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The Regulatory Reform and Private Enterprise Division of EDI (EDIRP) with the Parliamentary Center of Canada conducted a seminar on Parliament and Good Governance: The Challenge of Controlling Corruption in Kingston, Ontario, Canada from July 25-August 1, 1998. This was the second seminar offered since the initial Laurentian Seminar on Parliament and the Challenges of Good Governance that took place in Montebello, Canada between July 20-30, 1997. The eight-day program, the "flagship" of EDI-CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency) collaboration, was designed to help parliamentarians address critical, contemporary issues within a good governance framework that stresses principles of accountability, participation and openness. Specifically, the four primary objectives of the seminar were to: 1) present findings of studies on the factors associated with corruption and strengthen understanding of corruption; 2) discuss case studies of successful anti-corruption policies and highlight the role of parliament in controlling corruption; 3) raise awareness on the importance of holding the government financially and legally accountable and promote accountability, openness, and participation; and 4) identify concrete and effective means of improving parliamentary performance in controlling corruption. The seminar brought together 28 parliamentarians from 21 countries (all but 2 parliamentarians were from developing countries) to discuss how they and their parliaments can tackle the problem of corruption. Also in attendance were six observers from international agencies.

EDI's Evaluation Unit (EDIES) utilized an end-of-course questionnaire to evaluate the seminar. Twenty-one respondents completed the questionnaire, a response rate of 75 percent. There were 2 sections to the questionnaire. The first section asked respondents to rate the extent to which the course met its performance objectives through closed-ended responses. The second section asked the respondents about the qualities of the seminar which were most and least useful to them and also allowed them to offer suggestions for improvements through open-ended responses. A 5-point Likert type scale that ranged from 1 = minimum to 5 = maximum was used to rate respondents' ratings for each question. Following are summaries of the major evaluation findings.

- The mean scores of all seminar performance indicators, including relevance, design, effectiveness, and objectives met exceeded 3.0, the mid-point of the 5-point scale. Additionally, only four of the twenty-six questions in total did not exceed a mean of 4.0 (mean scores in the high or above average range are defined as 4.0 to 4.8; low or below average mean scores are from 3.5 to 3.9). Respondents indicated that the course was relevant to their current work or functions and relevant to their country's needs. Respondents' mean score for both indicators was 4.4 out of 5.0.

- A high range of scores was awarded to 3 of the 4 primary seminar objectives. The highest overall mean score attained (4.8) was for how the seminar raised awareness on the importance of holding the government financially and legally accountable and promoting accountability, openness, and participation for parliamentarians. Similarly, the seminar was highly rated (4.5) for presenting findings of studies on the factors associated with corruption and for strengthening parliamentarians' understanding of corruption. A mean of 4.2 was given to how the seminar
identified concrete and effective means of improving parliamentary performance in controlling corruption. However, the seminar's objective of discussing case studies of successful anti-corruption policies highlighting the role of parliament in controlling corruption received a mean score of 3.8, the lowest for any of its four primary objectives.

- An appreciation of both the complexity and importance of the issues was also rated above average by the seminar's respondents. The mean for both categories was 4.6, with 95 percent of the respondents awarding a score of 4 or 5.

- The overall effectiveness of the seminar was rated highly by the respondents. The mean for this category was 4.4, with 95 percent of the respondents awarding a score of 4 or 5.

- Increasing parliamentarians' understanding of important issues was another vital component of the seminar. The respondents indicated that the seminar helped them to understand the key elements of a realistic parliamentary action plan. The mean for this was 4.2 and 91 percent of the respondents gave this category a score of 4 or 5. Additionally, the respondents indicated that their understanding of the role of other groups involved in controlling corruption had been improved by participating in the seminar. A mean of 4.2 was awarded for this category.

- Creating partnerships with others has been envisioned as one means of controlling corruption. Results indicated that the seminar was helpful for the respondents in identifying areas for further cooperation with others. The mean for this was 4.2. However, relatively lower mean scores were observed in the effectiveness of the seminar in facilitating partnerships with others involved on the issues. Respondents mean scores for this was 3.9. This suggests that the respondents may need further direction and advice on the proper people they should work with to combat corruption.

- The seminar received high performance ratings in three other areas. Respondents felt that the seminar maintained their interest during its full duration. The usefulness of the sub-committee meetings in facilitating in-depth discussion was also seen as helpful by the respondents. Additionally, the respondents indicated that the time between topics was well balanced. The percentages of scores between 4 and 5 for respondents' ratings on these three indicators fell between 81-95 percent. Each of the three mean scores were 4.3 out of 5.0. A lower rating of 4.1, however, was assigned to how focused the seminar was on the issues which the respondents felt needed to be addressed.

- The respondents' rating of how much they learned about practical solutions which they had not previously considered had a mean score of 3.7 out of 5.0, the lowest rating of the course performance indicators. Sixty-seven percent of the respondents gave a score of 4 or 5 to this question, while 10% rated it with a 1 or 2. This implies that the respondents needed more practical answers to their problems on corruption. It also suggests that there may have been many seminar topics which were not new to them or relevant to their concerns.

- An analysis of the open-ended questions had several notable findings. It was revealed that the respondents' exchange of experiences with their seminar colleagues from around the world contributed to the usefulness of the seminar. Additionally, the respondents stated that one of their intentions as a result of the seminar would be to share their experiences with other members of their countries. The respondents also indicated that they would strive to remain in contact with each other to further share ideas and experiences. Finally, the respondents indicated that better translation of the speakers and materials in the seminar and holding regional seminars would both help to improve future seminars such as this one.