as economic factors (Conyers, 1982).

Bryant and White (1982) proposed that in order to achieve the kind of development described above, project design should not flow from a blueprint or follow a prescribed set of steps. Rather, it should be a process which includes a means of learning from the environment, exploring opportunities, and evaluating different kinds of interventions. The implementation of development is best conceived as a learning process, where projects are open to feedback from the environment, and project managers are able to revise their approaches in the light of that feedback.

The concept of a process approach to development is gaining increasing attention from development analysts, and Uphoff (1986) noted that support for this approach has grown out of practical experience, since it has achieved promising results. Binnendijk
(1989a, p. 2) stated that project designs should be flexible and phased so that they can be modified in the light of implementation experiences. She continued:

Rural development strategies should encompass a phased "learning" process approach more consistent with the experimental nature of many rural development efforts. This phased approach implies a longer time horizon and a commitment of 15 to 20 years.

Conyers (1982) reported that whereas the conventional approaches to development planning consisted essentially of the production of detailed plan documents designed to achieve economic growth over a fixed period of time, more recent approaches involve a more complex and continuous process of decision making designed to bring about a wide range of social, economic, environmental, and political change. In the past, the dominant approach to development planning was a "blueprint" approach, involving the creation of a comprehensive and detailed plan before the implementation of the project, which is passed on to project implementors to be carried out as prescribed (Uphoff, 1986). A technology may be suggested to raise productivity, and the plan specifies the financial, human, and material resources required to apply the technology. This approach has several weaknesses. It assumes that all the problems and goals can be identified before the beginning of the project or program, and that it is therefore possible to specify the precise interventions to be carried out. It does not allow for changing situations, or the fact that a standard plan may need to be adapted or modified to suit a particular situation.

Trends in rural development indicate that increasing emphasis is being placed on the achievement of sustainable results through increasing the capacity of the people and institutions involved. The Institute of Cultural Affairs International (1985) identified 18 key trends in rural development and 12 key factors within those trends. Included in the trends were greater local participation, strengthening financial linkages, emphasizing improved agriculture, involving rural women, utilizing local resources, increasing
education prowess, exchanging rural information, training underdeveloped groups, managing community finance, and enhancing comprehensive community development. Included in the factors within these trends are total community participation, committed grassroots planning, cohesive community identity, viable local economics, community structural approach, and education and skills training. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has identified institutional development as one of the four leading elements of its development strategy (Uphoff, 1986). Most emphasis has been placed on institutional development at the national level. National institutions are important for the development and dissemination of new technologies and the mobilization and management of resources, but local institutions are closest to the intended beneficiaries and also affect project outcomes.

The changing of emphasis from a blueprint approach to process and capacity-building in development requires changes in project evaluation that must be built into the initial project design. In reviewing the experiences of the USAID, Binnendijk (1989b) observed that in the 1980s, there was a reorientation of monitoring and evaluating systems and reporting requirements to support project management's information needs for operational decisions, and emphasis was put on continuous, ongoing evaluation. In addition, special interim evaluations were timed to meet key management decision points. Bryant and White (1982) stated that in the process approach to development, organizations need to learn from their environment in order to adjust over time to new problems and demands. It is therefore essential to establish an information process that collects and uses data in the initial project design stage, monitors processes and outcomes to provide feedback, and evaluates what has occurred. Projects should not be judged solely on the rate of return they give, but also on other criteria such as their effectiveness in enhancing the capacity of organizations to respond to local initiatives and the extent to which a project develops
institutions that will be able to organize and maintain new services over time. Evaluation of a process-oriented project will therefore involve not only an examination of output (amount produced or the resources expended), impact (the immediate results the outputs have), and outcome (long-range estimate of what difference was made by the output), but also an examination of the processes of designing and implementing policy.

**Development in the United States of America**

In the United States, there is also a concern with process and capacity-building. In defining the philosophy of program development in the Cooperative Extension Service, the Program Development Ad Hoc Committee (1974, p. 3) stated that:

Cooperative Extension work is "education for action-action by individuals-action by groups." It is education in which, through participation, individuals develop their own abilities in problem solving. It is education that helps people develop skills in problem identification, goal determination, analysis, evaluation, and choice. It is education that provides opportunities for people to develop traits of character, qualities of leadership, and knowledge of issues and concerns that enable them to be productive citizens and to achieve progress in a changing society.

The Cooperative Extension Service has been involved for many years in community education for development (Compton and McClusky, 1980). It has been involved in working with and training community leaders, helping establish community councils, and in providing assistance in analyzing community problems and needs. Blackburn and Vist (1984) explained that historically, extension has meant education in agriculture and home economics for rural people. In addition to short-term objectives, extension has long-term goals connected with problem-solving, improving food production and quality of life, and supporting the family farm.

Participation plays an important part in extension. Rural people are encouraged to participate in examining their needs and in program planning, and it is hoped that through that participation people will increase their capacity to identify their own problems and that
leaders will develop within the community. Prawl et al. (1984) identified several other principles underlying extension activity. These included cooperation, grassroots organization, recognition of interests, needs, cultural changes and scientific changes, use of local leaders and existing agencies, use of community approach, and gradual development of programs.

Prawl et al. (1984) described the development of an extension program as a process of planning, implementing and evaluating an educational effort which involves a joint effort between community and educational leaders who represent various clientele groups, extension workers who act as process implementors, and extension specialists and other resource persons who serve as consultants and facilitators. Since the late 1950s, rural development has been emphasized in the extension service and there has been a move away from traditional, agricultural production-oriented programs. Programs with homemakers have been expanded and youth activities have been broadened to include urban and suburban as well as rural youth. Community resource development has always been a part of the extension philosophy, but since the early 1970s, it has been recognized as one of the four major extension program areas from an administrative and financial viewpoint.

Compton and McClusky (1980, p. 229) described community education for development as:

a process whereby community members come together to identify their problems and needs, seek solutions among themselves, mobilize the necessary resources, and execute a plan of action or learning or both.

They stated that the overriding concern in communities today is that they are unable to organize their forces to cope with their specific problems. There is a need to develop local problem solving ability, making use of the participation of local citizens to adapt development efforts to local conditions, to make best use of local resources, and to induce a sense of identity and belonging which is fundamental to community development.
Community developers have come to realize that top-down approaches to community development have limitations, particularly in being able to accommodate to local variation, or to obtain needed local resources.

Community education for development involves the notion that people have not only the right, but the need, to practice self-determination. It emphasizes the use of nonformal education channels to help people direct their own learning. Education is seen as a process, and educators as facilitators in promoting self-actualizing, self-directing behavior in others, and in inducing change for the betterment of the community. The education program involves the education of the community so that it understands its problems, and the development of some organization for their solution. Community education for development focuses on individuals, institutions and communities.

The Program Development Ad Hoc Committee (1974) stated that Extension program development is perceived as a series of processes, including developing the institutional framework for program development, developing an organizational base for program development, determining the program, developing the program strategy, implementing the program, and evaluating program accomplishments. Relevant information is required for successful decision making, planning, action, and evaluation, which are involved in all these processes.

Evaluation has received much attention in the extension service, and attempts have been made to evaluate the economic and social consequences of extension activities (Prawl et al., 1984). Evaluation has been used to facilitate decisions made as a program progresses, and to summarize the effects of a program when it is over. However, it has been recognized that it is harder and more expensive to obtain evidence of the final impact of a program than to obtain data of activities carried out during the program. Warner and Christianson (1984) stated that while goal statements give criteria for determining
effectiveness, it is not always easy for evaluators to agree on criteria. They further stated that output, in terms of program impact, is difficult to measure in extension since products are not clearly defined, so there has been a tendency to use program operations such as number of clientele contacted and number of meetings held as standards for evaluation.

**The CIPP Model as a Framework for the Evaluation Process**

This section describes the so-called CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) model of evaluation, developed by Stufflebeam in the late 1960s, as reviewed and updated by him in 1983 (Stufflebeam, 1983). The CIPP model was chosen because it pays attention to all phases of a project, providing information for decision making and evaluation, and considers both process and product. In addition, it provides valuable background data against which project outcomes may be interpreted and understood. The model has been applied to many institutions, including the National Center for Vocational and Technical Education and the U.S. Office of Education, and has been referenced in many conferences and publications.

The CIPP approach is based on the view that the most important purpose of evaluation is not to prove but improve (Stufflebeam, 1983, p. 118).

It was developed in response to the need for a broader definition of evaluation than one focused solely on whether objectives had been achieved, a definition that would lead to evaluations which assisted in the management and improvement of programs. Evaluation was redefined as a process of providing useful information for decision making.

Stufflebeam (1983) conceptualized evaluation as including context, input, process, and product evaluations to assist with planning, structuring, implementing, and recycling decisions respectively. The CIPP model can serve the needs of both formative and summative evaluation. In order for it to do so, evaluators should include the information
needs of both the implementors and the external audience that may at some time wish to form conclusions about the worth or merit of the program. A record of the information collected should also be kept, together with evidence of the extent to which developers used it to guide their work.

The following subsections will describe the four types of evaluation included in the CIPP model:

1. **Context evaluation**: Evaluation related to objectives and needs assessment.
2. **Input evaluation**: Evaluation related to input specification and strategy.
4. **Product evaluation**: Evaluation related to guidance for termination, continuation, modification or installation.

**Context evaluation**

The purpose of context evaluation is to identify the strengths and weaknesses of an object such as an institution, program or population, and to provide direction for improvement. It is necessary to define the institutional context, and to identify the target population, their needs, and the problems underlying those needs. Goals and priorities need to be set or adjusted to address the problems identified. Decisions associated with context evaluation are related to deciding upon the setting to be served, and establishing objectives which will provide a basis for planning needed changes and judging outcomes.

**Input evaluation**

The main purpose of input evaluation is to help prescribe a program by which to bring about needed changes. Input evaluation should assist in selecting the most appropriate plan of action from among possible alternatives, in terms of factors such as
strategies, procedural designs, budgets, and schedules. It should also help in the identification of possible barriers and constraints to the implementation of programs, and provide a basis for judging implementation.

Process evaluation

Process evaluation is an ongoing check on the implementation plan, providing feedback to managers and staff about whether the project is going according to plan. It will also provide guidance to the implementors for modifying the plans as the project progresses, and assist in assessing how capable the program participants are in accepting and carrying out their roles. It should include an extensive record of the implementation of the program, how it compared to the initial plan, the costs of implementation, and the judgements of participants and observers about quality and worth. Process evaluation is thus a valuable source of information for interpreting the outcomes of the program in product evaluation.

Product evaluation

The product evaluation will measure, interpret and judge the attainments of a program in order to see if the program has met the needs of the people it was intended to serve. It should view the outcomes from the viewpoints of the recipients as a whole group, and of subgroups of the recipients, and it should examine both positive and negative results, and intended and unintended outcomes. It may be used both during and at the end of a project, and should assess long-term effects. Product evaluation should offer an estimation of the extent to which the failure to achieve objectives was related to a failure to implement the project plan. Decisions resulting from product evaluation may be related to continuing, terminating, modifying, or refocusing a program.
Features of Evaluations of Rural Development Projects

This section draws on lessons learned in the areas of education, extension, sociology, and international development, which provide insight into the evaluation of rural development projects. The description corresponds to the four parts of the CIPP model and special reference is made to process and capacity-building.

Context evaluation

As a result of the context evaluation it should be possible to establish goals for the project which are applicable to the situation. Gow and Morss (1985) noted that clear project objectives, stated in terms which are operational, provide management with a tangible basis for planning, and a means by which to measure progress. However, Röling (1986b, p. 107) warned that objectives should not be inflexible, stating:

Extension must have room for maneuver; it must not paint itself into a corner by setting targets.

Röling (1986b) explained that it is difficult to set realistic, specific targets without careful research into, or experience with the project conditions. While he acknowledged that a flexible approach creates difficulties in planning and supervising extension projects, and evaluating their impact, he recommended process-orientation as a means of systematically implementing a flexible project.

In the case of process-oriented projects directed toward the building of capacity, the goals should clearly reflect this direction, for example, performance improvements should be stressed rather than production increases. Capacity-building objectives should be clearly stated in the early stages of project identification and planning (Conyers, Warren and van Tilburg, 1988). Unless this is done, there are likely to be difficulties in getting resources for capacity-building activities, and in evaluating the impact of the project at a later date.
Conyers and Warren (1988) pointed out that the adoption of capacity-building objectives in integrated rural development projects (IRDPs) has major implications in terms of donor and host country objectives, which usually tend to emphasize product rather than process.

Oakley (1986) observed that a review of extension practice, mainly in the non-government sector, revealed that extension practice not immediately promoting technical innovation utilizes a different set of objectives. Such objectives included promoting participation, developing an organizational base, creating an awareness among rural people of their problems, building up solidarity to tackle problems, and encouraging greater self-determination and self-reliance. Bryant and White (1982) reported that it is not an easy matter to examine whether the goals of a development project are being met when those goals include the improvement of qualitative characteristics such as capacity which cannot be directly observed. Indicators of goals must be both valid and reliable and it is usually advisable to select multiple indicators which will correct any validity or reliability problems that single measures may have. Social planners face similar difficulties in identifying indicators which measure certain aspects of social development, for example, quality of life, or degree of contentment (Conyers, 1982).

According to Oakley (1986), there is a substantial body of literature on relevant indicators of quantitative objectives, but little has been written about relevant indicators for the evaluation of qualitative objectives. It is necessary to identify kinds of observable actions, events, or changes in behavior that reflect the qualitative changes taking place. Oakley (1986) suggested a number of qualitative indicators for evaluating the process of participation. He suggested that qualitative indicators of group characteristics are: genuine and spontaneous participation in group meetings and activities; emerging feeling of group purpose and solidarity; awareness of issues and problems; and enthusiasm and support for group activities. Suggested qualitative indicators of self reliance are: organization of
meetings by groups to identify problems; ability of groups to plan and organize activities; and reduction of group dependence on extension staff. Suggested qualitative indicators of independence are: organizational growth and development of the group; ability of the group to progress without extension staff; establishing contacts with other agencies; linking up with other groups; and formalization of group organizational structure.

Robins (1987) also suggested that measurement of skills transfer should be given higher priority in evaluating project growth, although it should not replace measurement of technological development. He stated that growth in the ability of counterparts and others to manage programs is shown in their increased ability to operate projects without donor assistance. This increased capacity is demonstrated in skills such as the ability to develop work plans and submit them on time, to file requests for advances of funds correctly and on a timely basis, to keep accurate records, to plan project activities sufficiently in advance to make more likely the attainment of technological goals, and to demonstrate financial accountability. Honadle, Walker, and Silverman (1985) stated that when focusing on organizational processes and human behavior, activities such as meeting deadlines, collecting fees, recruiting volunteers, identifying needs, achieving broad-based participation, approximating time requirements to do a job, analyzing constraints, delivering goods or services, and keeping records become important indicators of effectiveness. In addition, performance improvements have to be achieved in such a way that they do not require outside help for continuance, so building resource bases and incentives to sustain performance becomes a key priority.

Robins (1987) further stated that project evaluations tend not to include measurement of capacity-building unless failure to transfer skills causes project breakdowns. He suggested that in order to encourage its personnel to work more in the collaborative mode and to create an environment in which human resource development takes place, USAID
needs to establish criteria for measuring host country participation and growth of capability, and to hold its people more accountable for skills transfer than for strict adherence to technological models and fiscal and legal regulations.

Popular participation provides a valuable means of obtaining information about local conditions, needs, and attitudes (Conyers 1982). It may be achieved by carrying out local consultation and surveys, using extension staff to provide feedback, decentralized planning, utilizing local government, and by community development. Participation at all stages of a project is considered of special importance in developing countries because the social and cultural gap between planners and people tends to be greater, so it is very important to get input from the people who are potential or direct beneficiaries of development plans to ensure that their needs are being met. In addition, people are more likely to be committed to a development program if they are involved in its planning and implementation because they are more likely to identify with it and claim ownership of it. Russel (1986) emphasized the importance of including participation in extension strategies for the development of local institutions that can help farmers to be more self-reliant, and for sustaining development investments.

In the United States, the importance of popular participation is also stressed. The Program Development Ad Hoc Committee (1974) stated that the strength of the Extension Service lay in the involvement of people in the program development process in determining, planning, and carrying out programs to meet their needs. They stressed that it was particularly important to involve people in identifying needs, concerns, and interests, and to analyze problems which are of importance to them.

The context evaluation may be carried out by using needs assessment methods such as surveys, interviews and document review (Stufflebeam, 1983). In the case of international projects, Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) as described by Chambers (1983) may
be a valuable approach. RRA involves using a combination of methods including the use of existing documents, interviewing key informants, direct observation and asking questions about what is seen, guided interviews, and group interviews with informal or selected groups. The aim is to produce reliable information in a cost-effective manner within a short time frame.

**Input evaluation**

For input evaluation, it is necessary to inventory and analyze available human and material resources, solution strategies and procedural designs for relevance, feasibility, and economy (Stufflebeam, 1983). Methods used could include literature search, visits to exemplary programs, advocate teams, and pilot trials.

Uphoff (1986) claimed that a learning process approach to project design, where development efforts can proceed inductively, experimentally, and flexibly, is more likely to help create local capacities for mobilizing and managing resources than the blueprint approach. Conyers, Warren and van Tilburg (1988) also stated that capacity-building involves an experiential approach to project planning and implementation, and concluded that initial planning should not involve the preparation of a blueprint plan. Instead, after broad project objectives are identified, the scope of the project should be defined in terms of the approximate scale of the project and the form of technological assistance to be required. In addition, it is necessary to determine the procedures for the detailed planning of specific inputs which will occur on an ongoing basis as the project progresses. The blueprint and process approaches to planning are perhaps better viewed as two ends of a continuum, rather than absolute alternatives. Thus the exact mix of process and blueprint approaches will vary from project to project and from one component of a project to
another, but the emphasis should be on the process approach rather than the blueprint approach.

In support of his proposal that process planning seems more suited to extension than blueprint planning, Röling (1986b) stated that process planning is interactive and strategic, using systematic procedures for eliminating unknowns and for identifying activities. It allows for popular participation and use of information, for organic and incremental development from a small start, and for flexible allocation of resources. The process, rather than outcomes, is planned, and objectives are formulated as process functions over time rather than as targets.

Honadle, Walker and Silverman (1985) stated that project designers should give institutional development objectives an increased priority, moving their primary emphasis from production increases to performance improvements. Honadle, Silverman, and Mickelwait (1985) suggested that the design process should be based on documents that explain that the project's highest priority is to build capacity, not to achieve visible short-term results. Unless this step is taken, technical assistance personnel are likely to place emphasis on attaining production targets at the expense of building capacity, and evaluations will reinforce the performer and product approach instead of stressing the impact on local capacity. The significance of sustainability can also easily be obscured by short-term considerations, particularly the desire of project managers to achieve visible results, both in terms of financial disbursements and meeting specified targets (Morss, Gow and Nordlinger, 1985). However, it is rare that sustainability is seriously considered at the project design stage.

Capacity-building involves the allocation of resources specifically for training and related capacity-building activities (Conyers, Warren and van Tilburg, 1988). It should be remembered that institutional development depends on developing the skills, motivation
and personal efficacy of individual people (Uphoff, 1986). Robins (1987) stated that USAID monies should be spent mainly on building local capability and not just to reach technological goals. Conyers, Warren and van Tilburg (1988) stated that in the past integrated rural development projects (IRDPs) have tended to allocate capital resources to infrastructure development and the provision of services, but the development of institutional capacity has been neglected. Most IRDPs are expected to fulfil both a product role of having a direct impact on rural development, and a process role of having an indirect impact through strengthening the local institutions responsible for supporting rural development on a long-term basis (Conyers and Warren, 1988). The relationship between product and process objectives is complex, and while in some cases the two are positively related, this is not always so, particularly when the two kinds of objectives need different time frames or methodological approaches, or compete with each other for scarce resources. Röling (1986a) also stated that the two main traditions in extension education, technical innovation and human resource development, should support each other, but in practice they frequently end up in conflict.

A problem occurs with allocation of resources because capacity-building objectives can often only be achieved at the expense of other donor or national objectives (Conyers, Warren and van Tilburg, 1988). For example there is usually donor or national pressure to obtain rapid, visible, easily measurable results, to utilize a short time frame, and to have all the activities planned and budgeted in advance. This kind of pressure does not encourage the development of capacity, which requires a more flexible approach, a longer time frame, and produces results which are not easily measured. Another problem arises since donors and national governments often measure development in terms of money utilized (Uphoff, 1986). While projects that promote capacity-building can utilize money reasonably rapidly and productively, the best results are not achieved by a rigid pace of expenditure or by
investing money in a project at a rate which is greater than the local institutions' capacity to absorb and utilize it efficiently.

Norton and Benoliel (1987) stated that all USAID Development Assistance and Economic Support Fund projects should contain a data collection, monitoring, and evaluation plan. However, it was observed that Project Papers frequently did not contain evaluation plans. Stufflebeam (1983), also stated that when a new program is developed, it should provide for ongoing evaluation once it has been implemented. The original evaluation design should not be a rigid plan, but should remain responsive to the needs of the audiences. The evaluation itself should be viewed as a process, not a product, which may be modified as necessary to provide the most appropriate information. The Program Development Ad Hoc Committee (1974) also suggested that program development processes should have a built in framework for accountability in terms of the impact of educational programs on the welfare of people, the economy and/or the institutions in the communities in which people live.

Norton and Benoliel (1987, p. 7) stated:

Quantitative analysis cannot answer many of the questions A. I. D. managers have—questions concerning institutional performance, the implementation process, participants' behavioral change, participants' quality of life, and unanticipated as well as anticipated project impacts. Exploratory and inductive methods are also needed to provide qualitative information and to examine these kinds of questions.

In the case of monitoring the achievement of qualitative objectives, a major problem arises in determining how indicators of qualitative objectives can be observed and recorded (Oakley, 1986). It is necessary to give substance to qualitative indicators and relate them to some observable activity of the project group in order to be able to understand the process. A baseline survey and then continuous description around a number of predetermined indicators will be needed, and this will require the inclusion of participatory, as well as external evaluation in the evaluation plan.
The discipline and profession of social planning, which is concerned with planning for and by people, can make a valuable contribution at the input evaluation stage. Social planning is concerned with the "non-economic" aspects of development, which may not contribute directly to production or physical output, but which may contribute to the general quality of human life (Conyers, 1982). In addition, it is concerned with the attainment of intrinsic rights and objectives, especially those related to equality, and with direct involvement in the planning and development process. At the project level, social planners may be responsible for forecasting and monitoring social changes which may occur as a result of implementing projects, particularly those which are primarily economic in nature, and for ensuring that steps are taken to minimize social disruptions. In addition to the above responsibilities, social planners may take responsibility for ensuring popular participation takes place in planning, to facilitate obtaining detailed information on social conditions and needs, and to encourage a sense of involvement in, and commitment to projects.

**Process evaluation**

Process evaluation is conducted by monitoring the program's potential procedural barriers and by being observant for unanticipated barriers. In addition, specified information for planned decisions may be collected, the actual process of the program may be described, and feedback from and activities of the project staff may be recorded.

Norton and Benoliel (1987) stated that project information systems should be based on the routine collection and analysis of existing administrative data to the extent to which it is possible. However, it is often mistakenly assumed that implementors of the project will carry out process evaluation as part of their normal duties (Stufflebeam, 1983). One or
more persons should be assigned the task of providing ongoing review, feedback and documentation.

A number of problems can occur during project implementation. Robins (1987) criticized implementors of USAID projects for not allowing their counterparts the opportunity to make mistakes which are part of the learning process. He stated that USAID should be more willing to compromise the design once the project is underway, supporting local efforts at implementation. Another problem that may be identified at the process stage was described by Conyers, Warren and van Tilburg (1988). They stated that rather than attempting to strengthen the capacity of existing institutions to build and maintain the infrastructure and services, there has been a tendency to by-pass them by establishing temporary, semi-autonomous organizations which rely heavily on expatriate resources. The neglect of the development of the local institutional capacity has resulted in the failure of projects to become self-sustaining, or to adequately maintain and operate the infrastructure and services provided, after the withdrawal of donor inputs.

Oakley (1986) stressed the importance of collecting descriptive data in process-oriented projects. He explained that the evaluation of the non-material activities of an extension project should be concerned more with description which may be interpreted than with the measurement of results which can be judged.

**Product evaluation**

Product evaluation may be conducted by defining operationally and measuring outcome criteria, by collecting judgements and outcomes from stakeholders, and by carrying out both quantitative and qualitative analysis (Stufflebeam, 1983). Product evaluation should look at intended and unintended outcomes, and positive and negative effects. A combination of techniques should be used to obtain a comprehensive view of
effects and to cross-check the various findings. The assessment of long-term effects is particularly important in process-oriented projects which may take longer to produce measurable outcomes since emphasis has been placed on process rather than product.

Robins (1987) pointed out that if the measurement of the success of the programs were based more on the achievement of skill transfer and less on technological development, then projects which were judged to have failed to meet some technological output objectives would be considered successful if they demonstrated an improvement in host country capability. However, even when capacity-building objectives are included at the planning stage of a project, they are usually not included in the evaluation of the project which tends to concentrate on tangible or quantitative results (Oakley, 1986). Objectives which are qualitative in nature, and involve processes, cannot be completely understood by measuring tangible results. It is therefore important to interpret the output of a process-oriented project in the light of the information gathered during the process evaluation. This information may be more descriptive in nature, and will assist in providing an understanding of the effects which have occurred.

**Summary**

Stufflebeam's CIPP model provided a suitable framework for analyzing the monitoring and evaluation of the capacity-building components in rural development projects since it pays attention to all elements of the planning and implementation process, including the process element. The body of literature related to development and project evaluation revealed valuable information for selecting specific problem areas in process-oriented development which needed to be investigated, and led to the development of questions which needed to be addressed when conducting this study.
The key points may be summarized under the headings of:

1. Context evaluation
2. Input evaluation
3. Process evaluation
4. Product evaluation

**Context evaluation**

1. The project objectives should be clear.
2. The project objectives should be operational.
3. The project objectives should be flexible rather than rigid.
4. Capacity-building and skills transfer objectives should be identified and clearly stated.
5. The objectives of the project should be compatible with donor and host country goals.
6. Indicators of qualitative objectives should be valid and reliable.
7. It is advisable to use multiple indicators of qualitative objectives.
8. Popular participation should be used to identify needs.

**Input evaluation**

1. The project design should be process-oriented.
2. Institutional development objectives should be given increased priority in the design, and should be clearly stated.
3. The design should include resource allocation for capacity-building objectives.
4. The design should aim to minimize constraints to capacity-building objectives, such as conflicts between host or donor country objectives and those of the project, and the by-passing of local institutions.
5. An evaluation plan should be included in the project design.
6. The evaluation plan should be responsive to the needs of audiences and viewed as a process.

7. The evaluation plan should use a combination of methods to collect both qualitative and quantitative data.

8. The evaluation plan should determine how the indicators of qualitative objectives can be observed and recorded.

9. The evaluation should collect baseline data.

10. Participatory evaluation should be used for the continuous collection of information.

11. Popular participation should be used in planning the project.

**Process evaluation**

1. The routine collection of data should include both quantitative data and qualitative description.

2. Specific people should be assigned the responsibility for evaluation.

3. The evaluation should utilize popular participation.

4. Adaptation of project processes should be made in the light of the information collected.

5. In the implementation of the project, local institutions should not be by-passed.

**Product evaluation**

1. Product evaluation should look at intended and unintended outcomes.

2. Product evaluation should look at positive and negative effects.

3. Product evaluation should look at short-term and long-term effects.

4. A combination of evaluation techniques should be used to get a comprehensive view of the project.
5. Output should be measured in terms of skills transfer as well as technical development.

6. The output of a process-oriented project should be interpreted in the light of descriptions of the processes involved.
CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to develop a framework for evaluating the capacity-building components in rural development projects, and to determine which factors contributed to the successful implementation of these components. In the process of achieving this purpose the following steps were taken:

1. The process of planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating selected rural development projects in both the United States and developing countries was described, with particular reference to capacity-building objectives.

2. The practices in the process which facilitated or constrained the building of capacity were identified.

3. Indicators of development of capacity used by the project were identified and the extent to which they were useful in measuring improved capacity of people or institutions was assessed.

4. Consideration was given as to the extent to which lessons learned from evaluation of extension work in the United States are transferable to selected developing country situations or the lessons learned from evaluation of rural development projects in developing countries are applicable to the United States or other developed country situations.

Design

This study may be described as a meta-evaluation since it was an evaluation of an evaluation process (Patton, 1982). In order to meet the objectives of this study, it was decided that a documentary analysis of project administrative records and related documents would be the most appropriate approach. Merriam (1988) suggested that documentary
analysis should be used as a research strategy if it appears that the documents can provide more data, or data of better quality than other strategies, or if the strategy is less costly than other tactics. In the case of this study, given the wide geographical area of inquiry, documentary analysis provided an economical and feasible way of studying the topic in question. Furthermore, since the subject of study was the evaluation process, evaluation documents provided the most appropriate data. Hakim (1987, p. 38) stated that:

Administrative records are used in their own right . . . for research on the policy process itself and in evaluation research. In this case records and documents, albeit incomplete accounts, are part of the reality being studied, rather than being regarded as a poor substitute for data that would ideally be obtained in other ways.

In terms of overall research design, the study may be described as historical and descriptive. Merriam (1988) stated that the main purpose of descriptive research is to examine events and phenomena and to describe and explain them. The study was historical in the sense that it utilized documents as its only source of data. Historical research is useful for investigating administrative structures and processes (Van Dalen, 1979).

The research design also had a comparative element since it attempted to draw comparisons between different process-oriented development projects. Hakim (1987) pointed out that it has been possible to carry out international comparative studies through the analysis of documentation in spite of the international variations in record keeping systems. Comparative studies may be used:

(1) to increase the range of observations on variables of interest, (2) to determine variations found in variables in different settings, (3) to analyze trends and common problems, and (4) to check the generality of theories and modify them if necessary to account for differences in findings across time and space (Van Dalen, 1979, p. 330).

A naturalistic, qualitative approach was taken to develop an in-depth study that could be sensitive to unanticipated variations and individual characteristics in the project evaluations. Naturalistic inquiry makes no attempt to manipulate the program or its
participants for purposes of the evaluation, and the design is not locked into looking at only predetermined variables and outcomes (Patton, 1987). A naturalistic approach is useful for focusing on variations in program implementation which cannot be fully predicted or anticipated. However, it should be remembered that the extent to which a study is naturalistic in design is a matter of degree.

This study was historical in that it utilized documentary evidence as its only source of data. However, Merriam (1988) stated that some specialized case studies rely exclusively on written materials, and in comparing historical and case study research, revealed that their elements often merge and their strategies may overlap, particularly in the study of contemporary events. This study contained a number of elements that are characteristic of qualitative case study research with multiple cases, as illustrated by the following quotations:

A qualitative case study is an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a bounded phenomenon such as a program, an institution, a person, a process, or social unit (Merriam, 1988, p. xiv).

Qualitative methods are particularly oriented toward exploration, discovery, and inductive logic. An evaluation approach is inductive to the extent that the evaluator attempts to make sense of the situation without imposing pre-existing expectations on the program setting. Inductive designs begin with specific observations and build toward general patterns (Patton, 1987, p. 15).

(Qualitative) research is exploratory, inductive, and emphasizes processes rather than ends. In this paradigm, there are no predetermined hypotheses, no treatments, and no restrictions on the end product. One does not manipulate variables or administer a treatment. What one does do is observe, intuit, sense what is occurring in a natural setting, hence the term naturalistic inquiry (Merriam, 1988, p. 17).

Finally, documentary data are particularly good sources for qualitative case studies because they can ground an investigation in the context of the problem being investigated (Merriam, 1988, p. 109)

Cross-case, cross site, or multi-site case studies (terms used interchangeably here) involve collecting and analyzing data from several cases (Merriam, 1988, p. 153).
Figure 1. Conceptual framework for the evaluation of the capacity-building components in rural development projects
Instrumentation

In developing the methodology for the study, approaches suggested by Miles and Huberman (1984) were utilized. In order to make comparisons among the projects, a conceptual framework was developed, and questions were formulated to establish whether and how increase in capacity was encouraged and monitored during the evaluation process. The framework and questions were developed on the basis of the findings in the literature review. They were not intended to represent a rigid plan, rather a starting point for investigation. In order to provide as complete an analysis as possible, an emergent approach was used and the plan was adapted in the light of the information discovered in the records.

The conceptual framework is illustrated in Figure 1. The main factors indirectly affecting the development of capacity may be divided into three categories: overall management, development approach and external factors. In addition, there are factors directly related to capacity-building which affect success in development of skills. The initial questions, based on the CIPP model of Stufflebeam (1983), included the following:

Context evaluation

1. What were the project objectives?
2. Were the project objectives clear?
3. Were the project objectives operational?
4. Were the project objectives flexible rather than rigid?
5. Were capacity-building and skills transfer objectives identified and clearly stated?
6. Were the objectives of the project compatible with donor and host country goals?
   Explain why/why not.
7. What were the indicators of the qualitative/capacity-building objectives?
8. Were indicators of qualitative objectives valid and reliable? Is there any evidence of this?

9. Were multiple indicators of qualitative objectives used?

10. Was popular participation used to identify needs? If so, explain how.

11. Are there any further observations of significance to context evaluation? If so, state what.

**Input evaluation**

1. Was the project design process-oriented? If so, explain how?

2. Were institutional development objectives given increased priority in the design, and were they clearly stated? If so, elaborate.

3. Did the design include resource allocation for capacity-building objectives?

4. Did the design aim to minimize constraints to capacity-building objectives, such as conflicts between host or donor country objectives and those of the project, and the by-passing of local institutions? If so, explain how.

5. Was an evaluation plan included in the project design?

6. Was the evaluation plan intended to be responsive to the needs of audiences and was it viewed as a process? What evidence is there of this?

7. Did the evaluation plan use a combination of methods to collect both qualitative and quantitative data? What were the methods used?

8. Did the evaluation plan determine how the indicators of qualitative objectives could be observed and recorded? If so, elaborate on what was specified.

9. Did the evaluation include the collection of baseline data. If so, what baseline data were collected?
10. Was participatory evaluation planned for the continuous collection of information? If so, describe how.

11. Was popular participation used in planning the project? If so, explain how.

12. Are there any further observations of significance to input evaluation? If so, what are they?

**Process evaluation**

1. Did the routine collection of data include both quantitative data and qualitative description? What data were collected?

2. Were specific people assigned the responsibility for evaluation? If so, who were they?

3. Did the evaluation utilize popular participation? If so, explain how.

4. Were project processes adapted in the light of the information collected? Give examples.

5. In the implementation of the project, were local institutions by-passed? If so, describe how.

6. Are there any further observations of significance to process evaluation? If so, what are they?

**Product evaluation**

1. Did product evaluation look at intended and unintended outcomes? Specify which outcomes were observed.

2. Did product evaluation look at positive and negative effects? Specify which effects.

3. Did product evaluation should look at short-term and long-term effects? Specify which effects.
4. Were a combination of evaluation techniques used to get a comprehensive view of the project? What techniques were used?

5. Was output measured in terms of skills transfer as well as technical development? If so, explain how.

6. Was the project considered successful in terms of skills transfer or capacity-building?

7. Was the project considered successful in terms of technical development?

8. Was the output of the project interpreted in the light of descriptions of the processes involved? If so, elaborate.

9. Are there any further observations of significance to product evaluation? If so, what are they?

**Units of Analysis**

In a qualitative design, it is necessary to specify the unit or units of analysis. Patton (1987, p. 51) stated that:

>The key factor in selecting and making decisions about the appropriate unit of analysis is to decide what unit it is that you want to be able to say something about at the end of the evaluation.

In this study, the units of analysis were the program development processes in selected rural/agricultural development projects in both the United States and selected developing countries, in which development of capacity was one of the overall goals.

The cases were selected in a purposeful, rather than a random manner. Merriam (1988, p. 47-48) stated:

>There are two basic types of sampling: probability and nonprobability sampling. Both types have been used in case study research, but nonprobability sampling is the method of choice in qualitative case studies. ... Since generalization in a statistical sense is not a goal of qualitative research, probabilistic sampling is not necessary or even justifiable in qualitative research.
Random sampling is the most familiar example of probability sampling, and purposive or purposeful sampling is the most common form of nonprobabilistic sampling (Merriam, 1988). Patton (1987), stated that in purposeful sampling, cases are chosen which are rich in information that is of main importance to the purpose of the study. The strength of purposeful sampling for qualitative research lies in the fact that it is possible to select such information-rich cases for in-depth study.

The following projects were selected on the basis of availability and wealth of information related to capacity-building, and suitability for providing a good test for the framework:

**Developing Countries**

1. Zambia: the Integrated Rural Development Project in Mpika, Chinsali and Serenje Districts (IRDP/SMC), supported by the British Overseas Development Administration (ODA).
2b. Zambia: the Integrated Rural Development Project in Northern Province (IRDP/NP) supported by the SIDA.
2c. Zambia: the Integrated Rural Development Project in Luapula Province (IRDP/LP) supported by the SIDA.
3. Sri Lanka: the Hambantota District Integrated Rural Development Program (HIRDP), supported by the Norwegian Agency for International Development (NORAD).
4. Zaire: the North Shaba Rural Development Project (Project North Shaba, PNS) supported by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).
5. Haiti: the HACHO Rural Community Development Project supported by USAID.
The United States

1. West Virginia: the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program implemented through West Virginia University's Center for Appalachian Studies and Development.

2. Iowa: Tomorrow's Leaders Today (TLT) Program supported by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and conducted by Iowa State University Cooperative Extension Service.

3. Iowa: Vision for the 90s Program conducted by Iowa State University Cooperative Extension Service.

Data Collection and Analysis

As suggested by Hakim (1987) this section provides an account of how the records were compiled and the documentation for the data extracted from the records. Evaluations and reports related to the selected projects were collected, and the documents were coded according to country and project. A list of the documents used and their codes follows:


Zamsidep 1  IRDP (Eastern Province) annual report for 1986.


The initial questions framed in the CIPP model of evaluation, and the conceptual framework were combined to form a matrix to assist in data recording and analysis (Figure 2). Initially, each project was analyzed separately, with the exception of the SIDA supported IRDPs in Zambia which were analyzed as a group. A group approach was taken to the SIDA supported projects since much of the documentation referred to the overall IRDP program supported by SIDA in Zambia. However, reference was made to individual IRDPs within the SIDA program where applicable. The contents of the documents were analyzed and categorized, using the matrix as a guide, to provide detailed descriptions of the development of each project, with particular reference to factors which either contributed to, failed to contribute to, or hindered the building of capacity. The projects in Zambia and Sri Lanka provided the richest sources of data. The documents from these projects were analyzed first to test whether the matrix was an adequate tool for handling detailed information related to capacity-building in rural development projects.

The findings from all the projects were compared and synthesized to produce a holistic view of the project development process in order to make recommendations for improving the success of the capacity-building components in rural development projects.

The Trustworthiness of Naturalistic Study

In experimental research, reliability, internal validity, objectivity, and external validity, are important in establishing the trustworthiness of the study. Four terms in naturalistic
## Project Development Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY FACTORS</th>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>INPUT</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>e.g., clear goals and objectives</td>
<td>e.g., prescribed program, procedural designs, budgets, schedules, evaluation plan</td>
<td>e.g., record of implementation, comparison of process with initial plan, monitoring procedures</td>
<td>e.g., interpretation of output in light of process, types of output data collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY BUILDING</td>
<td>e.g., objectives related to skills transfer and strengthening local institutions, indicators of capacity-building</td>
<td>e.g., capacity-building objectives reflected in design, plan to use local institutions, resources allocated</td>
<td>e.g., feedback related to capacity-building, local institutions used, resources spent on capacity-building</td>
<td>e.g., outputs related to capacity building reported, rating of success in terms of capacity-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT APPROACH</td>
<td>e.g., flexibility in goal formation</td>
<td>e.g., process or blueprint orientation, training programs planned</td>
<td>e.g., plans modified in light of process evaluation</td>
<td>e.g., plans modified in light of product evaluation, recommendations for improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL FACTORS</td>
<td>e.g., compatibility with host and donor goals, philosophies and policies, environmental factors</td>
<td>e.g., compatibility with host and donor goals, philosophies and policies, environmental factors</td>
<td>e.g., compatibility with host and donor goals, philosophies and policies, environmental factors</td>
<td>e.g., compatibility with host and donor goals, philosophies and policies, environmental factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Matrix indicating key characteristics to be considered in the analysis of the capacity-building components in rural development projects.
research which are equivalent to the terms used in experimental research are dependability, credibility, confirmability, and transferability, respectively (Guba and Lincoln, 1983). In this study, some of the suggestions listed by Guba and Lincoln (1983) and Merriam (1988) were used to help establish its trustworthiness.

A dependable naturalistic study is one which has stability and consistency after discounting the conscious, unpredictable changes made in the emergent design. In this study, the researcher provided an "audit trail" in the form of the conceptual framework, research questions, matrix, and description of the methods used and steps taken in the study, so that it could be used by other researchers as a guide for replicating the study.

In order to be credible, the researcher's analysis, formulations and interpretations must adequately represent the data provided. Qualitative data should also be confirmable, in the sense that they can be traced to their source and do not reflect any bias of the investigator. Documentary data, as used in this study, have the advantage that they are more objective than other sources of data, such as interviews and observation, since the investigator does not alter what is being studied by his/her presence (Merriam, 1988). A number of people assisted in maintaining the credibility and confirmability of this study by providing comments and suggestions at various stages in the research process. Faculty members at Iowa State University were asked to comment on the initial design, the findings as they emerged, and key methodological steps in the emergent design. The faculty members involved comprised one or more representatives from each of the following departments: Agricultural Education, Technology and Social Change, Research and Evaluation, and Family Environment. In addition, comments on the results were sought from one or more development professionals involved with the IRDPs in Zambia and Sri Lanka in order to gain a sense of whether the data and their interpretation in this study were reasonable and meaningful.
The concept of transferability refers to the degree to which the study provides sufficient description to allow the reader to make reasoned judgements about whether the information is transferable to his/her own situation. To improve the generalizability of the findings of this study, detailed description was used to provide sufficiently rich information on which people interested in the generalizability of the data could base their judgement. Also, the cases were selected in a purposeful, rather than a random manner to provide cases which were rich in information.
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to develop a framework for evaluating the capacity-building components in rural development projects, and to determine which factors contributed to the successful implementation of these components. In the process of achieving this purpose the following steps were taken:

1. The process of planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating selected rural development projects in both the United States and developing countries was described, with particular reference to capacity-building objectives.

2. The practices in the process which facilitated or constrained the building of capacity were identified.

3. Indicators of development of capacity used by the project were identified and the extent to which they were useful in measuring improved capacity of people or institutions was assessed.

4. Consideration was given as to the extent to which lessons learned from evaluation of extension work in the United States are transferable to selected developing country situations or the lessons learned from evaluation of rural development projects in developing countries are applicable to the United States or other developed country situations.

The contents of this chapter represent the results of utilizing the framework described in Chapter III to analyze and present the project development processes, with particular reference to capacity-building, as related to 10 rural development projects in five countries.

First, findings from individual projects are presented. These findings are then compared. Finally, the results are summarized.
Findings from Individual Projects

For each project, or group of projects in the case of the IRDPs supported by SIDA in Zambia, a description of the project, a matrix describing the project development process, and a summary of the key points in the project development process are provided. The sources of information are provided in the form of the document codes listed in Chapter III.

Zambia: the Integrated Rural Development Project in Moika, Chinsali and Serenie Districts (IRDP/SMC)

Description IRDP/SMC was supported by the British Overseas Development Administration (ODA). It was initiated in 1981.

Zambia's economy was based on copper. When copper prices declined in the 1970s, greater emphasis was placed upon agriculture as an important sector in the economy (Zam 4). In its Second National Development Plan (1972-1976), the Government of the Republic of Zambia (GRZ) introduced the Intensive Development Zone (IDZ) strategy, which concentrated resources in selected areas considered suitable for rapid agricultural development, in order to increase agricultural self-sufficiency and reversal of rural-urban migration. In the Third National Development Plan (1979-1983), the IDZ program was reformulated into the Integrated Rural Development Program (IRDP). The objectives of the IRDPs were to increase income for the rural poor in areas of relatively high potential, and to strengthen GRZ decentralization to the Provincial rather than the District level. By 1983, six IRDPs had been established, including IRDP/SMC (Zamod 3).

The Local Administration Act (1980) made the District Councils (DCs) responsible for district development. However, the newly formed councils were poorly prepared for the planning and implementation of programs at the district level, having inadequate
numbers of staff and weak financial and planning capacities. In addition, there was no strategy for the transfer of responsibilities from central government (Zamod 3).

The initial Project Identification Mission for IRDP/SMC was carried out by British agricultural consultants, Booker Agriculture International (BAI) and ODA in 1978 at the request of the GRZ (Zamod 1). Although the initial BAI plan, presented at the end of 1981, described a traditional rural development program largely planned and directed by expatriates, the project direction was changed before implementation, toward sustainably improving rural welfare through the development of local institutions. The program was therefore in line with the GRZ decentralization policy (Zamod 1, 3).

**Project development process**

The project development process for IRDP/SMC is represented in Table 1. The overall goal of the project was to raise the living standards in the rural areas of the districts of Serenje, Mpika, and Chinsali. This goal was to be achieved through two main strategies: the provision of capital funds for the building of infrastructure to reduce constraints on services, and the provision of technical assistance personnel to develop the capacity of the DCs to run and sustain an effective development program of services to the population (Zamod 3).

A learning process approach to development was to be taken, and the planning, coordination, and implementation of the program were to be evolved by the DCs themselves (Zamod 3). The expatriate officers were to act as catalysts. There was to be no direct intervention or implementation by the donor. All development operations were to be carried out by indigenous institutions (Zamod 1).

A Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Unit was set up within IRDP in the early stages of the project. Its purpose was to monitor the progress of the program and to provide a baseline picture of farm and household systems against which to measure progress toward
Table 1. Project development process of the Integrated Rural Development Project in Mpika, Chinsali, and Serenje Districts (IRDP/SMC), Zambia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>The Integrated Rural Development Project in Mpika, Chinsali, and Serenje Districts (IRDP/SMC), Zambia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td>provision of funding to build infrastructure to ease constraints on services, &amp; technical assistance personnel to develop capacity. Monitoring &amp; Evaluation (M&amp;E) Unit to monitor program, &amp; to provide baseline data of farm &amp; household systems against which to measure progress toward living-standard goals (Zamod 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>provision of technical assistance personnel to develop the capacity of the District Councils (DCs) to plan, implement, &amp; monitor the development program initiated by capital funds (Zamod 2). Expatriates to act only as catalysts, providing temporary support and advice to DCs. No direct intervention or implementation (Zamod 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Indicators of raised living standards included higher disposable income, reduced malnutrition, improved health, education &amp; participation, increased awareness &amp; choice, &amp; increased agricultural productivity (Zamod 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY-BUILDING</td>
<td>Immediate objective: to develop District Institutions so that they are able to run and sustain an effective development program of provision of services to the rural population (Zamod 2). Indicators: improved decision making, organizational structures, technical ability, financial capability, &amp; monitoring &amp; evaluation (Zamod 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT APPROACH</td>
<td>Objectives were stated in general terms and expressed in a causal chain (Zamod 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRDP to work in accordance with new (1980) decentralization legislation (Zam 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL GOAL</td>
<td>To raise living standards in the rural areas of the three districts: Serenje, Mpika, and Chinsali (Zamod 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROCESS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PRODUCT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive record of implementation of project kept by M&amp;E Unit. DCs submitted detailed planning documents (work programs), required for funding from IRDP. At the end of the project, a completion certificate, showing actual quantities &amp; costs for comparisons against estimates, was submitted (Zamod 3). M&amp;E Unit collected annual data on agricultural change (Zamod 2).</td>
<td>The product was interpreted in light of process. Attention was paid to constraints. Numbers of items of infrastructure completed were reported (Zamod 2, 3). Maize sales were reported (Zamod 1). Ecological and indirect effects were considered (Zamod 3). M&amp;E Unit reported changes related to project goals but provided little information on capacity-building objectives (Zamod 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCs gained capability to submit work programs for building wells, bridges etc. (1981), &amp; 3 year rolling plans (1982) (Zamod 1, 2). Rate of implementing work programs (Zamod 3) &amp; number of programs funded &amp; completed each year (Zamod 1) increased. Staffing limitations, especially in financial departments, resulted in poor monitoring &amp; delayed problem recognition (Zamod 2, 3).</td>
<td>Ability of DCs to submit accurate work programs (Zamod 1, 3), &amp; prepare quality District Development plans with little assistance from IRDP (Zamod 2, 3), seen as indicators of improved planning capability. Increased rate of implementation &amp; use of funds seen as indicators of improved implementation capability (Zamod 1, 3). Accounting problems recognized as limitations to implementation (Zamod 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on process. Coordination, planning systems &amp; subcommittees evolved (Zamod 1). &quot;Learning-by-doing&quot; approach supplemented by workshops in management &amp; development skills (Zamod 3). 1982: First 3 year rolling plan produced (Zamod 1). 1987: Limited locally raised finances &amp; lack of district control over staffing identified as threats to sustained institutional capability (Zamod 3).</td>
<td>1982: Basic systems of planning, coordination, funding, implementation, monitoring, &amp; replanning for capital development projects were established (Zamod 1). Indicators were being sought to monitor District Institutions (Zamod 3). IRDP to assist DCs to improve financial monitoring (Zamod 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors did not demand immediate physical results, Zambian government retained commitment to decentralization &amp; gave the program high status (Zamod 3). Decentralization incomplete, &amp; District Councils had no power to hire &amp; fire staff, but central government was attempting to pass legislation to allow more autonomy over staffing in 1987 (Zamod 3).</td>
<td>Approach seen as successful in terms of national impact, &amp; used as a model for IRDPs in Zambia (Zamod 3). As a result of a comparative assessment study of IRDPs (1984), all IRDPs to have a capacity-building function, operating with &amp; through Zambian institutions, particularly DCs, &amp; an infrastructure development function (Zamod 2, 4).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
living-standard goals. However, little attention was paid to the monitoring of improvement in institutional capacity or infrastructure (Zamod 2).

The strategy was carried out more or less as planned. Attention was paid to process, and the development program was carried out by the DCs which developed the capacity to produce work programs, which were detailed, costed work plans, completion certificates which showed actual quantities and costs, and longer term development plans in the form of three year rolling plans (Zamod 3). The DCs increased their rate of implementing projects as the program progressed (Zamod 1). The increased abilities of the DCs to plan and implement programs were taken as indicators of improved institutional capacity.

The M&E Unit provided an extensive record of project implementation, and collected annual data on agricultural change which related to project goals. Few data were collected related to capacity-building (Zamod 3).

During the implementation process, certain problems were identified. Many failures in implementation were due to delayed problem recognition and correction of problems. This problem was particularly true in the area of financial monitoring (Zamod 2). It was recognized that although the GRZ retained its commitment to decentralization, decentralization was incomplete, and the DCs had no power in the area of staffing, resulting in weaknesses in staffing quality and quantity, particularly in the financial departments (Zamod 1, 3). In 1987, the central government was attempting to pass legislation to allow more local autonomy over staffing (Zamod 3). Concern was expressed over the fact that the DCs were more or less dependent on central government for grants, which could result in the funding of projects bearing little relation to District priorities (Zamod 1), and in poor sustainability of institutional capability after the withdrawal of donor funds (Zamod 3). The lack of data related to capacity-building was noted, and indicators were being sought to monitor District institutions (Zamod 3).
Although IRDP/SMC was not without its problems, it was viewed as successful, and used as a model for other IRDPs in Zambia (Zamod 3). As a result of a comparative assessment study of IRDPs (1984), all IRDPs in Zambia were to have a capacity-building function, operating with and through Zambian institutions, particularly DCs, and an infrastructure development function (Zam 2, 4).

Zambia: the Integrated Rural Development Project in Eastern Province (IRDP/EP) the Integrated Rural Development Project in Northern Province (IRDP/NP), and the Integrated Rural Development Project in Luapula Province (IRDP/LP)

Description IRDP/EP, IRDP/NP, and IRDP/LP were supported by the Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA). The Intensive Development Zone Programs (IDZPs) in Eastern Province (IDZP/EP) and Northern Province (IDZP/NP) were started in 1972 and 1973 respectively, as part of the IDZ strategy explained above under the description of the IRDP in Serenje, Mpika, and Chinsali. In 1978 and 1979 respectively, IDZP/EP became IRDP/EP and IDZP/NP became IRDP/NP. Also, in 1979, IRDP/LP was started. As previously stated, the objectives of the IRDPs were to increase income for the rural poor in areas of relatively high potential, and to strengthen GRZ decentralization to the Provincial rather than the District level (Zamod 3). IRDPs EP, NP and LP were supported through the Agricultural Sector Support Program (ASSP), jointly operated by the Government of the Republic of Zambia (GRZ), and SIDA (Zamsid 1).

Project development process The project development process for IRDPs EP NP and LP is represented in Table 2. Although the IDZ and IRDP Programs had overall goals, the SIDA supported IRDPs did not start with a project document which had quantified goals, development indicators or timeframes (Zamsid 4). However, the strategies included focusing on infrastructure, and planning and implementation through local institutions
Table 2. Project development process of the Integrated Rural Development Projects in Eastern Province (IRDP/EP), Northern Province (IRDP/NP), Luapula Province (IRDP/LP), Zambia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>The Integrated Rural Development Projects in Eastern Province (IRDP/EP), Northern Province (IRDP/NP), and Luapula Province (IRDP/LP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>The program was never really defined in a project document with quantified goals, development indicators, or time frames (Zamsid 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>Strategies varied depending on donor philosophies &amp; local conditions. E.g., EP: Strategy involved improving infrastructure &amp; development planning (Zam 1). No system for continuous recording of effects of program on living standards (Zam 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY-BUILDING</td>
<td>IRDP objective to contribute to strengthening competence in Provincial &amp; District levels (Zam 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>IRDP was to be integrated into government structure at Provincial &amp; District levels (Zam 3). Planning &amp; implementation to be through local institutions (Zamod 3). Improved planning capacity seen as an important factor in the causal chain for improving living standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT APPROACH</td>
<td>Joint GRZ/SIDA Agricultural Sector Program (ASSP), to review progress annually &amp; make plans for next 2-3 years. Also, 3 quarterly reviews a year to be held (Zamsid 1). Planning process to start at lowest possible level, &amp; to follow ASSP &amp; IRDP guidelines so that suitable area plans could be made (Zamsid 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>Consistent with GRZ policies on decentralization &amp; integration (Zam 3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL GOAL**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRDPs carried out much of their intended work programs. Different approaches to integration were used, due to different understanding of concept. Need for clearer guidelines expressed (Zamsid 3). Proper monitoring system not introduced (Zamsid 4). Facilities &amp; systems for filing reports extremely poor. Reports used mainly to check if something was being done (Zamsid 6).</td>
<td>1983 evaluation stated it was not possible to carry out evaluation as thoroughly as intended due to data deficiencies: data were unavailable, the wrong kind, unreliable, or hard to find (Zamsid 3). Results could only be evaluated in very general terms due to poor monitoring (Zam 3). A number of studies collected specific data, e.g., rice production &amp; nutritional data (Zam 3, Zamsid 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All projects planned &amp; implemented through an autonomous project body (Zamod 3). Programs provincially based until 1982 (Zamsid 3). Until 1985, SIDA supported IRDPs worked largely as separate entities, with limited involvement of local government &amp; departments (Zamsid 4).</td>
<td>Development impact of IRDPs only sporadically reported, partly due to poor monitoring &amp; evaluation system (Zam 3). 1983-1984: ASSP-supported IRDPs were redirected to institution-building programs (Zamod 1). Management training provided (Zam 3). IRDP/EP to phase out direct intervention by the end of 1985 (Zamsid 2). Efforts made to add monitoring capability (Zam 3), but progress was slow (Zamsid 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with donor dependency &amp; handing over responsibility to indigenous institutions since no capacity built up (Zamod 3). Lack of accounting capacity, staff transfers, &amp; limited sources of local revenue noted as problems (Zamsid 2). Quarterly reporting not based on proper plans with objectives, targets, &amp; indicators Need to improve monitoring of activities noted (1983) (Zamsid 3).</td>
<td>IRDPs willing to restructure programs to utilize District Councils (DCs) (Zam 3). 1986: IRDPs NP&amp;LP still kept close links with Provincial level. IRDP/EP operated more or less entirely at District level &amp; below (Zamsid 3). 1987: Comprehensive review of IRDP, &amp; production of a project document with objectives &amp; indicators, in response to Annual Review (1986) (Zamsid 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local institutions did not have adequate capacity, leading to frustration, loss of effectiveness, &amp; decline of staff motivation (Zam 3). Certain DCs, e.g., Chama DC (EP), were unwilling to cooperate with IRDP procedures, resisting monitoring for accountability and training workshops (Zamsid 3, Zamsid 1).</td>
<td>1982 Annual Review: All ASSP-supported IRDPs to phase out direct implementation &amp; work through existing institutions (Zamsid 2). 1984: Comparative assessment study of IRDPs led to restructuring of all Zambian IRDPs to work through DCs (Zam 2, 4). 1986: National Development Strategy not properly formulated into detailed guidelines (Zam 3, 5). ASSP still using pressure of intervention type (Zamsid 1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This approach was in keeping with the GRZ decentralization policy (Zamod 1). Program progress was to be reviewed annually at the ASSP Annual Review, and plans for the next two to three years were to be made at this time. In addition, three quarterly reviews a year were to be held (Zamsid 1). The planning process was to start from below, at the lowest possible level, and IRDP staff were to provide information on ASSP and IRDP guidelines so that suitable area plans could be made within an overall District plan and strategy (Zamsid 2). At the planning stages, no system of monitoring and recording program progress was planned (Zam 3).

The local institutions did not have adequate capacity to perform the tasks expected, and this problem led to frustration, loss of effectiveness, and decline of staff motivation (Zam 3). Eventually, all three IRDPs were planned and implemented through an autonomous project body (Zamod 3). Programs remained provincially based until 1982 (Zamsid 3). In 1982, an Annual Review decided that all SIDA supported IRDPs should gradually phase out direct implementation, and work through existing institutions (Zamsid 2). The IRDPs were willing to redirect their activities to work through DCs (Zam 3). Even so, until 1985, SIDA supported IRDPs worked largely as separate entities, and there was limited involvement of local institutions (Zamsid 4). IRDP/EP moved faster into working entirely at the District level or below than IRDPs NP and LP, which continued to keep close links with the Provincial level (Zamsid 3).

Problems in monitoring and evaluating progress and output of the SIDA supported IRDPs arose because no efficient monitoring and recording system was established (Zamsid 3, 4, 6). There were also problems in handing over to the local institutions, since planning, implementing, and accounting capacity had not developed. In addition, there were frequent staff transfers, and locally generated revenue was limited (Zamod 3, Zamsid 2). Lack of clear guidelines led to uncertainty about the way to implement an integrated
approach (Zamsid 3). There were indications that the ASSP was still maintaining an intervention-type pressure in 1986, directing from above, and ignoring the dialog resulting from the IRDP institution building strategy (Zamsidep 1).

Efforts were made to improve monitoring capability (Zam 3), but progress was slow (Zamsid 3). In 1986, the decision was made to perform a comprehensive review of SIDA supported IRDPs, with a view to preparing a project document, which clearly stated the objectives and strategy of the overall program, and assessed the impact and development indicators to be used to direct and evaluate progress. This review was published in 1987 (Zamsid 3, 5).

**Sri Lanka: the Hambantota District Integrated Rural Development Program (HIRDP)**

**Description**  HIRDP was supported by the Norwegian Agency for International Development (NORAD). NORAD committed support to HIRDP in 1978 (Sr 7).

The program of integrated rural development (IRD) in Sri Lanka was started in the late 1970s to develop rural areas, especially those Districts not benefiting from other major national development projects, and to improve the conditions of the rural population. Originally six Districts were selected, including Hambantota. By 1984, there were 11 Districts in the IRD Program (Sr 3).

The IRD Program was to work in conjunction with the national policy of decentralization. The District was to be the administrative unit, and the intention was to use existing institutions and develop implementation capacity at the local level (SR 3).

**Project development process**  The project development process for HIRDP is represented in Table 3. The overall goal of HIRDP was to achieve an increase in income, employment, and production, as well as improvement of social living standards of the men, women, and children of the Hambantota District, with special emphasis on the poorest
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>the Hambantota District Integrated Rural Development Program (HIRDP), Sri Lanka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Aims: to achieve more balance in regional development; to improve economic opportunities; to enhance living standards; to increase local involvement and decentralization; to achieve integrated development; to maximize effectiveness of projects (Sr 2). Needs &amp; objectives were not well documented or clear, making objectives analysis difficult (Sr 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>Project was started with a few selected sub-projects before a detailed strategy was worked out (Sr 7). District Planning Unit (DPU) of Ministry of Plan Implementation given substantial authority &amp; independence as the main coordinating body (Sr 7). Before 1981, no systematic monitoring system (Sr 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY-BUILDING</td>
<td>In the project agreement, the institutional capacity-building objective was only briefly mentioned, but it was an important one throughout the project, as reflected in sub-project, annual planning, &amp; other documents (Sr 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>IRDPs to work through existing agencies (Sr 2). Both Sri Lankan government &amp; NORAD agreed to mainly rely &amp; build on existing institutions for all project functions, with only limited involvement by outside experts &amp; consultants (Sr 7). Training programs, for staff &amp; target groups at all levels, planned (Sr 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT APPROACH</td>
<td>The original project agreement (1979) between the Governments of Norway &amp; Sri Lanka proposed: an integrated multidisciplinary approach; a method of recurrent planning; concerned participation of the population; &amp; a decentralized administrative framework (Sr 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>Revolving planning process approach (Sr 2, 3). Sri Lanka responsible for implementation. Planning to be at District level (Sr 8). Detailed, project plans to be submitted annually for NORAD &amp; Ministry of Plan Implementation approval. Annual Meeting to review District Plan as a whole. Quarterly progress reports to be made (Sr 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Decentralization process was underway (Sr 8). Sri Lankan government stressed short-term investments &amp; project implementation (Sr 3, 7). Norwegian government emphasized comprehensive District planning &amp; involving local people (Sr 2, 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>Sri Lankan Government wanted a 5 year implementing plan for projects. NORAD wanted a comprehensive, integrated District Plan. Eventually, the integrated plan &amp; recurrent planning were accepted as a goal to be achieved gradually (Sr 3). Strategy in keeping with government policy of using existing agencies (Sr 2) &amp; decentralization (Sr 7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OVERALL GOAL

To achieve an increase in income, employment, & production, as well as improvement of social living standards of the men, women, & children of the Hambantota District, with special emphasis on the poorest groups (Sr 3, 7).

### PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1979-1981: Program started by implementing a few selected projects, e.g., irrigation schemes, &amp; by building infrastructure for program, e.g., offices, training center etc. No overall planning integration. 1981: Annual meeting stated concern over lack of well functioning monitoring system. 1979-1984: Projects became smaller in scale &amp; more related to felt needs (Sr 3).</th>
<th>1981-1983: Much of major infrastructural work completed (Sr 3). 1984: NORAD Review process rather than product oriented (Sr 3). Initially, reporting not consistent or complete (Sr 3). The DPU continued to work on its system &amp; include a monitoring element for inputs, outputs &amp; effects in project proposals (Sr 1). 1985: Slow progress in monitoring &amp; evaluation noted (Sr 3).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in organizational, planning, &amp; implementing capacity noted (Sr 3). DPU sometimes had to be implementing agency to get projects started &amp; reach the poorest people (Sr 3, 7). Capacity-building first aimed at improved performance in District government departments, through improved physical facilities &amp; training. Later, voluntary &amp; semi-public organizations were included (Sr 7).</td>
<td>Impact of IRDPs in building up line agencies in terms of infrastructure &amp; performance noted (Sr 8). Utilization of funds used as indicator of implementing capacity (Sr 1). The large number of institutions involved in HIRDP benefited from institution-building measures. Scope for capacity-building grew with the increasing comprehensiveness of HIRDP, &amp; stronger involvement of groups in the project development process (SR 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981: First 3 year rolling plan produced. Implementing agencies not involved, &amp; plans not implemented (Sr 3). Popular participation in project decision making improved (Sr 2). 1983-1985: Planning occurring at sub-District levels (Sr 3). The large number of reviews held facilitated revolving planning (Sr 3). Training programs took place (Sr 3).</td>
<td>A gradual decentralization of power took place, &amp; a wide range of institutions became involved. Participation by beneficiaries increased. Learning was an important feature for decentralization (Sr 7). There was a shift in planning to cater to target or poorer groups, &amp; from infrastructure to production (Sr 1). Beneficiary involvement, &amp; training of local teachers &amp; officers facilitated choice of appropriate projects (Sr 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited expenditure on project by Sri Lankan government slowed progress &amp; integration (Sr 3). HIRDP understaffed (Sr 4). Poor horizontal linkages with line agencies at sub-District level led to problems in coordination, implementation &amp; monitoring. DPU sometimes by-passed line agencies &amp; acted as implementing agency (Sr 8). Line agencies did not perceive HIRDP projects to be theirs (Sr 7).</td>
<td>No deadline set for terminating the project. It was expected to continue into the 1990s. It was noted that sustained innovative capacity after the project period would depend on a strong DPU with substantial authority (Sr 7). Concept of a more comprehensive plan for the District did not gain acceptance at the national government level until early 1985 (Sr 3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
groups (Sr 3, 7). The project agreement only briefly referred to the objective of institutional capacity-building. However, this objective was an important one throughout the project (Sr 7).

The governments of Sri Lanka and Norway had different perspectives on the approach to be taken. The Sri Lankan government favored short-term investments, and problem-solving and implementation by District Officers. The Norwegian government emphasized comprehensive District planning, and involving village people. Eventually the idea of an integrated plan and recurrent planning was accepted as a goal to be achieved gradually (Sr 3). Both governments agreed on the strategy of working through local institutions (Sr 2). Training was to play an important part in building capacity in staff and target groups at all levels (Sr 7).

The District Planning Unit (DPU) of the Ministry of Plan Implementation was given substantial authority and independence, and became the main coordinating body for HIRDP (Sr 7). Planning was to be carried out at the District level (Sr 8). The Sri Lankan government was to be responsible for implementing project plans, which were submitted annually for NORAD and Ministry of Plan implementation approval. The District Plan as a whole was to be reviewed at the Annual Meeting. In addition, quarterly progress reports were to be made (Sr 3). However, a systematic system of monitoring was not planned in the initial stages (Sr 1).

HIRDP was started in 1979 with six sectoral projects (Sr 6). Unlike other IRDPs, there was no blueprint plan. From the beginning, the development approach was that of a learning-process, revolving plan approach (Sr 6). Such an approach was intended to involve community focused planning, active participation of different local level officers, and active participation of the community (Sr 5). However, initially, participation in project decision making was limited. When the DPU began its initiatives in 1981, there
were poor horizontal linkages with the line agencies at sub-District level, which caused
difficulties in coordination, implementation and monitoring of projects. The DPU
sometimes found it necessary to by-pass the line agencies and act as the implementing
agency in order to get projects started and reach the poorest people. The line agencies did
not perceive that they had ownership of the HIRDP projects and were therefore reluctant to
implement them (Sr 7, 8).

Over the next few years, a gradual decentralization of power took place (Sr 7), and
improvements occurred in organizational, planning, and implementing capacity (Sr 3).
Capacity-building approaches were extended to include not only District government
departments, but also a wide range of voluntary and semi-public organizations (Sr 7).
Popular participation in project decision making increased (Sr 2), and planning took place
at sub-district levels (Sr 3). Training took place at all levels and was an important feature in
the capacity-building process (Sr 3, 4). As the program progressed, projects became
smaller in scale, and more related to felt needs (Sr 3). There was a shift in planning to cater
to target or poorer groups, and to emphasize production rather than infrastructure (Sr 1).
By 1985, the concept of a comprehensive plan for the District had gained acceptance (Sr 3).

Many reviews of the project were conducted which assisted in revolving planning,
but problems were faced in evaluating the output of HIRDP due to the lack of systematic
monitoring (Sr 3). Although attempts were made to improve the monitoring and evaluation
system, progress was slow (Sr 3). Limited expenditure on the project by the Sri Lankan
government (Sr 3), and understaffing of HIRDP (Sr 4) slowed progress. It was predicted
that sustained innovative capacity after the project period would depend on a strong District
Planning Unit which had substantial authority (Sr 7).
Zaire: the North Shaba Rural Development Project (Project North Shaba, PNS)

Description PNS was supported by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). It is described in document Zai 1. The first Project Agreement was signed by USAID and the Government of Zaire in 1976. This agreement was initially for six years, but a 1980 amendment extended the project for another year. In 1983, the project was extended for further three years. PNS was supported by funds from USAID and the Government of Zaire.

The Government of Zaire wanted a controlled collective farming project, with high levels of inputs such as fertilizer to achieve high levels of food production. USAID wanted an integrated rural development project run in cooperation with small-scale farmers. This tension between host and donor is reflected in the goals and objectives of the project, which were modified over the life of the project from food production to institutional development and sustained agricultural production and marketing.

Project development process The project development process for PNS is shown in Table 4. The changing goals and objectives of the project led to confusion over whether the main priority was to be overall development or agricultural production. The objectives failed to clarify whether the farmer groups were to be broad-based village organizations focusing on development actions or primarily economic entities focused on economic gain.

The project was to be designed and implemented as a semi-autonomous public sector entity. Due to the isolated location of the project, the process-oriented contractor was given relative independence for day to day project decisions. The strategy was to create sustainable development by working with small-scale farmers. The plan included six subsections: research-adaptation-extension, farmer group productivity, intermediate technology, marketing and credit, infrastructure, and data collection and analysis. The research-adaptation-extension subsection was to be responsible for collecting technical
Table 4. Project development process of the North Shaba Rural Development Project (PNS), Zaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>North Shaba Rural Development Project (PNS), Zaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td>Objectives changed over life of PNS: 1976: To identify an effective rural development process for improving small farmer production &amp; income. 1980: To increase small farmer income by 75% as a result of raising maize. 1983: To develop institutions that can sustain increased production &amp; marketing of agricultural produce (Zai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>Plan included 6 subsections: Research-adaptation-extension to collect technical data; farmer group productivity; intermediate technology; marketing &amp; credit; infrastructure; data collection &amp; analysis for monitoring &amp; evaluation. Project Management Unit (PMU) to prepare financial reports. No baseline data collected (Zai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY-BUILDING</td>
<td>Targets were set for infrastructure &amp; production but process was not to be measured at all. 1983 objective was to develop institutions that could sustain increased production &amp; marketing of agricultural produce. Objectives did not clarify whether farmer groups should be focused on village development or on income &amp; economic gain (Zai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>Zairians eventually to be in charge. 40 pre-cooperative groups to be formed &amp; organized into 25 farmer councils. 75 farmer centers to be formed. Farmer groups to be encouraged to carry out basic services. Evaluation to assess assumption of responsibility, &amp; capability of sustaining development. Little training planned (Zai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT APPROACH</td>
<td>Changing goals could be attributed to lack of long-term strategy or to flexibility in redesigning activities in response to changing circumstances. Project lacked overall focus (Zai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>To be a semi-autonomous public sector entity. One US contractor for design &amp; implementation, with relative independence for project decisions. Strategy to create sustainable development by working with small-scale farmers. Flexible project design to allow for modifications (Zai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Lack of consensus among Government of Zaire, USAID, &amp; contractor on whether the main priority should be food production or rural development. Government wanted controlled collective farming with high levels of input; USAID wanted an integrated rural development project with small-scale farmers. The contractor was process-oriented (Zai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>Funding was to come from USAID &amp; Government of Zaire. Isolated location-contractor given independence for day to day decisions, &amp; financial &amp; administrative management. Government of Zaire structure reached to farmer level but had insufficient capacity to be used. (Zai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>1983: To achieve self-sufficiency in food production (Zai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCESS</td>
<td>PRODUCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational activities overshadowed information collection &amp; evaluation. Problems: Inadequate guidelines &amp; inexperienced staff. Monitoring &amp; evaluation improved over project life but effective use of data for management not achieved. Until 1983: no budgeting procedures or documentation. Financial recording increased over the life of the project. After 1983, subsystems were able to produce project costs (Zai 1).</td>
<td>Short-term production &amp; marketing successes noted. Quantities reported as quantities &amp; percentages of targets. Data collection &amp; analysis subsection provided household information &amp; village profiles used in presentations. Mixed success in other subsections: Farmer group &amp; intermediate technology subsystems, &amp; research element of research-adaptation-extension subsystem dropped (Zai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Zairian staff not assigned to project till half way through. Expatriates continued to take major responsibility while Zairians took a less aggressive management role. Farmer group subsection was dropped. Training programs were inadequate. Little training for Zairian staff. PNS management tried to delegate authority to mid-level management &amp; field agents, but confusion arose over change in objectives (Zai 1).</td>
<td>1984: 38 of the proposed 40 farmer groups &amp; 60 of the proposed 75 farmer centers were formed. Crisis management and delegation may have resulted in improvements in mid-level management since decisions had to be made. Contractor personnel moved into roles of advisors &amp; counselors instead of directors (Zai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong internal project linkages but poor linkage with national government level. Some linkage with USAID-PNS was reviewed at USAID quarterly meetings. Crisis management occurred, with little forward planning. Decision making not based on information analysis. Contractor did not provide quality financial management technical assistance so financial information limited (Zai 1).</td>
<td>Specific approaches to sustain project subsystems after USAID support ended never explained in any official documents. In conversation, Government of Zaire officials indicated that they assumed that USAID support would continue if the project was well managed—this assumption was false (Zai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension between product &amp; process goals grew as process was emphasized, affecting all levels of management. Certain ethnic groups hostile to government or opposed to farmer group formation. Government failed to meet proposed funding levels. Government provided well trained, experienced staff but there was no qualified Zairian to fill the financial management position until 1983 (Zai 1).</td>
<td>Private company owned by ex-colonial Belgian interests to take over management of project when donor pulled out since there was insufficient capacity for the project to be integrated into the government structure. Continuation on a semi-autonomous basis was not considered. Private company takeover was opposed by contractor, but supported by USAID &amp; Government of Zaire (Zai 1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
data, and the data collection and analysis subsection was to collect data for project monitoring and evaluation. The Project Management Unit (PMU) was to prepare financial reports.

During the implementation stage, operational activities took priority over information collection and evaluation. Although there was some improvement over the life of the project, the information generated was inadequate for monitoring and evaluation purposes, and decision making was not based on information analysis. The project was operated under crisis management and there was little forward planning. Contractor personnel failed to hand over responsibility for management of the project to Zairian staff until late in the project. The Zairian government provided well trained, experienced staff, but the project failed to provide adequate ongoing training for project personnel. Some attempt was made to delegate authority to mid-level management, but confusion over changing project objectives hindered progress in this direction. Although linkages within the project were good, there was poor linkage with the government at the national level. Some linkage with USAID was maintained as the project was reviewed at quarterly meetings.

The different subsections of the project met with mixed success. Farmer groups and farmer centers were formed. However, the farmer group subsection of the project was dropped, as was the intermediate technology subsection. The research element of the research-adaptation-extension subsection failed because of a lack of trained personnel, and was also dropped. The data collection and analysis subsection produced some household information and village profiles which were used in presentations on agricultural progress.

Some improvement may have occurred in the management ability of mid-level personnel, since under crisis management they were forced to make decisions. Although no other progress was noted in terms of capacity-building, short-term production and
marketing successes were recorded in terms of absolute quantities and percentages of targets.

Constraints to project success included the tension between product and process goals which continued throughout the life of the project, the opposition of certain ethnic groups to the government and the formation of farmer groups, and the failure of the government to meet proposed funding levels.

As the life of the project came to a close, there was insufficient institutional capacity for the project to be integrated into the government structure, and negotiations for its takeover by a private company owned by ex-colonial Belgian interests were held. This takeover was supported by the Government of Zaire and USAID, but opposed by the contractor.

**Haiti: the HACHO Rural Community Development Project supported by USAID**

**Description** The HACHO Rural Community Development Project was initiated in 1966, through a grant to the Cooperative Agency for American Relief Everywhere Inc. (CARE), and was supported for most of its life by USAID. It is described in document Hai 1. Although the name of the project was changed in 1979 to Harmonisation de l'Action des Communautés Hatien res Organisees, HACHO originally stood for Haitian-American Community Help Organization, and the project was best known by its acronym.

The original aim of the project was to help the development of communities in the areas of health, education, nutrition, and agricultural production with the active participation of the interested population. The area chosen for development was the rural Northwest. The Government of Haiti (GOH) had a policy of centralization which concentrated authority in Port-au-Prince, and there was a lack of Government presence in the Northwest. The area also had very poor infrastructure and basic services. USAID
continually pressed the GOH to make HACHO a regional agency, responsible for integrated rural development in the area. Because of this pressure, the goals of the project changed over its life. In addition, since HACHO was one of the few organizations in the area, it was called upon to be a vehicle for providing disaster relief. The objective of providing relief was in conflict with the capacity-building objective of the project, since the provision of relief skewed the development efforts toward nonsustainable projects.

Project development process The project development process for HACHO is shown in Table 5. The focus of the objectives of the project changed over its life from community development, health, nutrition, and agricultural production (1966), to coordination of drought aid provided by USAID (1968), to nutrition, agriculture, community development, and integration with GOH structure (1972 and 1974), to agriculture and capacity-building (1977). Since 1966, one objective was to encourage self-help and community organization.

The strategy selected for the project was one in which community development was to be a guided self-help process with HACHO workers acting as facilitators. HACHO was to be an autonomous organization administered by CARE and headed by a Haitian technical director, who was to be both a health and community development specialist. The project was to have its headquarters in Port-au-Prince. A regional office was to be responsible for project operations and maintenance. The headquarters and the regional office had authority for approval of expenditure and project review. It was not till the mid 1970s that the GOH provided funding for HACHO and entered negotiations to acknowledge it as a semi-autonomous body.

HACHO interpreted its mandate to focus on health and health-related activities such as the provision of health clinics, mobile clinics and nutrition centers. The project started by providing health services in one small town. Eventually it expanded geographically.
Table 5. Project development process of the HACHO Rural Community Development Project, Haiti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>The HACHO Rural Community Development Project, Haiti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>1966: HACHO interpreted mandate to focus on health &amp; health-related activities, e.g., provision of health clinics, mobile clinics, nutrition centers. No system for monitoring &amp; evaluation set up (Hai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>1966: The objective was to encourage self-help &amp; community organization. 1972 &amp; 1974: Explicit focus on integration with Government of Haiti (GOH) activities &amp; building HACHO into a regional development agency. 1977: Focus on building of organizational capacity (Hai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY-BUILDING</td>
<td>Community development was to be a guided self-help process with HACHO workers acting as facilitators (Hai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT APPROACH</td>
<td>HACHO to be an autonomous agency administered by CARE &amp; headed by a Haitian technical director. Headquarters to be in Port-au-Prince. Regional office was to be in charge of operations &amp; maintenance. Headquarters &amp; regional office had authority for approval of expenditure &amp; project review (Hai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Lack of GOH presence, basic services &amp; infrastructure in Northwest. HACHO started with funds from the Cooperative Agency for American Relief Everywhere Inc. (CARE) &amp; USAID. 1972: USAID pressure to focus on agriculture &amp; integration. 1976: German Government collaborated with HACHO &amp; funded agricultural activities (Hai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GOH practiced a policy of centralization to concentrate authority in Port-au-Prince. USAID pressure to make HACHO a regional agency to undertake integrated rural development in the Northwest. Mid 1970s: USAID pressure led to financial support of HACHO by GOH, &amp; discussions on recognizing HACHO as a semi-autonomous body (Hai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL GOAL</td>
<td>PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1966</strong>: To help the development of the communities in the areas of health, education, &amp; agricultural production with active participation of the population.</td>
<td>Project started by providing health services in one small town. It expanded geographically, &amp; expanded sectorally into community organization &amp; road construction. It later expanded into agricultural extension, irrigation, potable water, &amp; handicrafts. Emphasis remained on health &amp; nutrition. Reporting systems inconsistent, preventing comparisons over time in terms of projects planned, in progress, or completed (Hai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1974</strong>: To strengthen the framework for development in the rural Northwest, &amp; to turn over progressively responsibility for HACHO to the Government.</td>
<td>Community Councils were formed &amp; became the major mechanism through which HACHO tried to operate in all sectoral development activities. Some integration achieved by secondment of GOH sectoral technicians to HACHO, &amp; by staff holding joint GOH/HACHO positions. No specific set of activities focused on improving HACHO's management performance (Hai 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1977</strong>: To develop self-sustaining community councils capable of implementing projects in agriculture, health, &amp; rural infrastructure (Hai 1).</td>
<td>Apart from provision of health services, nearly all HACHO's activities, to achieve both relief &amp; community development goals, were carried out in collaboration with Community Councils, using a small project mode of operation. USAID advisors were purely administrative. 1976 evaluation suggestions for organizational improvements did not lead to a change in HACHO structure or practices (Hai 1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HACHO** was one of few organizations operating in the area. It became the focus for residents seeking help, & for donors looking for a means of providing assistance. Periodically, HACHO was asked to coordinate disaster relief to provide emergency services. Relief & capacity-building goals were in conflict. Relief efforts reduced the time available for spending on institutionalization process (Hai 1). **1979**: USAID funding terminated. **1982**: GOH abolished HACHO, & incorporated functions & activities into the newly formed Organization for the Development of the Northwest (ODNO). ODNO was to absorb HACHO's personnel & resources, with the exception of the top management (Hai 1).
Although it expanded sectorally into community organization, road construction, agricultural extension, irrigation, potable water, and handicraft projects, the main emphasis of the project always remained on health and nutrition.

HACHO was responsible for the formation of Community Councils. By the mid to late 1970s, there were 212 Councils in the region. This number was gradually reduced to 106. Apart from provision of health services, nearly all HACHO's activities, whether focused on relief or community development objectives, were carried out in collaboration with the Community Councils in the form of small projects.

Although it could be seen that the creation of health services, building of infrastructure including roads, formation of Community Councils, and conducting of sectoral projects were carried out by HACHO, it was very difficult to assess the results of the project due to the almost complete lack of baseline, input, output, or management records. The records which did exist were often incomplete or inappropriate.

Some degree of integration was achieved on the project through the secondment of GOH sectoral technicians to HACHO, and the holding of joint GOH/HACHO appointments by some of the staff. Increasing interaction with GOH field staff occurred over the life of the project as the GOH established a greater presence in the area. USAID funding was terminated in 1979 after allowing a relatively short time for institutionalization to take place. In 1982 the GOH abolished HACHO and incorporated its functions into the newly formed Organization for the Development of the Northwest (ODNO). ODNO was to absorb HACHO's resources and all but its top management personnel.

**West Virginia: the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program**

**Description**  The Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program was implemented through West Virginia University's Center for Appalachian Studies and
Development in 1970. It was a pilot program which was evaluated after its first two years in document WV 1. Its purpose was to attempt to utilize a broad range of university resources to support community development efforts in two West Virginia counties, Randolph and Upshur.

**Project development process** The project development process of the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program is represented in Table 6. The objectives of the program were related to the achievement of more efficient utilization of existing federal and state resources, and the acquisition of additional resources in order to improve community facilities, services, and economic conditions. In addition, the objectives were to develop a more effective relationship between the community and West Virginia University, and to develop community development (CD) programs in West Virginia. The program aimed to develop a CD process based on local responsibility, initiative, and decision making, and to stimulate the development of organizational structures and capacity.

The strategy involved the integration of university teaching, research and extension functions on a university-wide basis to provide support in areas such as health, education, transport, and housing. This type of integration was different from the traditional procedures and relationships established at the university. In order for it to be successfully established, changes in attitude would be necessary. In addition, new and expanded interdisciplinary and inter-institutional linkages would have to be developed.

Evaluative research on both process and outcome was to be an integral part of the program. Existing data sources, such as health, education, and employment records, were used to provide baseline data and facts from which to identify problems.

Using an emergent approach, the program was to be integrated into existing structures by the channelling of organized, locally supported CD programs through the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>The Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program, West Virginia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td>Objectives related to: Achieving more effective acquisition &amp; organization of federal &amp; state resources to improve community facilities, services, &amp; economic conditions; developing a more effective relationship between the community &amp; West Virginia University; developing community development (CD) programs in West Virginia (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>Strategy involved the integration of university teaching, research &amp; extension functions on a university-wide basis. Key areas to include health, education, transport, &amp; housing. Evaluative research on both process &amp; outcome to be an integral part of the program. Existing data sources used to make data profiles (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Objectives included: To create a CD process based on local responsibility, initiative &amp; decision making; to stimulate the development of organizational structures and capacity needed to undertake CD efforts on an ongoing basis; to make an impact on the counties lasting beyond the period of university involvement (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY-BUILDING</td>
<td>CD to be a joint effort between citizens &amp; the university. Task-oriented citizen groups to be formed to work on immediate problems. The university was to take a mainly supportive role, but it was to be able to take initiative too. Monthly review &amp; training sessions were to provide support &amp; informal training for county staff (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT APPROACH</td>
<td>On a pilot program basis, CD was to be integrated within the existing structure, by channelling organized, locally supported CD programs through County Extension Offices. Using an emergent approach, county agents were to act as a team, sharing responsibility for CD. Strong local citizen participation &amp; control were to be stressed (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Constraining factors in the community included a narrow view of, &amp; a piecemeal approach to, CD, lack of financial resources, &amp; leadership &amp; development skills (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The rapport of extension agents with citizens was already established. Extension agents had to expand their roles to CD. An integrated, university-wide approach conflicted with traditional procedures &amp; relationships. An attitude change, &amp; new &amp; expanded, interdisciplinary &amp; inter-institutional linkages were needed (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL GOAL</strong></td>
<td>To provide new choices &amp; a general improvement in quality of living for the citizens of Randolph and Upshur Counties (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROCESS</strong></td>
<td>Efforts were begun 3 months ahead of plan. Data were collected systematically during the pilot program through observation of meetings, conferences, training sessions etc., interviews with citizens, program staff members, &amp; university faculty, &amp; study of program documents &amp; records. Orientation meetings for county extension staff were carried out (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRODUCT</strong></td>
<td>Outcomes in the form of specific community improvements were fewer &amp; less extensive than hoped, but some success was achieved, &amp; future improvements were expected. In less than 2 years, medical system, nursing home, school health, &amp; cultural arts projects had been implemented (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Randolph used the existing Randolph County Planning Commission as the citizen group. Upshur had no established group. Eventually, problems were identified, &amp; committees were formed at public meetings. 3 community efforts were initiated by the university, but only one got community support. Monthly reviews were the primary vehicle for program direction &amp; leadership, &amp; staff development &amp; training (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews indicated that greater insight into opportunities, problems and requirements of CD had been generated in program staff. Sustained and extensive mobilization of community resources were not achieved as hoped. Failure to generate &amp; maintain local support for specific projects was noted. The early start to the project reduced the opportunity for developing community support (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As the program developed, extension staff effectively shared CD responsibilities. Sometimes agents had to take a leadership role to maintain sustainability. A need for local leadership training was expressed. Divergent projects with little obvious relationship between them were implemented (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Although CD on the scale hoped for was not achieved, a community development process was begun, community services were created &amp; improved, some citizen committees were functioning successfully, &amp; new experiences were being gained by participants in the process. Interagency cooperation increased (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pressure to begin the program rapidly had undesirable results. County staff &amp; citizens were not clearly identified as responsible for the program, since area/state leaders &amp; the university took a prominent role at the start. Problem identification &amp; committee formation were rushed. University support was less than intended. Tension existed between planning orientation of university &amp; crisis management of citizen groups (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor timing of organizational efforts at community level, unclear definition of the university-community relationship, limited non-extension university support, conflicts between local organizations, &amp; local &amp; university staff turnovers were named as major constraining factors to project success (WV 1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
County Extension Offices. Task-oriented citizen groups were to be formed to identify and work on solutions to immediate problems. The university was to take mainly a supportive role, but allowance was made for it to initiate projects as well. County extension agents were to act as a team, sharing responsibility for Community Development. However, strong local citizen participation and control were to be emphasized. Monthly review and training sessions involving county staff, the area director, and evaluation staff were to be held to focus on the progress and problems of the CD effort, and provide support and informal training for county extension agents.

Interest and pressure at the university level resulted in the program being initiated three months ahead of the planned time. Randolph utilized the existing Randolph County Planning Commission as the citizen group. Upshur had no established group. Problem identification and committee formation took place at public meetings, which were at first poorly attended. The university initiated three projects, but only one received community support.

Local citizen committees were formed, and a number of these carried out their functions successfully, initiating a number of projects including emergency medical, nursing home, school health, and cultural arts projects. However, a number of constraints to the CD process were identified. The early initiation of the program led to the increased prominence of university and area staff in the early stages. As a result, county staff and citizens were not clearly identified as responsible for the the program, and citizens expected the university to play a more prominent role. In addition, the early start reduced the opportunity for building community support for the program before it was initiated. Changes in university structure and development of interdisciplinary and interinstitutional linkages did not occur readily, and university involvement was less than intended. Tension existed between the planning orientation of the university and the crisis management.
orientation of the citizen groups. Occasionally there was conflict between community groups.

The county extension agents had the advantage that they had already established rapport with the members of the community. However they faced the challenge of expanding their roles to include Community Development. The monthly reviews became important for establishing program direction and leadership, and providing staff development and training. As the program developed, extension staff effectively shared CD responsibilities. At times, agents had to take a leadership role to sustain a project. A need for local leadership training was expressed. Staff turnovers at both the local and university level hindered progress.

Evaluation of the program revealed that sustainable community development on the scale envisaged was not achieved, but that the community development process had been started, promising new community organizations had been formed, tangible improvements in community services were made, and participants were exposed to new experiences. The evaluation was optimistic that further progress would be achieved in the future.

**Iowa: Tomorrow's Leaders Today (TLT) Program**

**Description** The TLT program was supported by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and conducted by Iowa State University (ISU) Cooperative Extension Service (Iowa CES). W. K. Kellogg Foundation approval for funding a project to vitalize small rural communities through leadership development was granted in August 1987. The project was developed in response to the farm and rural crisis of the 1980s (IATLT 1).

**Project development process** The project development process for the TLT program is represented in Table 7. The aim of the program was to change the capacity of the local human resource base, to enable it to make decisions and mobilize resources to
Table 7. Project development process of the Tomorrow's Leaders Today (TLT) Program, Iowa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>Tomorrow's Leaders Today (TLT) Program, Iowa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td>INPUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Objectives included: To provide an intensive educational experience for emerging community leaders; to enable community leaders to mobilize resources to resolve the priority issues identified by the citizens of the community; to multiply the human resources who can assist rural communities by training a group of leaders (IATLT 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY-BUILDING</td>
<td>Objectives of the intensive educational experience were to improve leadership skills, broaden the vision of the possibilities for rural revitalization, help participants explore and learn the community development (CD) process, &amp; give direction to participants' efforts on the basis of issue identification in their own communities (IATLT 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT APPROACH</td>
<td>The intent was to experiment with the concept of networking small communities, either as a cluster of small communities within a relatively small geographic area, or as a set of similar sized communities that were geographically dispersed (IATLT 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Iowa State University (ISU) Cooperative Extension Service (Iowa CES) to implement program using a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation (IATLT 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL GOAL</td>
<td>To change the capacity of the local human resource base, which in turn can make decisions &amp; mobilize resources to create new opportunities and relationships (IATLT 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCESS</td>
<td><strong>PROCESS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process of implementation documented in detail. By late 1987, TLT had its name, PS, implementation &amp; advisory committees, marketing strategy, tentative curriculum &amp; application process. 15 applications, representing 68 communities (20% of the eligible communities) in the targeted region of the state, were received. 3 clusters involving 18 communities were chosen as a pilot project (IATLT 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PRODUCT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most process objectives were well exceeded by Iowa CES in the first year (1987-1988). First year emphasis on formative evaluation. External reviews planned. Formative review teams to review program content &amp; progress. Substantive review teams to be used one to two years later to evaluate sustainability of program &amp; whether it had improved economic conditions or quality of life (IATLT 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum outline of 50 hours of instruction by more than 20 speakers &amp; 20 panel discussants, in 11 sessions produced. First classes for 92 individuals began in late March, &amp; were scheduled to run to December 1988. In addition, a 2 day retreat was held on ISU campus involving all 3 clusters of communities &amp; input from Faculty &amp; Extension experts. Community work experiences also planned (IATLT 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires from first session contained favorable responses from participants. Pre-test/post-test evaluation of participants was planned to assess participants' level of participation in organizations, self-assessment of own leadership skills &amp; confidence as potential leaders, &amp; personal &amp; social characteristics (IATLT 1). Communities involved in the program were initiating CD projects (IATLT 2, 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad hoc &amp; informal work groups evolved from the implementation team. Coordination was maintained through monthly meetings of the full implementation team. The market research &amp; selection process helped identify suitable communities. The advisory committee advice to receive only cluster applications in the second round of applications was followed. Modifications were made in light of participant input (IATLT 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New concepts &amp; methods in program delivery &amp; design emerged, including: Pictorial description of community action objectives; clustering of communities; the Cluster Action Model for implementation of joint action by a group of communities; team building by production of slide shows of communities by teams of participants. Additional program objectives were to be met in the future (IATLT 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest in TLT efforts grew &amp; information was disseminated to other large institutions (IATLT 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa CES was enthusiastic about the TLT program &amp; expected to continue it upon completion of W. K. Kellogg Foundation grant (IATLT 1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
create new opportunities and relationships in the community. This aim was to be met by providing an intensive educational experience for emerging community leaders to improve leadership skills, broaden the vision of the possibilities for rural revitalization, help participants explore and learn the community development (CD) process, and give direction to participants' efforts on the basis of issue identification in their own communities. In addition, the intent was to experiment with the concept of networking small communities, either as a cluster of small communities within a relatively small geographic area, or as a set of similar sized communities that were geographically dispersed (IATLT 1).

Process objectives, or steps necessary to achieve the program objectives, included hiring a project specialist, establishing a design and implementation committee, completing a market research within a small community, identifying communities and participants, hiring a communication specialist, setting dates for the first class, designing evaluation instruments, and gathering baseline data (IATLT 1).

The project specialist and the design and implementation committee, comprising campus staff and faculty, and Extension field staff from varied backgrounds, were to plan and direct the project. The advisory committee, comprising local community leaders or agency personnel actively involved in rural development efforts outside Iowa CES was to review and advise on the development and implementation of the program. A curriculum work group was to develop details of subject matter, speakers, and methods of instruction to be used in classes for emerging leaders. Ad hoc work groups were to develop curriculum materials for classes. Focus groups (input teams) were to be used to identify issues, concerns, and emerging leaders in specific communities. In addition, they were to be utilized to disseminate information about TLT (IATLT 1).

The implementation process is documented in detail in IATLT 1. By late 1987, TLT had been given its name, a project specialist had been hired, implementation and advisory
committees had been formed, and a marketing strategy, tentative curriculum, and application process had been developed. Five applications, representing 68 communities and one-fifth of the eligible communities in the targeted region of state, were received. Market research and the selection process resulted in three clusters involving 18 communities being chosen for participation in a pilot project.

A curriculum outline of 50 hours of instruction, to be provided by more than 20 speakers and 20 panel discussants in 11 sessions, was produced. The first classes for 92 people began in late March 1988, and were scheduled to run to December 1988. In addition, a two day retreat, involving all three clusters of communities and input from Faculty and Extension experts, was held on ISU campus. Community work experiences for participants were also planned (IATLT 1).

For the first year, emphasis was placed on formative evaluation. Most process objectives were well exceeded by Iowa CES in the first year (1987-1988). External reviews were planned to begin in 1989. Formative review teams would review program content and progress, and substantive review teams would be used one to two years later to evaluate the sustainability of program and to assess whether it had improved economic conditions or quality of life (IATLT 1).

Questionnaires from the first session contained favorable responses from participants. In addition, communities involved in the program initiated CD projects (IATLT 2, 3). More detailed assessment of the program was to be made by utilizing a pre-test/post-test evaluation of participants to assess their level of participation in organizations, self-assessment of their own leadership skills and confidence as potential leaders, and personal and social characteristics (IATLT 1).

As the program progressed, new concepts and methods in program delivery and design emerged. Innovations included the pictorial description of community action
objectives; clustering of communities; the Cluster Action Model for implementation of joint action by a group of communities; and team building by production of slide shows of communities by teams of participants (IATLT 1).

Iowa CES was enthusiastic about the TLT program, and expected to continue it upon completion of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation grant. Plans were in process to meet more of the program objectives. Interest in TLT efforts grew, and information was disseminated to other large institutions (IATLT 1).

Iowa: Vision for the 90s Program

Description The Vision for the 90s Program was conducted by Iowa State University (ISU) Cooperative Extension Service (Iowa CES) in response to the farm and rural crisis of the 1980s. The overall aim of the program was to assist rural leaders in visioning, planning, implementing, and evaluating activities to enhance the social and economic structure of their communities. This goal was in keeping with the mission of Iowa CES (IAVIS 1).

Project development process The project development process for the Vision for the 90s program is represented in Table 8. The specific objectives of the program involved the provision of a forum for rural and urban leaders to focus on how changing economic and social realities were impacting the delivery of services and the provision of facilities for the people of the community or county. Interaction about these trends and impacts was to be fostered, and it was hoped that participating leaders would be able to develop an action-oriented vision and identify strategies that would guide a revitalization process in the local community or county over the next 10 years. The program also aimed to identify local potential, emerging, and practising leaders, and to facilitate identification and prioritization of adjustments needed in the provision of community services and facilities (IAVIS 1, 2).
Table 8. Project development process of the Vision for the 90s Program, Iowa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>The Vision for the 90s Program, Iowa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Objectives included: To provide a forum for rural &amp; urban leaders to focus on how changing economic &amp; social realities are impacting the delivery of services &amp; the provision of facilities for the people of the community/county; to foster leader interaction about these trends &amp; impacts (IAVIS 1, 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>Strategy: To present a workshop to be presented in about 5 hours in one day or two evenings (IAVIS 1). Nine months later, a random selection of participants to be asked to evaluate the program (IAVIS 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY-BUILDING</td>
<td>Objectives included: To enable participating leaders to develop an action-oriented vision, &amp; to identify strategies that will guide a revitalization process in the local community/county over the next 10 years; to identify community/county potential, emerging &amp; practising leaders (IAVIS 1, 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>Extension agents to act as facilitators in certain follow-up activities (IAVIS 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT APPROACH</td>
<td>Objectives included: to facilitate identification &amp; prioritization of adjustments needed in the provision of community services &amp; facilities (IAVIS 1, 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>Workshops to involve the use of video introductions, presentations by state specialists, discussion by a panel of community leaders, &amp; questioning of specialists &amp; panel by critical thinkers. Identified issues to be shown in a matrix &amp; used in a group process to enable participants to prioritize issues &amp; strategies for community vitalization (IAVIS 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Program to be conducted by Iowa State University (ISU) Cooperative Extension Service (Iowa CES). The overall goal of the program was in keeping with the mission of Iowa CES (IAVIS 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPUT</td>
<td>Videos to to include introductions by the State Governor &amp; the Community Resource Development Program Leader at Iowa State University (IAVIS 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL GOAL</td>
<td>PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assist rural leaders in visioning, planning, implementing, &amp; evaluating activities to enhance the social &amp; economic structure of their communities (IAVIS 1).</td>
<td>Iowa CES area and county staff in the 13 counties in Northeast Iowa formed planning committees to plan &amp; develop a &quot;Vision for the 90s&quot; forum. Each county planning committee identified critical issues in their county to be addressed in forums (IAVIS 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants thought of or developed actions needed to maintain or improve the economy of the community, &amp; community services &amp; facilities (IAVIS 4). Participants indicated that the forum gave them increased knowledge, answers to questions, contact with other people about community issues, leadership skills, new ideas, improved planning &amp; thinking ability, &amp; increased confidence (IAVIS 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 650 community &amp; county leaders attended forums, each consisting of 5-6 hours teaching time &amp; held in either one session or 2. Participants identified &amp; prioritized actions to be taken in the county to address issues discussed. Small action planning groups met to develop plans for addressing the issues. Strategies for aiding community revitalization processes over the next ten years were identified (IAVIS 2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The strategy was to develop a workshop to be presented in about five hours in one day or two evenings (IAVIS 1). In addition, Extension agents were to act as facilitators in certain follow-up activities (IAVIS 3).

The workshops were to involve the use of video introductions, by the State Governor and the Community Resource Development Program Leader at Iowa State University. Presentations by state specialists were to be made, and discussion by a panel of community leaders was to take place. The specialist and panel were to be questioned by a pool of critical thinkers. The issues identified through this process were to be presented in a matrix. The matrix was to be utilized in a group process to enable participants to prioritize issues and strategies for community vitalization (IAVIS 1).

The Iowa CES area and county staff in the 13 counties in Northeast Iowa formed planning committees to plan and develop a "Vision for the 90s" forum. Each county planning committee identified critical issues in their county to be addressed in forums. Approximately 650 community and county leaders attended forums, each consisting of five to six hours teaching time and held in either one session or two. Participants identified and prioritized actions to be taken in the county to address the issues discussed. Small action planning groups met to develop plans for addressing the issues. Strategies for aiding community revitalization processes over the next ten years were identified (IAVIS 2).

The program was described in the Iowa CES annual report, utilizing a narrative report format which emphasized accomplishments through success stories. Participants indicated that the forum gave them increased knowledge, answers to questions, contact with other people about community issues, leadership skills, new ideas, improved planning and thinking ability, and increased confidence (IAVIS 2). Also, participants became more effective in their community service activities, sought extra information about issues, took
on new community leadership roles, and became more aware of Extension resources (IAVIS 4).

Follow-up actions from the forums included forming economic development organizations, conducting county-wide economic development workshops, and marketing tourism development efforts. In addition, road improvement projects were developed, and recommendations were made regarding the improvement of school facilities (IAVIS 2).

Comparison of Individual Project Findings

A comparison of the individual project development processes is provided in Table 9. Although a table of this size cannot contain a detailed comparison of projects, it does enable a summary of some of the key points to be made. In this section the findings are summarized and compared by using the format of the CIPP evaluation model.

Context Evaluation

In the majority of the selected projects, some attempt was made at setting objectives. Although production objectives were measurable, community development and capacity-building objectives were usually expressed more generally in terms of improvements. IRDP/SMC attempted to identify more measurable indicators of living standards and institutional capacity at the context stage.

In the case of IRDPs EP, NP and LP, and HIRDP, objectives were not well documented at the context stage. The objectives of PNS and HACHO were refocused over the life of the projects to include capacity-building. The objectives of the Iowa CES projects were related to the provision of learning experiences to develop leadership skills in individuals.
Table 9. Comparison of key points from individual project development process analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CONTEXT (Goals &amp; Objectives)</th>
<th>INPUT (Project &amp; M&amp;E plans)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRDP/SMC</td>
<td>Focus:</td>
<td>Focus:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRDP/EP/NP/LP</td>
<td>Living-standard goal indicators</td>
<td>Infrastructure/capacity. M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIRDP</td>
<td>Objectives not well documented</td>
<td>Infrastructure/capacity. No M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNS</td>
<td>At first production, later capacity</td>
<td>Started before strategy. No M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACHO</td>
<td>Originally CD, later capacity</td>
<td>Develop 6 subsections. M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>General CD goals</td>
<td>Health. No M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLT</td>
<td>Providing an educational experience</td>
<td>Integrated university input. M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision for 90s</td>
<td></td>
<td>Step-by-step plan. M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY-BUILDING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRDP/SMC</td>
<td>Goals to:</td>
<td>Utilize:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRDP/EP/NP/LP</td>
<td>Develop District Institutions (DIs).</td>
<td>Existing agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIRDP</td>
<td>Build Institutional competence</td>
<td>Existing agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNS</td>
<td>Build capacity (brief mention only)</td>
<td>Existing agencies. Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACHO</td>
<td>Develop DI's (later objective)</td>
<td>Contractor. Zairians to take over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Develop structures &amp; capacity</td>
<td>Autonomous agency. Self-help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLT</td>
<td>Develop individual leadership</td>
<td>Extension Service. Facilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision for 90s</td>
<td>Develop individual leadership</td>
<td>Extension Service. Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension Service. Forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEVELOPMENT APPROACH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRDP/SMC</td>
<td>General objectives, causal chain</td>
<td>Utilize:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIRDP</td>
<td>Changing direction with time</td>
<td>Rolling plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revolving, integrated planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACHO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Centralized administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLT</td>
<td>Experiment with clustering</td>
<td>Emergent, community approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision for 90s</td>
<td>Facilitate in CD process</td>
<td>Course presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forum organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRDP/SMC</td>
<td>GRZ decentralization/IRDP policies</td>
<td>Decentralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIRDP</td>
<td>Government decentralization policy</td>
<td>Government project-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNS</td>
<td>Government wanted collective farm</td>
<td>Isolated location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACHO</td>
<td>Lack of GOH involvement</td>
<td>GOH centralization policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Narrow view of CD</td>
<td>Extension agents established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLT</td>
<td>Consistent with Iowa CES mission</td>
<td>Key people utilized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision for 90s</td>
<td>Consistent with Iowa CES mission</td>
<td>Key people utilized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCESS (Implementation &amp; Monitoring)</td>
<td>PRODUCT (Outcomes &amp; Decisions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic implementation &amp; monitoring</td>
<td>Outcomes noted in terms of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects performed. Poor monitoring</td>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; living standard indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started with a few projects. Poor M&amp;E</td>
<td>Some results on specific activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational activities overshadowed M&amp;E</td>
<td>Data deficiency limited product evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health projects implemented. Poor M&amp;E</td>
<td>Some product &amp; household data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started 3 months early. Detailed monitoring</td>
<td>Data deficiency made evaluation difficult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation process well documented</td>
<td>Specific community improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of improved leadership planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative reports of success stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity-building efforts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used existing agencies; workshops held</td>
<td>Evaluation indicated:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became autonomous. Capacity not built</td>
<td>Improved planning &amp; rate of implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved facilities &amp; provided training</td>
<td>Need to redirect to institution building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late handover, little training. Weak capacity</td>
<td>Line agencies &amp; other organizations built up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Councils formed &amp; utilized</td>
<td>Farmer groups formed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects implemented through citizen groups</td>
<td>Community Councils formed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes &amp; community work experiences</td>
<td>Limited sustained mobilization of resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forums</td>
<td>Participants perceived improved leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling plan. Process approach.</td>
<td>Development achievements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor monitoring for planning decisions</td>
<td>Basic development system established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving plan, increased participation</td>
<td>Project to be redirected. PD to be written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor monitoring, crisis management</td>
<td>Decentralization of power achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Councils implemented projects</td>
<td>No plans for maintaining sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension sometimes in leadership role</td>
<td>Limited documentation available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes presented as planned</td>
<td>CD processes started</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum conducted as planned</td>
<td>New concepts for program development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete decentralization was a constraint</td>
<td>Follow-up community actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak institutional capacity of local Councils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor horizontal linkages with line agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension between process &amp; product goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief &amp; capacity-building goals conflicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for early start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judged a success. Used as a model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redirection consistent with GRZ policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong DPU needed to sustain program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be taken over by Belgian interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HACHO absorbed by a government agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor timing &amp; other constraints were noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa CES enthusiastic about program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
The selected projects all made mention of capacity development of either institutions or individuals during context evaluation. However, in the case of PNS and HACHO, capacity-building was not included in the original objectives. The Iowa CES projects differed from the others in that their target beneficiaries were individual potential community leaders, rather than institutions.

Specification of the development approach did not play a significant part in context evaluation. In the case of HIRDP, emphasis was placed on the development approach to be taken during the formulation of the original project document. The evaluators of PNS suggested that the changing direction of the project with time could either be interpreted as taking a flexible approach or as inadequate long-term planning. The Iowa TLT program stated its intent to experiment with utilizing clusters of communities to initiate community development efforts.

External factors played a significant role during the context stage. One of the most significant factors was the policy of the host country government. The initiation of projects which aimed to build institutional capacity was facilitated in countries which had a policy of decentralization. In the case of PNS, tension existed between the host government desire to initiate a controlled collective farming project and the USAID intent to initiate an IRDP with small-scale farmers. In Haiti, the centralized government was under continual pressure from USAID to integrate HACHO into government structures. In the case of the community development project in West Virginia, the narrow view of community development held in the community itself was identified as a constraint.

**Input Evaluation**

Various approaches to project development were taken. The intent of the IRDPs in Zambia was to concentrate on the development of infrastructure and capacity. HIRDP was
initiated with six small projects before an overall strategy was developed. The PNS strategy involved the development of six subsections, each to be responsible for one area of community development. The developers of HACHO chose to focus on health. The Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program involved an integrated university input approach. The Iowa CES made step-by-step plans to provide relevant educational experiences in their projects.

In many cases, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) was considered during the planning stage. However M&E was not included in the plans of IRDPs EP, NP, and LP, HIRDP, or HACHO. The M&E of capacity-building objectives was not emphasized in any of the project strategies, although for PNS, some monitoring of farmer group capacity was planned.

The IRDPs were planned to work through existing agencies. PNS was intended to establish an autonomous agency, initially run by an expatriate contractor, and gradually to be handed over to Zairians. Community development was to involve the formation of farmer groups. HACHO was also to be autonomous, but the director was to be Haitian. Community development was to be achieved through the formation of community councils to implement projects. The role of the Extension service in the projects in the United States was to be that of facilitating community development.

In the initial planning stages of IRDP/SMC and IRDPs EP, NP, and LP, capacity-building was to be achieved through a learning-by-doing process approach rather than training. Similarly, training was not emphasized in the PNS or HACHO plans. In all the other projects, a training or formal learning experience component was included at the planning stage.

The IRDPs planned to use a process-oriented, revolving plan approach to development. PNS also intended to allow for flexible planning, and the Allegheny
Highlands Community Development Program was to follow an emergent community development approach. Although a process-oriented approach was to be utilized at the community level, HACHO's community development component had to be implemented under the restriction of a centralized administration. The Iowa CES projects differed from all the others in that they were focused on the successful planning and implementation of specific learning experiences.

As with context evaluation, the orientation of host and donor governments influenced the project development processes at the planning or input stage. The isolated location of PNS was a significant factor in allowing the contractor relative independence in the administration of the project. The Extension Service was an ideal vehicle for the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program, since the existing agents had already established rapport with the members of the community. However, the concept of an integrated university approach was in contradiction to traditional university structures and relationships. The Iowa CES projects involved key people who were in a position to promote or publicize project activities.

Process Evaluation

IRDP/SMC developed a systematic method of project implementation through the District Councils. The process was carefully monitored and records were used for planning and evaluation. IRDPs EP, NP and LP implemented planned projects, but planning and evaluation were limited by poor monitoring. HIRDP started with a few small projects, and expanded over the life of the project. A poor monitoring and evaluation system also limited planning and evaluation of this project. Although monitoring and evaluation was planned as an integral part of PNS, it was neglected during implementation as emphasis was placed upon operational activities. HACHO concentrated on
implementing health projects. Monitoring of this project was also limited and unsystematic. The projects implemented in the United States were well monitored and documented. They were implemented as planned, with the exception that the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program was implemented three months ahead of schedule because of university interest and pressure.

The capacity-building efforts of IRDP/SMC involved utilizing existing agencies. Workshops in management were used to supplement the learning-by-doing approach. In comparison, IRDPs EP, NP, and LP became autonomous because of the frustration generated by trying to work through indigenous institutions with weak capacity. The capacity of indigenous institutions was therefore not built up, since they were by-passed in the project implementation process. HIRDP focused on improving facilities and providing training for staff in local government institutions. Later, these capacity-building efforts were expanded to include voluntary and semi-public organizations. Capacity-building of project staff in PNS was constrained by late transfer of management positions to Zairians, and the failure to provide further training to Zairian staff members. HACHO succeeded in forming and utilizing Community Councils for project implementation. In the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program, the Extension Service facilitated the implementation of projects through citizen groups. The TLT program provided classes and community work experiences for its participants, and the Vision for the 90s program encouraged leadership development and community action through forums.

A revolving or rolling plan approach was achieved for all the IRDPs. However, in the case of IRDPs EP, NP, and LP planning was constrained by poor monitoring. Although there was no systematic monitoring system for HIRDP, planning was facilitated by the large number of reviews that were performed. In HIRDP, it was sometimes necessary for the District Planning Unit (DPU) to by-pass line agencies and become the
implementing agency in order to initiate certain programs. Poor monitoring and crisis management were characteristic of PNS. HACHO utilized Community Councils to achieve both relief and capacity-building goals. The projects in the United States were conducted using the approaches planned, with the exception that in the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program, it was sometimes necessary for extension agents to take a leadership role to maintain a project.

Incomplete decentralization was a constraint to the success of IRDP/SMC. Staffing problems resulted since the project had no power to hire or fire staff. Capacity-building in the IRDPs EP, NP, LP was constrained by the by-passing of indigenous institutions because of their weak institutional capacity. HIRDP was constrained by poor horizontal linkages with line agencies. Capacity-building through PNS was constrained because of the tension between process and product goals. The tension between relief and capacity-building goals constrained the development of capacity of the Community Councils through HACHO. Pressure for an early start of the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program resulted in a number of implementation problems, including the expectation of community members that the university was to take significant responsibility for project implementation.

Product Evaluation

The outcomes of IRDP/SMC were more frequently presented in terms of infrastructure and living-standard goals than capacity-building goals. Although monitoring was generally poor, some results on specific activities were recorded for IRDPs EP, NP, and LP. A lack of appropriate, accurate data made product evaluation of HIRDP and HACHO difficult. Some product and household data were provided for PNS. Specific community improvements were recorded as a means of evaluating the Allegheny Highlands
Community Development Program. The Iowa TLT program was still at the formative evaluation stage, but evaluation of improved leadership skills resulting from the program was planned. Narrative reports recorded success stories from the Vision for the 90s program, and included details of the activities carried out and participants' perceptions of their improved leadership characteristics.

Evaluation of the capacity-building component of IRDP/SMC indicated that District Councils exhibited improved planning capability, and increased rate of implementation of projects and utilization of funds. The failure to achieve development of capacity, and the need to redirect IRDPs EP, NP, and LP to institution-building were recognized. HIRDP succeeded in building up line agencies and a large number of other organizations. Farmer groups were formed through PNS, but the farmer group subsection was dropped. HACHO succeeded in forming and utilizing Community Councils to implement projects. The evaluation of the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program recorded that sustained mobilization of resources had not reached the level hoped for. Favorable responses to first session in the Iowa TLT program were received, and in the Vision for the 90s program questionnaires revealed that participants perceived that their leadership abilities had improved.

Evaluation of the development process of IRDP/SMC recorded that a basic development system had been established through the project. Ways of improving financial monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building goals were being sought. It was necessary to redirect IRDPs EP, NP, and LP to institution-building through the utilization of District institutions and provision of management training. In addition, the decision was made to write a formal project document to include the objectives of the SIDA-supported IRDPs. Decentralization of power, involvement of a wide range of organizations, and increased participation by beneficiaries were achieved by HIRDP. No plans for
maintaining sustainability evolved during the development process of PNS. In the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program, although sustained mobilization of resources did not reach the level hoped for, community development processes were initiated. New concepts for program development evolved during the process of the TLT program, and the Vision for the 90s program resulted in follow-up actions in the communities. Limited documentation was available to assess the evolution of the development process of HACHO.

In conclusion, IRDP/SMC was judged a success, and used as a model for all Zambian IRDPs by the GRZ. Redirection of IRDPs EP, NP and LP was therefore consistent with GRZ policy. However, in 1986, the Agricultural Sector Support Program still maintained an interventionist philosophy. Evaluation of HIRDP led to the conclusion that a strong District Planning Unit was needed to sustain the program. Sustainability by integration with Government of Zaire institutions was not achieved by PNS, and the project was to be taken over by ex-colonial Belgian interests. HACHO was absorbed by a newly formed government agency. Poor timing, unclear university-community relationships, and other factors were noted as constraints limiting the success of the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program. The Iowa CES was enthusiastic about its programs and intended to continue the TLT program after funding from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation ended.

Summary

The matrix described in Chapter III was used to evaluate the capacity-building components in ten rural development projects. Key characteristics of the project development process relevant to the building of capacity were identified as follows:
Context Evaluation

2. Consideration of host and donor philosophies and policies.

Input Evaluation

1. The development of a strategy, including plans for monitoring and evaluation which incorporate capacity-building.
2. The intent to work through indigenous institutions.
3. The inclusion of plans for management training.
5. A revolving planning approach.
6. Consideration of host and donor philosophies.

Process Evaluation

1. Implementation of strategy as planned.
2. The implementation of monitoring and evaluation as planned.
3. The utilization of indigenous institutions as planned.
4. The implementation of training programs carried out as planned.
5. The utilization of process-orientation and flexibility as planned.
6. The utilization of revolving planning as planned.
7. Consideration of host and donor philosophies.

Product Evaluation

1. Evaluation of capacity-building as well as other goals.
2. Examination of the extent to which the project development process has evolved.
3. Consideration of host and donor philosophies.

4. Consideration of all other previously mentioned factors which may have affected outcomes.
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to develop a framework for evaluating the capacity-building components in rural development projects, and to determine which factors contributed to the successful implementation of these components. In the process of achieving this purpose the following steps were taken:

1. The process of planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating selected rural development projects in both the United States and developing countries was described, with particular reference to capacity-building objectives.

2. The practices in the process which facilitated or constrained the building of capacity were identified.

3. Indicators of development of capacity used by the project were identified and the extent to which they were useful in measuring improved capacity of people or institutions was assessed.

4. Consideration was given as to the extent to which lessons learned from evaluation of extension work in the United States are transferable to selected developing country situations or the lessons learned from evaluation of rural development projects in developing countries are applicable to the United States or other developed country situations.

This chapter involves a discussion of the utility of the developed framework in the analysis of capacity-building components in rural development projects, and a discussion of the findings from the analysis of the project development processes of the selected projects. A matrix, revised in the light of the findings, is proposed. In addition, the applicability of lessons learned to different situations is discussed.
Discussion of the Framework

The developed framework provided a valuable tool for evaluating the capacity-building components of rural development projects, providing an overview of all stages in the project development process. By dividing the analysis into segments, it helps to ensure that key factors affecting the development of capacity are not overlooked.

As will be shown in the discussion of the findings, the key factors emerging from the analysis are consistent with previous literature. This consistency indicates that the projects chosen were typical of rural development projects in which capacity-building is an objective. It also indicates that the framework focuses on points of concern to evaluators of such projects. However, it should be emphasized that any evaluation can only be as complete as the information made available to the evaluator.

Consideration of the tables in Chapter IV reveals that certain comments could be placed in more than one cell. In particular, in the analysis of process-oriented projects process and product evaluations tend to merge. In a situation where there was a choice of where to put the data, the researcher chose the cell where the data would best contribute to making a clear overall picture of the project, and placed the comparable data in the same cells for each project. In situations where comparative research is carried out by a number of different reporters, it would be valuable to establish more specific standards on the placement of information which could validly be placed in more than one cell. It should be borne in mind, however, that each project is different, and as more specifications are made about data entry, the framework will be less easily adapted to each circumstance. It would therefore be inadvisable to put unnecessary limitations upon data entry.

For those projects for which there was an abundance of information it would have been possible to report the findings in greater detail, and situations may arise where it would be valuable to use the framework to study one or more projects in greater depth.
However, given the scope of this research study, it was necessary to limit the findings reported on each project. The framework may also prove valuable for studying one project over time. In this case, for one project, a matrix would be drawn for each of a number of time periods. The product evaluation of one period would then provide information for the context evaluation of the next period. The framework may also prove suitable for on-site, case study evaluation of the capacity-building components of rural development projects as well as for documentary analysis alone.

Examination of the tables in Chapter IV shows that for some projects, certain cells remain blank. The lack of information in the context-development approach cell is understandable, since development approach may not be considered till the input evaluation stage. However, limited information in other cells may point to important factors that project developers have failed to consider. For example, it may have been valuable for the reporters of the projects conducted in Iowa to have paid more attention to the external factors affecting the projects.

Although the framework was developed and utilized as an evaluation tool, it could also be used by planners and implementors of development projects who wanted to ensure that they were considering factors which had implications for capacity-building from the very start of the project.

Discussion of the Findings

In this section, the findings are discussed under headings suggested by the list of key characteristics of the project development process given at the end of Chapter III. The relevance of each topic to capacity-building will be discussed in terms of the CIPP evaluation model:
Capacity-building objectives

In the majority of the selected projects, some attempt was made at setting objectives at the context evaluation stage. Although production objectives were measurable, community development and capacity-building objectives were usually expressed more generally in terms of improvements. At the product evaluation stage, project outcomes were more frequently presented in terms of infrastructure and living-standard and product goals than capacity-building goals. This observation is consistent with that of Oakley (1986) that even when capacity-building objectives are included at the planning stage of a project, they are usually not included in the evaluation of the project which tends to concentrate on tangible or quantitative results. Evaluations of IRDP/SMC utilized the rate of implementation of projects and utilization of funds as indicators of implementation capacity. It would seem that these and similar indicators could be used in setting measurable objectives for capacity-building. For those characteristics of institutional capacity for which no quantitative indicator has been identified, objectives can still be set which can be evaluated in more qualitative terms. For example, as illustrated by IRDP/SMC, it is possible to evaluate the improvement in the quality of plans produced by indigenous institutions and the extent to which those institutions developed the ability to produce those plans without outside assistance. This suggestion is in keeping with that of Robins (1987) who stated that increased capacity is demonstrated in skills such as the ability to develop work plans and submit them on time, to file requests for advances of funds correctly and on a timely basis, and to keep accurate records.

A number of the projects recorded the formation of community groups as outputs. It would seem reasonable to list the formation of community groups capable of working in a community development role as an indication of successful capacity-building if those groups were created as a result of the project.
Projects such as IRDPs EP, NP and LP which fail to clearly state objectives in a project document must face the problem of having a weak foundation on which to base strategy and direction. As explained by Gow and Morss (1985), clear project objectives, stated in terms which are operational, provide management with a tangible basis for planning, and a means by which to measure progress. The implementing agencies of IRDPs EP, NP and LP eventually recognized the value of having a project document which clearly delineated the objectives and direction of the project, and decided that one should be written.

The objectives of PNS and HACHO were refocused over the life of the projects to include capacity-building. It would seem that when objectives are refocused, tension may exist between the new objectives and earlier ones which may constrain the success of the project. These observations are in keeping with those of Conyers, Warren and van Tilburg (1988).

The objectives of the Iowa CES projects were related to the provision of learning experiences to develop leadership skills in individuals. These projects therefore differed from the others in that their target beneficiaries were individual potential community leaders, rather than institutions.

External factors

External factors played a significant role during all stages of the development process. Among the most significant factors were the policy and philosophies of the host country government and the donors. For example, the initiation of projects which aimed to build institutional capacity was facilitated in countries which had a policy of decentralization. In the case of PNS, the host government desire to initiate a controlled collective farming project constrained USAID efforts to initiate an IRDP with small-scale farmers. These
findings are consistent with those of Conyers and Warren (1988) who pointed out that the adoption of capacity-building objectives in IRDPs has major implications in terms of donor and host country objectives.

At the input evaluation stage, the isolated location of PNS was a significant factor in allowing the contractor relative independence in the administration of the project. In the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program, the Extension Service was an ideal choice of vehicle for the program, since the existing agents had already established rapport with the members of the community. However, the concept of an integrated university approach was in contradiction to traditional university structures and relationships. The importance of considering external factors at the input stage is explained by Stufflebeam (1983), who stated that input evaluation should help in the identification of possible barriers and constraints to the implementation of programs. It is important to record constraining and facilitating factors in the context stage so that project planning can be carried out with these factors in mind.

At the process stage, external factors played a significant part in the implementation of projects. Incomplete decentralization was a constraint to the successful implementation of IRDP/SMC. Staffing problems resulted since the project had no power to hire or fire staff. Capacity-building in the IRDPs EP, NP, LP was constrained by the by-passing of indigenous institutions because of their weak institutional capacity. HIRDP was constrained by poor horizontal linkages with line agencies. Capacity-building through PNS was constrained because of the tension between process and product goals. The tension between relief and capacity-building goals constrained the development of capacity of the Community Councils through HACHO. Pressure at the university level for an early start of the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program resulted in a number
of implementation problems, including the expectation of community members that the university was to take significant responsibility for project implementation.

Stufflebeam (1983) pointed out the value of context, input and process evaluations for providing valuable background information against which to interpret the outcomes of a project. In the case of the selected projects, evaluation of the project development processes led to external decisions which would affect the future life of the projects, and these are recorded in the external factors section of the product evaluation. For example, IRDP/SMC was judged a success, and used as a model for all Zambian IRDPs by the GRZ. Sustainability by integration with Government of Zaire institutions was not achieved by PNS, and the project was to be taken over by ex-colonial Belgian interests. HACHO was absorbed by a newly formed government agency. The Iowa CES was enthusiastic about its programs and intended to continue the TLT program after funding from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation ended. In addition, an understanding of the external constraints on the projects enabled conclusions to be made about the success of the projects in the light of these constraints. For example, poor timing, unclear university-community relationships, and other factors were acknowledged as constraints limiting the success of the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program.

**Strategy development and implementation of plans**

Various approaches to project development were taken. With the exception of HIRDP, which was initiated with six small projects before an overall strategy was developed, the planners of the selected projects developed an implementation strategy. It should be noted that during the input stage, the developers of HACHO chose to focus on health, rather than other community development or capacity-building objectives, thus limiting the opportunity for capacity-building during implementation. The Iowa CES
made step-by-step plans. This approach was different from the strategies adopted for other projects, but it should be remembered that the Iowa projects were primarily designed to provide specific educational experiences rather than to develop an overall program of community development.

The majority of projects implemented their programs as planned. It can be observed that many of the projects had to operate within the constraints caused by poor planning at the input stage. For example, IRDPs EP, NP and LP implemented planned projects, but planning and evaluation were limited by poor monitoring. HACHO concentrated on implementing health projects, sacrificing the opportunity for capacity-building and community development.

In a number of cases, failure to implement the projects as planned limited capacity-building and the success of the projects. The Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program was implemented three months ahead of schedule because of university interest and pressure. The early start caused a number of problems, such as reducing the time available to develop support for the program. IRDPs EP, NP, and LP became autonomous instead of working through existing agencies as planned because of the frustration generated by trying to work through indigenous institutions with weak capacity. The capacity of indigenous institutions was therefore not built up, since they were by-passed in the project implementation process. Conyers, Warren and van Tilburg (1988) also warned of the dangers of by-passing local institutions for the sake of easier implementation.

Planning and implementation of monitoring and evaluation

Norton and Benoliel (1987) and Stufflebeam (1983) stressed the importance of planning for ongoing evaluation of projects when they are developed. In many cases,
monitoring and evaluation (M&E) was considered during the planning stages of the selected projects. However, M&E was not included in the plans of IRDPs EP, NP, and LP, HIRDP, or HACHO, and the M&E of capacity-building objectives was not a main component of any of the project plans. Those projects that did not plan for monitoring and evaluation at the input evaluation stage faced problems related to inadequate data for decision making and evaluation throughout the lives of the projects. Monitoring of HACHO was also limited and unsystematic.

The project implementation process of IRDP/SMC was carefully monitored as planned, and records were used for ongoing planning and evaluation. Although monitoring and evaluation, including some monitoring of farmer group capacity, was planned as an integral part of PNS, it was neglected during implementation as emphasis was placed upon operational activities. It should therefore be emphasized that it is not only important to plan for project monitoring and evaluation, but also to carry out those plans.

Utilization of indigenous institutions

In all cases, capacity-building was to be achieved through some form of participant involvement. The IRDPs and the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program were designed for the greatest involvement in that they were planned to utilize local government or community organizations to plan and implement projects.

Failure to incorporate local participation resulted in loss of opportunity for capacity-building. Sometimes this failure was due to not implementing the projects as planned. For example, IRDPs EP, NP, and LP became autonomous. Capacity-building of project staff in PNS was constrained by late transfer of management positions to Zairians, and the failure to provide further training to Zairian staff members.
Planning and conducting management training

Training was not emphasized in the PNS or HACHO plans. In the case of PNS, the limited amount of training provided for Zairian staff was identified as a constraint to the building of capacity and project success. In the initial planning stages of IRDP/SMC, and IRDPs EP, NP, and LP, capacity-building was to be achieved through a learning-by-doing process approach rather than training. However, during the implementation of IRDP/SMC, the learning-by-doing approach was supplemented by management workshops. IRDPs EP, NP, and LP also included management training after the project focus was redirected to institution building. In all the other projects, a training or formal learning experience component was included at the planning stage. The provision by HIRDP of a variety of training programs, including the training of community members, was seen as a factor contributing to the success of the project. In the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program, the need for training community leaders as well as extension agents was identified. These observations are consistent with the view of Conyers, Warren and van Tilburg (1988) that capacity-building involves the allocation of resources specifically for training and related capacity-building activities.

Planning and implementing a process approach to development

Uphoff (1986) and Conyers, Warren and van Tilburg (1988) recommended a flexible, learning process approach to project design for the development of capacity. The IRDPs planned and utilized a process-oriented, revolving plan approach to development. PNS and the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program planned a flexible program approach. Although a process-oriented approach was to be utilized at the community level, HACHO's community development component had to be implemented under the restriction of a centralized administration. The Iowa CES projects differed from
all the others in that they were focused on the successful planning and implementation of specific learning experiences.

The findings on the selected projects illustrate the point that in order to successfully implement a process approach, it is necessary to have a systematic monitoring system to assist in making ongoing decisions. The process approach to IRDP/SMC was facilitated by a systematic monitoring system. In the case of IRDPs EP, NP, and LP planning was constrained by poor monitoring. Although there was no systematic monitoring system for HIRDP, planning was facilitated by the large number of reviews that were performed. Poor monitoring and crisis management were characteristic of PNS.

Although the projects initiated in Iowa followed a step-by-step approach in keeping with the plan of providing specific educational experiences, the evaluation of the TLT program indicated that the program was modified in the light of feedback from the participants, and that new concepts for program development evolved during the process of the TLT program. These findings indicate a certain flexibility in the approach to the TLT program which would facilitate its improvement and ultimate success.

**The evolution of the project development process**

An overview of the present state and future direction of a project may be discerned by considering the product/development approach segment of the analysis matrix. Such an examination may provide an indication of the degree of capacity and sustainability established. For example, evaluation of the development process of IRDP/SMC recorded that a basic development system had been established and that ways of improving financial monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building goals were being sought. This finding illustrates that IRDP/SMC was achieving some success and that ways of improving the process were still being sought. In the case of IRDPs EP, NP, and LP, analysis revealed
that the projects were to be redirected and a formal project document was to be written, indicating that attempts were being made to rectify earlier mistakes which had constrained the success of the project. Decentralization of power, involvement of a wide range of organizations, and increased participation by beneficiaries were achieved by HIRDP. No plans for maintaining sustainability evolved during the development process of PNS. This failure to develop sustainability contributed to the project's take over by ex-colonial Belgian interests.

In the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program, although sustained mobilization of resources did not reach the level hoped for, community development processes were initiated, indicating some degree of project success. This finding illustrates the value of considering the progress made, in addition to examining whether project goals have been achieved. In some projects, certain goals may be unrealistically high given the constraints under which the project is to operate. Binnendijk (1989a) stated that projects using a learning process approach require a longer time horizon. It is therefore likely that in some process-oriented projects, expectations for achievement of results in a limited time may be unrealistically high. In cases such as these, it is valuable to consider what progress has been made, the constraints under which the project has been operating, and the degree of success likely to be achieved if a longer time-frame is allowed, before deciding whether the project should be considered successful. This suggestion is consistent with that of Oakley (1986) who argued that objectives which are qualitative in nature, and involve processes, cannot be completely understood by measuring tangible results. He emphasized the importance of interpreting the output of a process-oriented project by utilizing information which may be more descriptive in nature to assist in providing an understanding of the effects which have occurred.
Revised Framework

The findings, which were consistent with previous literature, highlighted certain areas of concern for planners, implementors, and evaluators of projects with capacity-building components. The matrix in Figure 2 was modified in the light of the findings, and the revised matrix is provided in Figure 3. Although Figure 3 does not differ greatly in content from Figure 2, the revision emphasizes the main areas of concern revealed by the findings. The revised matrix should be used by all those involved in development projects who wish to ensure that factors affecting capacity-building are not overlooked at any stage in the project development process.

Application of Lessons Learned

The Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program bore many similarities to the projects selected from developing countries, although it must be emphasized that cultural, political, and geographical factors affecting each project differed. Nevertheless, the key points discussed above could provide insightful information for developers of rural development projects in developing countries and for developers of projects similar to the Allegheny Highlands Community Development Program in developed countries. In each situation, the general principles regarding the evaluation of capacity-building remain the same even though details inserted in the framework need to be adapted for each case.

The projects conducted in Iowa differed from the other selected projects in that although their aim was to develop human resources in communities, they were directed toward providing specific educational experiences to individuals in a limited time frame rather than building institutional capacity over a longer period of time. Although the framework can still be used to evaluate the capacity-building components of projects providing specific educational experiences, it is hard to make comparisons between such
### Figure 3. Revised matrix of key characteristics to be considered in the analysis of the capacity-building components in rural development projects
projects and projects with broader scope. Nevertheless, many of the points raised in this chapter apply to projects like those implemented by the Iowa CES. For example, it is still important to establish objectives and indicators of developed capacity, decide on a strategy, implement the projects as planned, and allow for adjustment in the light of feedback.

The Iowa projects utilized questionnaires completed by participants to evaluate the projects. While this approach is worth consideration for projects in developing countries, it must be acknowledged that the administration of questionnaires to obtain accurate results would be considerably more difficult in a developing country than in the United States, especially if the questionnaires had to cover a program with wide scope rather than a controlled educational experience.

In searching for projects to evaluate, it proved difficult to find community development programs in the United States that had the scope of those selected from developing countries. It may be valuable for community developers in the United States to more frequently develop and evaluate small projects within the larger framework of an overall community plan, thus providing opportunities for individual projects to complement each other in achieving the overall goal of community development.

**Summary**

The developed framework proved to be a valuable tool for evaluating the capacity-building components in rural development projects during project identification, planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. The framework was useful for focusing on points of concern to planners, implementors and evaluators of projects in which capacity-building is an objective. It may have potential as a tool for in-depth studies, on-site case studies or for examining the same project in different phases of its development.
The areas of concern for planners, implementors, and evaluators of projects with capacity-building components which emerged from the evaluation of the selected projects were consistent with the findings from previous literature and were represented in the matrix in Figure 3. These included:

1. Establishing capacity-building objectives and ways of evaluating their achievement.
2. Consideration of external factors affecting the project at all stages in its development.
3. Strategy development and implementation of plans.
4. Planning and implementation of monitoring and evaluation, including monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building.
5. Utilization of indigenous institutions.
6. Planning and conducting management training.
7. Planning and implementing a process approach to development.
8. Consideration of the evolution of the project development process.

It is suggested that these key areas are of concern to those involved in projects with the goal of building capacity through experiential learning in local institutions or groups, whether those projects are in developed or developing countries. The matrix provides a valuable tool for ensuring that factors affecting the development of capacity are not overlooked at any stage in the project development process. However, specific details of project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation will vary with the circumstances. Although projects which are directed toward providing a specific learning experience over a short time period may be evaluated using the framework, and many of the listed key areas apply to them, they are not readily compared with long-term projects aimed at building capacity through a more general community development approach.
CHAPTER VI. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

In development situations in both the United States and developing countries, there is a concern with the development of the capacity of people to identify and solve their own problems and to determine their own future. Agricultural extension professionals and others involved in development planning and implementation need to be aware of and understand the factors affecting the achievement of capacity-building objectives in order to successfully develop human resources.

The purpose of this study was to develop a framework for evaluating the capacity-building components in rural development projects, and to determine which factors contributed to the successful implementation of these components. In the process of achieving this purpose the following steps were taken:

1. The process of planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating selected rural development projects in both the United States and developing countries was described, with particular reference to capacity-building objectives.

2. The practices in the process which facilitated or constrained the building of capacity were identified.

3. Indicators of development of capacity used by the project were identified and the extent to which they were useful in measuring improved capacity of people or institutions was assessed.

4. Consideration was given as to the extent to which lessons learned from evaluation of extension work in the United States are transferable to selected developing country situations or the lessons learned from evaluation of rural development projects in
developing countries are applicable to the United States or other developed country situations.

Stufflebeam's CIPP model provided a suitable framework for analyzing the monitoring and evaluation of the capacity-building components in rural development projects because it pays attention to all elements of the planning and implementation process, including the process element. The body of literature related to development and project evaluation revealed valuable information for selecting specific problem areas in process-oriented development projects which needed to be investigated, and led to the development of questions which were to be addressed when conducting this study.

In order to meet the objectives of this study, it was decided that a naturalistic, qualitative documentary analysis of project administrative records and related documents would be the most appropriate approach. In order to make comparisons among the projects, a conceptual framework of investigation was developed, and questions were formulated which were designed to establish whether and how increase in capacity was encouraged and monitored during the evaluation process. The framework and questions were developed on the basis of the findings in the literature review. In order to provide as complete an analysis as possible, an emergent approach was used and the plan was adapted in the light of the information discovered in the records. The conceptual framework illustrated that the main factors indirectly affecting the development of capacity may be divided into three categories: overall management, development approach and external factors. In addition, there are factors directly related to capacity-building which affect success in development of skills.

In this study, the units of analysis were the program development processes in selected rural/agricultural development projects in both the United States and selected
developing countries, in which development of capacity was one of the overall goals. The cases were selected in a purposeful, rather than a random manner.

The initial questions framed in the CIPP model of evaluation, and the conceptual framework were combined to form a matrix to assist in data recording and analysis. Initially, each project was analyzed separately, with the exception of three related projects which were analyzed as a group. The contents of the documents were analyzed and categorized, using the matrix as a guide, to provide detailed descriptions of the development of each project, with particular reference to factors which either contributed to, failed to contribute to, or hindered the building of capacity. The findings from all the projects were compared and synthesized to produce a holistic view of the project development process in order to make recommendations for improving the success of the capacity-building components in rural development projects.

The developed framework proved to be a valuable tool for evaluating the capacity-building components in rural development projects during project identification, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The framework was useful for focusing on points of concern to planners, implementors and evaluators of projects in which capacity-building is an objective. It may have potential as a tool for in depth studies, on-site case studies, or for examining the same project in different phases of its development.

The areas of concern for planners, implementors, and evaluators of projects with capacity-building components which emerged from the evaluation of the selected projects were consistent with the findings from previous literature, and were incorporated into the revised matrix (Figure 3). These areas of concern included:

1. Establishing capacity-building objectives and ways of evaluating their achievement.
2. Consideration of external factors affecting the project at all stages in its development.
3. Strategy development and implementation of plans.
4. Planning and implementation of monitoring and evaluation.
5. Utilization of indigenous institutions.
6. Planning and conducting management training.
7. Planning and implementing a process approach to development.
8. Consideration of the evolution of the project development process.

It is suggested that these key areas are of concern to those involved in projects with the goal of building capacity through experiential learning in local institutions or groups, whether those projects are in developed or developing countries. The matrix provides a valuable tool for ensuring that important factors affecting the development of capacity are not overlooked at any stage in the project development process. However, specific details of project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation will vary with the circumstances.

**Implications to Planners, Implementors, and Evaluators of Rural Development Projects**

It is essential for those involved in rural development to understand the complexities of the constraints affecting the projects with which they are involved if successful implementation is to be achieved. This necessity is particularly true of the capacity-building components in rural development projects. In order to facilitate the building of institutional capacity, project planners, implementors, and evaluators should work closely together, and utilize the revised matrix to:

1. Establish capacity-building objectives and ways of evaluating their achievement.
2. Identify external factors affecting the project at all stages in its development, making use of those factors which facilitate, and minimizing those factors which constrain the building of capacity. Also, to interpret project outcomes in the light of these factors.
3. Develop a strategy and implement it.
4. Develop and implement a monitoring and evaluation system which records facts relevant to capacity-building.
5. Utilize indigenous institutions.
6. Plan and conduct management training.
7. Plan and implement a process approach to development.
8. Consider the evolution of the project development process to gain insight into the degree of success and the future direction of the project.

Implications to Agricultural Extension Professionals

In rural development projects, agricultural extension professionals are actively involved in the process of technology transfer and developing the capacity of individuals and institutions to make use of that technology. Like other development professionals, they may be involved in activities such as needs assessment during the context evaluation stage, the planning of learning experiences, and monitoring and evaluation systems during the input evaluation stage, the implementation and monitoring of planned programs during the process evaluation stage, and the evaluation of the products of a program during the product evaluation stage. It is therefore essential that those involved in agricultural extension in a rural development context work together with other development professionals to follow the recommendations listed above.

Agricultural extension professionals should be aware that the training component in rural development projects plays an important role in capacity-building, and should work with others involved in project development to ensure that appropriate educational experiences are planned, implemented and evaluated. These learning experiences may be
provided in a number of ways, including the utilization of a learning-by-doing approach, and the organization of workshops, classes and forums.

Agricultural extension professionals need to be aware of the factors that facilitate or constrain the building of capacity. In particular, they should remember that capacity-building is facilitated when it is given serious consideration at all stages in the program development process.
REFERENCES


I would like to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to the following people for their guidance, encouragement, and assistance during my Ph.D. program.

To Dr. Robert A. Martin for serving as my major professor, and for advising me throughout my coursework and research.

To Dr. D. Michael Warren for serving on my committee, providing advice, and making available to me the resources in his office, as well as those of the Technology and Social Change Program.

To Drs. W. Wade Miller, Rosalie H. Norem, and David L. Williams for serving on my committee and being ready to provide assistance whenever I needed it.

To Dr. Mary E. Huba for her willingness to take time to discuss the study with me.

To Diana Conyers, Rob Mellors, and Jack Eldon for their feedback on the findings from the Zambian projects.

To K. A. S. Wickrama for sharing his collection of reports on the Hambantota District Integrated Rural Development Project with me, and for providing me with feedback on my findings about the project.

To members of the Iowa CES and the West Virginia University Center for Extension and Continuing Education, who provided me with valuable research material.

To the numerous people who shared their time and thoughts as I planned the study and looked for appropriate projects to evaluate.

To my husband, Bill, for all his encouragement and assistance, and to my children, John and Tamsin, for their cooperation.