The Environment and Natural Resources Division of EDI (EDIEN), in collaboration with the Institutional and Social Policy Unit of the Africa Region of the World Bank (AFR/ISP), conducted a workshop on Social Development in Kampala, Uganda, from June 22-25, 1998. The workshop was designed to provide Bank NGO liaison officers and selected NGO members with an overview of the Bank's agenda on the social dimensions of development. The workshop covered such issues as the framework and methods of social analysis, and local participatory processes in project design and implementation. Nineteen participants attended this workshop, consisting of 10 NGO liaison officers of the World Bank from 10 Anglophone African countries and 9 representatives from collaborating NGOs in those countries.

The EDI Evaluation Unit (EDIES) conducted a Level I (participants' reaction) evaluation using 3 methods. First, a participants' feedback questionnaire was used to assess the workshop's design and overall achievement of objectives. The questionnaire was completed by all 19 participants at the end of the workshop. A 5-point Likert type scale that ranged from 1=minimum to 5=maximum was used for each question. Secondly, participants' self-assessed knowledge levels measured by a participatory monitoring and evaluation (M&E) instrument were used. The M&E instrument was designed by the workshop organizers to allow participants to develop relevant measurement indicators on their capacity to manage a social assessment at the beginning and end of the workshop. At the beginning of the workshop, or Phase I, participants were asked to consider individually, and then in small groups, which indicators they believed were useful and necessary for evaluating a participant's capacity to conduct the social analysis and participatory processes. Participants were then asked to meet as a whole group and develop a set of no more than ten indicators. A total of five indicators were developed by the participants in Phase I. Participants then rated their perceived level of knowledge of each of the indicators using a 5-point scale. On the final day, or Phase II, participants reviewed the usefulness and relevancy of the indicators developed at Phase I based on what they learned in the workshop. Three new indicators were added in Phase II. Participants then rated each of the 8 indicators of Phase II using the same scale.

The third method of evaluation was a correlation analysis. This analysis was conducted to examine which factors of the self-reported "process" indicators, such as the degree of focus on high priority issues and the methods of conveying principles, were related to the self-reported "outcome" indicators, the degrees to which respondents felt strengthened in certain areas or skills. A Pearson's product-moment correlation test was used for this analysis. Test results in the form of correlation coefficients between 4 particular process indicators and 3 outcome indicators are summarized in Table 1 (See page 4). Each of the 4 self-reported process measures was correlated with each of the 3 self-reported outcome measures separately. Coefficients range
from –1.0 to 1.0, and measure the extent to which process and outcome factors vary together. The higher the positive or negative coefficient, the stronger the relationship. A coefficient of 0 indicates no relationship. Following is a summary of the evaluation findings.

Review of Workshop Objectives and Design

- Respondents’ overall assessment of the workshop was measured by 2 questions. They were the relevancy of the workshop to the respondents' professional work (mean=4.53) and the extent to which the workshop was a productive use of their time (mean=4.37). These were among the highest scores given by the respondents.

- One of the 3 questions asked to measure the extent to which the workshop achieved its objectives was how respondents felt the workshop strengthened their skills in undertaking social analysis and participatory process issues. Respondents were asked to rate 3 specific items of the workshop on this topic. They indicated that the item on the implementation and evaluation process was most strengthened (mean=4.06). Ratings on the other two topics, policy dialogue and project design, were in the 3.0 range on a 5-point scale, 3.67 and 3.84, respectively.

- Respondents gave higher ratings to the other 2 questions measuring the level of workshop’s achievement of objectives. These were the extent to which the workshop strengthened the ISP/social development family network (mean=4.29) and extent to which the workshop provided an effective forum for information exchange between the Bank staff and NGO representatives (mean=4.16).

- Among the 4 questions on workshop design, one aspect of the workshop received a rating exceeding 4.0. It was the selection of readings and other supporting materials (mean=4.24). The other 3 areas of workshop design were in the 3.0 range. These were whether the workshop focused on high priority issues related to social analysis and participation (mean=3.89), used effective methods to convey key principles and understanding of the issues (mean=3.68), and sustained the respondents’ interest and interchange (mean=3.58).

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Exercise

- At Phase I of the participatory training evaluation, the participants developed 5 measurement indicators that they felt important for capacity to manage a social assessment (SA). These were the understanding of SA processes and conceptual theories, understanding of tools and techniques of SA processes, participants' confidence in SA processes, participatory processes in design and implementation, and managing and mainstreaming SA processes. At the end of the workshop (Phase II), the participants developed 3 additional indicators. These were sourcing, networks, and Bank procedures.

- Respondents' self-assessment of knowledge showed an increase in rating by at least 15% before and after the workshop across the 5 indicators developed in Phase I. At the beginning of the workshop, respondents' ratings of the five indicators ranged between 2.9 and 3.35 on a 5-point scale. At the end of the workshop, the ratings ranged between 3.45 and 3.86. The largest increases in the rating were observed on the level of understanding SA tools and techniques, a gain of 25%, and on the respondents’ confidence level in dealing with SA processes, a gain of 19%.
• Respondents’ ratings of the 3 additional indicators developed at Phase II were above 3.0 on a 5-point scale. Their mean score on networking was the highest among all indicators developed at Phase II, 3.90. It was followed by knowledge of sourcing (mean=3.60) and Bank procedures (mean=3.45).

• This was the first time that EDI used a participatory monitoring and evaluation instrument in a training course. While the exercise was valuable in that it allowed participants to have hands-on experience in developing their own evaluation designs, there were a number of shortcomings to measuring the knowledge gains. First, participants’ pre/post knowledge gains were measured on only 5 indicators developed at Phase I, but not on the 3 additional indicators developed at Phase II. Second, the results of participants' knowledge ratings may have been contaminated because a course organizer participated in rating the indicators in Phase I, as well as 3 organizers in Phase II. Third, the scope of evaluation was limited within the indicators developed by the participants, which may not have been exhaustive in evaluating the social assessment process. Fourth, the exercise did not allow one-on-one comparisons of pre/post knowledge change because all responses were submitted anonymously.

Results of Correlation Analysis

• The correlation analysis used 4 self-reported process indicators. They were the degrees to which respondents felt the workshop (i) focused on high priority issues, (ii) used effective methods to convey key principles and understanding of the issues, (iii) sustained interest, learning and interchange, and (iv) selected the readings and other supporting materials well. Each of these 4 indicators was examined against each of the 3 self-reported outcome indicators, the degrees to which respondents felt the workshop strengthened their skills in undertaking 3 specific areas in social analysis and participatory process, namely, policy dialogue, project design, and implementation and evaluation.

• Test results showed a number of statistically significant relationship between the process and self-reported outcome indicators (Table 1). Among the 3 self-reported outcome indicators, one item ("the degree to which the workshop strengthened participants skills on project design") did not show any correlation with the 4 process indicators. Two of the self-reported outcome indicators, on the other hand, showed a significant positive relationship to at least 2 of the 4 process variables. The first outcome indicator, "the degree to which the workshop strengthened skills on policy dialogue," was positively related to 2 process indicators, the degree to which respondents felt the workshop focused on high priority issues (=.694 at the .01 level) and the degree to which they felt the workshop sustained their interest, learning and interchange (=.626, .01).

• A second self-reported outcome indicator, "the degree to which the workshop strengthened skills on implementation and evaluation," was related to 3 of the 4 process measures. The effective use of instructional methods (=.588, .05), how well instructors sustained interest, learning and interchange (=.742, .01), and how positively participants viewed the selected readings and other supporting materials (=.626, .01) showed a relatively strong positive relationship with this particular outcome indicator.

• The correlation analysis does not establish any "causality" between the compared indicators. However, the results offer useful insights about which features in the course's design or presentation may affect participants' self-reported outcomes. Test results indicated that the workshop's ability to sustain participants' interest and interchange may have been important in determining the participants' perception of at least 2 skill-building
areas, policy dialogue, and implementation and evaluation. Also notable was that the workshop's selection of reading materials may have been a critical feature for strengthening participants' implementation and evaluation skills, while it showed almost no relationship to their policy dialogue or project design skills. These indicators may serve as a useful reference for designing future workshops.

Table 1.

Correlation Coefficients Between Self-Reported Process and Outcome Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-reported process indicators</th>
<th>Focused on high priority issues</th>
<th>Used effective methods to convey principles</th>
<th>Sustained interest, learning and interchange</th>
<th>Selected the readings and other supporting materials well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree to which the workshop strengthened your skills on policy dialogue</td>
<td>.694**</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.626**</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree to which the workshop strengthened your skills on project design</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree to which the workshop strengthened your skills on implementation and evaluation</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.588*</td>
<td>.742**</td>
<td>.626**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level