

**Review and evaluation of The Salvation Army's Asia-Pacific Regional Facilitation Team Project  
(NORAD-funded project) PD 1897**

**Evaluation Report, August 2012**

**External evaluator: Dr Jill Olivier**

**Acknowledgements**

The evaluation team would like to thank NORAD and The Salvation Army for the opportunity to review such an interesting and hopeful array of activities. For internal assistance with this evaluation, the accompaniment and handling of practical matters by Ms Emily Pilborough and the advice of Major Dean Pallant were invaluable. We would also like to thank the gracious and exceptionally well-organised hosting of the in-country visits by all those who escorted and assisted us, including all the knowledgeable drivers and helpful staff, but in particular Mr Charles Clement (PNG), Major Susan Tandayag and Ms Airene Lozada (Philippines), and Major Widi Tampai and Major Donna Barthau (Indonesia). Most importantly, however, we would like to express our deepest appreciation for the respondents and participants of the interviews, focus groups and site visits. Everyone gave generously of their time and knowledge – clearly demonstrating what local development practice looks like when driven by mission and enthusiasm. Our warmest thanks and regards to everyone, and we hope you find your words expressed faithfully in this document.

**CONTENTS**

**Executive Summary 3**

**Abbreviations 11**

**1. Introducing Faith-based Facilitation and this Evaluation 12**

**1.1 Introduction: Faith-based Facilitation in the Salvation Army 12**

**1.2 The Process of this Evaluation 15**

**2. Introducing FBF in the Asia-Pacific Region 19**

**2.1 History of FBF in the Asia-Pacific 19**

**2.2. Comparing Country FBF Responses 21**

**3. Faith-based Facilitation in Papua New Guinea 25**

**3.1 Country context: PNG 25**

**3.2 Findings on FBF in PNG 26**

**4. Faith-based Facilitation in the Philippines 36**

**4.1 Country context: the Philippines 36**

**4.2 FBF in the Philippines: Findings 37**

**5. Faith-based Facilitation in Indonesia 47**

**5.1 Country context: Indonesia 47**

**5.2 FBF in Indonesia: Findings 48**

**6. Summary of Findings and Recommendations 59**

**6.1 Meeting the Goals of PD1897 and the Principles of FBF 59**

**Bibliography 71**

  

**Appendix A: TOR for Evaluation of PD1897 72**

**Appendix B: Electronic Questionnaire and FGD Outline 72**

**Appendix C: Glossary 75**

**Appendix D: FB-Facilitators Regional List 78**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF THE SALVATION ARMY'S ASIA-PACIFIC REGIONAL FACILITATION PROJECT PD 1897**

*Faith-based facilitation* (FBF) is intended to be a process or approach for deepening relationships across all levels of The Salvation Army operations and programmes. FBF incorporates several different theoretical concepts from social science and development practice, as well as from Salvation Army policies and theology, such as: human capacity development, community driven development, assets based community development, and 'integrated mission'. It also draws from specific activities and tools, such as SALT (Stimulate, Appreciate, Listen, and Transfer), participatory action research, community asset mapping and facilitation. It thereby aims to be both a way of thinking and doing – as well as provide basic tools to this purpose. The introduction to the new FBF manual, *Building Deeper Relationships* states:

*“Faith-Based Facilitation (FBF) is a way of helping people think, talk, explore and respond to their issues in the light of faith...FBF is not a theory or a project – it is a way of working. It is not a new idea but it needs to be practiced, remembered and implemented. It needs to become a habit. Giving this process a name and linking it with a set of tools and theological resources will be new for some people...People can be trained in these relationship-building skills and become faith-based facilitators. They can then form teams (or use the skills in their everyday personal relationships) to improve the relationships in their communities. Such an approach is not separate to normal Salvation Army processes but should become an integral part of its structure and way of working” (TSA 2010b, 3).*

The process and toolset that is now called 'faith-based facilitation' has undergone a series of policy and strategy shifts over the last two decades. In the 1990s, 'facilitation teams' were set up at an international and then regional level to share lessons, particularly around HIV/AIDS response. Local community facilitation activities were encouraged, and a pool of Salvation Army staff was developed that had experience in facilitation and enthusiasm for participatory and assets-based community development approaches. The facilitation teams then began to get engaged in a much wider range of issues than HIV/AIDS, for example, getting involved in primary health care (PHC), community development, youth work, or sustainable food supply. By 2008, an 'integrated approach' was being advocated, which positioned facilitation and its community engagement processes as important across all Salvation Army health, development and mission activities. In 2008, there was also a deliberate renaming of facilitation as '*faith-based facilitation*': an effort to develop a faith-relevant resource for community engagement for The Salvation Army.

Faith-based facilitation, in its current incarnation, is intended to be an integrated process or approach for deepening relationships across all levels of Salvation Army operations and activities. It is a challenge to standard programme evaluation or monitoring approaches. There is no basic logic model with activities and outputs that can be tested here, and no simple list of impact indicators on which to judge success. As a process for all levels of Salvation Army action, FBF becomes a 'systems strengthening intervention' rather than a project or programme. This evaluation is therefore similarly complex, and this evaluation report therefore provides more information than is usually required for such a project evaluation. The intention is to provide as full an account as possible in order to support the future development of this complex systems initiative and thinking.

Broadly speaking, the original goals of PD1897 (see TOR below) have largely been met in the Asia-Pacific region. FBF activities such as regional meetings, the development and introduction of a training manual (in a participatory manner), coordination of the process from a regional platform, development of internal processes for change, and training processes for human capacity development have been enacted so far as the resources (human and financial) have taken them. Some territories might be later in the 'roll-out' stage than was originally envisioned, but this could be counted as a reality of broad-scale systems change and development response.

*We summarise the sixteen main recommendations made in this report, with corresponding sub-level recommendations (noting that country-specific findings and recommendations are made in the country chapters):*

**R1. There are clear opportunities or entry points for engagement through FBF that need to be more intentionally sought out and leveraged in the Asia-Pacific region**

---

- There is a significant opportunity for FBF to be wielded as a tool and process for building community resilience and strengthening responses for natural disasters in the Asia-Pacific region.
- The CIA+ teams in Indonesia provide a strong case example for the integration of disaster response with everyday community development capacity that needs to be learnt from.
- FBF should be considered as a tool for developing 'disaster readiness' in the region (perhaps with lessons from HIV/AIDS competence).
- FBF could be more properly utilised as a tool and approach for relational conflict management (or peace building), most particularly in PNG.
- FBF could be more properly utilised as a tool and approach for inter-faith collaboration and engagement, the specific nature of which need to be considered in relation each territory's specific context.
- Sulawesi-Indonesia provides a useful case study for interfaith cooperation, and Philippines provides a useful case to consider the ramifications and realities of interfaith cooperation in contexts of evangelical competition.
- The primary health care services and operations of the Salvation Army provide a particular opportunity for strengthening community engagement and relationships, and FBF would be a most useful tool for that process.
- There is a great international interest in understanding the most appropriate mechanisms for connecting health services to the local communities they serve. The Salvation Army could benefit greatly from further reflection and research on this, and has the potential to become a world leader on this critically important issue.
- There is an opportunity to be more intentional about taking the lessons learnt from HIV/AIDS (and the facilitation processes developed more than a decade ago), and transferring those lessons to other issues and systems strengthening more generally.

**R2. There are many issues and areas that require further research – or building capacity for information collection and knowledge transfer, if FBF is to develop further**

---

- There is low capacity for 'research' in all territories of the Asia-Pacific, and capacities for such needs to be urgently strengthened if the FBF process is to succeed, and for TSA operation strengthening in general.
- There is a huge desire for stories and examples of FBF in practice to be gathered and shared, although little capacity being put towards doing so. Capacity needs to be developed for story-gathering for FBF, and particular roles (such as a 'lore-keeper' or 'communication facilitator') established.
- We would recommend that someone at the territorial FBF team-level is tasked with becoming the central repository for local FBF stories, and that this is maintained in such a way as is available to all teams, and would not move with that person should they leave that role.
- The gathering of FBF stories should be developed as a process item for FBF training (for example, requiring that the examples provided in training sessions are reported on)
- Case studies are a particularly valuable and low-cost product which should be encouraged from a regional and international level. Case studies of success, failures, and FBF champions should be sought out and developed into a central resource (not necessarily only for the Asia-Pacific region).

- Stories and case studies of ‘failures’ or activities which had to be adapted should be encouraged and ‘celebrated’ more vigorously. These are critically important learning tools – and this is also a valuable approach so that FBF is understood as a tool for genuine internal reflective practice and learning (rather than as a promotional tool for external audiences).
- The current case studies on the IHQ/BBF website are not sufficient, and need to be developed further, with specific thematic items and contextualised examples. That is, if certain case scenarios are requested from all territories this should encourage reflection on what is possible through FBF.
- Research and documentation skills need to be taught at different levels. For example more complex communication, participatory research and web-based skills are clearly necessary for some while more ‘simple’ story-telling and oral research skills would be useful for others.

### **R3. The cascade model for FBF needs to be carefully considered – and alternative entry-points such as integration into TSA education system emphasised**

---

- It is recommended that the territorial FBF teams not be rushed into a training cascade model without careful consideration of local context and capacity.
- Experience in some territories has demonstrated that appropriate resourcing, leadership support, the appropriate position and make-up of a territorial FBF team all need to be considered before cascade training should be implemented.
- Un-governed re-echoing of training should be discouraged, unless there is a process or mechanism in place to ensure that the concepts underpinning FBF are properly understood and maintained.
- Alternative ideas for FBF ‘coaching’ should be considered, and if necessary resourced. For example, long-term mentoring of a highly skilled facilitator with a newly interested individual over a period of time, or pairing of a highly skilled grassroots facilitator with someone trained in the theoretical underpinning and conceptual bases of FBF.
- Alternative ideas for FBF training should be developed in areas where travel is restricted. This would differ depending on what alternative communication strategies are possible.
- TSA officers and staff require specific support in moving from a needs-based approach towards an assets-based perspective. It should be considered whether more in-depth engagement on specific tools or skills such as assets based community development might not have a more significant impact than rapid lessons on the entire BDR toolset.
- For the FBF process to become less dependent on support for training sessions, given the rapid and detrimental staff reallocation cycling that occurs, and given the desire for FBF integration across all operations as an everyday way of working, integration onto TSA education systems *at all levels* appears to be both necessary and a significant opportunity. (This would include FBF modules in schools, theological training, officers’ education, staff training, health worker’s education, officer’s further education, leadership education at IHQ and the like).
- Integrating FBF into the educational curriculum of the Salvation Army system at all levels is a high priority. Developing specific curriculum packages for FBF (for teaching in different contexts) is of high priority.

### **R4. The sustainability of the regional FBF process require urgent attention – as does the process for response to issues that the FBF process highlights**

---

- At this time, it is not clear how the FBF regional process will be supported or sustained in the future. The FBF regional process is not yet at a point where it is fully integrated or self-sustaining at a territorial level, and the PNG example has demonstrated how much slower the process unfolds without financial support. Alternative resourcing (whether internal or external) needs to be sought.
- An issue that requires direct engagement in relation to FBF is the concern that community engagement (e.g. through conversations or mapping) by Army officers raises expectations at a community level that they are not resourced or equipped to respond to. This fear inhibits the building of deeper relationships – and asset mapping is not a sufficient

response (that is, it is not sufficient to argue that all needs that are identified need to be supported through the identification of community assets not through TSA charity). This is a fundamental issue that requires direct reflective and conceptual engagement from leadership as well as those being trained in FBF.

- Several examples in this evaluation suggest the success of small ‘drip-fed’ funding streams for strengthening community-level activities. FBF teams should be encouraged to be involved in engagement and joint learning on best practices for the support of community initiatives (in-kind and financial).
- Several examples in this evaluation demonstrate the value of the Salvation Army acting as an ‘intermediary’, supporting the incubation of small community initiatives. This role and opportunity should be researched and reviewed for future engagement and sustainability.

#### **R5. The FBF materials (such as the Building Deeper Relationships manual) require continued development**

- The BDR manual is generally well received and appreciated. However, all territories demonstrated a desire for a localised manual (translated, with local stories and images).
- There was a strong request for further shared training materials to be developed that would accompany the manual – this should be supported with some urgency, and considered for different audience needs.
- It is recommended that targeted FBF case studies are developed specifically for teaching practice at different levels and in different contexts.
- It is recommended that FBF ‘educators’ are identified and/or capacitated (in addition to skilled operational FBF ‘trainers’) – that is, key individuals able to communicate the concepts, principles and policy-related strategy that underpins FBF, whether to territorial leadership or to cadets.
- It is recommended that now that the ‘easy-reading’ manual has been completed in the form of *Building Deeper Relationships*, a higher level resource is also developed – specifically for engaging leadership and encouraging organisational and theological reflection on the issues which FBF highlights. This could also be utilised to develop ‘FBF Champions’ once they have been caught by the initial introduction to the FBF.

#### **R6. There is a need for further capacity to be established for regional coordination and communication of the FBF process**

- The governance of the FBF process at an international and regional level needs to be more clearly articulated – clarifying the different roles of the various players.
- The role of the Zonal Facilitation Resources Officer (ZFRO) needs to be urgently reviewed, articulated, and if necessary provided with improved capacity for regional coordination and knowledge transfer.
- Given the transportation difficulties in the region, the length of time that genuine ‘FBF demonstration’ takes, and how rarely competent FBF Champion-teachers have the time for training and demonstration – it is suggested that a new role could usefully be developed and resourced: a *Regional Faith-based Facilitation Officer*. This would be a more junior level staff member than the ZFRO, but would be someone passionate about FBF and skilled at communicating it at different levels. Such a person could move slowly through the region, and rather than spending resources on costly meetings and workshops, demonstrate FBF through ‘accompaniment’ over more extended periods of time.
- Communication flows and processes between THQ and DHQ(s) need to be reviewed. Many soldiers or officers at a divisional level felt isolated from information flows. FBF could be utilised as a process to map communication flows and the underlying issues of trust and power that enable or create barriers to information sharing.

### **R7. There is still a significant role for international (IHQ) engagement, in particular in gaining leadership commitment and systems integration**

---

- Lack of leadership commitment for FBF is a key obstacle in most territories evaluated. There is a significant role for international FBF Champions (wherever they are situated) to facilitate high level reflection and engagement on FBF.
- Territorial FBF teams have found it difficult to gain leadership support from those positioned higher than themselves, for example the territorial commanders. It is therefore necessary for the regional and international leadership to demonstrate and vocalise their commitment to FBF.
- The current plan for Programme Resources to be in charge of integrating FBF across all activities at an international level seems to be an effective strategy. Clear suggestions were made that FBF be included in funding proposals and reporting requirements (such as CPMS). It would likely be very effective if FBF were made visible as part of such every-day processes throughout TSA operations.
- Commissioner Alistair Herring, International Secretary for the SPEA Zone, appears to be personally interested and committed to FBF as a process. It would be useful if the Commissioner was more overtly seen to be supportive of FBF, for example, perhaps in his leadership role, he could be visibly observed utilising FBF as part of an internal process in a meeting of regional leadership.

### **R8. The governance of the FBF process cannot be left to chance at a territorial level, and the formation of territorial teams needs to be more properly managed and resourced**

---

- The capacity and location of territorial FBF teams has a fundamental effect on how FBF evolves in that territory. The territorial team function needs to be more strongly 'managed' and resourced to ensure an effective FBF response. The development of territorial (and divisional) FBF teams cannot be left to be done in an ad-hoc manner.
- Kick-start seed funding for FBF has been supportive of efforts in those countries which received it – and detrimental to those that did not. Seed funding not only provides support for initial territorial team development and initial training, but the basic project processes (reporting, leadership approval) roots the FBF process more deeply into the territorial organisational system.
- Dedicated staff time for territorial (and divisional level) FBF teams is necessary for the success of the FBF process. Staff time might need to be reviewed or negotiated with or by leadership.
- In the Asia-Pacific, even a bottom-up grassroots intervention will have little visibility within the hierarchical Salvation Army system unless it is validated from the top-down, and is made visible as a systems requirement. The insertion of FBF into TSA operations (such as the projects planning in the Philippines) should be recognised, celebrated and set as an evaluation indicator.

### **R9. Strengthening the FBF process and human resource pool requires improved coordination, improved communication, leadership commitment and internal reflection on TSA staff processes**

---

- The issue of staff reallocation or cycling as being detrimental to FBF and to building deeper relationships must be considered by leadership at all levels as a matter of extreme urgency.
- Handover processes need to be more strongly monitored and managed – and the relational nature of the handover more carefully observed.
- Consider if there are creative opportunities to counter the destructive effects of staff cycling, for example the creation of facilitation team *roles* that are maintained in each team, or the pooling and tracking of FBF Champions into different roles.
- Clear roles and responsibilities need to be clarified for those engaged in FBF coordination.

- Creative strategies are needed for FBF to be included in officer or staff performance appraisals – for example, mapping what relationships were built during time in a particular role (internal or external to TSA), or indicating the strength of certain collaborative relationships. The inclusion of such indicators in performance reviews would ensure that FBF is more adequately embedded and valued.
- We suggest that ‘FBF Champions’ be identified in a database or simple document that is maintained at a regional or international level. This could be utilised to track FBF capacity development, to improve communication, and to ensure that capacity is not entirely ‘lost’ if a person is transferred to another role.
- We suggest that for those considering a different approach to the cascade model (see above) another approach might be to concentrate and track FBF activities around FBF Champions (where-ever they are physically allocated).

---

#### **R10. FBF Champions need to be more effectively sought, recognised and valued for this work at all levels**

- ‘FBF Champions’ need to be actively sought and drawn into the FBF process in every territory and division.
- FBF Champions need to be creatively drawn into joint engagement with FBF – and not only as ‘trainers’. We suggest that an alternative role or title is created which would allow for key individuals that practice FBF in an exemplary manner to be recognized, celebrated and drawn into community with the FBF teams.
- The FBF activities of FBF Champions needs to be recognised as an essential part of their work – and celebrated in some fashion (for example, case studies of FBF Champions in a Salvation Army publication).
- The competencies and capabilities of FBF Champions need to be researched and better understood in the contexts in which they operate.
- Skilled facilitation or its competencies such as skilled multi-sectoral collaboration or skilled community activism, needs to be recognised as a professional competency and activity within the Salvation Army organisational culture and operational processes.

---

#### **R11. The ‘conceptual integrity’ or processes for conceptual governance of FBF needs to be more carefully protected**

- As an integrated process, it is even more important that the core concepts and values on which FBF is based are actively protected through a strategic and intentional process. The conceptual governance of FBF needs to be tasked to someone at regional or international levels.
- A key area for such engagement is around the tension between FBF as a tool for evangelisation and FBF as a tool for interfaith and community relationship building (see box below).
- There was surprisingly little evidence of FBF as ‘theology in practice’ in the Asia-Pacific region. It is suggested that the conceptual governance of FBF also involves theological engagement on several issues as identified in the country chapters above.
- FBF raises various concerns relating to practical theology - and therefore could be a useful teaching tool for theological education.
- FBF provides rich entry-points and a process for leadership reflection on the mission of the Salvation Army, especially in relation to the tensions between service provision (charity) and community development approaches.

---

#### **R12. FBF can be more intentionally positioned and demonstrated as a leadership tool for reflection, the development of internal processes, and policy engagement**

- FBF should be considered and promoted as a tool for reflective practice that can balance top-down and bottom-up organisational trends by creating safe spaces for engagement on leadership and organisational processes.
- Case study examples are needed demonstrating FBF as a tool for reflective practice.



- High level leadership need to demonstrate how FBF can be utilised as a tool for reflective practice and staff engagement within the Salvation Army – most particularly for long-term planning.
- Case studies should be developed which demonstrate how FBF can be utilised as tool for policy engagement on sensitive internal or external issues – for example the re-engineering of TSA health services.
- Case studies should be developed which demonstrate how FBF could be utilised as a tool for advocacy at a community level.
- Regional, territorial and divisional mapping of Salvation Army assets and activities should be encouraged, demonstrating FBF in practice.
- Mapping activities should be undertaken that could make FBF more visible on the Salvation Army websites and in the Salvation Army Yearbook. For example partner/network mapping, or improved mapping of territorial social programs.

### **R13. The development of follow-up or M&E processes for FBF in territories needs to be capacitated**

---

- The development of M&E processes and indicators for FBF has been identified as a key focus area however, as there is only limited human resource capacity for this at this time, the development of a regional M&E process should be supported with some urgency.
- In lieu of more complex models of M&E, a basic (non-threatening) process for follow-up of those trained in FBF or leadership commitments should be designed and suggested.
- M&E should be oriented towards the measurement of process or systems strengthening rather than impact. The diffused nature of the new approach makes measuring impact of FBF on integrated programs a difficult and not clearly valuable undertaking.
- Consider indicators which evaluate the quality of relationships rather than the quantity of relationships
- Consider social network mapping as a useful tool for assessing relationship strength, and can be done at fairly low cost.
- Consider the introduction of more creative indicators such as ‘trust’ (e.g. interpersonal or institutional trust).
- FBF evaluation elements should be inserted into all possible funding and reporting forms, such as CPMS and annual project reports.

### **R14. Regional communication needs to be more strong resourced and coordinated**

---

- The regional meetings were highly valued, and if such can be resourced again, would be a valuable method for maintaining communication and shared learning.
- If further regional meetings are resourced, it might be more useful to frame them as a process of ‘joint learning’ rather than a workshop in a deliberate effort to create a regional learning community which would share experiences on FBF (e.g. where shared communications strategies and issues could be identified).
- A lower-cost regional communication system is highly desired, and urgently required. This might take the form of a newsletter with shared experiences, or a simple email list. This should be tasked to someone at an international or regional level with some urgency.
- A regional communication strategy should be developed. This might entail a simple document or diagram detailing how information about FBF is to be communicated in the region, who is tasked with the communication, and how regularly this should occur.
- The ‘follow-up’ of FBF process communications needs to be more strongly encouraged – for example, trip or meeting reports after exchange visits need to be quickly shared with participants and informants. Deeper relationships and trust require effective and reliable communication. The FBF communication practices within and outside of TSA need to be in line with the ethics of participatory communication practices.

- The collection and sharing of stories and case studies should be prioritised, and made into a standard practice in all FBF-related meetings and activities.
- The existing Salvation Army communication network with its newsletters, magazines and websites could be more effectively utilised to spread the FBF stories and thinking out across the Salvation Army operations.

**R15. The Salvation Army should research and leverage its unique capacity for integrative activities, and role as an intermediary – and consider this role seriously in relation to effecting systems change**

---

- The Salvation Army should utilise FBF as a process for researching and reflecting on its unique capacity for integrated service and engagement. We provided several examples in the country-chapters for unique cases of integration, such as the physical integration of assets in TSA compounds, mission trip to Pani'i, integrated strength of husband-wife officer teams, the CIA+ team integrating HIV/AIDS with disaster response, or the unique resilience of the Salvation Army system with international, national and local support structures. All of these suggest a unique capacity for blended and integrated activities.
- Leveraging these assets requires taking the concept of systems change and systems thinking more seriously.
- Salvation Army staff should review FBF as a systems strengthening intervention – and should begin a process of articulating the Theory of Change of FBF. This would inform the future process if FBF internationally and regionally.
- 'Integration' is emerging as a key issue on the international health agenda – and could be an important area for the Salvation Army to engage at both policy and practice levels.
- Some reflection and further planning is needed as Asia-Pacific HIV/AIDS programmes are integrated into broader community and development activities. It is important that we do not lose the capacities and lessons from HIV/AIDS in this process of integration. Someone should be tasked to look more closely at integration and ensuring 'lessons from HIV/AIDS' activities are properly documented, considered and fed back into the broader system.

**R16. 'Steady as she goes': systems change requires time, and it is recommended that the FBF process in the Asia-Pacific region now moves into a period of constancy and reiteration**

---

There is no question that continued leadership action and process management is required if FBF is to succeed. However, given the number of policy and terminological shifts that have occurred over the last two decades, there is understandable anxiety and caution from many different levels within TSA. Some officers and staff articulate FBF as a wonderful or terrifying new way of thinking (terrifying if it is perceived as counter-cultural to the TSA's organisational and power structure); some see FBF as simply a new terminology for what they have always been doing; and others suspect it is simply a new fad or fashion that will blow over and be replaced by something else, so should just be waited out. Officers and staff often view themselves as critically busy individuals, surrounded by a wealth of tools, methods and organisational guidance mechanisms. If FBF is truly going to shift from becoming 'another programmatic burden' to a changed way of thinking and being within TSA, then all of these expectations need to be opened up for debate – and constancy is probably the most important tool to ensure success.

All the recommendations above therefore operate within the overarching recommendation that the purpose, terminology and principles of the FBF process remain unchanged for some time. There would be great value in letting the dust settle, continuing to build on the current achievements, and where appropriate making creative adaptations to the process for greater impact and effect.

## Abbreviations

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome	RFT	Regional Facilitation Team
ART	Anti-retroviral therapy/treatment	RPF	Regional Programme Facilitation
BDR	Building Deeper Relationships	SALT	Stimulate, Appreciate, Listen, Transfer
CBO	Community-based Organisation	SALT (ADO)	Salvation Army Leadership Training (Africa Dev Office)
CDD	Community Driven Development	SPEA	South Pacific East Asia
CHW	Community Health Worker	TC	Territorial Commander
CPMS	Community Projects Management and Support	THQ	Territorial Headquarters
CPT	Care and Prevention Team	TSA	The Salvation Army
CSS	Community systems strengthening	VCT	Voluntary Counseling and Testing
DC	Divisional Commander	ZFRO	Zonal Facilitation Resources Officer
DHQ	Divisional Headquarters		
FBF	Faith-based Facilitation		
HBC	Home-based care		
HCDR	Human Capacity for Development and Response		
HIV	Human Immuno-deficiency virus		
HPSR	Health policy and systems research		
HR	Human resources		
HSS	Health systems strengthening		
IHQ	International Headquarters		
IHSC	International Health Services Coordinator		
IRHAP	International Religious Health Assets Programme		
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation		
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding		
MTCT	Mother to Child Transmission		
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation		
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation		
OTC	Officers Training College		
OVC	Orphans and vulnerable children		
PNG	Papua New Guinea		

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCING FAITH-BASED FACILITATION AND THIS EVALUATION

*In this chapter we introduce some of the core concepts underpinning faith-based facilitation, as well as the process and methodology of this review and evaluation.*

### 1.1 Introduction: Faith-based Facilitation in the Salvation Army

There is a core tension in this evaluation report: we have set out to provide a programme or project evaluation on a process that is strongly opposed to being understood or described as a programme or project. *Faith-based facilitation* (FBF) is intended to be a process or approach for deepening relationships across all levels of Salvation Army operations and programmes. FBF incorporates several different theoretical concepts from social science and development practice, as well as from Salvation Army policies and theology: such as human capacity development, community driven development, assets based community development, and ‘integrated mission’. It also draws from specific activities and tools, such as SALT (Stimulate, Appreciate, Listen, and Transfer), participatory action research, community asset mapping and facilitation (see glossary in Appendix C). It thereby aims to be both a way of thinking and doing – as well as provide basic tools to this purpose. The introduction to the new FBF manual, *Building Deeper Relationships* states:

*“Faith-Based Facilitation (FBF) is a way of helping people think, talk, explore and respond to their issues in the light of faith...FBF is not a theory or a project – it is a way of working. It is not a new idea but it needs to be practiced, remembered and implemented. It needs to become a habit. Giving this process a name and linking it with a set of tools and theological resources will be new for some people...People can be trained in these relationship-building skills and become faith-based facilitators. They can then form teams (or use the skills in their everyday personal relationships) to improve the relationships in their communities. Such an approach is not separate to normal Salvation Army processes but should become an integral part of its structure and way of working” (TSA 2010b, 3).*

The process and toolset that is now called ‘faith-based facilitation’ has a particular history in the Salvation Army (TSA). We will not address this general evolution in too much detail, as it has been addressed elsewhere and we address the Asia-Pacific context specifically in the chapter that follows (see Patterson 2010 and Pallant 2011). However, it is important that we consider some of the conceptual underpinnings, as there have been a number of policy and strategy shifts over the last two decades with regards to TSA’s community engagement and response strategies. In the 1990s, ‘facilitation teams’ were set up at an international and then regional level to share lessons, particularly around HIV/AIDS response. These Regional Facilitation Teams (RFTs) broke with conventional wisdom about clinical and professional knowledge and prioritised community knowledge and response. Local community facilitation activities were encouraged, and a pool of Salvation Army staff was developed that had experience in facilitation and enthusiasm for participatory and assets-based community development approaches. The Salvation Army was considered a global leader in the practice of community engagement in relation to HIV/AIDS, based largely on this facilitative approach (see Pallant in TSA 2009b).

The facilitation teams then began to get engaged in a much wider range of issues than HIV/AIDS, for example, getting involved in primary health care (PHC), community development, youth work, or sustainable food supply. While in some places the HIV/AIDS focus remained, by 2008, an ‘integrated approach’ was being advocated, which positioned facilitation and its community engagement processes as important across all Salvation Army health, development and mission activities.

Such discussion on best practices for community engagement drew ‘facilitation’ into a much broader scope of debate within TSA. Since 2005, TSA has been re-thinking many of its existing systems. As Patterson (2010) notes, TSA has always had an active outwards social engagement arm, but many of its social institutions were no longer thriving or financially sustainable: *“The need to make schools and hospitals pay for themselves is undermining the principle of service to the poor and disadvantaged.”* The Salvation Army therefore undertook a massive review of its mission, ministry and social engagement institutions. In 2009, this resulted in a decision (at international leadership level) to locate TSA’s health and development work as close to families and local communities as possible. *“The gap between the corps and the social programme would be narrowed, and church members would participate in the work. Corps officers would be encouraged to engage in a dynamic interaction between church, social program, community, and home: a connection which is central to integrated mission thinking”* (Patterson 2010).

This shift towards integrated mission can be seen in practical terms on the refocusing of health services away from expensive hospitals towards primary health care (PHC) in many territories. For the last few years, priority has been given to community-based rather than hospital-based health ministry, which was seen to be more sustainable. However, as Pallant (2011) notes, although the TSA withdrew from hospital-centred care in its economically developed countries, there was significant resistance to this move in the developing countries, where *“Salvationists expressed a desire to continue to serve poor and marginalised people through institutional, corps and community-based health ministry by offering a continuous chain of care from home to hospital and back”* (Pallant 2011, 3-4). In response, TSA has now prioritised health practices with a ‘relational’ dimension – those that benefit from community-based interventions, and again, a focus on integration of health services as close to the community level as possible.

It should be noted that speaking of The Salvation Army as though it is one monolithic ‘development organisation’ is misleading. The military hierarchy of TSA masks a complex weave of levels of engagement (international, zonal, territorial, divisional, church/corps and community); there are also numerous clusters of leadership and cross-programming to be considered. Ultimately, however, it should not be forgotten that The Salvation Army is a worldwide evangelical Christian church. While it might seem easier to review the development and health-related projects of TSA as somehow separate from its faith, this would not be a realistic reflection. The nature of TSA’s social and charitable work is mainly characterised and driven by its faith and theology. As Pallant notes, *“Its religious and charitable objects are ‘the advancement of the Christian religion’*” (TSA 2012, 11). This element also needs to be remembered, given the pervasive ‘integrated mission’ policy, and the intentionality by which ‘faith-based facilitation’ is a deliberate and unapologetic strategy to (re)infuse good development practice with its particular faith.

## BUILDING DEEPER RELATIONSHIPS

**1. What is Faith-Based Facilitation?** FBF is a process and a set of tools that help people to think, talk, explore and respond to their issues in the light of faith. It results in the development of healthier people and communities. FBF uses a process of theological reflection enriched by tools from the social sciences.

**2. Why does The Salvation Army use Faith-Based Facilitation?** The Salvation Army believes faith is an essential dimension in the development of healthy people and communities. Faith does not limit The Salvation Army’s ability, as described in its mission statement to ‘meet human needs without discrimination’...However, faith dimensions need to be handled with wisdom and care particularly in multi-faith societies. FBF offers a process and a set of tools to assist in this task...

**3. Is Faith-Based Facilitation only for Salvationists?** No, it can be used by many people...The mission of The Salvation Army is to live out and share the whole gospel for the whole person for the whole world...Using the FBF process and tools can create opportunities for people with different faiths and worldviews to work together. This results in deeper relationships, healthier people and more capable communities.

**4. How can Faith-Based Facilitation be applied?** This is not a ‘project’ or a ‘program’ but rather a way of working that is encouraged across The Salvation Army. It can be used in all parts of The Salvation Army including community development, social work, health, evangelism, emergency services, administrative decisions, counseling, etc. The FBF process and tools are helpful when engaging in caring, learning, planning and solving activities.

source – *Building Deeper Relationships Manual* (TSA. 2010b, 22 ), see also [www.salvationarmy.org/ffbf](http://www.salvationarmy.org/ffbf)

Indeed, around 2008, there was a deliberate renaming of facilitation as ‘faith-based facilitation’. Although documentation prior to this demonstrates that many facilitators in TSA were already infusing their facilitation practice with religious content and examples, renaming of the process as ‘faith-based’ signalled a clear license and intentionality. Pallant notes this was a response to an unease at how pervasive secularist development thinking was in Salvation Army health and development programmes: *“...too many frameworks for development were based on western secularist development models promoting ‘autonomous rational individuals...therefore, the development of resources to enable a theologically informed way of understanding professional practice became a priority”* (2011, 172). FBF is this response, an attempt at the creation of a faith-relevant resource for community engagement for the Salvation Army. Of course, this is a direct challenge to secular funders and development practitioners who might sometimes work to ‘avoid religion’.

The new form of community engagement, FBF, is a refocusing of existing Salvation Army strategy – and in this version focuses intensely on ‘building deeper relationships’, that is, on ‘the relational aspects’ that cross issues, projects, program. It is understood that *“...(in an) environment of contested and conflicting relations...experience has shown that barriers can be overcome and relationships developed if the process is properly facilitated”* (Pallant 2011, 170). In doing so, the FBF process walks a very careful line. It aims to be faith-relevant, and true to its own organisational and community culture, but at the same time (as can be seen in the box insert in the page above), FBF is also expected to facilitate conflicting relationships with people of other faith or culture.

FBF is also placed at the crosshairs of an organisational debate between ‘charitable’ service delivery through programs and projects (which remains a driving focus of TSA’s operations) and the idea that this approach might be potentially harmful, creating dependency in communities - the latter giving preference to the ideals of assets-based and community driven development (see TSA 2009b). This hints at another tension: between the fundamentally hierarchical military structure and nature of TSA’s powerful institutional culture, and the bottom-up power disrupting approaches advocated for in FBF. As we will see in this evaluation study, the complex conceptual landscape in which FBF is currently positioned is not entirely clear or comfortable to all parties. Some Salvation Army staff and officers admit to feeling some caution towards the ‘new’ FBF, while others perceive FBF as ‘a new name for what we have always done’.

We have introduced a few of the conceptual issues here since it is important to understand the complexity of both the FBF project (or rather ‘process’) and this evaluation. There is no basic logic model with activities and outputs that can be tested here, and no simple list of impact indicators on which to judge success. As a process for all levels of Salvation Army action, FBF becomes a ‘systems strengthening intervention’ rather than a project or programme. This evaluation is therefore similarly complex, and is more in the nature of ‘evaluation research’. To this end, this evaluation report provides more information than is usually required for a project evaluation report. The intention is to provide as full an account as possible in order to support the future development of this complex systems initiative and thinking.

## CONCEPTUAL ASSUMPTIONS

(source TSA 2009b)

The goal is ‘relational health’ – all areas of life are impacted and therefore all parts of The Salvation Army need to work together with community to achieve this (*Integrated Mission*)

That the people affected by an issue are best placed to respond (*community driven development*)

That communities, no matter how impoverished, have assets that can be leveraged for change (*assets-based community development*)

When people ‘own’ the planning, delivery and assessment of programs, the process of change is accelerated (*Community Driven Development*)

By walking alongside communities, ‘invited’ teams initiated a process of change (*Accompaniment*)

The process is easily disrupted by change in leadership, economics, community.

‘Projects’ can damage the process of change through short-term, donor-driven interventions which encourage a dependency mindset

FBF prioritizes a ‘bottom-up’ approach

## KEY FBF TOOLS (source TSA 2010b)

- listening
- exploring
- community walks and visits
- community mapping
- brainstorming
- prioritizing
- creative thinking
- problem solving
- self-assessment

## 1.2 The Process of this Evaluation

This evaluation is a shared initiative of NORAD and TSA. For TSA, the multi-year and multi-region project has come during a period of significant change, and it was deemed that the Army and the communities it serves will benefit from a review of practice and external assessment of lessons learned. NORAD, in turn, expressed a need for understanding what has been achieved over this period, leading to a clearer articulation of future objectives and of strategies for achieving them. This review of the Asia-Pacific Regional Facilitation Team Project followed on the completion of a matched evaluation of the Africa region in 2010 (see Patterson 2010).

While the full Terms of Reference is available in Appendix A, the broad aims of this evaluation were to: 1) review the long-term pattern of practice, 2) evaluate policy development, 3) assess factors governing sustainability, 4) review available resources that have been developed over the years, and 5) identify the strengths/weaknesses of the future strategy for scale-up

This evaluation of TSA's Asia-Pacific Regional Facilitation Process was carried out over a five month period (April to August 2012). The evaluation team consisted of Dr Jill Olivier (external reviewer), assisted by Ms Emily Pilborough (IHQ), as well as in-country individuals who accompanied the team on the country site visits (named below). The principle methodologies utilised were:

- *Documentary analysis* (desk review of policy and program documentation and outputs)
- *Semi-structured interviews* (electronic) with key identified international informants engaged in FBF leadership in the Asia-Pacific region
- *Site visits to three countries:* Philippines, Singapore and Papua New Guinea (PNG) – including observation, focus group discussions (FGD), and semi-structured interviews with individuals
- *An electronic questionnaire* emailed to selected respondents from all TSA Asia-Pacific zones

Summaries of the FGD guides and questionnaire are provided in Appendix B. Data collection and thematic analysis was framed by questions on five main concerns:

- *Reporting on FBF activities:* measureable or observed activities and outputs such as training, meetings and documentation – as well as self-report of FBF toolset utilisation
- *The interpretation of FBF:* Questions intended to draw out perceptions of what FBF is and how it is integrated into daily work of TSA
- *'Facilitating' FBF (program and governance):* Perceptions of how the FBF process has unfolded, and what governance strategies and structures were in place
- *Stories of systems change:* e.g. stories of strengthened community engagement, enhanced local ownership, impact on community development, change of TSA operations, improved community service provision, management/motivation of volunteers
- *Stories of deeper relationship and trust:* deeper relationship and trust examined – including relationship mapping and identification, and FBF information sharing

## The evaluation unfolded in the following stages:

<b>APRIL-MAY 2012</b>	
Planning and desk research (publications and documents relating to facilitation, including previous evaluations)	
Telephonic interviews requested to key Asia-Pacific leaders with experience in FBF, as identified by IHQ	
<b>13-21 APRIL: SITE VISIT TO PAPUA NEW GUINEA</b>	
<i>Dr Jill Olivier, accompanied by Mr Charlie Clement (PNG-TSA Health Services Manager)</i>	
15Apr: Port Moresby	Interview with Chief Secretary Lt.Col. Neil Webb and Lt.Col Chris Webb
16Apr: Port Moresby (THQ)	Interview with Charlie Clement, Health Services Manager Visit to Papa Health Centre (observation and interview with clinic nurse) Visit and FGD at Ela Beach House of Hope (FGD with Ela Beach staff)
17Apr: Port Moresby	Visit and FGD with Settlement Ministries group based at South Central Division
18Apr: Lae	Visit and FGD with Lae Street School staff (North Coastal Division) Visit and FGD with Jim Jacobson Centre staff (Street workers and HIV project) Visit to Back Road ministries and development project
19Apr: S.E. Division	Visit to South Eastern Division Visit to Boregaina Health Centre (interview with clinic staff and officer)
19April: Port Moresby	Brief interview with Maj Iveme Yanderave
<b>22-27 APRIL: SITE VISIT TO PHILIPPINES</b>	
<i>Dr Jill Olivier, accompanied by Ms Emily Pilborough (IHQ), Maj Susan Tandayag &amp; Ms Airene Lozada</i>	
23Apr: Manila (THQ)	Introductory meeting with FBF Team (Maj Susan Tandayag and Ms Airene Lozada) at THQ Brief interview with Chief Secretary Lt.Col. Ronald Clinch and Lt.Col. Robin Clinch Visit and FGD with Central Philippines Division (CPD-DHQ staff and Manila Cluster officers)
24Apr: Cebu City	Visit and FGD with Cebu Cluster officers and DHQ staff (Visayas Isl. Division, Cebu City) Visit and FGD at Lapu-lapu corps
25Apr: Urdaneta City	Visit and FGD with Northern Luzon Division (NLD-DHQ) staff and metro Pangasinan Officers Debriefing with THQ FBF team
<b>27APR-01MAY: SITE VISIT TO INDONESIA</b>	
<i>Dr Jill Olivier, accompanied by Ms Emily Pilborough (IHQ), Maj Donna Barthau (THQ), and Maj Widi Tampai</i>	
27Apr: Palu (DHQ)	Introductory interview with Major Donna Barthau and Major Widiawati Tampai (wife of Divisional Commander of Eastern Palu Division Major Yusak Tampai)
28Apr: Pani'i	<i>Observation of mission and brief FGD with mission team to Pani'i</i> Interviews with officers in charge at Pani'i village, and mission team members
29Apr: Palu	Attended church service and meeting
30Apr: Palu	FGD with Compassion in Action Team Visit to Palu School Complex and interview with staff
01May:	Visit to Woodward Hospital and brief FGD with hospital leadership team
<b>MAY 2012: ELECTRONIC QUESTIONNAIRES TO REGIONAL INFORMANTS</b>	
Electronic questionnaires redesigned based on in-country experience, sent to all Asia-pacific territories and chased	
<b>JUNE-AUGUST 2012: ANALYSIS AND REPORT WRITING</b>	
June	Review and synthesis meeting with Salvation Army International staff
26 August	last questionnaire response accepted



**Country selection and reporting bias:** Countries identified by IHQ for this evaluation were: Indonesia, PNG, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Fiji, Taiwan, Tonga, Hong Kong, Singapore, Myanmar and Malaysia (Sri Lanka, China, Korea, Marshall Islands, Micronesia are also in this zone, but were not identified as key for PD1897). This evaluation is dominated by information gathered during the three site visits. Papua New Guinea (PNG), Indonesia and the Philippines were selected by IHQ as useful representations of FBF activity in the Asia-Pacific region, and as the most expedient route, given the time and travel limitations of the evaluation team. Based on responses to the electronic questionnaire, it would seem that Pakistan and Taiwan could also have been usefully visited, in that they appear to have vibrant or emerging FBF activities. In addition, some of the other countries in the region (e.g. Bangladesh, Fiji, and Hong Kong) are poorly represented in this report, given that there were no responses from these territories to the electronic questionnaire, and no project documentation relating to FBF in these territories.

**Evaluation country-visits:** In the three countries visited, there were the expected delays and travel constraints, given that all three countries have challenging travel conditions. In most cases travel delays were treated as opportunities for team debrief and interviews. Although in the week prior to the evaluation visit, PNG had experienced a military uprising and there had been regional earthquakes and tsunamis, the evaluation was not adversely hampered by these occurrences, which provided useful insight into the realities of operation in these contexts. It must be noted that in-country organisers in all three countries did an exemplary job of organising the visits and an impressive number of focus groups and interview opportunities given the short planning phase. However, it was somewhat difficult to predict how many people would attend specific meetings, and in what capacity they were connected to 'FBF'. A flexible approach was required by the evaluators. However, although focus group discussions (FGDs) and interviews followed different structures, they attended to a core logic by following a series of related questions. Translation was required in all three countries to greater or lesser degrees. Re-translation, and group checking was done as often as possible to mitigate some of these difficulties. It was felt that the evaluation process was particularly hampered by translational difficulties during the Indonesia site visit, since the FBF coordinator and translator were unexpectedly called away to another Salvation Army meeting on a different island.

The main obstacle in all three countries was the lack of interviewees with long-term exposure to FBF (as detailed in the country chapters below). In several focus group discussions, the majority of the participants had little to no exposure to the process of FBF (they had not heard of the term, seen the book, or been exposed to previous forms of 'facilitation practice' in communities). In several cases, the divisional groups interviewed had only just been trained in FBF (in both Philippines and Indonesia, for example, some had only been trained one week prior to the evaluation visit), making it almost impossible to judge the impact of this training. In PNG, there was also no explicit evaluation 'team' or process in place, and the in-country accompaniment was not undertaken by someone directly utilising FBF in their work. It is important to note that during the planning phase in April, several of the in-country leadership did express concern at the ramification of the evaluation taking place in their territories, for these very reasons. These concerns will be addressed below – but the evaluation process was somewhat hampered by these circumstances.

## EVALUATION DATA SOURCES

### PRIMARY DOCUMENTATION:

- Review and analysis of primary institutional reports
- previous evaluations
- in-country monitoring reports
- policy documents
- produced materials (tools, presentations, booklet)
- email correspondence

### INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED:

**Papua New Guinea:** 7 individual interviews; and 4 FGDs with 17 participants total

**Philippines:** 6 individual interviews; and 4 FGDs with 64 participants total

**Indonesia:** 7 individual interviews; and 2 FGDs with 14 participants total

**Regional / International electronic interviews:** 5 requested, 2 conducted

**Questionnaires:** sent by email to all countries in Asia-Pacific, resulting in 9 responses from 7 countries (Pakistan 1, Indonesia 2, Tonga 1, PNG 1, Taiwan 1, Philippines 2, Malaysia 1).

**Review meeting at IHQ:** 2 meetings (6 participants total)

**A shift towards participatory process evaluation:** In essence, on arrival in PNG (the first of the evaluation sites), after a few days in the field, a decision was taken to redesign the evaluation strategy. The emphasis and design was shifted towards a '*participatory process evaluation*'. The emphasis on process evaluation was seen to allow for a greater emphasis on the early development and implementation of the FBF strategy – focusing on a description of the environment in which FBF operates, the process for implementation, the operations and intervening events or changes. A participatory approach was also considered to be important for three reasons. Firstly, FBF advocates for a participatory evaluative approach, so this would match the content of the discussions. Secondly, the evaluation would therefore in part act as a demonstrative and reflective facilitation experience for those not already exposed to FBF. Thirdly, there were some tensions around the evaluation that were best mitigated by a participatory approach. Participants, especially lower level staff and officers were initially reluctant to point out faults in Army leadership or process. FBF stirs up relational tensions and critique of power which needed to be managed in an appropriate manner. After being assured of anonymity (that their name would not be attached to their words in this report), that they would be fed the results of the evaluation, and that the discussion was a 'safe space' for reflection – a significant change was observed in the quality and content of the responses. On the whole, participants shifted quickly from anxiety or reticence to engagement. Several participants noted that they had appreciated the evaluation format, noting: "...*this was great...we learnt so much...it was facilitation in practice*" (participant-Indonesia 2012). In this way, the evaluation process fed into the evaluation findings and recommendations. This has also affected the reporting, as the nature of the evaluation demands that the input from the participants is properly honoured. We have therefore provided stand-alone country chapters, so that these might be fed back to the countries and contain enough detail to support further discussion and engagement at a country level. As an ethical consideration, only the external consultant holds the primary documentation and participants' lists – stored in a secure storage location for future reference if necessary. Quotations from participants will not be referenced with full names, unless with direct permission, or if taken from project documentation in the public realm. In Appendix D we provide a general list of 'Faith-based Facilitators', which is viewed as a working list of those named as key drivers of FBF in Asia-Pacific. The purpose of this Appendix is to act as a draft resource, not as a list of evaluation participants.

**Managing expectations for individual program impact evaluation:** Another process note is that there was some tension around expectations of this evaluation and whether it was evaluating the impact of the programmes visited (such as the HIV/AIDS community projects in PNG). The evaluation team articulated that this was not the main purpose of this evaluation. PD1897, funded by NORAD, was designated to supporting the development of the FBF *process* in the region. Funding was directed towards communicative strategies (meetings and visits), training and process tools (such as the manual *Building Deeper Relationships*). It is understood that funding was not directly put towards programmes or projects, even if they utilise FBF. Separating out the one from the other is not a simple task. Indeed, this was noted by Evans et al in an earlier NORAD facilitation team evaluation in the Asia-Pacific. Evans (2006) reports the difficulties of attributing measurable impact to a facilitative approach, and that there were few staff skilled in the qualitative participatory research approaches necessary to track such change (we will address this again below). Therefore, while TSA runs many effective community programs, it was understood that measuring the impact of these projects was not the purpose of this evaluation. We provide a few 'case-study' stories in the country-chapters that follow which describe particular programmes visited. All of these are demonstrative only and would benefit greatly from more in-depth research and case study.

**Questionnaire response:** Finally, the response of the country representatives to the electronic questionnaire was limited and caused considerable delay to the evaluation. Given the experience of the previous evaluation in Africa (in which only two responses were made to the leadership survey), substantially more time was granted to chase down more responses (extending the evaluation by a further two months). The final survey response was received on 28 August 2012. However, even then, country representation remains limited, and a more detailed 'mapping' of regional FBF activities would be a valuable undertaking.

## CHAPTER 2: INTRODUCING FAITH-BASED FACILITATION IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

*This chapter introduced the historical context of FBF in the Asia-Pacific Region – and provides basic country comparative results from the questionnaire.*

### 2.1 History of FBF in Asia-Pacific

As described in the introduction, the Asia-Pacific zone has experienced some changes in relation to FBF process over the last decade. In 1995, an Asia-Pacific Regional Facilitation Team (RFT) was formed. An evaluation for NORAD on 2006 (Evans) describes a range of subsequent facilitation-related activities, joint learning meetings, visits and training.

When NORAD support began in 2007 (PD1897), TSA's Asia-Pacific Regional Program Facilitation Team's main strategy was defined as: *"To support and expand country teams and local implementing teams' development. This is through facilitation and accompaniment of local implementing team's 'on site' with participatory approaches that encourages care and support within home settings, linking to motivation and mobilisation of communities for change. This recognises strong family connection and community interaction that encourages participation in families and communities as well as among individuals"* (TOR see Appendix A).

The facilitation approach for HIV/AIDS, health and development as conceived at the start of this project, was designed to work alongside the following structures: local/community implementing teams, territorial facilitation teams, clusters of the regional facilitation team, and partners in 'industrialised' countries.

In 2007 it was decided to strengthen territorial teams and reduce the regional facilitation team role. This followed on an earlier decision to reduce the international facilitation team (based in London) in preference to regional operations. This was described as a decentralisation process, to strengthen local, community and territorial facilitation teams. The declared goal of this approach was:

*"To enhance the human and social capacity of local communities across the Asia-Pacific region where TSA is present through local learning and facilitation processes; for communities to change, care and hope by demonstrating increased HIV/AIDS competency*

REGIONAL FBF TIMELINE	
1883	Salvation Army begins operations in Asia-Pacific region
1994	Integrated Mission workshop in Indonesia
1995	Asia Pacific Regional Facilitation Teams (RFT) formed
1997	Joint visit of Asia Pacific RFT with UNICEF and UNDP
2003	Various personnel are attached to the Asia Pacific RFT
2003	Asia Pacific Regional Consultation and funding for Upper Myanmar programme by NORAD
2005	Participatory evaluation with NORAD and Asia Pacific RFT
2006	Evaluation by Evans et al – 'Expanding human capacity for response to HIV and AIDS'
2007	NORAD PD1897 begins: support for FBF 2007–2012
2007	FBF management transferred from IHQ to SPEAZone
2007	Prioritization of territorial, divisional and local facilitation teams, reduced spending on international and regional teams.
2008	TSA shifts towards PHC and community hospitals and clinics
2008	12-16 Nov: South Pacific and East Asia Health Ministries Workshop - Hong Kong
2008	TSA internal assessment of effectiveness of AsiaPac facilitation
2009	African RFT closed, shift to territorial responsibility
2009	Zonal Facilitation Resources Officer for South Pacific and East Asia (ZFRO) Maj Dr Graeme Rigley appointed, replacing RFT
2009	May: Conference in India: the territorial coordinators agreed there is a need for 'conscious competence'
2009	26-30 October: Building Deeper Relationships for Mission Workshop, Geelong Conference Centre, Australia
2009	ZFRO visits Philippines, PNG and Indonesia. Major Pallant visited Philippines and Bangladesh.
2009	Local and territorial facilitation teams declared active in Philippines, Indonesia and PNG
2010	Evaluation (Africa zone) by Patterson et al: <i>"The Salvation Army Africa Regional Facilitation Process Evaluation Report"</i>
2010	<i>Integration of FBF across all programmes</i> - IHQ shifts policy and embeds FBF in SArmy practice and strategy at all levels
2010	<i>"Building Deeper Relationships Using Faith based Facilitation"</i> is published and distributed (and translation approved)
2010	FBF website set up – including stories of FBF experience from the field <a href="http://www.salvationarmy.org/fbf/">http://www.salvationarmy.org/fbf/</a>
2010	ZFRO attends meeting of Indian Territorial AIDS Coordinators - Lessons learnt noted as relevant for TSA work across Asia-Pacific.
2010	Training visits by ZFRO and the International Health Services Coordinator to Indonesia, PNG and the Philippines
2010	The value of FBF discussed at workshops held in Singapore, Makassar Indonesia and the Mizoram conference in NE India
2011	<i>Integration of FBF across all programmes</i> (i.e. not as a separate project) is prioritised for the Asia-Pacific region
2011	14-18 February: Singapore - Building Deeper Relationships using Faith-Based Facilitation Workshop
2011	26 Sept-02 Oct: Graeme Rigley (ZFRO) - SPEA visit to Philippines
2011	Jan: Programme to programme visits: Indonesia and PNG
2011	Feb: ZFRO visit to China and Taiwan for consultation
2011	March: International Health Services Coordinator to Bangladesh for workshops with facilitation team members
2011	May 2011: ZFRO visit to Singapore and Myanmar for workshops with facilitation team members
2011	July: International Health Services Coordinator to Sri Lanka for workshops with facilitation team members
2011	July: Follow-up visits to PNG
2011	Sept: ZFRO visits to Indonesia and Philippines
2011	Nov: ZFRO follow-up visit to Hong Kong for workshops with facilitation team members

*source, FBF project documentation (2011 events unverified)*

that reduces stigma, HIV infection and ensures quality of life for individuals (especially children and youth), families and community members affected by AIDS” (TOR in Appendix A).

Therefore, by 2007, the African RFT had been shut down and in time, the Asia-Pacific RFT role was also ended. In 2007 the governance and management of the FBF process in the Asia-Pacific region was officially transferred from International Health Services to SPEA Zone (South Pacific and East Asia). Priority and spending was shifted from the international and regional levels, to the territorial, divisional and local facilitation teams. However, it is important to note that International Health Services remained centrally involved (as will be described below), with Major Dean Pallant, the International Health Services Coordinator (IHSC) driving much of the FBF process.

In 2009, a significant moment came when a *Zonal Facilitation Resources Officer for South Pacific and East Asia* (ZFRO) was appointed, replacing the regional facilitation team structure. This role was created in order to more effectively facilitate the relationship between TSA leadership at an international, regional and country level. The new ZFRO, Major Dr Graeme Rigley is based in Australia as a Divisional Commander for TSA Melbourne Central Division (and is a Salvation Army officer and medical doctor by profession). Major Rigley has undertaken a significant amount of travel for FBF purposes over the last three and a half years. It is important to note that PNG, Philippines and Indonesia were the first countries to be visited by the ZFRO in this role in 2009, and these countries continued to receive the bulk of his visits in the following years (so far as can be ascertained from the project documentation).

Three significant regional meetings were held, in which FBF was directly addressed with Salvation Army officers and staff from the Asia-Pacific region. In Nov 2008, in Hong Kong, a Health Ministries Workshop was held, which sought to “clarify and document the lessons learnt from the facilitation process to ensure ongoing use of facilitation techniques by national, divisional and local teams” (TSA 2008b). Then in October 2009, another workshop was held, this time in Australia, where the new FBF tool-book ‘*Building Deeper Relationships*’ that had been drafted by the Oxford Centre for Ecclesiology and Practical Theology was reviewed. Another milestone came in 2010 when the finalised manual was published. The third important regional meeting was held in Singapore in February 2011, which was a five day workshop aimed at enabling key regional TSA staff to implement the FBF process and toolset.

It is also important to be reminded that the Asia-Pacific FBF process was similarly affected by the 2010-2011 policy shift from IHQ, which prioritised the *integration* of FBF across all programs,

## SUMMARY OF STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES (TSA 2012)

### **Goal1: Strengthen community development response to HIV/AIDS, health & related community development issues**

*response e.g.:* development and adoption of a shared way of working across all TSA community-engagement programs

*response e.g.:* embedding of community development response into TSA structures. In 2011 achieved by grant allocation to territories (Pakistan, Indonesia, Philippines, Taiwan, Fiji and Tonga)

### **Goal2: Strengthen programme facilitation process and human resource pool**

*response e.g.:* 2011 Singapore workshop enabled implementation of FBF process and tool box. Since then territorial & divisional workshops held to roll out the process and increase HR pool

### **Goal 3: Transfer of lessons learned from countries where community capacity development and facilitation work are more advanced to countries still at the initiation stage**

*response e.g.:* regional workshops and translation of the manual “Building Deeper Relationships” into a number of languages (Urdu, Indonesian, Spanish, French, English, Mandarin and African languages).

### **Goal 4: Organizational development through the facilitation and participation approach in order to enhance organizational capacity to be more self-reliant and reduce external support**

*response e.g.:* Territorial and local teams are increasingly using facilitation methods

*response e.g.:* Territories have been encouraged to develop territorial facilitation teams with support available from Zonal Facilitation Resources Officer

*response e.g.:* Senior Army leaders are using the facilitation approach and promoting it as an embedded way of working into Salvation Army programmes

### **Goal 5: Impact on Policy development**

*response e.g.:* Built links with national organisations who set national policy.

*response e.g.:* TSA ‘integration’ policy has embraced the FBF approach (working policy has been adopted)

### **Goal 6: Increase and enhance personnel development through Human Capacity Development approach**

*response e.g.:* FBF endorsed by all personnel in the International Program Service team at IHQ

embedding FBF in Salvation Army practice and strategy at all levels. By 2011, FBF was no longer viewed by management as an individual project but rather a systems intervention. Whereas IHQ Programme Resources took responsibility for coordinating the development of FBF tools and resources, the implementation of FBF in the Asia-Pacific was understood as the responsibility of the SPEA-Zone.

The logic for the FBF process in Asia-Pacific (not articulated in any of the project documents – and still to be confirmed by TSA) appears to have remained close to the ‘cascade’ model designed by the earlier facilitation teams. That is: through regional activities (meetings, visits, workshops), selected individuals will be won over by FBF thinking, and trained in the basic process. Armed with the new manual (Building Deeper Relationships - BDR), these individuals will set up territorial level facilitation teams (or at least clusters of FBF trainers), who will in turn provide introductory training at a territorial and divisional level, which will cascade to the corps and community level (in the Philippines they called this the ‘re-echoing’ of FBF training). The territorial facilitation team would also be responsible for seeking other opportunities of inserting FBF into other Salvation Army practices. Supported by ZFRO and International Health Services Coordinator visits and in some cases seed funding for initial training workshops and material localisation, enthusiasm and human capacity for FBF would slowly develop in each territory, and become integrated into the broader range of Salvation Army operations. International strategy and leadership support for FBF would also be driven out of Program Resources at IHQ.

It is important to note that the last few years of this process were viewed by staff as an important time for reflective practice and that this, plus the restructuring described above, slowed down implementation. As noted in the most recent project report (TSA 2011c): *“The focus on clarifying, describing and simplifying the way The Salvation Army engaged in facilitation work has been helpful. This was not foreseen in the original project...However, it was necessary – after more than 15 years of intensive work in AIDS, development and facilitation – to pause and reflect.”*

## 2.2 Comparing country FBF responses

In the following section we briefly describe and compare the responses to the survey questionnaire that was sent to all countries in the region. We do not provide this as an analytical part of the evaluation report, but rather as important background to the more detailed country chapters and analysis that follows. This survey was sent to all individuals who were considered to be key FBF drivers in their country (for example, those who had attended one of the regional FBF meetings). We have amalgamated the nine responses from seven territories), only addressing those questions that had a comparative element to the responses. We avoid numerical comparison given the small sample size, and direct quotations in this section are from survey respondents.

**Understanding and perceptions of FBF:** One respondent first heard of facilitation (and FBF) in 2010, the rest in 2011. All had a copy of the booklet ‘Building Deeper Relationships’, although some did not have a hard copy. The respondents understood FBF to be either an ‘experience’, a ‘process’ or a ‘toolset, and the examples provided mainly focused on FBF being utilised at a community level (that is, there were no examples given of FBF being utilised within the Salvation Army):

*“This is the experience of working with different people and sharing each other’s values and faith...”*

*“Faith-based Facilitation is a process that can be used to build relationships with people in a community...to help them to better understand the dynamics, needs and ideas of others that will help them move forward together to meet the needs of that group or community.”*

*“I would say, ‘a tool’ in which many ideas to get before helping our people to think, talk, explore and response to daily issues.”*

Most of the respondents believed that FBF was ‘what the Salvation Army was doing anyway’ – and that FBF concepts and process were in line with TSA ethos and practices – or at least with TSA aims: *“I think we (the Army) ‘attempt’ to serve out of a biblical narrative in the way we reach out into our communities.”*

Several respondents noted that there were already a number of tools available within TSA, which were intended to be utilised at different levels (internationally or territorially), and that this created some confusion. Examples provided were: Hearts and Minds, CPMS Facilitation, CBHP, social work process in case management, and human capacity development. *“There are many innovative expressions of Salvation Army Church or outreach that are attempting to contextualise the gospel in their own communities, by listening to and walking with their community, building capacity, building deep networks and developing their own faith community expression accordingly.”* Several respondents noted that FBF was similar to CBHP *“...only that grace is added.”* Another observed, *“...many of our social service programming takes into account this type of activity, (although many that are client-centred, best practice will often fall short on the biblical narrative input).”* In fact, this spiritual element was the main identified difference between FBF and other Salvation Army processes: *“The ‘Kairos’ a special experience of God’s moment...This element of FBF is incorporated in the process cycle”*

Identified FBF Activities*	Pakistan	Indonesia	Tonga	PNG	Taiwan	Philippines	Malaysia
Is there an FBF Team in place at the territorial level?	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
Has there been any FBF training at the territorial level?	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
Has there been any FBF training or discussion at the divisional level?	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
Does anyone in your territory utilise ‘Building Deeper Relationships’?	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
Do you have a local language version of this booklet? **	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
<b>Would you say that FBF is being introduced during any of the following activities...?</b>							
management and decision-making at a territorial/ divisional level	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
during education of corps officers, cadets or others	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
during project or program design or planning	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
during monitoring or evaluation activities	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO
as an intentional strategy to connect community with Salvation Army activities	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO
for HIV/AIDS-related activities	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
in disaster response	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO
conducting research of any kind	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
building collaboration between The Salvation Army and other organisations	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
in local corps activities and relationship-building	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO
other situations for building deeper interpersonal relationships	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO

*\*Note that blank or uncertain responses are marked here as ‘no’. These responses are demonstrative only, and should not be used for analytic purposes. Furthermore, these are uncorrected responses from individuals (i.e. responses have not been ‘corrected’ even if they are contrary to project documentation/reporting).*

*\*\*The respondents in which the booklet had not yet been localised or translated overwhelmingly thought this would be a good idea. In Taiwan, an additional training manual had been locally developed and was being translated into Chinese.*

**Intentional enactment of the Process Cycle (also called the Pastoral Cycle, or Kairos Cycle):** In the BDR manual the *Process Cycle* for FBF is described as a continuous cycle through the identification of an issue. When asked if they utilised this cycle in an intentional manner, or if they could provide examples of others doing so, most of the respondents answered no. Those that did give examples did not describe a specific ‘faith-related’ process (although no particular judgment should be made on this absence, given the nature of the survey):

Pakistan: *“In planning of community based program activities... Such as the launching of an awareness campaigns on Malaria we start from an issue, well discuss and analyse within the group, reflect on causes and then decide and plan.”*

PNG: *“We have many young people in the streets without homes/food sleeping alongside the road and the process was applied...now we are starting to put up a tent for worship on Sundays. We have more than 100 kids and 60 adults and more coming...Helping them to help themselves...”*

Taiwan: *“In commencing the human trafficking network we are moving through the cycle for the first time.”*

Philippines: *“One non-Salvationist family was threatened by human traffickers - the father was trafficked in Australia. After going through the FBF process cycle, the mother and her three children cooperated and acted on the treatment plan one problem at a time...such as: the issue of temporary shelter because they have to move from their house, the problem of finances, schooling and now the prep of their re-integration with the father.”*



**FBF as a tool for building of trust in different circumstances:** All of the respondents answered in the positive – that FBF was a useful tool for trust-building. For example:

Pakistan: *“The area is entirely Muslim where our flood rehabilitation program is going on we build good trust with those people. We give them facilitation on the base of their faith they have confidence in us that we are not trying to preach them Christianity but respect their faith and facilitate them according to their values and believe.”*

Taiwan: *“...has been significant as the TSA does not have a high profile and is not well known in Taiwan. The FBF process was crucial in gaining support from local organisations that had not only not worked with us before but had not known we were in Taiwan”.*

**Is there sufficient ‘reflective practice’ on the nature and focus of Salvation Army activities in your territory (e.g. time to reflect on whether Army actions match local issues and to conduct long-term planning)?** All of the respondents except for one answered no to this question. The one positive was from the Philippines where it was noted that there is reflective practice with officers about their ministry. The rest (including the other Philippines respondent) strongly noted that more reflective practice was needed and that FBF was a proper process for this practice. As one respondent said, *“(FBF) really needs to be known and understood by Leadership here in the Territory first. The template here is dictatorial, not at all within the teaching/practices of FBF. But, younger officers and lay people/local leaders seem to get it, and are excited about it.”*

**Targeted financial or in-kind support for FBF activities:** All the territories except for PNG and Malaysia noted that they had received some financial support for FBF activities over the last few years. Most indicated seed grants for conducting FBF workshops and printing the localised manual and materials. Only one territory (Pakistan) indicated other kinds of financial support: utilised for health program in three divisions to work in nine communities: *“We established mother and child health clubs in these communities along with the health education campaigns. Community development training was imparted for the committees and volunteers by the FBF national Team.”* When asked if they had ever been asked to include any FBF elements in other funding proposals, most answered no, and that they perceived few opportunities to do so: *“I have done 3 project proposals recently and it was not asked on the form...”* Two territories did respond in the positive: Pakistan, who

was currently working on a proposal with an FBF focus, and the Philippines, where the Project Board have asked for an FBF element to be included in all project proposals.

**Perceptions about FBF regional leadership and governance:** When asked who was driving the regional and international FBF process, two respondents did not know. Of those who did have an answer, most understood it to be Major Dean Pallant (the International Health Services Coordinator). Only one mentioned the ZFRO (Major Rigley) and then as secondary to Major Pallant. Two respondents perceived that Health Services ('Social Services') or IHQ Program Resources were 'somehow involved'.

**Regional knowledge sharing and translation:** Most of the respondents did not know of any regional knowledge exchange or transfer in relation to FBF. They noted that this was highly desirable, and gave examples such as sharing stories and successes, shared newsletters, FBF teaching materials, staff exchanges, and improved sharing of visit reports. The examples provided in the two positive responses were the Singapore 2011 workshop where experiences were exchanged, and the Taiwanese respondent noted they shared FBF resources with Singapore and Hong Kong territories.

**FBF as good development practice infused with the Christian faith:** When asked if this happened in their territories, most of the respondents said that it did or at least that it should. *"Now when we plan and think of any program the first thing that comes in our mind is to refer to the Bible."* The few who responded in the negative noted that *"I answered no because I believe that our Territory does not exercise good development practice"* and one respondent noted that in their opinion, *"...good development practice need not be infused with theology or religious language."*

**Does FBF highlight any relational tensions?** Surprisingly, most of the respondents answered in the negative. Only one noted that *"It should anyway – anytime a biblical worldview is introduced it will always create tensions with any culture – even church culture. FBF creates tension, but also allows for healing to occur (but we have) no examples as our use has been limited thus far."* Another respondent said: *"The booklet does not highlight things very much, but mentions that persons of any faith may still come together from the angle of there being a God, and work and plan together to develop or better their community. This is a big issue here in Indonesia where the majority of the population is Muslim..."*

**FBF as a useful tool for building deeper relationships:** Most of the respondents answered in the positive. Some detail was provided (included below), and most respondents noted elements of the toolset that were particularly helpful, such as those that developed communication skills, planning and reflective practice, the process cycle and application stories. Some did note that the toolset was not sufficient to develop unto itself without strong leadership buy-in and proper links to Salvation Army processes.

**Suggestions for the improving the FBF process:** A number of suggestions were made, in summary, respondents felt that more FBF regional workshops and experience sharing opportunities were needed. A suggestion was made that FBF should be addressed at the next Zonal Leadership Conference, or FBF education at the leadership-cabinet level. Improved communication and knowledge transfer was a main request such as sharing of training resources and experiences. Continued support of territorial training and localisation of materials was also requested.

*In this chapter we provided a brief overview of the FBF process, contextualised to the Asia-Pacific region. In the chapters that follow we present a more in-depth analysis of the three countries visited, followed by analytical summary and recommendations.*



## CHAPTER 3. FAITH-BASED FACILITATION IN PAPUA NEW GUINEA

This chapter provides a brief case study of FBF in Papua New Guinea (PNG), beginning with an overview of the context in which The Salvation Army (TSA) operates, followed by country specific findings based on analysis of the materials from the site visits and secondary materials.

### 3.1 COUNTRY CONTEXT: PNG

#### COUNTRY INFORMATION (source CIA Factbook 2012)

**Geography:** Oceania, group of islands including the eastern half of the island of New Guinea between the Coral Sea and the South Pacific Ocean, east of Indonesia. 462,840 km<sup>2</sup>

**Natural Hazards:** active volcanism, subject to frequent and sometimes severe earthquakes, mud slides, and tsunamis

**Capital:** Port Moresby

**Language:** Tok Pisin (official), English (official), Hiri Motu (official), some 860 indigenous languages spoken

**History:** Independence from Australia in 1975

**People:** the indigenous population is one of the most heterogeneous in the world; PNG has several thousand separate communities, most with only a few hundred people; divided by language, customs, and tradition, some of these communities have engaged in low-scale tribal conflict with their neighbours for millennia; the advent of modern weapons and modern migrants into urban areas has greatly magnified this conflict.

**Administration:** 18 provinces, 1 autonomous region and 1 district

**Maternal Mortality:** 230 deaths/100,000 live births (2010)

**Life expectancy at birth:** total pop: 66.46 years

**Health expenditures:** 3.1% of GDP (2009)

**HIV/AIDS (adult prev):** 0.9% (2009 est.)

**HIV/AIDS (PLWHA):** 34,000 (2009 est.)

**Literacy:** (total pop, 15yrs older, can read-write): 57.3%

**Population below poverty line:** 37% (2002 est.)

**Population:** 7,013,829 (2011 est.)

**Religion:** Roman Catholic 27%, Protestant 69.4% (Evangelical Lutheran 19.5%, United Church 11.5%, Seventh-Day Adventist 10%, Pentecostal 8.6%, Evangelical Alliance 5.2%, Anglican 3.2%, Baptist 2.5%, other Protestant 8.9%), Baha'i 0.3%, indigenous beliefs and other 3.3% (2000 census)



#### THE SALVATION ARMY IN PNG (source TSA 2012)

**Territorial Headquarters:** Boroko, PNG

**Established:** 1956

**Zone:** South Pacific and East Asia (incl PNG & Solomon Isl.)

**Officers:** 294 (257 active)

**Schools:** 8

**Cadets:** 25

**Motels:** 2

**Employees:** 459

**Health Centres:** 4

**Corps ('Churches'):** 55

**Community HealthPosts:** 19

**Outposts:** 75

**Counselling Centres:** 4

**Officer Training College:** 1

**Staff Clinic:** 1

**SALT College:** 1

**Social programs and Initiatives include:** women's ministries, driving school, computer school, child care centres, community services, HIV/AIDS programmes,

PNG is one of the most diverse countries in the world in terms of geography, language and culture. Intercultural conflict and tension is still present as part of PNG life. The mountainous terrain also plays a key contextual role, making transport extremely difficult and costly.

The Salvation Army has been in PNG since 1956, but it is one of the fastest growing Army clusters in the world (Pallant 2011). The social service and community engagement focus of TSA-PNG crosses a range of activities and focus areas, including health, HIV/AIDS, feeding, income generation projects, prison ministry, youth work, literacy and education. Organisationally, the health services are clustered as part of TSA-PNG 'Support Services' reporting to the Program Manager; as opposed to 'Social Mission', where initiatives like community development, literacy and food generation are nested. TSA-PNG has a significant presence in the PNG health sector, mainly at the level of primary health care (PHC).

### 3.2 FINDINGS ON FBF IN PNG

The participatory process evaluation research process was designed to identify findings in five key areas:

- *Concerning the historical process in which FBF has emerged in PNG*
- *Concerning the scope of FBF-specific observable activities (utilisation of tools)*
- *Concerning planning and human resource capacity within TSA for FBF*
- *Concerning utilisation of FBF to build deeper relationships with community (and partners)*
- *Concerning the utilisation of FBF to build deeper relationships within the Salvation Army in PNG*

Within these five areas, the participatory research process produced the following findings in PNG – emerging from analysis of interview and FGD materials, project documentation and survey results (unless otherwise indicated, direct quotations in this section come from interviews and FGDs held in PNG).

#### **FINDING 1: PNG has been the focus of recent regional FBF process attention, however currently has no FBF territorial team in place and low capacity for further FBF cascade training**

---

**Regional support:** As can be seen on the timeline above, PNG (with Philippines and Indonesia) has been the focus of much of the regional FBF attention since 2009. PNG participants were invited to key regional FBF meetings, and there have been several visits from the International Health Services Coordinator and the Zonal Facilitation Regional Officer (ZFRO) to PNG with a focus on FBF. In the project documentation, a Territorial Facilitation Team was declared active in PNG in 2009. Subsequent visits from the ZFRO have been named as visits supportive of this team, and in 2011 the visit by the ZFRO was described as taking the FBF process further in PNG, *“to assess the use of tools and to continue to develop the capacity to measure change”* (TSA 2011a).

**Territorial FBF team and HR capacity:** However, at the time of the evaluation site visit (in May 2012), there was no visible territorial FBF team in place. This was confirmed by Major Iveme Yanderave, who was a PNG representative to the Singapore 2011 FBF workshop, and is currently considered (by IHQ) to be the driver of FBF in PNG. Major Iveme noted that there is currently no territorial or divisional FBF teams in place in PNG. In fact, it would appear that Major Iveme is currently alone in her responsibility for driving FBF in PNG with the only other FBF-informed person identified as Major Chris Goa who attended the Singapore 2011 conference with her, although he was not visibly engaged in FBF at the time of the evaluation visit. There were a few other staff who had been present at some of the earlier regional meetings (see Appendix D). However, those who were still available did not appear to be utilising FBF in their work. In fact, a few seemed somewhat opposed to the participatory and faith-infused basis of the FBF approach. For example, when asked about participatory processes, one staff member with exposure to FBF at the regional level noted that they generally prefer to use survey-style questionnaires rather than participatory research (such as mapping or qualitative engagement); or in the case of a confrontation between a TSA project and the local community in which it is based, another noted that TSA should *“just speak to the landowners”* rather than spending time engaging in conversation with broader community. In a couple of cases, there seemed to be a conceptual split between TSA programme staff and TSA officers, for example, a comment was made about community development practice by one of the programme staff: *“we do the social science and they do the theology.”* Another programme staff member noted that *“in PNG we respect the pastors - if they can speak both the theology and the social science.”* (Indeed, as will be discussed below, this emphasises the point that exposure to FBF or regional training workshop participation does not always lead to ‘FBF champions’ or ‘local FBF activity’.)

It appeared to the evaluator that at this time, FBF was perceived more as a programmatic burden than a resource for those interviewed. No staff were identified as having dedicated time for FBF processes (e.g. training

or planning). In fact, it is important to note that Major Iveme is in a senior leadership position as the territorial Secretary for Personnel, so there is some question as to how she can be capacitated to engage in training and coordination of the FBF process. The expected tension between previous 'modes' of facilitation process (such as regional facilitations teams) was not found in PNG, as there appeared to be few with this institutional history (those who were currently identified as being involved in FBF had been introduced to facilitation only one year prior in 2011). One of the glaring reasons for this absence of FBF process in PNG at a territorial level was the rapid rotation of staff into new positions. Two key Salvation Army staff members who were identified as 'FBF champions' had recently moved to other territories (in fact, one officer perceived that in so doing, "*...(they) took facilitation with them to Myanmar.*")

**FBF training:** Major Iveme noted that the training for FBF has not yet occurred as it should have, at a territorial or divisional level, but that a training session was being planned with Divisional Commanders for August 2012 (for which the BDR manual had recently been handed to these DC's for this purpose).

**FBF process planning:** There is currently a basic plan in place (developed at the Singapore 2011 conference) which describes a cascade model of training beginning at a divisional level in the first half of 2011, followed by active participation at other levels "*in the future or when training has been received*". It was not clear how the cascade model would work or who is tasked with these actions.

**FBF cascade (of information and human resource capacity at a local level):** As noted, training had not cascaded down to divisional and corps level in PNG as yet (and we do wonder if there is currently the capacity and passion for facilitation to enable this model). It should also be noted that in PNG, travel is extremely difficult and prohibitively expensive, with poor communication systems between the divisions (although there was a plan in process to strengthen the email system). This makes the cascade model particularly challenging in this territory.

**FBF funding:** PNG has not received any targeted seed funding for FBF training or capacity development, nor do staff perceive any opportunities for FBF-related elements to be included in current proposals. Questions on whether FBF was an element of funding proposal got responses such as "*we never successfully get any funding from IHQ anyway...FBF or other.*"

**FBF research or documentation:** There was very little project documentation available relating to FBF or community engagement in PNG. It was suggested that one of the senior officers was currently busy conducting a 'survey of partnerships and overlap of programs', however, the evaluators were unable to establish if this was happening (PNG staff did not seem to consider it relevant to the FBF evaluation, and considering that no one seemed to know the details of this survey it can be assumed it was not undertaken in a participatory manner with TSA staff). It was noted that in PNG, Salvation Army staff were "*more suited and comfortable with oral communication practices than with questionnaires or surveys*" however, we were unable to establish if this was an issue of literacy, organisational culture, or capacity.

**FBF regional communication and knowledge transfer:** Although PNG staff had attended recent regional FBF meetings there was little sense of shared knowledge or experience with other territories. Staff that were interviewed wondered who the main drivers of FBF were, and some mentioned Major Dean Pallant as a driver. The only mention made of the ZFRO during the evaluation visit, was one participant who noted that "*there was a Major from Australia who came to evaluate us who may be involved.*" There was no knowledge of information sharing between territories in relation to FBF, such as email exchanges or newsletters. Increased regional and territorial knowledge transfer was highly desirable, especially information on facilitation strategies. A localised manual (translated into a local language) was also desired.

**Leadership support:** Leadership support for FBF was not apparent during the country visit. Although a senior leader had attended an earlier FBF meeting, he was not available for interview during this evaluation. Officers reported that he seemed more focused on "*...improving structure, organisation and financial sustainability*" and therefore did not appear to support FBF as a useful tool for that purpose. New incoming senior leadership that

were briefly interviewed did seem interested in FBF as a concept and process, but had not had time to consider FBF implementation, noting a lack of clarity on the governance procedures, asking “...is this something we are supposed to be doing?”

## **FINDING 2: ‘Facilitation-like’ activities with community engagement elements are present and embedded throughout TSA-PNG activities**

---

If judged on the previous section, PNG would appear somewhat behind where they were expected to be in terms of formal process of FBF (in relation to anticipated cascading training, intentional FBF activities, engagement with the new manual and the development of territorial and divisional teams). In fact, the evaluation team was somewhat surprised at this given that PNG had been identified as an exemplar of FBF practice during informational interviews. In fact, PNG had been described as a place with ‘fantastic outcomes’ in relation to community engagement. It seemed unlikely that an exemplar site would suddenly lose all capacity for this kind of engagement even if some staff had been cycled out of the territory, or that the situation could have been so badly misread. It was therefore necessary to reconsider what the evaluation team was looking for and whether the right questions were being asked.

Certainly, the expected formal indicators of anticipated success were not apparent. However, both the ZFRO and the International Health Services Coordinator had spoken about the ‘intuitively consultative’ community engagement processes that took place in PNG. This does suggest that although staff might not be ‘conscientised’ or aware of the FBF process or the concepts underlying it, they might still engage in a facilitative manner. When asked if FBF built trust, one response was “*Yes, this is very true even though I have not trained the people here... but they are doing it...And now I come to realised that it is FBF*”. Therefore, not having found many overt signs of ‘FBF process’ in PNG, it was more fruitful to look for the underlying FBF-like actions, of which there were many more signs, even if they were not articulated as such, or intentionally described to the evaluation team in the language of community response. We provide two brief descriptive examples, noting again that the purpose is not to evaluate the impact of these programmes, but rather to provide information for the context in which FBF is or could be utilised:

### **PROJECT EXAMPLE: STREET LEVEL MINISTRIES IN LAE**

Five years ago, a Salvation Army Officer (‘Major Sarah’) was engaged in street ministry in Lae, the second largest city in PNG. During this ministry, children started coming to the Salvation Army compound “*for food and for ministry.*” After conducting a ‘survey’ of the community, Major Sarah saw the need for education of street children and started a street ministry education project (note that ‘street children’ does not necessarily mean those without homes, but children that are physically on the streets instead of at school during the day). At first there were 7 children, after three years there were 120, and now there are 220 at a time. This is not a school, but an educational feeder program that educates street children in core subjects (mathematics, English, science, and social science). Once the children have caught up to their expected level for their age, the staff assists the students in feeding back into the schooling system.

There are currently three young enthusiastic staff members – some of whom had been capacitated as educators for this purpose. They described the programme as currently running at full capacity for this many staff and the classroom size: “*We can’t get bigger...we currently take 60 students each at a time, all in the same room, so it gets noisy...we also need to keep up the monitoring and keep connections.*” While the core element of the programme is the teaching, the re-integration of students into the education system takes a substantial effort from staff. As part of the process, the staff write reports on each child and take them to local schools with whom they coordinate (schools near the settlements from which the children come). Once situated back in school, the

programme ensures that guardians are set up for counselling, and students are monitored to ensure they are managing and have not dropped out again. *“On Tuesdays we visit...we look for absentees, and follow up in the settlements if necessary.”* The staff described a series of network activities, such as meeting principles and business managers, in order to keep good relationships and maintain this important network and goodwill.

At the centre, diagnostic tests are run so that student’s levels are assessed – from ages 5 to 18. The classes are integrated into age groups (5-7, 8-10, 12-14, 16-18), but the staff have a process of putting older children into younger groups so that they are motivated to advance into an older age group. The older children are not always placed back in schools, and are instead fed into job placements with local businesses.

The staff are considering starting a second street ministry and are currently developing the project documentation for this. The main elements of the program were identified as: staff budget, proper premises, food budget, stationary, clothes, uniforms, and transport budget. Staff skills were identified as teacher training, in service training, and business management.



*Lae Street Level Ministries team in their teaching space – PNG 2012*

This programme is well integrated into TSA divisional activities. The room in which the classes are held is a Salvation Army hall in the Army compound that is utilised as an income generation space in the evenings (a sleeping space for those waiting for transport). The programme rents the space from the Salvation Army hostel manager. Ministry is a strong part of the operation, although what began as group street counselling has now evolved into individual counselling as part of the programme. In addition to psycho-social care, students are provided with cooked meals and clothes. The students do not attend Salvation Army church services, although they do take part in youth convention activities. Other programmes are connected such as the mother’s literacy programmes. An annual plan is submitted to the Salvation Army programs office and the staff utilises the computer and printer in the DHQ offices.

***Observation in relation to FBF and the program’s ‘relational health’:*** This was an impressive programme to observe. Started after a local need was identified by a Salvation Army officer, this program feeds into the existing educational system, addressing a gap rather than overlapping with existing projects, and builds on the available assets within the Salvation Army and in the local community. The programme demonstrates what small resources, great enthusiasm, and good relationship management can accomplish at a local level. The programme (and staff) exemplified relationship building and network maintenance, not only with the children, but with the broad range of partners needed to achieve programme goals. The Salvation Army Division (and officers) appear to play a quietly supportive and important intermediary function, supporting the programme in numerous small ways but not over-managing it. This example also demonstrates how such a programme is rooted into a complex community system with ties to other Army support and activities. The staff seem to have a healthy awareness of their capacity limitations, and demonstrate the success of ‘drip fed’ funding (although possibly reliant on the capabilities of the current staff). This would be a very useful case for further research and engagement by The Salvation Army. The young staff members seem to operate in a naturally ‘facilitative’ way, and would be very usefully included in the FBF process at the divisional level.

## PROJECT EXAMPLE: JIM JACOBSON MEMORIAL SOCIAL, REMAND AND COMMUNITY CENTRE, LAE

Established in 1995, the Jim Jacobson Centre began as a domestic remand centre, and in 2005 was shifted to a domestic violence and HIV/AIDS centre. It appears to do a little bit of everything: domestic remand, a day care centre, counselling, nutrition support, hygiene education, spiritual ministry and counselling, peer education, positive living programs, support of PLWHA (inside the centre and outside), street ministry, prevention awareness, mobile and situated VCT, OVC support (school fees, clothes, and food). The centre is funded as a Salvation Army Health Programme. It has an established network of relationships, mostly in relation to patient referral (for example to the Day Care Centre in the hospital, the Welfare Department, ADRA, the police, Lutheran life care, the Provincial AIDS Council, PLWHA Network (volunteers and clients), IEA (training information and funds), MSIF (referral), Save the Children (referral). Staff were aware of Mormons and Jehovah's Witness teams working in their area, and noted that they network with Catholics at meetings but that, "...we don't really know what other NGOs are doing or implementing."

The Centre reports to the HIV/AIDS Council (to whom they are obliged to get statistical feedback), and report to THQ. They noted very little informational feedback from either. They occasionally got a magazine from the Salvation Army headquarters, but nothing from other organisations ("*Oxfam came here asking similar questions but we didn't get any feedback*" and "*the WHO was asking about HIV and community competence, but they didn't come back to us*").

They described an FBF facilitation process cycle as: "*In the village up in the mountains there was a woman with HIV who was sick, a young boy came to tell us. One of our volunteer went and washed her and brought her here. She was only with us for one week. (The Salvation Army Health Services Manager) managed to get a coffin, and Save the Children helped with a donation. She was transported back to her village and the family was happy.*"

Two of the staff members had been at the centre for many years. However, the others including the Salvation Army officers posted there had only recently arrived. The officers had arrived from Port Moresby where they were previously doing Settlement Ministries work with children. They noted that the shift to adult health ministry was taking some effort "...we were trained to do evangelism and church work." On arrival there was no briefing from the outgoing officers, although there were a few notes. This meant that relationships had to be built from scratch in the communities in which they were expected to operate. The staff described some levels of reflective practice and planning such as: 'needs prioritisation' and 'needs assessments' where risk communities were identified – but noted that "*everything is done with little debate*".

**Observation in relation to FBF and the program's 'relational health':** The Jim Jacobson Centre appears to be a well-functioning programme with many effective activities. In relation to its 'relational health' it appears to be well connected in relation to patient referral, with the patient processes described demonstrating a sound awareness of local resources. However, there was very little intentional 'assets-based' thinking demonstrated. The staff had no awareness if there were similar programs in Lae, or what the other NGOs were doing – and the focus was strongly towards the management of individual patient needs. Stigma in relation to working on HIV/AIDS at a community level did not appear to be a significant problem – perhaps indicating a healthy level of trust in the Army programme staff and officers.

These examples demonstrate that while it might not be currently called 'FBF' – there are complex community engagement processes in place within The Salvation Army operations. While there were few examples of intentional 'FBF' practices, or staff who described their work in the language of 'participation' or 'human capacity development', these were demonstrated in some of their actions.

**FINDING 3: There are indications that the community health worker activities utilise some form of FBF, but this would require more investigation**

---

PNG has a significant presence in the PNG health sector, mainly at the level of primary health care level (TSA-PNG has no medical doctors on staff), operating local health centres and posts (as opposed to hospitals), although these are fully funded by the government with staffing about to be placed on the government payroll. The Salvation Army health services staff estimates that all community health workers (CHWs) and 80% of nurses in PNG are trained and supported through the 'mission sector'. There is some suggestion in the project documentation that the PHC and CHW programs in PNG exemplify FBF. For example, in the 2009 project report, it was noted that one of the key examples of territories embedding facilitation into key roles was the CHW programme in PNG – and that the CHW educational syllabus in PNG was one of the few examples (at the time) of documentation that was actively utilised in supporting facilitation. It has also been noted that TSA-PNG has a particularly good relationships with external partners in relation to their PHC services, such as the PNG government and AusAID (see Pallant 2011) – and has a significant presence in national health policy development. Some of those interviewed observed that churches work very well together around health in PNG, pointing to the Church Medical Commission (CMC), which has a representative in the National Health office. It was noted that the government is focusing on the development of hospitals, *“handing out more and more PHC to the churches”*. When asked for an example of the FBF process cycle, the following example was provided: *“We found many mothers dying in villages due to distance from hospitals and now through the FBF process we have trained village health helpers who can help the mother deliver the baby safely in the village. We also found many people walking all night and day to reach the nearest health care, now the Salvation Army through findings we have health post where the Salvation Army church hall is.”*

All this suggests a significant potential for activity on FBF for community engagement in health. Unfortunately, the country site visit did not draw such examples forward, nor was there any project documentation made available that demonstrated, for example, how CHWs were engaging with community in PHC. This might also have been a case of poor timing, since one of the health posts visited was shut down due to a community dispute, and at the other, described next, the nurse and CHW had only been at the site for a few weeks.

**PROJECT EXAMPLE: BOREGAINA HEALTH CENTRE, SOUTH EASTERN DIVISION**

The evaluation team visited the remote village of Boregaina in the South Eastern Division, where the Salvation Army had been present for some years: with officers present and health services staff running a health centre there since 1988. The situation was a fascinating example of the complex weaving of relationships, with the Salvation Army health centre situated next door the officer's home and a new church building, within sight of the local school which was run by the Roman Catholics. The officer (who had been there for two years) described a mix of relationships, describing some relationship with the Catholics with whom they shared some events such as Thanksgiving, but no relationships with the Pentecostals in the area. They were engaged in a small business program and an HIV/AIDS program (although there was currently no one to keep it running), mothers and men's fellowship, community care ministry, visitation of the sick or elderly. Rape was identified as an issue in the community, as well as drugs and alcoholism – although there were no specific programmes being run on those issues. When asked how they decide on what issues to engage, it was noted that *“the pastor says what the needs are.”*

The health centre had two new staff members (a nurse and CHW) who had been there for two weeks. Neither had any significant knowledge of the community or community engagement processes, and they had not received any take-over report or instructions. The programmatic activities being coordinated by the officers did not seem to be related to the health centre's function, apart from referral. For example, it did not appear that there was any shared planning, support (such as volunteering) or community activities, but this was difficult to

assess given the health centre staff had only been there a few weeks. The health centre staff were fairly young and newly trained but did not observe any facilitation, or community engagement elements in their training (please note, translation was limited during this visit, and the interviewees were not entirely comfortable with the evaluator's presence, which may have limited responses).

**Observation in relation to FBF and the program's 'relational health':** This example highlighted the importance of a process being put in place to maintain community relationships. After over twelve years in operation, the health centre clearly has a substantial history of community connectedness. It seems unlikely that this goodwill or relationship was wiped out when the old staff left. Indeed, there were some clues to community engagement processes, such as a sign outside the building that declared a spot fee for actions such as graffiti around the health centre signed by '*The Community Health Committee*'. This suggests a certain level of community engagement and ownership. However, the new staff did not have access to any of this relational knowledge, and did not know about the Community Health Committee. All of this points to PHC and CHWs in particular being potentially important areas for FBF engagement. It is possible that the rapid evaluation process meant that key activities were not observed (which is why we place this finding here) and note it might be important for future FBF engagement and research.

#### **FINDING 4: FBF could be utilised effectively as a process for 'conflict management'**

---

PNG is a multicultural society, and cultural conflict is a daily reality – sometimes on a large scale, but often on a smaller scale of community-level violence. The evaluation team consistently saw opportunities for FBF to be utilised as a process for 'conflict management' (or if preferred: peace building or reconciliation). In fact, given the high level of violent conflict and community clashes, it was surprising that TSA-PNG did not seem to have a process for building deeper relationships in place (FBF or otherwise). We provide two simple examples:

Several officers described a situation of community violence that had recently occurred. In brief, a Japanese organisation had funded the construction of water pumps (water access points) to be built in several locations in a settlement that did not have access to clean water, with the Salvation Army as the implementation partner. The community had not understood the plan, and rather understood that each household in the settlement was going to get their own tap. When this did not happen, they became violent and burnt down the Salvation Army building in the settlement. This story (which we were not able to verify, so may have some inconsistencies), was described to the evaluator to demonstrate the difficulties of operating in PNG communities. None of the staff who described this story mentioned what community relational process might have mitigated this outcome. For example, was there a process in place to communicate to the community what the plan was? Why did this violence occur? What could have been done once tensions rose?

The second example comes from when the evaluation team was taken to visit Papa health post which has all the necessary elements for success. A new health post facility in a community in which there were no other such services and run by TSA-PNG (who are increasingly supporting PHC services in PNG and training primary care nurses, and financially supported by the government). The health post building was new, built on land donated by a local landowner, and had supportive Salvation Army corps buildings and offices constructed next to the health post. The post would normally have three staff (nurses), seven community health workers (CHWs) and some health extension officers. An advisory committee consisting of the landowner, the Salvation Army pastor (officer) and his wife, a ward counsellor, village chief, United Church pastor, and overseer was established. However, it turned out to be unfortunate timing for a visit. The Institute for Medical Research had arranged to conduct a medical trial at the post, which required a secure room for equipment and a fence around the health post to protect this equipment. The community objected and burnt down the new fence – apparently enraged that the fence was being built around what they considered a community-owned asset. On the day of our visit, the clinic had been shut down as a result of this dispute with the community. Too much should not be read into



this scenario. By now, the fence has probably been rebuilt and the clinic reopened for business. We provide this example however, as it says something about how relationships with communities are being managed in PNG. One cannot help but wonder if a more facilitative process had been followed – to communicate with the community about the need for a fence – whether this dispute would have occurred at all. These kinds of questions and speculation can only be answered by those operating in the realities of the PNG context, but we would recommend that at least a discussion is started on how FBF might well be a resource for *managing* and building deeper relationships, especially in the face of tension, confrontation or conflict.

**FINDING 5: FBF could be utilised for improved reflective practice within TSA-PNG (to map, plan and integrate TSA activities) as well as to build better relationships with outside partners**

---

While in the electronic survey, the respondents noted that FBF was being utilised intentionally in PNG during project or programme design and planning, specifically that *“the importance of Community Mapping is asked before designing the program,”* the evaluation team did not observe any concrete examples of asset or issue mapping (although there were a few needs-based surveys as mentioned above).

We provide one brief example from the Settlement Ministries Team in Port Moresby. If any group is characteristically close to the ideal of a local level facilitation team in PNG, it is settlement ministries teams in PNG. A team operating at community level on an array of activities including ministry, literacy, feeding, HIV/AIDS and working with women in prisons, blending ministry with local social action. However, when asking staff why they chose to do one activity or another, the main response was that they were working on that issue *“because headquarters says we should.”* When asked about networks and knowledge of other organisations working in that area, some noted that there were other organisations working in the same settlements doing similar work: *“there are some organisations also working in these settlements – we don’t talk to them.”* Another respondent added, *“...but it goes back to the leadership, it is not for us to network”*, and another jumped saying, *“yes, they decide, they decide what is best.”* When asked about information sharing or knowledge translation, it was clear that not only was information not shared within the team, but also only in a limited way with the other Salvation Army programmes operating in the same building or with THQ. The group noted that the two officers in charge of the ministry (who were not in the room at the time), were the ones that went to meetings at THQ and gave information there, but that information was rarely fed back again (this was confirmed by vastly different accounts from the team and from THQ as to why the team’s activities had recently been restricted in certain settlement areas). When asked about community mapping or gathering of stories of their work, the group automatically related this to ‘surveys’, and responded that it was not a good idea in the contexts in which they operate: *“we don’t like surveys, they raise expectations,”* and another agreed, *“we don’t go to talk to people about their needs...they come and ask...it doesn’t work to go and ask.”*

Again, what we have done in the above description is sought hints about the process and nature of their ‘relational health’ in relation to FBF, not the strength of their programme – so it should not be taken as a critique of their work. However, considering the ideal placement of settlement ministry teams for FBF – and for all the ideals that FBF represents for community engagement, the above accounts were concerning. Clearly this local team relates to the Salvation Army organisation as an institution of power, where information sharing and decision making is very much a top-down affair. It also appeared that information sharing (within the team and within TSA operations) was viewed as a potential loss of power, rather than an empowering experience. The staff did not perceive that they could be questioning whether the social services they were doing were suited to the issues or needs of the communities in which they were working, or that they could be building relationships with organisational partners working in the same communities. There are a number of lessons within this brief example that need to be taken into account by PNG leadership, before FBF training is cascaded down to the level of settlement ministry teams. It seems clear that such teams might be a wonderful asset or resource for

FBF, however, this would require much more care than a few days of training – and requires more careful reflection on TSA operations and management processes.

Indeed, few of the divisional-level staff interviewed in PNG seemed to have an awareness of the scope of TSA's activities. And in some places there seemed to be a significant schism between the mission services and the social services (health and development). Pallant had a similar observation on his visit to PNG, noting that *"Although health post and church share land, I noted variable levels of engagement. Where the health worker had a good relationship with the corps officer there was significant synergy released by the integrating the clinical and pastoral work. However, there were tensions in some places which was not helped by an organisational divide in the management structure between the divisional commander (supervising corps officers) and the health services manager (supervising CHWs)"* (2011, 62). Certainly these variable levels of engagement were observed during the evaluation visit. In some places (such as those described above in Lae), the programme staff and officers seemed to have strong relationships and shared knowledge of TSA activities. In other places, there appeared to be limited relationship or awareness, even between staff working in the same building. The most extreme story that was heard was about a TSA health post on one of the very small and remote islands where it takes more than a day to get to by boat, so health services staff only visit once a year, if that. It so happens that there is also an officer running a ministry in the same location – but it was reported that there was no known coordination between the management of these two (even coordinated management visits). There is something to be said about how deeper relationships can be sustained in contexts with difficult travel and communication systems, and how operational systems sometimes prevent the building of deeper relationships across activities.

Officers repeatedly spoke of being relocated without sufficient preparation, not only to remote regions, but also into programme areas that they were initially ill-equipped to handle. Staff mentioned the different skills that were needed to run a settlement ministries project, a school or a health programme – but that these skills were not taken into account when they were re-deployed. Not one officer who was interviewed felt they had experienced an adequate 'hand-over' process on reallocation, for example managing a physical meeting with outgoing officer, or receiving the expected hand-over report. Even those that had found some notes, did not feel this was adequate to building deeper relationships, so that they were required to introduce themselves into the local community and build a network of relationships from scratch at each move, both with the external community, and with their Salvation Army colleagues (this was a common issue, and will be discussed below).

In addition, although interviewees were asked repeatedly (and in multiple ways), few were able to articulate a theological element to their work. That is, while activities were described such as 'street ministry', there was very little theological articulation for why TSA was engaged in health or development activities. Some participants appeared unusually reluctant to discuss faith at all, one saying *"...only the (Territorial Commander) is doing any theological reflection here."* This suggests that there is little intentionality behind the *faith*-based facilitation, and that it might be necessary to consider the schism between 'ministry' and 'social work' more carefully in rolling out FBF in PNG.

All of these concerns point to the potential for FBF to be utilised in PNG as a process for reflective practice – in particular at a territorial and divisional level. The term 'reflective practice' was mentioned several times, and staff cautiously observed that Salvation Army staff and officers find few opportunities to be reflective about the practices of the Salvation Army. For example, few felt that they had any control over what issues they were working on, or understood why some issues were being worked on rather than others. Few felt that TSA authority could be challenged, even in so small a way as asking why there were duplicated services in an area. At its heart, FBF is profoundly disruptive to institutions of power - it prioritises the bottom-up approach and local authority. For FBF to be undertaken these issues need to be taken into account.

**FINDING 6: The ‘delayed’ FBF process in PNG might actually be an opportunity for a ‘home-grown’ FBF process in PNG - if there is the leadership commitment to do so**

---

We are aware that some of the description of the FBF process in PNG in this chapter may be difficult for TSA leadership to accept. However, we have attempted to go beyond noting the absence of a planned process – to considering that there may be ‘something else’ in PNG that needs to be protected by FBF in the future. If there is an intuitive cultural affinity for community engagement in PNG as has been described, then this needs to be highlight, celebrated, and protected. Clearly some of the organisational and systematic processes that are in place might smother the voice at the local and community level. ‘Reflective practice’ is a meaningless phrase - unless leadership at all levels have genuinely bought into the concepts on which FBF are built – and allow the space for power to be challenged.

We would cautiously recommend that the cascade (training of trainers of trainers) model of FBF might not be the best plan for FBF in PNG in the near future. There are several reasons for this thinking: firstly, it is possible that there is ‘intuitive community engagement’ going on in PNG, and this needs to be supported, not reshaped into something else. It is often said that FBF needs to be ‘caught not taught’. In PNG it seems that there are many who have caught it without being taught, and if that is the case we need to find other ways of enabling that way of thinking, even if that means thinking outside the box for FBF. In any case, given the communication and transport challenges, and the lack of currently FBF-capacitated staff in PNG, a more creative solution might be necessary.

One basic suggestion would be that FBF and the concepts that underpin FBF are integrated as quickly as possible into the PNG Salvation Army education streams. The SALT centre (SALT as in Salvation Army Leadership Training in Africa, not the SALT facilitation tool), the Officer Training College, the nursing and community health worker training programs – all could benefit from FBF-related pieces of curricula. Not to mention the standard training that happens at territorial level such as officer extension training. It might also be useful to consider how (non-officer) staff are trained on the job (and how performance is evaluated), and whether there are different opportunities for FBF engagement there. This is one of the only ways that FBF thinking will infuse the Salvation Army in PNG in an integrated fashion.

*There is great potential for future FBF engagement in PNG – although it might take some out-of-the-box thinking to harness local FBF assets. Generalised recommendations are made in the final chapter below.*

## CHAPTER 4. FAITH-BASED FACILITATION IN THE PHILIPPINES

*This chapter provides a brief case study of FBF in the Philippines beginning with an overview of the context in which TSA operates followed by country specific findings based on analysis of the materials from the site visits and secondary materials.*

### 4.1 COUNTRY CONTEXT: THE PHILIPPINES

#### COUNTRY INFORMATION (source CIA Factbook 2012)

**Geography:** Southeastern Asia, archipelago between the Philippine Sea and the South China Sea, east of Vietnam. The Philippine archipelago is made up of 7,107 islands. 300,000 km<sup>2</sup>

**Natural Hazards:** astride typhoon belt, usually affected by 15 and struck by five to six cyclonic storms each year; landslides; active volcanoes; destructive earthquakes; tsunamis

**Capital:** Port Moresby

**Language:** To Filipino (official; based on Tagalog) and English (official); eight major dialects - Tagalog, Cebuano, Ilocano, Hiligaynon or Ilonggo, Bicol, Waray, Pampango, and Pangasinan

**History:** 12 June 1898 (independence from Spain); 4 July 1946 (from US)

**Administration:** 80 provinces and 39 chartered cities

**Maternal Mortality:** 99 deaths/100,000 live births (2010)

**Health expenditures:** 3.8% of GDP (2009)

**HIV/AIDS (adult prev):** less than 0.1% (2009 est.)

**HIV/AIDS (PLWHA):** 8,700 (2009 est.)

**Literacy:** (total pop, 15yrs older, can read-write): 92.6%

**Population below poverty line:** 32.9% (2006 est.)

**Population:** 103,775,002 (July 2012 est.)

**Religion:** Catholic 82.9% (Roman Catholic 80.9%, Aglipayan 2%), Muslim 5%, Evangelical 2.8%, Iglesia ni Kristo 2.3%, other Christian 4.5%, other 1.8%, unspecified 0.6%, none 0.1% (2000 census)

#### THE SALVATION ARMY IN THE PHILIPPINES (source TSA 2012)

**Territorial Headquarters:** Manila, Philippines

**Established:** 1937

**Zone:** South Pacific and East Asia

**Officers:** 224 (174 active)

**Cadets:** 16

**Employees:** 50 (at THQ: 17 officers and 18 employees)

**Corps:** 79

**Societies, Outposts, Outreaches:** 69

**Institutions:** 2

**Training College:** 1

**Divisions:** 4

**Social Programmes and Services:** 23 (incl Residential Social Centres, Abused girls/children's homes, street children protection, learning centres, child care centres, nutrition and feeding programmes, dormitories for students and working women, minatory programmes, skills training, livelihood support, agricultural assistance, micro-credit enterprise projects, anti-human trafficking projects, combat and care anti-trafficking project, drop-in centre for trafficking survivors, health centre)



## 4.2. FINDINGS ON FBF IN THE PHILIPPINES

*The participatory process evaluation research process was designed to identify findings in five key areas:*

- *Concerning the historical process in which FBF has emerged in The Philippines*
- *Concerning the scope of FBF-specific observable activities (utilisation of tools)*
- *Concerning planning and human resource capacity within TSA for FBF*
- *Concerning utilisation of FBF to build deeper relationships with community (and partners)*
- *Concerning the utilisation of FBF to build deeper relationships within the Salvation Army in The Philippines*

*Within these five areas, the participatory research process produced the following findings in the Philippines – emerging from analysis of interview and FGD materials, project documentation and survey results (unless otherwise indicated, direct quotations in this section come from interviews and FGDs held while in the Philippines).*

**FINDING 1: The Philippines has been the focus of FBF process support for some years now. There is a territorial team in place with growing organisational capacity, cascade training has been taking place over the last year, and there appears to be strong buy-in from leaders at a territorial and divisional level**

---

**Regional support:** The Philippines has been the focus of much of the recent regional FBF process attention. The earlier regional facilitation team focused on the Philippines as part of the earlier programme (as can be seen in the regional facilitation team evaluation report by Evans in 2006). In the last three years, participants from the Philippines have attended regional FBF meetings, and there have been several visits from the Zonal Facilitation Regional Officer (ZFRO) to the Philippines with a focus on FBF. In the project documentation, a Territorial Facilitation Team was declared active in the Philippines in 2009, and then again in 2011. Subsequent visits from the ZFRO have been named as visits supportive of this team, and in 2011 the visit by the ZFRO was described as taking the FBF process further in the Philippines *“to assess the use of tools and to continue to develop the capacity to measure change”* (TSA 2011a).

**Territorial FBF team and HR capacity:** There was a visible territorial FBF team in place at the time of the evaluation. Namely, Lt. Colonel Virgilio Menia (Secretary for Programme Administration), Major Susan Tandayag (Territorial Secretary for Social Programme) and Ms Airene Lozada (Projects and Community Services Coordinator). It should be noted that at the time of the country visit, Ms Lozada, who was clearly a very important team member (and whose name appears in the facilitation documentation since 2005) was working out her final weeks before leaving TSA for another position in government administration. This will clearly be a blow for the team, and will require some reorganising. Major Ruby Casimero (Training and Development Secretary and Educational Services Coordinator), who attended FBF training in the Philippines was also identified as a potential team member who was applying FBF in her work. Importantly the divisional leadership that had recently been trained were also identified as being part of the territorial FBF team – suggesting a developing territorial-level team capacity. The territorial team in the Philippines had the strongest organisational capacity for FBF of the three countries visited. In terms of process, facilitation is mainly driven out of the Program Department at THQ. This positioning seems to have enabled a significant amount of leverage and integration. The FBF team saw the direct relevance of FBF to their work in programmes and on projects. As one noted, *“This is part of my work, the oversight of programmes in the territory...FBF is very naturally part of my work, as a soldier.”* Another team member noted that the tools such as participatory evaluation were exciting and easily utilised in the programmatic work they were doing anyway.

Another benefit of the placement in the Program Department at THQ level was that territorial leadership were quickly informed (and apparently made the suggestion of integrating FBF into concept notes before they are presented to the board). All departments within THQ attended the training – even if not all saw the direct relevance to their work (it was noted that some felt that FBF was a community development initiative and that they are not working directly with the community.) In this case, the positioning of FBF process within the Program Department has at least ensured that a broad range of staff were quickly made aware of FBF. It is also significant to note that the Philippines Territory Project Board are supportive and are now requesting that FBF be included in all future project proposals. That is, THQ are implementing rules that before concept notes are submitted to the Projects Board officers must submit a summary of how FBF was used within the process. This kind of integration in the system is hugely important for the sustainability of the FBF process, and is also an indication of leadership commitment. The training college apparently created a concept note and project proposal using the FBF cycle following the training in 2011.

**FBF funding:** Significantly, the Philippines Salvation Army received seed funding to support FBF training in 2010-2011. The support was perceived to be for the local printing of the manual BDR and training of the divisional leaders, cluster coordinators, and cadets, as well as orientation of Philippine leaderships and THQ employees and officers.

**FBF process planning and training:** The territorial FBF team have a very clear plan for how FBF will unfold in Philippines, mainly as a cascade model where training is ‘re-echoed’ down from territorial to divisional to corps and community levels. FBF training was held at territorial and divisional levels in 2011 and 2012. The territorial team report that at this time 235 officers, employees, OTC staff and cadets have undergone *Building Deeper Relationship Using Faith-based Facilitation Training*. Training began in August 2011, with the territorial team training divisional leadership and cluster coordinators, who then reportedly in turn did the training at a divisional level in October and November 2011 (see timeline). Training sessions were two or three days long and included: morning devotions followed by FBF principles, FBF process, learned qualities of good facilitators, and then use of the BDR manual. At the end of the training, all officers were given Certificates of Participation and BDR manuals.

**The FBF cascade and leadership support:** From all accounts, the FBF training was well received and participants reported favourably on the potentials of use in their own lives and work. This was reported not only by the

## PHILIPPINES TEAM FBF OBJECTIVES

(source Singapore document, TSA 2011b)

1. To report FBF to the Leadership
2. To facilitate BDR-FBF to SAOTC Officers, employees and cadets
3. To facilitate BDR-FBF to THQ Officers and Employees
4. To facilitate BDR-FBF to DHQ Officers and Clusters’ Coordinators
5. To facilitate BDR-FBF to Corps Officers and Social Institutions Officers of the 4 divisions
6. To facilitate BDR-FBF to Corps People (L.O.’s & Community potential leaders in the 4 divisions
7. To use the BDR-FBF to existing social and corps program, projects and services

### PHILIPPINES FBF TIMELINE

1995	Asia Pacific Regional Facilitation Teams (RFT) formed
2006	Evaluation by Evans et al
2007	FBF management transferred from IHQ to SPEAZone
2009	26-30 Oct: BDR Workshop, Australia
2009	ZFRO visits Philippines
2009	Major Pallant (IHSC) visited Philippines
2009	Local & territorial facilitation teams declared active in Philippines
2010	ZFRO and IHSC visits Philippines
2011	14-18 Feb: Singapore FBF Workshop (Lt. Col. Menia & Major Tandayag attend)
2011	May: (J.Hibbert-Hingston IHQ) conducts tools workshop in Manila (Maj Tandayag and Ms. Lozada)
2011	16-18 Aug: FBF Training (Mindanao Island Division) 8 participants
2011	23-25 Aug: FBF Training (Northern Luzon Division) 10 participants
2011	Aug: FBF Training (Central Philippines Division) 13 participants
2011	27-29 Sept: FBF Training (Visayas Islands Divisional) 9 participants & ZFRO
2011	20-21 Oct: FBF Re-echo Training (MID) at DHQ, 37 participants
2011	26-28 Oct: FBF Re-echo Training (NLD) at Baguio Corps, 37 officer participants
2011	15-17 Nov: FBF Re-echo Training (CPD) at Shercon Resort (52 delegates)
2011	Oct-Nov: FBF Re-echo Training (VID), four sessions (30 participants total)
2011	26 Sept-02 Oct: Graeme Rigley (ZFRO) - SPEA visit to Philippines
2011	9-11 Nov: FBF Training (OTC), 22 Officer Training College Staff and Cadets
2011	28-29 Nov: FBF Training (THQ), 28 THQ Officers and employees

territorial team, but by the divisional and territorial leadership that were interviewed during the evaluation visit. One of the territorial leaders wrote that at the divisional level *"FBF really seems to be becoming part of the DNA (or preferred tool) of the officers. In sessions they all began mapping what resources or assets they already had in their community - hall/people/sponsorship families/love of music/ability to read and write/ability to cook economically and then planned from that point - really getting into the 'asset based community' mode."* However, it should be noted that they are still very early in the process. Several of those interviewed noted a lack of commitment on FBF from upper-level leadership in the Philippines. As one officer said, *"...we are already very busy (with FBF), but are not seeing commitment from the top...I do see the value in the concept but nothing happens in corps once they have identified needs...so what is the point in lots of training and meetings that take up valuable time?"* One of the more concrete suggestions made was that the Territorial Commander or the Chief Secretary should write to all divisions, 'ordering' that FBF be implemented, applied and practiced.

**Other suggestions from staff for the FBF process going forward:** Other suggestions included, continued regular training for officers and capable members of the corps who are involved in the ministry; that FBF should be integrated in policy and funding documents (e.g. property or social projects), into the CPMS system, and corps programs or activities. The stated plan for 2012 and further includes linking FBF training to the *20 Year Goals for the Territory for Evangelism and Discipleship*, and seeking new openings to introduce the approach in the territory. It was also suggested that FBF should be placed into the curriculum at the training college, that materials on FBF relating to specific issues should be developed (e.g. working with youth, people who have suffered abuse and people with disabilities), including success stories of the FBF cycle, and that a local language version of the BDR booklet with territorial pictures and stories should be developed. They also suggested that several participants had requested that the BDR manual was printed in a smaller format, so that it could be more easily handled in the field.

**FBF regional communication and knowledge transfer:** Although the FBF territorial team had been to regional meetings and had several visits from IHQ staff and the ZFRO, they felt that there was little regional information sharing or knowledge transfer occurring. They suggested that newsletters, sharing of materials, shared correspondence or staff visits would be useful. Interestingly, although FBF was seen to be slowly integrating into the funding system at a territorial level, the staff in the Philippines did not see opportunities for applying for FBF-related funding through the IHQ system, that is, they did not understand this to be a requirement by IHQ projects system. It should be noted that the seed funding for FBF in the Philippines has had the side effect of resourcing (and requiring) some FBF project documentation such as reports. This means that a little more documentation is available in the Philippines than elsewhere, which in turn gives more opportunities for knowledge transfer. However, despite all the training that has occurred in the last year, there is still very little 'participatory documentation' visible. For example, it might have been useful to collect some of the local stories and examples that must emerge in the discussion during training. As one FGD participant noted *"officers are talking to people and collecting stories but these are not always being passed on or recorded...(there is) a culture of oral sharing rather than writing or formal documentation."* In addition, in general, officers and leadership in the Philippines seemed to be more well-travelled than those in Indonesia or PNG, that is, more officers had experience in other countries or mentioned visits or meetings to other zones. This is a reminder that staff in territories might have differing opportunities for regional communication and knowledge transfer.

**Divisional level FBF support, engagement and leadership:** We noted earlier that there appeared to be growing support at the divisional level. Divisional teams were trained in FBF, and in turn have re-echoed the training to their officers. We had the pleasure of conducting three large FGDs with divisional-level groups of DHQ staff and cluster officers from three different divisions (Central Philippines Division, Visayas Island Division in Cebu City, and Northern Luzon Division). Although it is still very early days (indeed, one group had had their re-echo training only the week before our arrival), we were generally impressed with the current level of interest and engagement in FBF at all three divisions. It should be noted that the Divisional Commanders (DCs) at all three

sites demonstrated that they had 'caught' FBF and demonstrated reflection about the process. Their participation and enthusiasm appeared genuine, confirming the territorial FBF team's instincts that the DCs were the correct entry point for FBF and are part of the territorial FBF team. It also suggests that the training of FBF at the DC level, conducted by the FBF territorial team, was valuable. It is recommended that the territorial FBF team (and the ZFRO) keep a close eye on the developments at the divisional level in the Philippines. It would be a great pity if this initial enthusiasm was lost, and there is much to be learnt from here on how the FBF process can be strengthened at the divisional level for the other territories.

## **FINDING 2: While several FBF activities are reported in the Philippines, the overwhelming focus is on the personal-relational level and in particular on utilisation for evangelisation**

---

The territorial FBF team and FGD participants at a divisional level were quick to give examples of 'FBF activities' that were happening. For example, they noted it was being utilised:

- **during the education of corps officers, cadets or others:** specifically during the officers councils and in-service meetings for officers at a divisional level; in some clusters (group of corps) during the family day during group discussion; at the Officers Training College, where cadets were setting up an outreach work proposal to THQ by using the process and the problem tree analysis, and consulting the people through community survey which informed their project proposal.
- **during project or program design or planning:** for example in establishing a new outreach ministry.
- **during monitoring or evaluation activities:** for example while evaluating the Child Care Program of the Corps, participants were asked the objectives and intentions of the program, and then to compare it to the original purpose of the program, *"after doing (this) they have made their own plan...the tools used were self-assessment tool, brainstorming and ranking."*
- **as an intentional strategy to connect community with Salvation Army activities:** for example, the FBF process cycle was introduced to Officers Review, *"...including the different tools to improve trust and relationships with the community. This initiative was strengthened with the territory's mandate of massive evangelism and discipleship training"*.
- **in disaster response:** there was some community discussion on what was needed after a natural disaster.
- **in local corps activities and relationship-building:** for example, in women's meetings
- **in research:** for example, while no formal needs assessments are carried out, information is gathered verbally. One officer noted that *"surveys are sent to the community about once a year and whenever they arrive somewhere new to ask what is happening and what other groups are providing"*. Another noted that at their Learning Centre, parents are asked for feedback on how they know about The Salvation Army, why they send their children to the learning centre, how the children's work has improved – and this information is then given to DHQ and THQ in the form of a report.

There are many more examples that could be provided. There was some pride in the community work that TSA was doing, for example saying: *"TSA is known not just as an organisation, only TSA is showing community work directly with the community, not just words...the church is first to respond"*. The main observation is that FBF activities are being reported, or at the very least, those who have been trained in FBF are seeing a connection between what they are doing and the FBF process.

Indeed, as in the other territories visited, many of those interviewed felt that FBF was not new and that it was 'what we are doing anyway'. Several FGD participants noted that in their understanding the term FBF was interchangeable with integrated mission, saying: *"I would use the term integrated mission to mean the same thing."* One of the main perceived strengths was the focus of FBF on the individual level, and the freedom to utilise the tool for evangelisation (discussed below in more detail). As one FGD participant noted, *"I've been doing facilitation since I became an officer so it is nothing new. I believe that its main objective is to influence the"*



*community into faith in Jesus Christ.*” It is important to note that in the trip reports of the ZFRO to the Philippines territory, he noted that *“During my presentations I talked about the history of FBF, with the endorsement by the General and ownership by the Territories...I emphasised that this is a way of working rather than an actual process, and that there is really nothing new in the way of working but that the faith component has been emphasised in the cycle.”* It is interesting to see how the discourse of ‘this is nothing new’ has been taken up so strongly in the Philippines – and is perhaps worth some further reflection as to whether it is a useful strategy or not.

One of the main tensions this raises for evaluation purposes was that if FBF is being taught as part of ‘everything we do and nothing new’ then the examples of FBF activities become vast – literally descriptions of everything the Philippines staff are doing. This not only makes evaluation difficult, but it also makes it difficult for FBF teams to highlight exemplar stories of FBF, and raises questions about how much impact the FBF training has actually had on changing mind-sets and ways of doing. Several examples were provided to the evaluators of the FBF tools in action, in particular examples of relationships with individuals in communities being strengthened through FBF. However, despite probes and requests for clarification, few FGD participants at a divisional level were able to articulate how the principles of FBF were utilised in these examples – that is, there was great enthusiasm for how FBF fitted into what was being done, but only limited knowledge of or connection with the underlying principles of FBF.

In the analysis of responses from across the evaluation site visits, interviews and FGDs, there are two main observations: firstly, FBF is being perceived in the Philippines as most useful at an interpersonal level, for individual relationship strengthening – and most often within families. This idea is certainly in line with FBF teaching (that is should assist and infuse everything you do). There were many examples of FBF being put to use at the interpersonal level, in particular in officer marriages: *“(I use FBF) with my husband...we take time to evaluate if there are tensions within our relationships, we identified our own weaknesses or failures, pray to God then bring up what are the things to do or improve. This is helpful...Now we are more intimate, relationships became meaningful, healthier. Stress is minimised.”* And another example: *“The tools from the booklet are used during visits to social programmes, (and) when I need guidance from the Lord on personal and family matters and work related issues”.*

Secondly, FBF is being utilised in the Philippines most often for evangelical purposes. Several senior leaders had informed the evaluation team before arrival that the Philippines is a very evangelical country (primarily Catholic at 83%). One leader noted that *“the emphasis is on evangelism rather than social service,”* and this was confirmed throughout the evaluation visit. It is important to note that TSA in the Philippines does not have a significant health service program (that is, it does not run any hospitals or clinics) and the social services are mainly focused on child care homes, learning centres, feeding programs, skills training, anti-trafficking and livelihood support. The evaluation team was told in their first meeting with the FBF team that the current territorial goal that everyone is focused on is to double the number of corps by 2013. This prioritisation was expressed continually during the visit - and in discussion on FBF as a tool for engagement with community external to the Salvation Army the focus was overwhelmingly on increasing *the number* of relationships, as opposed to improving the quality of relationships with people of different culture or religion.

At the same time, despite an overwhelming evangelical focus, it was surprisingly difficult to get the officers to discuss the practical theological elements of community service or engagement. That is, while they spoke of the faith element of FBF being crucial, and were deeply evangelical about their work, they were unwilling or unable to discuss the elements underlying this faith, or the connection between their faith and their actions.

## CASE EXAMPLE: LAPU-LAPU CORPS MINISTRY

We visited a local corps in Cebu called Lapu-Lapu where FBF training had occurred at the corps level. The compound reflected the usual side-by-side placement of corps building, officers' home and social project - in this case a sewing school, which was the main community engagement project of the corps. Inside the building, a corps member was teaching sewing skills to unskilled young people, and we were told that they maintained relationships with local businesses to help the students gain employment, and that an element of counselling was involved with the teaching. We were told a story (as an example of FBF in practice) of a woman in the class who was being abused by her husband. Through the corps she was referred to the right person in the local Barangay (community council) for legal help and connected to the corps for spiritual support. She and her husband separated for a while, but *"they are now reconciled and she is receiving the support she needs"*. Unfortunately there is only one corps member volunteering, so the project is dependent on her presence, and we were informed that this also limited the interaction between the corps and the sewing project.

In the discussion with corps members and officers who had been trained in FBF, we asked about the value and utilisation of FBF in their lives. The overwhelming response was that its usefulness was *"as an evangelical tool to save souls."* In relation to future use and planning, the response was, *"through FBF we are planning to gain more souls and do more ministry."* Some of the examples provided of FBF in action were: FBF was being perceived as a tool to reach more customers for the sale of a wellness product; a woman grieving over the loss of her baby (who apparently died because of lack of funds for medical treatment) was successfully converted during grief counselling as part of FBF; and some youth were conducting strength and weaknesses assessments of their friends which enabled them to come closer together in faith.



Lapu-lapu corps 'asset', Cebu 2012

FBF was mainly perceived as a tool for personal relations or outside ministry, and had not been considered for use within the corps membership or activities. When asked about the relation of the social projects (such as the sewing project) to the assets and issues in the community, there was no response. When probed, an officer noted that *"HQ must tell us what we need to do"* and the only community asset that was identified was a van that had been generously provided by a corps member *"growing in giving."* There was some sense that this corps was an outpost, perceived as being surrounded by 'Others' (described as migrants, Catholics and Muslims). Most of the congregation travelled far from other communities to attend services there. The focus of their work, and FBF was therefore with 'the Other', and primarily their conversion. As in PNG, there were some concerns raised about how community conversations and engagement raised expectations *"in our country, we go and they expect us to bring something to them – we need time to change that – in the way FBF teaches us"*.

**Observation in relation to FBF and the 'relational health' of the corps:** We did consider whether or not to provide this case example in this report. There was a bitter-sweet edge to this visit, and we were concerned at how this brief description could be interpreted. On the one hand, it was one of the few examples in this evaluation of FBF training cascading down to the corps level. The corps members and officers were wonderfully engaging and caring, and their input was greatly appreciated. We therefore provide these examples of FBF in action with the greatest of respect. However, on the other hand, most of the examples provided were quite disturbing. There were also many opportunities for FBF to be utilised to strengthen the corps operations that the group seemed blind to, such as connecting the social (sewing) project with the corps activities, or matching 'outreach' to local community needs, issues and (social) assets. This visit highlighted for us the inherent dangers of the process model of FBF 'cascading without controls'. This is of particular concern since the FBF territorial

team has noted that the FBF process should shift as rapidly as possible to the corps level: *"...as officers do not have the time and have already grasped the concept. The congregation should own the ministry as it is their church and they are there on a permanent basis."* If the process shifts rapidly to the corps level, who acts as the guardian for the moral, ethical and theological foundations of FBF? (Who decides what is 'good' FBF and what is 'poor' implementation - especially in contexts with a prominent evangelical focus?)

In general, the territorial goal (to double the corps by 2013) and the driving evangelical purpose in the Philippines focuses attention on building *more* relationships with external community for one clear intention. We will address the issue of the evangelisation of FBF again later, but it is important to note that this is a particular issue for the Philippines FBF process and needs to be urgently addressed at territorial, regional and international levels.

### **FINDING 3: There were some concern about the how relationship-building can be supported financially at community levels**

---

In a number of different settings, concerns were raised about funding, and how the building of deeper relationships could be supported financially. As was noted above, this was sometimes raised as an issue about community expectations: that in the Philippines, engaging in a community conversation often raises expectations that funds would be brought in to solve the identified needs, and that in most cases this was not possible. Several of the officers perceived that this was opposed to the FBF ideals *"in our country, we go and they expect us to bring something to them – we need time to change that – in the way FBF teaches us."* In a different FGD, another observed, *"FBF is about getting the community to identify their own assets and strengths to solve issues rather than hand-outs so should still work with a very limited budget."*

However, it was stressed that this issue was not easily resolved, *"...if the people see us in uniform, they expect... many times we can facilitate...we can help them without giving, and can organise them into a team and avoid thieves - our purpose is not only giving."* Others agreed that if the community understood the Salvation Army mission *"they would see that the Salvation Army is not a funder...it would be a problem if the army was introduced as a charity, they need to understand who we are."* This was supported by another participant who responded *"...if we see a need for social services, instead of building a church you are grouping a group of beggars."* A particular reaction to this in the Philippines was that the *faith* in FBF meant that the only expectations that community should have is of spiritual sustenance: *"...if viewed as purely 'social' people would always expect money. Using faith means we can start by saying we are bringing you Jesus...If we can then help materially that is great."* The idea that the Salvation Army uniform was correlated with charity was a theme that was repeated again: *"if we identify a need with the community and raise their expectations but cannot deliver on the project people lose faith with the Army...If people see the uniform they expect them to be giving something out."* It seemed that the asset mapping tool was identified as a very useful way to get around this expectation, *"if you identify the needs then that raises expectations"*, although FGD participants did note that it would take a long time for skills to be developed and for asset mapping to be utilised.

However, reading between the lines, it is possible that many officers are reluctant to even begin conversations because of this expectation. Further reflection on this is necessary by leadership as it is a concern that cannot be bandaged with an asset mapping tool, but is rather conceptually woven into the practical theology of how these officers and staff perceive themselves to be doing what they are doing.

Not all of those who had been trained in FBF understood that funds were not attached to the FBF activities. As one asked, *"...when we attended FBF training, I understood that there was a certain amount being released to do the project."* He was quickly silenced by the facilitation team, and reminded that they had been told that no funds were attached. However, it was not clear if he had been convinced. This anecdote only acts as a reminder that expectations need to be continuously managed, not only with communities, but within the FBF teams and

trainees as well. The issue of how issues identified through participatory research and mapping processes such as FBF can be supported remains a critical question that needs to be dealt with regionally and internationally.

As the Philippines territorial FBF team noted when asked about the sustainability of the project, more support for more training was not the key need. What the real concern was, was how to support issues that bubbled up as a result of the FBF process, that are not clearly projects or programmes. For example, one respondent noted, *“we are dealing with relationships, and most of what we discovered in the community are families that are broken, husband and wife not living together...We are concerned of the welfare of the family...(and) thought of having marriage seminars or encounters among couples to restore broken or strengthen relationships. The problem is how are we going to fund such a project?”* Participants wondered if all issues that emerged as part of the FBF process should become projects, or if there was some other way to support the building of deeper relationships. As a side note, something that participants gave little response to was the issue of whether raising external support for activities that are so deeply evangelical in nature would be a challenge or not.

#### **FINDING 4: FBF is an opportunity to map, strengthen and reflect on relationships with external partners**

This leads to the following finding, that FBF is not being utilised to its full potential in the Philippines – in relation to building deeper relationships with external partners. At each meeting and FGD participants were asked to ‘map’ their network of relationships. Knowledge of other organisations’ activities was generally poor. (Only a few partner organisations were named, such as World Vision, Compassion International, the Department of Social Welfare, local businesses, and the Red Cross in disaster situations).

One resource that most participants noted as important was the local ‘Barangays’ – which are the local community councils set up by government in all the local communities in the Philippines. As the main form and smallest unit of local governance, Barangays offer finance, technical skills, advice and community networking. Many officers sat on their local Barangay, and it was noted that this should be encouraged as an excellent way to increase community engagement. As one officer observed, *“...one of my main jobs is to build a relationship with the Barangay...we feel that the relationship is mutual...we use each other’s strengths as the Barangay have trained health workers and Salvation Army offers counsel and care.”* The officers generally felt that sitting on the Barangay board provided the best opportunity to build better relationships with other community leaders. This observation should be taken seriously – and it is recommended that the Salvation Army in the Philippines considers more carefully how engagement with Barangays is taking place. Indeed, this would seem to be a good place to conduct some research or collect some stories of FBF in practice.

However, we do raise some concerns about whether the presence of the Barangays means that less initiative is being taken by TSA staff and officers to understand the core community issues and assets. Several officers noted that the courtesy visit with the Barangay was the only place that they asked about community issues and concerns when arriving in a new location. For example, as one officer describes *“I asked the Barangay...so they asked what is your strength?...you tell them and they see what the need is.”* We simply raise this as a caution, that some officers may not see the necessity of seeking out an understanding of that community’s issues or assets, if it is felt that relationship with the Barangay is sufficient. It was interesting that responses either indicated a poor awareness of other organisations and their activities, or indicated that networking was adequate because of the Barangay. This is something for the local team to consider.

One of the main points of tension for collaboration with external partners was again the evangelical focus of the TSA operations in the Philippines. Participants consistently noted that they struggled to build deeper relationships with other faith-based organisations because of the distrust between them. Several stories were provided of how the Catholics tried to ‘steal their sheep’ (convert TSA congregants). As one officer said, *“I am always evangelical in my approach, otherwise they steal my sheep.”*

There were some examples of 'ecumenical prayer meetings', but on the whole there appeared to be little cooperation in terms of social provision or service coordination. One divisional commander told a story of how he had encountered some Catholics at a lecture one time at seminary (there was some laughter as the story continued about how he had caught a lift back to the division in the same vehicle as a Catholic and everyone they passed was shocked to see them in the car together). The DC concluded this story saying, "...and to my surprise they are open-minded, my question is, are we also as open-minded?" Other stories of encounters with Catholics were less encouraging: "our relationship with the Catholics is very difficult...there is idolatry and penance...we try to make them born again...we can't build trust if we view each other with suspicion." At several times during the evaluation visit it was expressed that the TSA evangelical efforts in the Philippines are mainly targeted towards Catholic communities and individuals: because Catholics are preeminent in the Philippines, and perhaps because Catholics are perceived as being more easily converted than atheists or other religions.

In reality, in the Philippines, expecting FBF to be a process for supporting inter-faith relationship building seems directly opposed to its utilisation as an evangelical tool, and we are not sure what the solution to this dilemma is. If the inter-faith purpose is going to succeed, then something will have to shift in the evangelical operations in the Philippines. These are fairly difficult questions and substantial issues which FBF highlights and requires internal reflection from a number of levels within TSA.

#### **FINDING 5: FBF could be utilised more effectively as a process for engagement on human trafficking and disaster response**

---

One positive response in relation to interfaith collaboration was in disaster response, as one respondent noted, "In disasters, we are able to forget our differences." This leads to the next finding which addresses two issues which were raised several times during the FGDs and interviews: human trafficking and disaster response. Although both were raised as issues of significant concern in the territory, FBF was rarely being considered as a tool for engaging in either issue. For example, one of the territorial FBF team was the lead on the issue of human trafficking (although several participants mentioned human trafficking as an issue that they were working on, mainly through sharing of information and awareness raising). The full responsibility for the programme fell to this staff member - mainly consisting of requests for information about individuals from the international offices or the local embassies. (It was noted that this was an activity for which TSA-Philippines received no support, in that IHQ was perceived to receive the funds for this activity). The officer noted that it was very challenging to hunt down disconnected persons, often after adoption or in connection with US military station. It appeared that 'human trafficking' in this case was more about misplaced persons, and that the various trafficking activities and interests remain disconnected and disjointed. This is one example of an issue that might benefit from an FBF approach in relation to internal Salvation Army processes – both in relation to connecting different trafficking activities, and also in terms of building relationships on issues that are less oriented towards programmatic response, and more oriented to the development of informal communication networks.

The other issue that was raised was disaster response, for which many examples were provided of ad hoc teams responding to natural disasters by "filling a van and going." The stories had a similar form: TSA staff were often the first to respond, but without any real funds they had to bully store owners into providing supplies, and used corps volunteers to pack the vans in order to respond. We will discuss this again below in relation to Indonesia, however, it might be useful to consider whether FBF might not be a useful process for engaging on disaster response, especially in the case of developing more resilient community systems to respond to disasters (by knowing and being able to leverage community assets, and having good relationships and communication systems in place to respond rapidly and effectively when needed).

## **FINDING 6: FBF could be utilised for improved reflective practice within TSA-Philippines: to map, plan and integrate TSA activities better**

---

As in PNG, one of the greatest opportunities for FBF that was observed in the Philippines was for improved reflective practice and information sharing at and between divisional and territorial level. As we have mentioned above, FBF was primarily perceived as a tool for strengthening close personal relationships (in the family), or as an evangelical tool for working in the community – it was rarely seen as something to be utilised *within* the Salvation Army, to improve internal operations and relationships. However, there was large agreement that FBF should be used for reflective practice, which most considered was not happening enough in the Philippines territory, apart from “...some consultation with officers about their ministry...(where) we encouraged them to reflect the situation and plan for the future.”

As mentioned above, while officers were keen on the idea of community asset and activity mapping, they were often unable to link the activities they were engaged with to the needs or assets of that community. For example, one participant noted that they were working with a youth in the community who had turned to drugs (teaching them music and bringing them to youth fellowship to build relationships), but when probed, they noted that the drugs was identified as an issue because they “*just knew it was a problem*”. Similarly, a group of officers were working on housing, but when asked why, their only answer was “*because Catherine and William Booth focused on housing.*” Most commonly though, officers had inherited activities when they were relocated to their current position, so had no idea if it was a real issue in that community or not.

Indeed, as in PNG, there were two main obstacles identified: firstly, that it could be difficult to implement FBF given the strongly hierarchical organisational culture of TSA. It was noted that “*(FBF) can be confusing with power relationships at play.*” The reluctance to critique Salvation Army processes, or reflect about the appropriateness of particular actions was often verbalised as just being too busy for such reflection or sharing. “*In reality, the officers do not talk to each other or share stories of the work they are doing – we are simply too busy.*” It was agreed in one FGD, that relationships between officers need to be recognised and strengthened. “*(We) need a more unified way of working in Philippines. Many officers do not have time to talk to each other and share experiences.*”

Similarly to PNG, the reallocation or cycling of staff was brought up at several occasions as being detrimental to building deeper relationships. Officers noted that there usually great difficulties in the handover process, especially as the expected briefing report were rarely available. Incoming and outgoing officers rarely met, and no one was able to give any example of having been introduced to key partners or community members by the outgoing officer or staff member (in his project reports, the ZFRO noted that it was therefore important for incoming officers to continue the contact with the local Barangays, Rigley 2011). It was noted that there was a policy in place that officers were not to take previous work with them, which often meant dropping a community relationship that they felt strongly connected to. As one of the territorial team members noted, “*FBF shouldn't be sitting with one person – you could be cycled out at any time.*” This is another example of how local Salvation Army processes might be more carefully considered, perhaps utilising FBF as a tool for reflection on their own practices that impact on building deeper relationships in the Philippines.

*In this chapter we have provided an overview of the FBF process as it was observed in the Philippines. We sought to provide material for reflection and further engagement within the Philippines territory. We now move to the last country in which the FBF process was observed, Indonesia.*

## CHAPTER 5. FAITH-BASED FACILITATION IN INDONESIA

This chapter provides a brief case study of FBF in Indonesia: beginning with an overview of the context in which TSA operates, followed by country specific findings based on analysis of the materials from the site visits and secondary materials.

### 5.1 COUNTRY CONTEXT: INDONESIA

#### COUNTRY INFORMATION

(CIA Factbook 2012)

**Geography:** Southeastern Asia, archipelago between the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean. 1,904,569 km<sup>2</sup>

**Natural Hazards:** The most volcanoes in the world; floods; droughts; tsunamis; earthquakes; and forest fires

**Capital:** Jakarta

**Language:** Bahasa Indonesia (official, modified form of Malay), English, Dutch, local dialects (of which the most widely spoken is Javanese)

**History:** Independence from Netherlands in 1945 (1949)

**Administration:** 30 provinces, 2 special regions, 1 special capital district

**Maternal Mortality:** 220 deaths/100,000 live births (2010)

**Life expect. at birth:** total pop: 71.62 yrs

**Health expenditures:** 5.5% of GDP (2009)

**HIV/AIDS (adult prev):** 0.2% (2009 est.)

**HIV/AIDS (PLWHA):** 310,000 (2009 est.)

**Literacy:** (total pop, 15yrs older, can read-write): 90.4%

**Population:** 248,645,008 (July 2012 est.)

**Pop. below poverty line:** 13.33% (2010)

**Religion:** Muslim 86.1%, Protestant 5.7%, Roman Catholic 3%, Hindu 1.8%, other or unspecified 3.4% (2000 census)



#### THE SALVATION ARMY IN INDONESIA

(TSA 2012)

**Territorial Headquarters:** Bandung

**Established:** 1894

**Zone:** South Pacific and East Asia

**Officers:** 717 (581 active)

**Cadets:** 40

**Employees:** 1775

**Corps:** 274

**Outposts:** 115

**Kindergartens:** 13

**Primary schools:** 66

**Secondary schools:** 14

**High schools:** 5

**Technical high school:** 1

**Theological University:** 1

**Hospitals:** 6 (including general hospitals, branch hospitals, maternity hospital)

**Clinics:** 13

**Academy for nurses:** 1

**Medical college:** 1

**Social institutions:** 20 (incl. children's homes, homeless peoples centre, eventide homes, students hostels, guest house)

Indonesia is the world's largest archipelagic state, the world's third most populous democracy and home to the world's largest Muslim population – making this a particular context for the operations of The Salvation Army in the Asia-Pacific region.

The Salvation Army (known as *Bala Keselamatan*) has been present in Indonesia since 1894. With a high Muslim majority in the country, TSA-Indonesia has a relatively small presence (in terms of national percentage of 'soldiers' to population), but has a strong presence in terms of social institutions. As can be seen in the table above, not only does TSA-Indonesia engage in the usual range of social activities such as children's homes and support of the homeless, but it also owns and manages a significant number of educational and health facilities. (It is important to note that the health services in particular are currently undergoing strategic review, in

relation to the challenges of sustainability of hospital services.) Governance of these activities is divided within TSA-Indonesia into programmes (e.g. social services) and projects.

The evaluators did not visit the Jakarta region in which territorial headquarters are based. Instead, the team went straight to Sulawesi Island (where they were joined by Major Donna Barthau, Compassion in Action Facilitation Coordinator from THQ). Observations are therefore mainly from this location, and might not pick up on the territorial level concerns and observations in the same way as the other two country visits did. In Sulawesi, the Salvation Army has had a significant presence for many years, with many corps, educational and health institutions located in this area. Woodward General Hospital acts as a hub for the health services, connecting the other health clinics (7 in the central area and 3 in the north), a maternity hospital, outreach activities and a nurses training academy. Social programmes in this area include: a boy's home, a children's home, a homeless peoples centre, eventide homes, student hostels, and feeding programs.

## 5.2. FINDINGS ON FBF IN INDONESIA

*The participatory process evaluation research process was designed to identify findings in five key areas:*

- *Concerning the historical process in which FBF has emerged in Indonesia*
- *Concerning the scope of FBF-specific observable activities (utilisation of tools)*
- *Concerning planning and human resource capacity within TSA for FBF*
- *Concerning utilisation of FBF to build deeper relationships with community (and partners)*
- *Concerning the utilisation of FBF to build deeper relationships within the Salvation Army in The Philippines*

*Within these five areas, the participatory research process produced the following findings in Indonesia – emerging from analysis of interview and FGD materials, project documentation and survey results (unless otherwise indicated, direct quotations in this section come from interviews and FGDs held while in Sulawesi).*

**FINDING 1: Indonesia has been the focus of FBF process support for some years. There is a basic territorial team in place, and the first stages of cascade training have recently taken place at a divisional level. There does not appear to be overt leadership support for FBF as yet, and further strategic planning is required**

---

**Regional support:** Indonesia has seen some focused attention from the regional FBF process. In the last three years, participants from Indonesia have attended regional FBF meetings, and there have been several visits from the Zonal Facilitation Regional Officer (ZFRO) and the International Health Services Coordinator (IHSC) to Indonesia with a focus on FBF. In the project documentation, a territorial facilitation team was declared active in Indonesia in 2009. Subsequent visits from the ZFRO have been named as visits supportive of this team, and in 2011 the visit by the ZFRO was described as taking the FBF process further in Indonesia “to assess the use of tools and to continue to develop the capacity to measure change” (TSA 2011a).

**Territorial FBF team and HR capacity:** We were not able to observe a territorial FBF team in action. However, we were informed that there is one in place, made up of Major Mitra Sumarta, Captain Alberth Sarimin and Major Donna Barthau, who are the team that have gone around the territory conducting the first round of training in 2011-2012. Major Sumarta and Captain Sarimin attended the Singapore 2011 FBF workshop. Major Barthau has had FBF included as a part of her work portfolio, and feels FBF is well suited to her interests and experiences in participatory community engagement (although has not attended any regional FBF meetings as yet, so has been educating herself via the BDR resource materials).



Dedicated staff time was given by the team during the training workshops, but this has not been sustained and it is unclear what exactly this team will do towards the FBF process in the future: *“There is a need to take the next steps with this, but it is not happening right now.”* Another name mentioned was TSA Training Principal, Major Imanuel Supardi, who went to the Singapore 2011 workshop, but was not part of the FBF training team, so it is unclear if he has any personal commitment to FBF at this time. Given that we only had contact with Major Barthau it is difficult to make a judgment on the capacity of the territorial FBF team that is currently in place, or the attitudes towards FBF from territorial leadership. There were few explicit signs of FBF being integrated into the Salvation Army system at a territorial level (as is beginning in the Philippines). That is, FBF is not appearing in TSA-Indonesia project documentation; is not visibly supported by territorial leadership; nor can be observed as a management activity at territorial or divisional level. It is also not clear where accountability for the FBF process is located at a territorial level, with one suggestion being that a decision needs to be made: *“...(whether) it is a program development tool resting in the Programme Department or if the Personnel Department which only deals with officers should be doing it...It really should be blended and utilised by all.”* It would be recommended that the capacity of the territorial FBF team and process be reviewed in the near future.

**FBF funding:** Indonesia received seed funding for this project for conducting FBF training workshops and for printing the BDR manual. Some further funding from TSA IHQ Resources was identified as being allocated to print copies of BDR with indigenous pictures. No other funding opportunities were identified that might be opportunities to insert FBF elements. As a respondent noted, *“I have done three project proposals recently (CPMS Concept Notes) and it was not*

*asked on the form. This may be something important to start including in their proposal applications.”* It was noted that further financial assistance would most likely be needed if the training was to be continued.

**FBF process planning and training:** The seed funding was utilised by the territorial FBF team to conduct a series of seminars through which the FBF process was disseminated, as well as for the translation, localisation and printing of the BDR manual into Indonesian. The staff note that change of appointments (for those who went to the original FBF regional workshops) had an impact on the strategy for delivery of training. *“The change of personnel from the time of the first training presentation till the actual planning and delivery of territorial seminars has impacted the thinking, use and delivery of the FBF tool-thinking.”* Six training workshops were held: apart from the first one-day workshop at THQ, and the last workshop with cadets at the Officer’s Training College, all other workshops were held at a divisional level with participants comprising of local leaders, lay persons, Compassion in Action members, Sergeants, Divisional Commanders and their wives, as well as officers). In total, 238 individuals experienced FBF training (see timeline insert). During the country visits, we were not

## INDONESIAN TEAM FBF OBJECTIVES

(source Singapore document, TSA 2011b)

The people who take responsibility:

- Officers
- Local Officers
- Social Worker
- DHQ, THQ
- Community Leaders

Recommendations for Territory

- Translate textbook into Indonesian
- Training at every division
- Follow up

## INDONESIAN FBF TIMELINE

1894	Salvation Army work begins in Indonesia
1994	Integrated Mission workshop in Indonesia
1995	Asia Pacific Regional Facilitation Teams (RFT) formed
2006	Evaluation by Evans et al
2007	FBF management transferred from IHQ to SPEAZone
2009	26-30 Oct: BDR Workshop, Australia
2009	ZFRO Major Rigley visits Indonesia
2009	Local and territorial facilitation teams declared active in Indonesia
2010	Training visits by ZFRO and the International Health Services Coordinator to Indonesia
2010	Value of FBF discussed at workshops held in Makassar Indonesia
2011	Jan: Programme to programme visits: Indonesia and PNG
2011	25Nov: FBF Training: At THQ with mixed staff and officers (55 pax)
2012	10-11Jan: FBF Training: N Sumatera DHQ (30 pax, incl corp officers, CIA team)
2012	17-18Jan: FBF Training: Manado DHQ (30 pax)
2012	23-24Jan: FBF Training: Palu DHQ (35 pax)
2012	26-27Jan: FBF Training: Palu DHQ (35 pax)
2012	Mar: FBF Training, Officers Training-College (53 cadets)

(source: project documentation including TSA-Indonesia 2012 Training Report)

able to interview anyone about these training experiences. In their funding report (TSA-Indonesia 2012), the territorial FBF team noted generally positive responses to the training. One facilitator responded in this report that: *"This training is very good, because we were able to remind each officer, corps sergeant, local officer and CIA team member that in planning their program, project, problem-solving or community development that many people can should be included in the process. Ownership was a key-word for us."* They also noted that in the written evaluations to the training, *"...we heard that most of them would like this training to be made three times, or at least once, a year because the training is very useful. Beside the new people who should be invited, the people who already took part in this training should also be included."*

At this time, there has been no further training (no cascade or 're-echo'), although it must be noted that the evaluation visit occurred only a few weeks after this initial introductory training had been undertaken, so it is not possible to know what can be reasonably expected to occur. In terms of planning, there appears to be no further training planned at this time – and the FBF territorial plan for Indonesia (in box right insert above) does not have sufficient detail to know what model is intended, beyond the initial training. One respondent did note that there was concern that no formal follow-up is taking place to ensure that the training has had the desired effect, another observed that they were not certain of the impact of training and the BDR manual, saying *"...(we are) not sure since no strategic follow up is taking place."*

**During the education of corps officers, cadets or others:** One of the FBF training sessions was held with cadets at the Officer Training College. However, it was noted that FBF was not currently being included in other officer and leadership training, even those that have taken place since FBF was introduced. The main reason given was that there was no time for FBF in these training sessions (even though these training sessions ran from one week to two weeks at a time).

**During project or programme design or planning, research or M&E:** There were few examples of an intentional project planning process such as FBF advocates. One respondent noted that this would hopefully begin to happen now that the FBF training had occurred. Another observation was that projects tended to be fragile, often lacking sustainability because of a lack of research or because officers change location. No examples were found of FBF-like or participatory research and M&E.

**FBF communication and knowledge transfer:** The translated manual was handed out to all trainees, and extras were left at each division office at that time. However, it should be noted that during the evaluation visit there were no manuals evident in that area (no one had one, or knew where they could be found). After some enquiry, it was suggested that they *"were under someone's desk,"* but this was not resolved during the visit. A problem was also reported in getting the electronic version of the Indonesian BDR manual from IHQ so that it could be shared with participants who were requesting it. We were surprised to hear this since the electronic version was created in Indonesia, and it is also supposed to be on the IHQ/FBF website. However, on checking this, that specific link is indeed broken at this time. Major Barthau had some related materials that she shared with participants by placing electronic documents on flash-drives at the meetings – which was noted as the most reliable process for information sharing, since electronic communication was still very uncertain in many of the areas TSA operates in Indonesia. The territorial FBF team and divisional officers that we spoke to were all extremely keen on being part of some kind of regional FBF communication system, as they did not know of any information exchanges happening at this time. They suggested newsletters, periodic email exchanges, sharing of FBF progress stories, sharing of FBF evaluation tools, or sharing training ideas and materials between territories. It was noted that although the creation of informal regional networks might have been a purpose of the Singapore 2011 workshop *"...the ones who went have not networked with other territories formally or informally on (FBF)."* A few participants remembered meeting the ZFRO when he 'came to evaluate them', but could not remember getting any feedback recommendations from this visit, saying *"...we have no communication with the region, or (Major Rigley)...he is very busy."*

**Leadership engagement:** Most participants noted that it was critically important that FBF is introduced at higher leadership levels if it is to succeed in Indonesia (e.g. the Zonal Leadership Conference), as *“they do not sit in the training sessions, so have no or little idea of what it is about – and if it is seen as a priority way of working toward development or moving forward, it would possibly be accepted as a good way forward and have more priority within the territory.”* Other officers noted that the Salvation Army was a very hierarchical organisation, and visible commitment was needed at the leadership-cabinet level *before* it was delivered to the rest of the territory in further training, saying: *“Leadership buy-in along with reference and use of the term and daily use are critical for the effectiveness of this interaction program-thinking tool.”* Various processes to improve the chances of success were suggested, such as: requiring reporting on FBF in territorial publications to be reported back to IHQ (so that FBF came into the higher level leadership’s view), making a place for FBF on the CPMS Concept Note for FBF, or that high level leadership might be seen to be using FBF as a tool for development planning – which would demonstrate its applicability and priority. One respondent said that leadership engagement was key for the future of FBF, *“...we do not have it here. It probably needs to be pushed or prioritised from above, although I am trying from ‘below’.”*

**FINDING 2: It is still early days, but several FBF-like activities are reported in Indonesia, most visibly in the area of disaster response – providing fertile opportunities for future FBF engagement**

---

Although from the above it is clear that the recent version of FBF process is still in its birthing stages in Indonesia, there were several examples provided to the evaluation team of FBF-like activities. Since these officers had only received FBF training (if at all) a couple of weeks prior to the evaluation visit, these examples can be viewed as examples of strong intersection points between FBF-thinking and current activities, and areas of opportunity for future FBF development.

**CASE EXAMPLE: PALU COMPASSION IN ACTION TEAMS**

The Salvation Army’s ‘Compassion in Action Teams’ operate across Indonesia, often responding to disasters such as earthquakes and tsunamis, but in interim periods, working on community-level issues such as health information, personal counselling, education or recreation programs for children. In Palu, the Compassion in Action (CIA) team has very recently amalgamated its HIV/AIDS community engagement team with its Compassion in Action Team into the *CIA+ Team*. The CIA+ team is fundamentally a local level voluntary community-response mechanism.

The Palu CIA+ team is currently made up of ten core volunteers from local Salvation Army corps and five officers, with an extended team capacity of up to thirty (fifteen men and fifteen women who go out when they are able.) It is interesting to note that several of the volunteers were currently employed by the Department of Health in Palu (and had come to our weekday FGD meeting with DOH permission). They had been trained in community counselling, health information and spiritual support. Some had joined the CIA+ team having previously worked on HIV/AIDS, and others through Compassion in Action disaster response. At this time, their main activities appeared to be a mix of HIV/AIDS and health information and education, spiritual counselling and disaster response. For example:

**CIA+ engaged in Disaster Response:** The CIA+ team described disasters that had been responded to such as the major Sulawesi earthquake of April 2011, and the flash flood and mudslide in Kulawi District in December 2011. For the latter, the team described how they immediately responded with a ten person team who joined the medical team from TSA’s Woodward Hospital and went to the major disaster site. They put out a call for food and supplies to corps, the government, NGOs and local businesses, also utilising the Salvation Army radio station

to call for donations. They provided post-trauma counselling (for which most had been trained), food, care, and any support necessary by visiting disaster-struck homes (including normalisation 'play' activities for children).

Eight members of the team remained full-time at the site for a two week period, and those who were able to do so stayed on for two months after that (mainly the officers and students who did not have work commitments), living at TSA Divisional Offices in Kulawi since these had only been flooded with mud, not entirely destroyed. They noted how it was difficult to leave after this time, as the people still needed ministry and trauma counselling. They also noted that it was somewhat difficult to counsel to people of other faiths, although *"...in Sulawesi they don't mind as much as other places."* However, it was evident that the team was highly committed to this role, saying *"We could go tomorrow."*

The CIA Coordinator felt that the FBF training which occurred in the middle of the Kulawi relief work was immediately helpful as one CIA+ member utilised community assessment tools, and another continues to utilise them for ongoing post-traumatic stress counselling. It was also noted that the person in charge of Emergency Disaster Relief response was in the first group of participants trained in FBF at a territorial level. Previous CIA training (prior to the introduction of FBF) was considered very much in line with FBF: *"We saw the impact and ministry that was established through community involvement that was set up previously. Our visits, while not started as a result of the most recent training, was nevertheless the outcome of the training that was done previously using the same basic principles used in the recent FBF BDR workbook and training."*

As this report was written, another earthquake hit the Sulawesi region on 18 August 2012. It was widely reported that TSA CIA+ teams were supporting communities affected by the earthquake in Central Sulawesi Province – in particular in the district of Lindu which was badly hit, and is an area which has a strong Salvationist presence. It was reported that *"Salvation Army 'Compassion in Action' teams undertook a rapid response to supply food and medical services in Kulawi, Tuwa and Salua. Trauma counselling is also being offered."*

see <http://www.salvationarmy.org/ihq/news/inr230812/ihq/news/inr230812>

**CIA+ engaged in HIV/AIDS:** The local CIA+ team described the history of their engagement in community HIV/AIDS response. They noted that in Indonesia, HIV/AIDS was usually driven by leadership at a divisional level, and most often ran programmes out of the hospitals (reportedly sometimes not so effectively, especially since 2002). The CIA+ team understood that the Sulawesi emphasis was different, not just focusing on hospital care, but also on community and education. They felt that they were strongly appreciated by the government, for example, a ceremony of appreciation was held in December 2011 in which the government thanked them for their work. (This was substantiated by the fact that most of the CIA+ team who were part of the FGD, also worked for the government and Department of Health, suggesting strong collaborative links). They noted that the Sulawesi HIV/AIDS team was one of the few organisations doing HIV/AIDS work at a community level, so there were not very strong relationships with other organisations. It was noted that at the moment, the relationship between the CIA+ team and TSA's Woodward Hospital was not very strong, especially since ART was limited at Woodward, so there was no clear line of referral.

Their work included education, awareness-raising and information-sharing in schools and in community. They described a recent story of working with a community where a community member was diagnosed with HIV, and that the community found it difficult to accept him and *"...tried to send him to live in the forest."* The CIA+ team was able to go and bring him to hospital for treatment, and then continued working with the community and raising awareness for the future.

The evaluation team was taken to an example of a project that the CIA+ team was supporting in a local community called Sibalaya. Their activity took the form of support of a HIV/AIDS and Drug awareness information post. This post was run out of the home and business of a Muslim person living with HIV and AIDS. The CIA+ team had supported this person with the means to run his business (a hair-dressing salon in the same room as the information post), and information brochures and the like to share with the community. They believed that their presence and support helped against community stigma, and that the hair dressing salon was a good way to bring regularly draw community members into the centre and to reduce stigma. A team of local

musicians played a song that they had written about HIV/AIDS in their local dialect. It was noted that a CIA+ team member visits the centre three times a week to discuss issues and provide support.

The CIA+ team stressed that disaster response was only a small part of what they do. They felt that problems such as HIV/AIDS exist all the time and the ministry is constant – whereas disaster response was not seen as ministry. When asked what drove them to be engaged in the CIA+ team, most noted it was a ministry response *“Because of our care, because of our heart of care, no other NGOs do that kind of care...they know the Salvation Army knows the heart of man.”* Some of the officers that were involved noted that they were engaged because the DC had told them to



*Sibalaya Community HIV/AIDS & Drugs Information centre, Sulawesi 2012*

be part of the team. One officer said he joined the CIA+ team after attending FBF training in 2011, saying *“...he felt God wanted him to do something to build relationships within his community and use the training he just attended. So, he felt led to join the Compassion in Action team, and to become its coordinator...and usually goes out with the team when possible...once a week to Sibalaya and other things.”*

However, despite a clear mission-driven purpose, the practice of the CIA+ team seems much less evangelical (than was observed in the Philippines for example), and is strongly articulated as ministry through demonstration and practice. For example, most of the information brochures that are handed out are self-designed, and do not have any religious messaging. The team noted that their faith was expressed through their actions, not their words: *“...God is in our words and actions not in our brochures.”*

It is important to note that the CIA+ team and its activities are entirely self-funded with no support from DHQ or THQ. They currently design and print information materials themselves; pay for their own transport and food supplies for any community feeding projects, *“...we are paying for this ourselves, transport, materials, food... sometimes with help of our friends...we take food and whatever the community needs with us.”* When probed they noted that they had received some training from THQ (although their training on trauma counselling was received for free from government), and the in-kind support of those officers involved. Their main desire was for more training on specific skills, for example, people with special needs, and more information. (This need was made very strongly at the visit to the Sibalaya information centre, where there was a strong request made for more information such as flyers, brochures, books and posters in the local language, after showing us the cupboard where their few precious resources were stored). They did not know of any information being shared with DHQ and THQ – although one officer noted he made monthly reports to THQ for advice.

**Comment on CIA+ teams in relation to FBF:** We have provided some detail in this case example, since several important observations can be made from it. While it is difficult to argue that FBF training had a direct impact on CIA+ activities, there was certainly great resonance between FBF and the way they currently operate. What was interesting to the evaluation team was the dual face of the CIA+ team. In times of disaster response, the team acted as a rapid response unit, and seemed able to tap into a strong network of support in order to do so – including Salvation Army local, territorial (and international) resources, as well as government and community assets. In the interim periods, between disasters, the CIA+ team busied itself with local community activities, in this case, mainly self-supported HIV/AIDS response. At this time, they appear to be slightly disconnected from TSA operations, making decisions as a group on what activities should be undertaken. The evaluators got no

sense from this group that TSA (DHQ or THQ) are managing these activities. It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to go much further in addressing the CIA+ team roles in Indonesia. Suffice it to say that this appears to be an area for leadership reflection and further research. For example, how can the work of these teams be supported in-between disasters? Could their work be enhanced by better coordination and drip-fed funding or better information sharing? (Certainly tapping the Salvation Army International network to facilitate the supply of basic HIV/AIDS information materials could be a simple and effective starting point). The role of FBF in supporting and developing the capacity of these CIA+ teams seems to be a key opportunity, and alternatively these CIA+ teams are a critical entry point and proving ground for the FBF process in Indonesia. Not only are they operating at a community level, in line with many of the ideals behind FBF, but they are also demonstrating 'integration' at its very best, building resilience for disaster- and community response through on-going community relationship building. The consideration of the resilience of local communities and disaster response, enhanced by local response teams knowledgeable of local communities also seems to be potentially important.

**FINDING 3: It would be helpful to focus on and 'intentionalise' the integrated mission activities of the Salvation Army in Indonesia through FBF processes, and identifying 'FBF champions'**

---

During our evaluation visit to Sulawesi, we observed many examples of 'integrated mission' such as the CIA+ activities describe above. We observed three other such examples which provide useful insights:

**CASE EXAMPLE: INTEGRATED TEAM MISSION TRIP TO PANI'I**

Our evaluation team happened to coincide with a mission trip to Pani'i making it possible to observe this integrated activity in action.

**Integrative activities as mission outreach:** These mission trips apparently occur once every month, with different teams heading out to various villages in the Sulawesi region. In what was clearly a well-run and efficient practice, we departed early in the morning, driving several hours to Pani'i village in a convoy of Salvation Army vehicles. The convoy included: a Salvation Army radio station van and team; a vehicle with a medical outreach team from Woodward hospital (including, by chance, the Director of the Woodward Board in her capacity as a medical doctor, a nurse and their supplies); a van of youth (ages 16-30) from Palu Corps 1; and a group of Divisional officers and some CIA team members. During the day in which we visited, the medical outreach conducted basic free clinical services at the Pani'i Salvation Army health centre for two hours, seeing around eighty patients (with some of the youth team providing administrative support). It was interesting to note that notices had been placed about the health event in the local mosque down the road, and there were several Muslim villagers in attendance. After the medical services were completed, a series of ministry services began, starting with a children's service which included song and puppet shows run by the youth outreach team (and recorded by the radio station team to be aired the next day on the Salvation Army radio station during a family and health program). When the evaluation team departed that evening, the services were still going strong, with much of the outreach team remaining behind since the services were planned to run late into the night. Throughout the day we observed and spoke to officers and team members of different levels. The level of coordinated integration that occurred throughout the day was striking, as was the level of energy and commitment displayed by all actors.



*Corp 1 Youth Outreach Team in Pani'i - Sulawesi 2012*

**The everyday integrative activities of the local Pani'i officers:** In the small village of Pani'i, the Salvation Army has a cluster of buildings including a corps building, officer's housing, a grove of coconut trees (as income generator), a Salvation Army health centre, and housing for a persons living with disability. Integration also appeared to be a normal occurrence for everyday TSA operations in Pani'i. It is common in the TSA for married officers to operate as a team. The husband-wife officer team in Pani'i split their duties, with the husband overseeing the corps activities, and the wife trained by TSA as a nurse, running the health centre and women's programming (while completing her theological training, writing a thesis on clinical evangelism).

It was noted that because their health centre did not have a delivery room, they sent expectant mothers to the government clinic just outside the village, so there was a referral system between the two. The nurse officer noted that there was a free flow of patients from the clinic to the corps across the road, and that 80% of patients are Muslim (saying that they did not mind if they were prayed for, they still kept coming to the health centre). The Muslim community were invited and attended local celebrations such as Christmas, usually without any tensions. The officer pair had arrived in Pani'i in July of the previous year. They had spent one night together with the outgoing team to share information, and the community assembled to greet the incoming pair, and bid farewell to the outgoing officers.



*The Salvation Army health centre in Pani'i - Sulawesi 2012*

They noted that there are few social programmes being run in Pani'i, apart from the health centre, either by TSA or others (noting that there were Pentecostals and Protestants in the village, but that they did not run any social programmes to their knowledge). It was noted that TSA could not afford to do many social programmes either, although they had a coconut grove for income generation and food, and provided food to children under five after Sunday school.

**Comment on FBF relational health and process:** The mission trip to Pani'i provided a good opportunity to observe integrated mission in action. The mission team operated skilfully together: pulling together the assets of medical mission, CIA+ teams, communication through the radio, the enthusiasm of the youth teams and local officer's knowledge into a seamless response (which was certainly not done for our sake, as we were very much secondary observers to a well-practiced operation). Although no-one mentioned the term 'FBF' this was a clear example of FBF in practice, integrating TSA assets to respond to issues, and supplying support without forced evangelism. The local officers operate in an integrative way in a Muslim majority setting. There was clear evidence of good relationships with all local partners such as the local mosque and government clinic. There were clues to the necessities and assets of local integrated response, such as the storage of vaccines for the health centre in the fridge of the officer's home across the road. Both the outreach mission and the husband-wife local team demonstrated integrated mission and community engagement in exemplary fashion. The evaluation team noted that both the mission outreach activities and the husband-wife teaming of officers in very local conditions would be useful issues to investigate further.

### **CASE EXAMPLE: WOODWARD HOSPITAL (RUMAH SAKIT UMUM WOODWARD)**

We are cautious to provide Woodward as an example, since our visit there was brief and had some translation difficulties. However, throughout the stay in Sulawesi, participants observed that Woodward acts as a collaborative hub for TSA in the area, which is why we describe some of these insights briefly here. Woodward General Hospital is one of the largest hospitals in Palu, Central Sulawesi. It is named for British Salvationist missionaries Leonard and Margaret Woodward, who worked in Central Sulawesi before World War 2. Woodward currently has a capacity of 103 beds, 36 part-time specialists, 297 employees, 2 free rooms for poor people, 6 active clinics attached to Woodward, each with 1 nurse and 1 officer who also acts as a nurse. There is a nurse training school attached to hospital. The hospital provides four different classes of care based on income and fees. They also buy over the counter drugs and sell them at a lower cost as part of their mission action.

The clinics are viewed by the hospital staff as their main form of outreach, and the current focus is on improving the quality of the current clinics rather than opening more. Much of the region is extremely difficult to access, often only by motorbike and then by foot. It was noted that the community do sometimes organise together to transport patients into hospital but many have to make their own way. Other outreach activities included medical mission trips (as described in Pani'i, where volunteer staff provide basic services such as taking blood pressure and doing basic health checks while giving out information and basic medical supplies). It was noted that there are currently 30 volunteers who do such medical outreach, and that it was mainly older or retired staff – as *“none of the younger staff want to do medical outreach.”* It was noted that twenty years ago there were mobile clinics, but that there was no longer the staff or the funds to do this.

Salvation Army officers work in the hospital as 'medical social services', providing counselling and chaplaincy within the hospital, with six officers currently in this role. Families can stay with the patients at any time and receive counselling. It was noted that 40% of patients are Muslim, and staff believed they were happy to be prayed for. Staff felt that TSA and Woodward had a very good relationship in the community, and were more trusted than government or other health facilities. The staff that were interviewed could provide few examples of collaborative relationships between Woodward and any other organisations, although they noted that that would be helpful. There was currently no staff member tasked with networking or building collaborative relationships, whether funding-related or otherwise.

***Comment on FBF and relational health of Woodward:*** Woodward is a good example of more traditional community outreach activities – through medical mission trips and clinics. The staff seemed to have a fairly low awareness of other local health providers or organisations, and could possibly benefit from FBF in relation to community relationship mapping and network strengthening.

### **CASE EXAMPLE: TSA SCHOOL COMPLEX IN PALU (SEKOLAH BALA KESELAMATAN PALU)**

The final example we provide for Indonesia is that of the Salvation Army school complex in Palu. This complex is another physical manifestation of an integrated system – a physical compound consisting of corps and school buildings (including primary, senior and theological college level classes), administrative offices, officers housing, play grounds and a new library. Although we cannot evaluate the success of the programme, on brief observation it appears to be a vibrant project, with new buildings being built with donor funding, and healthy-looking children in the classrooms. In implicit and explicit ways, the school embodies integrated mission, and the principles underlying FBF. There is clear interaction between the corps and the school, not only in the sharing of the physical space, but in the linking of support and activities. For example, each week a collection is taken from the corps to help pay for students or supplies, and every Wednesday there is a voluntary 'happy session' where students are invited to the corps to attend a worship and fun activity session in the afternoon run by corps members, which usually has an attendance of around 200 children. Although this is not a boarding school, the officer who runs the school complex regularly houses children when they need a place to stay for any reason. He



currently has 28 children roomed in his home in the complex. He noted that they are currently feeding approximately 60 children every morning for breakfast, especially those children who live away from their family because it is too difficult to travel from mountainous areas. This is not a routine feeding program, *“...but we say, come to my home and get fed...it is food from God...many people donate something...last night someone brought toothpaste.”*

The theological college students are also often working in the school as administrative- or teaching assistants. They also carry out community works after three years of study, and help out in the case of disasters. The staff are proud of the fact that they believe that the TSA were the ‘first educators’ in Indonesia. They believe that the Christian education is superior to that offered by the Islamic schools, and note that the teachers at the school are of all faiths, and the master of the high school is not a Salvationist.

In terms of operation, the school is currently jointly funded, with a large portion coming from THQ every month for operations, and some posts fully funded by the government. The school complex appears to be expanding rapidly, with construction taking place in all free areas, and new classes being planned for each successive year. It should be noted that the officer administrating the school complex appears to be a highly skilled networker, demonstrating strong collaborative relationships with the government (who paid for a new library), independent donors from Indonesia and abroad (not necessarily Salvationists), local Muslim authorities, and external volunteers such as a group of airline employees who came to support the school *“...because of a discussion with a friend of a friend”* resulting in a long-term relationship. Indeed, the weakest relationship that the officers described was with THQ, with whom they felt there was little communication, and who they felt *“...only see the money, not the investment.”* The officers felt that the school was a valuable asset for mission and evangelisation *“...as a public demonstration of faith”*, but clearly did not feel appreciated by the Salvation Army system, noting that *“...health, social and corps have special meetings, but nothing for education.”*

**Comment on FBF and the relational health of the TSA Palu school complex:** Although our opinion is based only on a brief visit and a handful of interviews, the evaluation team felt that this school complex was an important example of integrated mission, both in terms of blended activities, but also in terms of leadership practice. It is important to note that one officer had attended an FBF regional meeting, but felt that this had been focused mainly on health, so was not about education (perhaps compounding the feeling that education services are not properly appreciated).

These various case examples demonstrate several entry points and opportunities for FBF engagement in Indonesia. It is impossible to know how the recent FBF training (or previous facilitation activities) have impacted on the development of these examples of integrated mission in practice. What can be said is that there are several fertile areas for engagement on FBF, places where TSA activities and actors intersect and together form a system that could be strengthened further through an intentional process. We would recommend that any of these sites would be excellent case examples for FBF research and reflection.

In the Sulawesi area, we also observed many genuine ‘FBF Champions’ who are operating following FBF principles in their everyday work in Indonesia, integrating mission and building deeper relationships in a skilled natural manner, even if not articulating this as ‘FBF’. It is recommended that instead of forcing an FBF model on such individuals, it might be better to consider ways of understanding their competencies and processes of activity in the Indonesian context first, perhaps flipping the training model from a downwards cascade, to an upwards joint learning approach, so that they can be shared and drawn into the development of the FBF process in Indonesia and internationally. As one respondent noted, *“We may need to identify key people who could be nurtured and trusted to then pass on knowledge, stories and training to others within their region, rather than expecting the Programme Department in THQ to carry all the responsibility.”*

#### **FINDING 4: There is potential to utilise FBF as a process for reflective practice at a divisional and territorial level in Indonesia**

---

As per the previous two country examples, it would appear that one very clear area of potential utilisation of FBF, is in internal reflective practice, in this case particularly at a territorial level. While local and divisional level activities appeared to be fairly well coordinated and integrated in places, there were constant references to the fact that officers (of all levels) felt disconnected from THQ leadership and decision-making. In relation to FBF, it was noted that there is a strong hierarchical system in TSA-Indonesia, and that only overt visible leadership commitment to FBF would enable it to get traction at lower levels as a process and practice. Again, the issue of staff reallocation or cycling as being detrimental to the FBF process and to relationship-building in general was frequently raised by respondents at all levels. For example, saying: *"...many programmes rely heavily on particular individuals, which is dangerous when officers are moved so regularly...the process when officers are moved could be reviewed as it is not conducive to building deeper relationships."* This was linked to the idea of focusing on local FBF champions, noting that since officers change so rapidly, local buy-in and identifying local champions might be even more important than further officer training.

#### **FINDING 5: Indonesia is an important site for learning about relationship building and FBF in non-Christian contexts**

---

Finally, it is important to note that Sulawesi, where this evaluation took place, has been the site of intense inter-religious (Muslim-Christian) violence in recent years. It was therefore interesting to observe that in every single interview or FGD in Sulawesi, TSA staff and officers only spoke of inter-religious cooperation and harmony. Officers noted that *"...here in Palu, everyone appreciates The Salvation Army."* As both the CIA+ examples above demonstrate, TSA activities appeared to be effortlessly interfaith and ecumenical, whether through supporting a Muslim PLWHA in the information centre in what appeared to be a genuine friendship, or supporting Muslim disaster victims who *"...all ran to the Salvation Army first asking what to do."* In the local visit to Pani'i village we observed Muslim villagers coming to the Salvation Army clinic for treatment, seemingly unperturbed by the services being held across the road. At the school complex cooperation with Islamic leaders was described, as was the presence of Hindu students. In the health services, while it was noted that there was not a strong collaboration with the Islamic health service group Alharat – it was noted that there is a generally good relationship *"we don't have meetings, but they know us and we know them."* As one officer noted, *"the Salvation Army has been here a long time...they look at us as old brothers and sisters, there is no tension."*

While this research was not lengthy enough to uncover the nuances of inter-religious cooperation, some of this reported interfaith cooperation must be taken at face value. Indonesia is a prominently Muslim country, and in our brief observation, the Salvation Army in Indonesia manages a delicate balance between expressing its Christian faith, and being sensitive to the faith of others. One of the key methods of this relationship-building is social service provision that is open to all – which relates to point made in the beginning of this chapter, that TSA in Indonesia might have a smaller percentage of the national population as congregants – but it has a significant presence in terms of relative social services. As International Health Services Coordinator, Major Dean Pallant noted: *"During visits to Indonesia, Salvation Army leaders serving in Christian minority contexts helped me understand the value of intermediary institutions such as clinic hospitals in serving hostile communities and building faithful relationships. The worshipping evangelical Christian church can be perceived as confrontational, but people of all faiths usually welcome FBOs who care for the health of the poorest people without discrimination"* (Pallant 2011, 146). It would seem that there is much for us to learn from Indonesia for how inter-religious relationship-building occurs. This is also clearly an area in which FBF process can be reflected on, and built upon.

# CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION: MEETING THE GOALS OF PD1897 & THE PRINCIPLES OF FBF

*The previous chapters have detailed some of the specific findings from the three countries visited as well as some basic country comparisons. In this chapter we summarise these findings, presenting key and recommendations and themes that emerge strongly when all of this is analysed together. Note that this chapter focuses on the FBF process in relation to the regional programme and process, and recommendations are specifically targeted at international and regional leadership (although should still have relevance for the in-country actors).*

In the first chapter to this evaluation report we noted a core tension inherent in attempting a programme evaluation of something that was opposed to being named or understood as a programme or project. Faith-based facilitation, in its current incarnation, is intended to be an integrated process or approach for deepening relationships across all levels of Salvation Army operations and activities. As this evaluation study has demonstrated, unpacking how much of the renewed FBF process is responsible for strengthening community development responses remains a challenge. In essence, what The Salvation Army has undertaken (and is undertaking) is a systems strengthening intervention. The real process activities of this intervention, while deeply rooted in historical practices of TSA, really only began in the last few years, and at a country level, sometimes only a few weeks before the evaluation team arrived – in all fairness, giving little time for genuine impact to be observed.

With that in mind, the original goals of PD1897 (insert right from TOR) appear to have largely been met in the Asia-Pacific region. FBF activities such as regional meetings, the development and introduction of a training manual (in a participatory manner), coordination of the process from a regional platform, development of internal processes for change, and training processes for human capacity development have been enacted so far as the resources (human and financial) have taken them. While some territories might be later in the ‘roll-out’ stage than was originally envisioned, this could be counted as a reality of broad-scale systems change and development response.

However, the assessment of success of this FBF process and making suggestions for its improvement in the Asia-Pacific region remains a challenging undertaking. In addition, evaluating any engagement or response at the very local levels is unarguably complex, and evaluating a system that is supposed to build capacity of community response across an entire region even more so. However, as we have seen in the preceding chapters, the individuals and communities operating in these contexts are not constrained by such limitations: they demonstrate clear knowledge and straightforward suggestions for what will or will not work in their contexts. In the sixteen recommendation areas below, we seek to transfer their knowledge to help improve the regional and international process (encouraging those seeking more specific detail to return to the country chapters with their context-specific recommendations).

### THE GOALS OF PD1897:

**Goal No 1:** Strengthen community development response to HIV/AIDS, health and related community development issues

**Goal No 2:** Strengthen the program facilitation process and human resource pool

**Goal No 3:** Transfer of lessons learned from countries where community capacity development and facilitation work are more advanced to countries where these processes are still at the initiation stage

**Goal No 4:** Organizational development through the facilitation and participation approach in order to enhance organizational capacity to be more self-reliant and reduce external support

**Goal No 5:** Impact on policy development

**Goal No 6:** Increase and enhance personnel development through Human Capacity Development approach

**R1. There are clear opportunities or entry points for engagement through FBF that need to be more intentionally sought out and leveraged in the Asia-Pacific region**

---

- There is a significant opportunity for FBF to be wielded as a tool and process for building community resilience and strengthening responses for natural disasters in the Asia-Pacific region.
- The CIA+ teams in Indonesia provide a strong case example for the integration of disaster response with everyday community development capacity that needs to be learnt from.
- FBF should be considered as a tool for developing 'disaster readiness' in the region (perhaps with lessons from HIV/AIDS competence).
- FBF could be more properly utilised as a tool and approach for relational conflict management (or peace building), most particularly in PNG.
- FBF could be more properly utilised as a tool and approach for inter-faith collaboration and engagement, the specific nature of which need to be considered in relation each territory's specific context.
- Sulawesi-Indonesia provides a useful case study for interfaith cooperation, and Philippines provides a useful case to consider the ramifications and realities of interfaith cooperation in contexts of evangelical competition.
- The primary health care services and operations of the Salvation Army provide a particular opportunity for strengthening community engagement and relationships, and FBF would be a most useful tool for that process.
- There is a great international interest in understanding the most appropriate mechanisms for connecting health services to the local communities they serve. The Salvation Army could benefit greatly from further reflection and research on this, and has the potential to become a world leader on this critically important issue.
- There is an opportunity to be more intentional about taking the lessons learnt from HIV/AIDS (and the facilitation processes developed more than a decade ago), and transferring those lessons to other issues and systems strengthening more generally.

**R2. There are many issues and areas that require further research – or building capacity for information collection and knowledge transfer, if FBF is to develop further**

---

- There is low capacity for 'research' in all territories of the Asia-Pacific, and capacities for such needs to be urgently strengthened if the FBF process is to succeed, and for TSA operation strengthening in general.
- There is a huge desire for stories and examples of FBF in practice to be gathered and shared, although little capacity being put towards doing so. Capacity needs to be developed for story-gathering for FBF, and particular roles (such as a 'lore-keeper' or 'communication facilitator') established.
- We would recommend that someone at the territorial FBF team-level is tasked with becoming the central repository for local FBF stories, and that this is maintained in such a way as is available to all teams, and would not move with that person should they leave that role.
- The gathering of FBF stories should be developed as a process item for FBF training (for example, requiring that the examples provided in training sessions are reported on)

- Case studies are a particularly valuable and low-cost product which should be encouraged from a regional and international level. Case studies of success, failures, and FBF champions should be sought out and developed into a central resource (not necessarily only for the Asia-Pacific region).
- Stories and case studies of ‘failures’ or activities which had to be adapted should be encouraged and ‘celebrated’ more vigorously. These are critically important learning tools – and this is also a valuable approach so that FBF is understood as a tool for genuine internal reflective practice and learning (rather than as a promotional tool for external audiences).
- The current case studies on the IHQ/FBF website are not sufficient, and need to be developed further, with specific thematic items and contextualised examples. That is, if certain case scenarios are requested from all territories this should encourage reflection on what is possible through FBF.
- Research and documentation skills need to be taught at different levels. For example more complex communication, participatory research and web-based skills are clearly necessary for some while more ‘simple’ story-telling and oral research skills would be useful for others.

### **R3. The cascade model for FBF needs to be carefully considered – and alternative entry-points such as integration into TSA education system emphasised**

---

- It is recommended that the territorial FBF teams not be rushed into a training cascade model without careful consideration of local context and capacity.
- Experience in some territories has demonstrated that appropriate resourcing, leadership support, the appropriate position and make-up of a territorial FBF team all need to be considered before cascade training should be implemented.
- Un-governed re-echoing of training should be discouraged, unless there is a process or mechanism in place to ensure that the concepts underpinning FBF are properly understood and maintained.
- Alternative ideas for FBF ‘coaching’ should be considered, and if necessary resourced. For example, long-term mentoring of a highly skilled facilitator with a newly interested individual over a period of time, or pairing of a highly skilled grassroots facilitator with someone trained in the theoretical underpinning and conceptual bases of FBF.
- Alternative ideas for FBF training should be developed in areas where travel is restricted. This would differ depending on what alternative communication strategies are possible.
- TSA officers and staff require specific support in moving from a needs-based approach (which dominates the region) towards an assets-based perspective. It should be considered whether more in-depth engagement on specific tools or skills such as assets based community development might not have a more significant impact than rapid lessons on the entire BDR toolset.
- For the FBF process to become less dependent on support for training sessions, given the rapid and detrimental staff reallocation cycling that occurs, and given the desire for FBF integration across all operations as an everyday way of working, integration onto TSA education systems *at all levels* appears to be both necessary and a significant opportunity. (This would include FBF modules in schools, theological training, officers’ education, staff training, health worker’s education, officer’s further education, leadership education at IHQ and the like).
- Integrating FBF into the educational curriculum of the Salvation Army system at all levels is a high priority.
- Developing specific curriculum packages for FBF (for teaching in different contexts) is of high priority.

#### **R4. The sustainability of the regional FBF process require urgent attention – as does the process for response to issues that the FBF process highlights**

---

- At this time, it is not clear how the FBF regional process will be supported or sustained in the future. The FBF regional process is not yet at a point where it is fully integrated or self-sustaining at a territorial level, and the PNG example has demonstrated how much slower the process unfolds without financial support. Alternative resourcing (whether internal or external) needs to be sought.
- An issue that requires direct engagement in relation to FBF is the concern that community engagement (e.g. through conversations or mapping) by Army officers raises expectations at a community level that they are not resourced or equipped to respond to. This fear inhibits the building of deeper relationships – and asset mapping is not a sufficient response (that is, it is not sufficient to argue that all needs that are identified need to be supported through the identification of community assets not through TSA charity). This is a fundamental issue that requires direct reflective and conceptual engagement from leadership as well as those being trained in FBF.
- Several examples in this evaluation suggest the success of small ‘drip-fed’ funding streams for strengthening community-level activities. FBF teams should be encouraged to be involved in engagement and joint learning on best practices for the support of community initiatives (in-kind and financial).
- Several examples in this evaluation demonstrate the value of the Salvation Army acting as an ‘intermediary’, supporting the incubation of small community initiatives. This role and opportunity should be researched and reviewed for future engagement and sustainability.

#### **R5. The FBF materials (such as the Building Deeper Relationships manual) require continued development**

---

- The BDR manual is generally well received and appreciated. However, all territories demonstrated a desire for a localised manual (translated, with local stories and images).
- There was a strong request for further shared training materials to be developed that would accompany the manual – this should be supported with some urgency, and considered for different audience needs.
- It is recommended that targeted FBF case studies are developed specifically for teaching practice at different levels and in different contexts.
- It is recommended that FBF ‘educators’ are identified and/or capacitated (in addition to skilled operational FBF ‘trainers’) – that is, key individuals able to communicate the concepts, principles and policy-related strategy that underpins FBF, whether to territorial leadership or to cadets.
- It is recommended that now that the ‘easy-reading’ manual has been completed in the form of *Building Deeper Relationships*, a higher level resource is also developed – specifically for engaging leadership and encouraging organisational and theological reflection on the issues which FBF highlights. This could also be utilised to develop ‘FBF Champions’ once they have been caught by the initial introduction to the FBF.

#### **R6. There is a need for further capacity to be established for regional coordination and communication of the FBF process**

---

- The governance of the FBF process at an international and regional level needs to be more clearly articulated – clarifying the different roles of the various players.

- The role of the Zonal Facilitation Resources Officer (ZFRO) needs to be urgently reviewed, articulated, and if necessary provided with improved capacity for regional coordination and knowledge transfer.
- Given the transportation difficulties in the region, the length of time that genuine 'FBF demonstration' takes, and how rarely competent FBF Champion-teachers have the time for training and demonstration – it is suggested that a new role could usefully be developed and resourced: a *Regional Faith-based Facilitation Officer*. This would be a more junior level staff member than the ZFRO, but would be someone passionate about FBF and skilled at communicating it at different levels. Such a person could move slowly through the region, and rather than spending resources on costly meetings and workshops, demonstrate FBF through 'accompaniment' over more extended periods of time.
- Communication flows and processes between THQ and DHQ(s) need to be reviewed. Many soldiers or officers at a divisional level felt isolated from information flows. FBF could be utilised as a process to map communication flows and the underlying issues of trust and power that enable or create barriers to information sharing.

### **DISCUSSION: PROCESSES FOR REGIONAL FBF COORDINATION AND GOVERNANCE**

Significant effort has gone into shifting the governance of FBF away from the international level (away from IHQ) to the regional, territorial and local levels; resulting in the creation of the *Zonal Facilitation Resources Officer (ZFRO)* role. While this intention is clear in the documentation, in practice most of the respondents to this evaluation still perceived that FBF was being driven from IHQ, in particular by Major Dean Pallant the International Health Services Coordinator. This perception was driven by the fact that Major Pallant was perceived as the primary 'face' of FBF, the person that most of the regional Salvation Army staff and officers saw speaking about FBF, the person they note having received the most correspondence from, and in some cases, the perceived 'source' of the seed grants channelled from NORAD. This perception has also recently been enhanced by the fact that the international integration of FBF has been made the responsibility of the Programme Resources Department which, like Major Pallant, is located at IHQ. This has had some repercussions on the FBF process, for example, while great enthusiasm for FBF is evidenced, many staff and officers still appear to be waiting for IHQ to tell them what should happen with regards to the FBF process. This of course impacts on the future success of the intended goal that this process be integrated and located at a local level. In addition, given Major Pallant's dual role as International Health Services Coordinator, this has also resulted in several respondents perceiving that FBF was mainly 'something to do with health', and therefore did not see it as relevant to education, social development or internal Salvation Army operations.

It must also be said, with some delicacy, that the role of ZFRO is poorly understood in the Asia-Pacific region. Certainly the ZFRO is yet to be perceived as having replaced the regional facilitation team. Barely any respondents to this evaluation made mention of Major Rigley or the ZFRO position, and certainly not as a 'resource' for FBF (financial, informational or operational). Those few who did mention Major Rigley did so in a peripheral manner as though he were an external evaluator, rather than the person intended to coordinate and facilitate the regional FBF process. This finding is not intended to cast a shadow on Major Rigley in any way, as he has clearly been a champion for FBF, doing arduous amounts of travel and engaging in conversations at all levels over the last three years. However, in terms of the future success of the FBF process, it does raise some questions about whether the ZFRO function can be fulfilled by a single person, especially if that person already has another full-time and extremely demanding role as Divisional Commander (DC) of a large division in Australia. In addition, being a DC appeared to confuse many of the participants, as they felt that he was visiting in his capacity as a DC in some kind of country-to-country visit to learn about implementing FBF in his own territory. Given the scope of FBF as a systems change intervention (rather than a single project), it would appear necessary for the ZFRO role to be reviewed, clarified to all the territorial and divisional FBF teams, and if necessary, further capacitated – for example, perhaps providing the ZFRO with some lower level support for the essential information collection and knowledge translation function of this role. This is particularly urgent, as the ZFRO role is only likely to get more demanding in the future as the FBF process evolves. For example, as teams become more active the regional coordination of such will require more attention. We cannot provide the solutions for this ZFRO role, as this is a decision that requires internal consideration. However, in our view, the success and capacity of the person (or persons) that enacts this ZFRO function, is critical to the future success of the FBF process.

#### **R7. There is still a significant role for international (IHQ) engagement, in particular in gaining leadership commitment and systems integration**

---

- Lack of leadership commitment for FBF is a key obstacle in most territories evaluated. There is a significant role for international FBF Champions (wherever they are situated) to facilitate high level reflection and engagement on FBF.
- Territorial FBF teams have found it difficult to gain leadership support from those positioned higher than themselves, for example the territorial commanders. It is therefore necessary for the regional and international leadership to demonstrate and vocalise their commitment to FBF.
- The current plan for Programme Resources to be in charge of integrating FBF across all activities at an international level seems to be an effective strategy. Clear suggestions were made that FBF be included in funding proposals and reporting requirements (such as CPMS). It would likely be very effective if FBF were made visible as part of such every-day processes throughout TSA operations.
- Commissioner Alistair Herring, International Secretary for the SPEA Zone, appears to be personally interested and committed to FBF as a process. It would be useful if the Commissioner was more overtly seen to be supportive of FBF, for example, perhaps in his leadership role, he could be visibly observed utilising FBF as part of an internal process in a meeting of regional leadership.

#### **R8. The governance of the FBF process cannot be left to chance at a territorial level, and the formation of territorial teams needs to be more properly managed and resourced**

---

- The capacity and location of territorial FBF teams has a fundamental effect on how FBF evolves in that territory. The territorial team function needs to more strongly 'managed' and resourced to ensure an effective FBF response. The development of territorial (and divisional) FBF teams cannot be left to be done in an ad-hoc manner.
- Kick-start seed funding for FBF has been supportive of efforts in those countries which received it – and detrimental to those that did not. Seed funding not only provides support for initial territorial team development and initial training, but the basic project processes (reporting, leadership approval) roots the FBF process more deeply into the territorial organisational system.
- Dedicated staff time for territorial (and divisional level) FBF teams is necessary for the success of the FBF process. Staff time might need to be reviewed or negotiated with or by leadership.
- In the Asia-Pacific, even a bottom-up grassroots intervention will have little visibility within the hierarchical Salvation Army system unless it is validated from the top-down, and is made visible as a systems requirement. The insertion of FBF into TSA operations (such as the projects planning in the Philippines) should be recognised, celebrated and set as an evaluation indicator.

#### **R9. Strengthening the FBF process and human resource pool requires improved coordination, improved communication, leadership commitment and internal reflection on TSA staff processes**

---

- The issue of staff reallocation or cycling as being detrimental to FBF and to building deeper relationships must be considered by leadership at all levels as a matter of extreme urgency.
- Handover processes need to be more strongly monitored and managed – and the relational nature of the handover more carefully observed.



- Consider if there are creative opportunities to counter the destructive effects of staff cycling, for example the creation of facilitation team *roles* that are maintained in each team, or the pooling and tracking of FBF Champions into different roles.
- Clear roles and responsibilities need to be clarified for those engaged in FBF coordination.
- Creative strategies are needed for FBF to be included in officer or staff performance appraisals – for example, mapping what relationships were built during time in a particular role (internal or external to TSA), or indicating the strength of certain collaborative relationships. The inclusion of such indicators in performance reviews would ensure that FBF is more adequately embedded and valued.
- We suggest that ‘FBF Champions’ (and those trained) be identified in a database or simple document that is maintained at a regional or international level. This could be utilised to track FBF capacity development, to improve communication, and to ensure that capacity is not entirely ‘lost’ if a person is transferred to another role (see for example Appendix E, where we have begun to this process).
- We suggest that for those considering a different approach to the cascade model (see above) another approach might be to concentrate and track FBF activities around FBF Champions (where-ever they are physically allocated).

#### **DISCUSSION: STAFF CYCLING AND BUILDING HUMAN RESOURCE CAPACITY FOR FBF**

The recognition that the reallocation or cycling of staff in and out of Salvation Army positions as being problematic is not new for TSA. Indeed, even in the early days of facilitation, this was noted as an urgent concern (although it does not appear that any significant action was taken on this early warning). This evaluation demonstrated repeatedly that rapidly reallocating officers and staff not only transfers skills out of the areas in which they are connected to experience and contextual knowledge, but also breaks the relationships which they have formed with the local community and partners. It is not for us to critique this fundamental practice within TSA. However, it must be noted that in the Asia-Pacific region, this practice was not only detrimental to the FBF process itself (where staff trained in FBF have moved, leaving the territorial process without capacity or champions), but also damaging to many of the fundamental principles built into FBF. The question then is what processes can be put in place to counter these damaging effects. *We suggest several ideas for further (urgent) internal discussion:*

1. The suggestion that the uniform negates the need for basic relational courtesies – such as introduction to community leaders or partners, needs to be carefully considered. The idea that the person within the uniform is somehow interchangeable, and that collaboration is something inherited rather than earned needs careful reflection.
2. Clearly, the improvement of ‘handover’ practices is a necessity – the single ‘healthy relational’ example from Pani’i demonstrated the impact and goodwill that is developed through a simple handover ceremony (a simple dinner and evening shared between incoming and outgoing officers, and a ‘celebration’ with the community in which the outgoing officers introduced those incoming to the community.)
3. In the face of arguments that it is too costly or impractical to have such staff overlap – the cost of damaged relationships and slower induction periods as a result need to be considered and counted.
4. Given the low levels of writing skills and reliance on oral reporting, relying on written handover report as the primary process seems to have little chance of success, and alternatives therefore need to be considered.
5. Community development is a long-term process of change. If staff are cycled out before they see the impact of what they have done, they never see the fruits of their labour, nor are they held accountable for their failures, so that they may learn and improve. It would be valuable for this to be considered more carefully: are there internal processes possible, for example for an outgoing officer to remain connected to a project they have left behind, even if in a ‘learning’ capacity?
6. Are there creative opportunities to counter this particular problem in relation to FBF team development? For example, could the facilitation team be split into specific roles (such as trainer, lore-keeper, communicator, and leadership facilitator), so that if a team member is cycled out, it is clear what role needs to be refilled, and what information needs to be shared before that person leaves?

## **R10. FBF Champions need to be more effectively sought, recognised and valued for this work – at all levels**

---

- 'FBF Champions' (natural facilitators at all levels) need to be actively sought and drawn into the FBF process in every territory and division.
- FBF Champions need to be creatively drawn into joint engagement with FBF – and not only as 'trainers'. We suggest that an alternative role or title is created which would allow for key individuals that practice FBF in an exemplary manner to be recognised, celebrated and drawn into community with the FBF teams.
- The FBF activities of FBF Champions needs to be recognised as an essential part of their work – and celebrated in some fashion (for example, case studies of FBF Champions in a Salvation Army publication).
- The competencies and capabilities of FBF Champions needs to be researched and better understood in the contexts in which they operate.
- Skilled facilitation or its competencies such as skilled multi-sectoral collaboration or skilled community activism, needs to be recognised as a professional competency and activity within the Salvation Army organisational culture and operational processes.

## **R11. The 'conceptual integrity' or processes for conceptual governance of FBF need to be considered and more carefully protected**

---

- As an integrated process, it is even more important that the core concepts and values on which FBF is based are actively protected through a strategic and intentional process. The conceptual governance of FBF needs to be tasked to someone at regional or international levels.
- A key area for such engagement is around the tension between FBF as a tool for evangelisation and FBF as a tool for interfaith and community relationship building (see box below).
- There was surprisingly little evidence of FBF as 'theology in practice' in the Asia-Pacific region. It is suggested that the conceptual governance of FBF also involves theological engagement on several issues as identified in the country chapters above.
- FBF raises various concerns relating to practical theology - and therefore could be a useful teaching tool for theological education.
- FBF provides rich entry-points and a process for leadership reflection on the mission of the Salvation Army, especially in relation to the tensions between service provision (charity) and community development approaches.

### **DISCUSSION: SHEPHERDS OR SHEEP-STEALERS – WHO WATCHES THE LINE?**

The intention of infusing good development practice with good theology is an admirable strategy for The Salvation Army, which not only aligns FBF more closely with TSA mission, policies and organisational culture, but is also deeply appreciated by all those who were interviewed.

However, the evaluation experience in the Philippines highlighted some of the inherent tensions and dangers of this approach. If FBF is taught to be faith-focused, and meant to impact on all parts of officers' lives, and their main purpose is perceived to be evangelism, then it is no surprise that they have immediately turned to utilisation of FBF as a tool for proselytisation. While not wanting to be in any way judgmental, it must be noted that FBF, as it is unfurling at the divisional and corps level in the Philippines, is counter to what those at IHQ envisage FBF to be (this assessment based on review discussions at IHQ). Furthermore, the inter-religious conflict this approach engenders is counter to some of the other core values of FBF, and detrimental to assets-based community development.

The question though is as an integrated approach (not a programme or project), who is now the guardian of FBF? All development practice has this problem, once a tool or method is released into the community, there are few controls for managing it (once the bird has flown out your hand). Yet FBF is no bird, and the Salvation Army has huge resources for leadership, theological reflection and organisational communication. Who then watches the line and provides guidance on whether the FBF process in a particular territory or community has taken a concerning direction?

It currently does not seem to be perceived to be a role of the ZFRO – as no such concerns were noted in the ZFRO’s trip reports to the Philippines. At the Singapore meeting in 2011, during a session when the territories were asked for issues they could use the FBF process for, when all the other territories noted issues such as development of social programs, restarting programs, health ministry, developing women’s ministries or grassroots engagement, the Philippines team said, ‘evangelise and discipleship’ (TSA 2011b). So it is no surprise that this is the main focus of this region.

The point here is simply to ask: where does the governance of the FBF process lie? Who watches the integrated process as it unfurls, and who keeps an eye out for areas of theological or process tension? This is something for regional and international reflection.

## **R12. FBF can be more intentionally positioned and demonstrated as a leadership tool for reflection, the development of internal processes, and policy engagement**

---

- FBF should be considered and promoted as a tool for reflective practice that can balance top-down and bottom-up organisational trends by creating safe spaces for engagement on leadership and organisational processes.
- Case study examples are needed demonstrating FBF as a tool for reflective practice.
- High level leadership need to demonstrate how FBF can be utilised as a tool for reflective practice and staff engagement within the Salvation Army – most particularly for long-term planning.
- Case studies should be developed which demonstrate how FBF can be utilised as tool for policy engagement on sensitive internal or external issues – for example the re-engineering of TSA health services.
- Case studies should be developed which demonstrate how FBF could be utilised as a tool for advocacy at a community level.
- Regional, territorial and divisional mapping of Salvation Army assets and activities should be encouraged, demonstrating FBF in practice.
- Mapping activities should be undertaken that could make FBF more visible on the Salvation Army websites and in the Salvation Army Yearbook. For example partner/network mapping, or improved mapping of territorial social programs.

### **DISCUSSION: IS FBF COUNTER-COUNTER CULTURAL IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC?**

It has been suggested that FBF might have some difficulty gaining traction in the Asia-Pacific region because it is counter-counter cultural. That is, the organisational culture of the Salvation Army enforces a military-style top-down hierarchy that is counter to the bottom-up prioritisation of FBF. In addition, in the Asia-Pacific region, several community operators have noted that in Asia-Pacific, social cultures are also more ordered, which might make the socially destabilising nature of FBF uncomfortable. As Pallant notes, *“Asian communitarians promote the values of social order...whereas African communitarians prioritise social relationships”* (2011, 54). This study cannot embark on a cultural analysis based on a rapid process evaluation. What can be said is that the cultural adherence to the top-down approach was strongly evident. Participants repeatedly noted that *“...it is for leadership to decide”*, and were initially reluctant to discuss Salvation Army processes in a critical way. As one respondent said quite frankly, *“...we do not always seek to deepen our understanding of the community around us, nor do we always invite them to move forward by strategising and planning with us. Too often we just have a leader decide on something, then the group or community must just follow along, willingly and enthusiastically, or not.”*

There is no immediate recommendation or solution to this concern. Being trained in FBF will not immediately capacitate individuals to flatten hierarchies of power; nor will leadership commitment to FBF mean that undermining TSA organisational culture might not prove dangerous to an officer or staff member's career. All that can be suggested is long-term commitment to the FBF process that has been undertaken - to give it time to infuse the organisational system and culture. In addition, the creation of 'safe spaces', such as those for reflective practice where staff and officers can communicate without fear of reprisal, might also prove supportive. It must be noted however, that outside of the Salvation Army culture, we observed many examples where the community was engaged and participating. The CIA+ teams in Indonesia, for example, or the School Feeder team in Lae, are integrated into the Salvation Army system, but operating in an independent way outside of TSA management. It is up to us to highlight and nurture these as exemplars of good community practice.

### **R13. The development of follow-up or M&E processes for FBF in territories need to be capacitated**

---

- The development of M&E processes and indicators for FBF has been identified as a key focus area however, as there is only limited human resource capacity for this at this time, the development of a regional M&E process should be supported with some urgency.
- In lieu of more complex models of M&E, a basic (non-threatening) process for follow-up of those trained in FBF or leadership commitments should be designed and suggested.
- M&E should be oriented towards the measurement of process or systems strengthening rather than impact. The diffused nature of the new approach makes measuring impact of FBF on integrated programs a difficult and not clearly valuable undertaking.
- Consider indicators which evaluate the quality of relationships rather than the quantity of relationships
- Consider social network mapping as a useful tool for assessing relationship strength, and can be done at fairly low cost.
- Consider the introduction of more creative indicators such as 'trust' (e.g. interpersonal or institutional trust).
- FBF evaluation elements should be inserted into all possible funding and reporting forms, such as CPMS and annual project reports.

### **R14. Regional communication needs to be more strong resourced and coordinated**

---

- The regional meetings were highly valued, and if such can be resourced again, would be a valuable method for maintaining communication and shared learning.
- If further regional meetings are resourced, it might be more useful to frame them as a process of 'joint learning' rather than a workshop in a deliberate effort to create a regional learning community which would share experiences on FBF (e.g. where shared communications strategies and issues could be identified).
- A lower-cost regional communication system is highly desired, and urgently required. This might take the form of a newsletter with shared experiences, or a simple email list. This should be tasked to someone at an international or regional level with some urgency.
- A regional communication strategy should be developed. This might entail a simple document or diagram detailing how information about FBF is to be communicated in the region, who is tasked with the communication, and how regularly this should occur.
- The 'follow-up' of FBF process communications needs to be more strongly encouraged – for example, trip or meeting reports after exchange visits need to be quickly shared with participants and informants. Deeper

relationships and trust require effective and reliable communication. The FBF communication practices within and outside of TSA need to be in line with the ethics of participatory communication practices.

- As noted above, the collection and sharing of stories and case studies should be prioritised, and made into a standard practice in all FBF-related meetings and activities. For example, it was noted that stories and examples were shared in Singapore 2011 meeting, but these were not included in the report.
- The existing Salvation Army communication network with its newsletters, magazines and websites could be more effectively utilised to spread the FBF stories and thinking out across the Salvation Army operations.

#### **R15. The Salvation Army should research and leverage its unique capacity for integrative activities, and role as an intermediary – and consider this role seriously in relation to effecting systems change**

- The Salvation Army should utilise FBF as a process for researching and reflecting on its unique capacity for integrated service and engagement. We provided several examples in the preceding chapters for unique cases of integration, such as the physical integration of assets in TSA compounds, mission trip to Pani'i, integrated strength of husband-wife officer teams, the CIA+ team integrating HIV/AIDS with disaster response, or the unique resilience of the Salvation Army system with international, national and local support structures. All of these suggest a unique capacity for blended and integrated activities.
- However, leveraging these assets requires taking the concept of systems change and systems thinking more seriously.
- Salvation Army staff should review FBF as a systems strengthening intervention – and should begin a process of articulating the Theory of Change of FBF (see box insert below). This would inform and shape the future process if FBF internationally and regionally.
- 'Integration' is emerging as a key issue on the international health agenda – and could be an important area for the Salvation Army to engage at both policy and practice levels.
- Some reflection and further planning is needed as Asia-Pacific HIV/AIDS programmes are integrated into broader community and development activities. It is important that we do not lose the capacities and lessons from HIV/AIDS in this process of integration. Someone should be tasked to look more closely at integration and ensuring 'lessons from HIV/AIDS' activities are properly documented, considered and fed back into the broader system.

#### **DISCUSSION: AS A SYSTEMS CHANGE INTERVENTION – IDENTIFYING THE 'THEORY OF CHANGE' OF FBF**

In the introduction to this evaluation, the FBF process was named as a 'systems intervention'. The idea that FBF is actually focused on systems and systems strengthening is an assumption made by the evaluation team – and still needs to be verified by the FBF facilitators. However, it certainly appears to be in line with a process that is focused on effecting broad-scale change across different levels and activities. (It was also interesting that in the Singapore 2011 FBF conference, it was noted that an analogy that resonated strongly with the delegates was of 'the hardware and the software' of FBF, which is intriguing since the concept of hardware and software of a health system needing to articulate together is a key concept of health systems strengthening and research.)

If FBF is about systems strengthening, then the future planning (and research) needs to be more clearly framed as such. For example, there is no point in shifting to project-oriented M&E strategies for measuring FBF, if the purpose and intention is not that of a project. Shifting into a mode of 'systems thinking' will require some effort for FBF, but we believe this is very important, and ultimately worthwhile. There are practical process implications, for example, instead of focusing on continuous education and training workshops to develop skills, with a systems perspective you would rather review related

training curricula to ensure that appropriate skills included in basic training. Similar observations are made above, highlighting the different approaches necessary for systems change.

If FBF is not a project, but rather a systems strengthening intervention, then what logic governs it? Said differently, what is the plan for how FBF will integrate itself throughout the FBF system, and what are the assumptions and expectations for what change should happen as a result? A key recommendation at this stage of the FBF process is that international, regional and territorial level leadership should undergo a process of articulating the 'Theory of Change' (TOC) for FBF. For those not familiar with TOC, it is not dramatically new, but it is an increasingly popular process for engagement around programmatic, organisational and systems change. As Vogel (2012) notes, *"In broad terms TOC encourages organisations and programmes to elaborate and document their views on: the long-term change they seek, what needs to change and why, the context for change and others active in it, how and why the program's strategy, activities and outputs will help to stimulate outcomes that contribute to long-term change...Theory of Change is a process not a product: it is viewed as an on-going process of discussion-based analysis and learning that produces powerful insights to support strategy, design, evaluation and impact assessment, rather than any particular product."*

The intention here is not to introduce yet one more concept, but to point out that TOC thinking fits seamlessly with FBF, as a flexible approach for thinking through fundamental questions. It should also fill an important gap in the current FBF plan, as an intentional process for articulating the assumptions about FBF (what it is, what it is for and where it is positioned in relation to other Salvation Army strategy and thinking). However, it is important to note that Vogel also points out that the time and resources for doing this effectively needs to be taken seriously – and this is also true for FBF.

#### **R16. 'Steady as she goes': systems change requires time, and it is recommended that the FBF process in the Asia-Pacific region now moves into a period of constancy and reiteration**

---

There is no question that continued leadership action and process management is required if FBF is to succeed. However, given the number of policy and terminological shifts that have occurred over the last two decades, there is understandable anxiety and caution from many different levels within TSA. Some officers and staff articulate FBF as a wonderful or terrifying new way of thinking (terrifying if it is perceived as counter-cultural to the TSA's organisational and power structure); some see FBF as simply a new terminology for what they have always been doing; and others suspect it is simply a new fad or fashion that will blow over and be replaced by something else, so should just be waited out. Officers and staff often view themselves as critically busy individuals, surrounded by a wealth of tools, methods and organisational guidance mechanisms. If FBF is truly going to shift from becoming 'another programmatic burden' to a changed way of thinking and being within TSA, then all of these expectations need to be opened up for debate – and constancy is probably the most important tool to ensure success.

All the recommendations above therefore operate within the overarching recommendation that the purpose, terminology and principles of the FBF process remain unchanged for some time. There would be great value in letting the dust settle, continuing to build on the current achievements, and where appropriate making creative adaptations to the process for greater impact and effect.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barthau D. 2012. Evaluation notes and observations. May 2012.

Campbell I, Rader A. 2001. Network and Organisational Learning Through Local Action and Experience; a human capacity development workshop process to support scaling up integrated care and prevention., The Salvation Army International Headquarters, London

Campbell I, Rader A, Moody R. 1998. A Culture of Facilitation, as a means of sustaining change and hope in responses to AIDS and HIV. The Salvation Army International Headquarters, London.

Evans DMA. 2006. Expanding human capacity for response to HIV and AIDS - the local community as change agent, An Integrated Evaluation Report on the work of the Upper Myanmar HIV/AIDS Programme (PD1930), Philippines Cross Cultural HIV/AIDS, Health and Development Project (PD2078), Asia-Pacific Regional Programme Facilitation Team (PD1897).

Pallant D, Pallant E "Faithful Future" – a chapter in Williams, Harry, 2008, "Every Army Needs An Ambulance", Salvation Books, London

Pallant D. 2011. Keeping faith in faith-based organisations: a practical theology of Salvation Army Health Ministry. WIPF & Stock. Eugene Oregon, USA.

Patterson G. 2010. The Salvation Army Africa Regional Facilitation Process Evaluation Report. November 2010.

Pilborough E. Evaluation notes and observations. May 2012.

TSA. 2008a. 10408 Annual Report. The Salvation Army International Headquarters Programme Resources: London.

TSA. 2008b. Report of the South Pacific and East Asia Health Ministries Workshop. Facilitated by Dr Helen Cameron in Shatin, Hong Kong. 12-16 November 2008. The Salvation Army International Headquarters Programme Resources: London, UK.

TSA. 2009a. PD10408 Annual Report. The Salvation Army International Headquarters Programme Resources: London.

TSA. 2009b. Report of the Building Deeper Relationships for Mission Workshop, Geelong Conference Centre, Australia 26-30 October 2009.

TSA. 2010a. PD10408 Annual Report. The Salvation Army International Headquarters Programme Resources: London.

TSA. 2010b. Building Deeper Relationships Using Faithbased Facilitation. The Salvation Army International Headquarters, London.

TSA. 2011a. PD10408 Activities Plan. The Salvation Army International Headquarters Programme Resources: London.

TSA. 2011b. Building Deeper Relationships using Faith-Based Facilitation Workshop: Singapore, Malaysia and Myanmar Territory. 14-18 February 2011. The Salvation Army International Headquarters Programme Resources: London, UK.

TSA. 2011c. Final report for Project 10408. The Salvation Army International Headquarters Programme Resources: London.

TSA. 2012. The Salvation Army Yearbook 2012. The Salvation Army. London, UK.

TSA-Indonesia. 2012: Faith-Based Facilitation Training in Indonesia Final Report.

TSA-Philippines. 2012: Philippines FBF report

Vogel I. 2012. Review of the use of 'theory of change' in international development: review report and practical resource. Vogel for DFID (draft)

## **APPENDIX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF THE SALVATION ARMY'S ASIA-PACIFIC REGIONAL FACILITATION TEAM PROJECT (NORAD-FUNDED PD1897)**

This evaluation is a shared initiative of NORAD and The Salvation Army. For The Salvation Army, the multi-year and multi-region project has come during a period of significant change, and the Army and the communities it serves will benefit from a review of practice and external assessment of lessons learned. NORAD, in turn, has expressed a need for understanding of what has been achieved over this period, leading to a clearer articulation of future objectives and of strategies for achieving them. This review of the Asia-Pacific Regional Facilitation Team Project follows on the completion of a matched evaluation of the Africa region in 2010.

### **Background**

In 2007, The Salvation Army Asia-Pacific Regional Programme Facilitation (RPF) Team's main strategy was defined as "to support and expand country teams and local implementing teams' development. This is through facilitation and accompaniment of local implementing team's 'on site' with participatory approaches that encourages care and support within home settings, linking to motivation and mobilisation of communities for change. This recognises strong family connection and community interaction that encourages participation in families and communities as well as among individuals." (Asia-Pacific region, NORAD funded – PD 1897).

The facilitation approach for HIV/AIDS, health and development – as conceived at the start of this project – was designed to work alongside the following:

1. Local/Community Implementing Teams
2. Territorial Facilitation Teams
3. Clusters of the Regional Facilitation Team
4. Partners in "Industrialised" Countries

During 2007 it was decided to strengthen the territorial teams and reduce the regional facilitation team role. This followed on an earlier decision to reduce the international facilitation team – based in London – in preference to working in the region. This decision is therefore a continuation of the strategy of strengthening local, community and territorial facilitation teams through a process of decentralisation. The declared goal of this approach was:

To enhance the human & social capacity of local communities across the Asia-Pacific region where The Salvation Army is present through local learning and facilitation processes; for communities to change, care and hope by demonstrating increased HIV/AIDS competency that reduces stigma, HIV infection and ensures quality of life for individuals (especially children and youth), families and community members affected by AIDS.

This goal would be achieved through building on and strengthening core activities of local responses, with specific emphasis placed on:

- documentation & measurement of impact;
- influence on local and country level responses;
- community counselling;
- integrated psycho-social support;
- TFT (facilitation team) development;
- partnership development.

The following strategic objectives were identified:

Goal No. 1. Strengthen community development response to HIV/AIDS, health and related community development issues.

Goal No 2. Strengthen the programme facilitation process and human resource pool.

Goal No. 3. Transfer of lessons learned from countries where community capacity development and facilitation work are more advanced to countries where these processes are still at the initiation stage

Goal No. 4. Organisational development through the facilitation and participation approach in order to enhance organisational capacity to be more self-reliant and reduce external support.

Goal No. 5. Impact on Policy development

Goal No 6: Increase and enhance personnel development through Human Capacity Development approach.



### **Projected results for the Asia-Pacific region by end of 2011**

1. The work of facilitating a community-based response to HIV/AIDS will be prioritised as close to the family/individual as possible. A key result will be active facilitation teams modelling and encouraging others to use appropriate methods of relationship-development in everyday interactions both within and outside of The Salvation Army.
2. Facilitation ways of working will be embedded into Salvation Army programmes through intentional engagement with the strategy making process.
3. The methodology and resources to be adopted across The Salvation Army will be overseen by the international head of Programme Resources at International Headquarters. Facilitation approaches and the response to HIV/AIDS have wider application than purely health services.
4. Lessons learnt through this project and the wider application of facilitation approaches in The Salvation Army will be the basis for a set of resources to embed and support the process after the ending of the project. This will include the development of training/educational resources in multiple languages, clarifying the methodology, embedding it into the programmes and budgets as close to the community as possible.

### **This review and evaluation:**

#### **Aims**

1. *Review the long-term pattern of practice:*
  - overview of the past 10 years of work (the years 2007-2012 in particular)
  - identification of key themes and lessons learned from this review
2. *Evaluate policy development*
  - questionnaire addressed to Salvation Army officers and key programme leaders across Asia-Pacific region,
  - interviews with individuals and groups – past and present - who have been engaged with such development,
  - observations gleaned from some sampling of practice
3. *Assess factors governing sustainability*
  - interviews with leaders, facilitators and community leaders
  - survey of key SA personnel
  - inspection of existing outcome evaluations
4. *Review of available resources that have been developed over the years*
  - Review how 'Building Deeper Relationships' has been utilised in the Asia-Pacific region (as well as other materials developed within the broader SA network)
  - Review other tools developed by the Asia-Pacific Regional Facilitation Team in recent years for future use
5. *Identify the strengths/weaknesses of the future strategy for scale-up*

### **Results will be used to:**

- Inform processes of change and development currently being undertaken including any future requests for NORAD funding.
- Identify factors to be born in mind at local, territorial and international level
- Assist in encouraging open and realistic dialogue between the different groups and individuals involved

### **Methods used will include:**

- Desk review of policy and programme documentation
- Site visits to 3 countries - currently identified as Philippines, Indonesia and Papua New Guinea
- Key informant interviews with identified individuals engaged in facilitation process (in-country and internationally, existing and former staff)
- Facilitated conversations with in-country groups
- A brief questionnaire in which key players are invited to comment on progress and review possibilities
- An electronic questionnaire with matching questions to key identified informants in Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Fiji, Tonga, Taiwan and Hong Kong (verbal or written).

**Results/products expected will include:**

- Written report with recommendations in English, addressed to Salvation Army IHQ, London
- In-country feed-back reports addressed to groups interviewed
- Shared reflection on the findings that emerge from this review (in particular in relation to Salvation Army strategy and health systems thinking)
- A co-authored academic-style article to be sent out for publication (dependent on clearance from appropriate parties) and, if accepted, presentation of a paper at the International Conference

**Logistics of evaluation:**

## External Reviewer:

- Dr Jill Olivier (UCT – IRHAP)

## Salvation Army Review &amp; Advisory Staff:

- Lieut-Colonel Jennifer Groves
- Emily Pilborough (Research Support)
- Major Dean Pallant

**Time scale:**

- Desk research: February-April 2012
- Research design and clearance: March-April 2012
- Site visits: 13-28 April 2012
- Electronic Questionnaires sent to Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Fiji, Tonga, Taiwan and Hong Kong: April 2012
- Analysis: May-June 2012
- Debrief and draft findings for comment by SA staff: end-May/early-June 2012
- Electronic response to in-country participants, with option for comment: end-June 2012
- Deadline for final report: July 2012 (*with flexibility built in if electronic responses are slow*)

## APPENDIX B: ELECTRONIC QUESTIONNAIRE OUTLINE

We outline the main questions posed in the electronic questionnaire sent to FBF facilitators in the Asia-Pacific region. Respondents were assured that this was a process evaluation seeking to improve the shared understanding of what practice has unfolded to-date, and to identify key themes and lessons for improvement. They were assured that responses would not be utilised to judge the success or failure of any actions at a territorial, divisional, corps, centre or community level. Instead, the results will be used to inform processes of change and development currently being undertaken including any future requests for NORAD funding; to identify factors to be born in mind at local, territorial and international level; and to assist in encouraging open and realistic dialogue between the different groups and individuals involved. Finally, respondents were assured of anonymity, and were offered translation into a local language if necessary.

- **Have you ever heard of ‘faith-based facilitation’?** If you answered ‘YES’, how/when/where did you first hear of FBF? (under what circumstances?)
- **Do you have a copy of the booklet ‘Building Deeper Relationships’**
- **If you had to briefly describe to someone else what ‘faith-based facilitation’ was, what would you say?**
- **Some people say that faith-based facilitation is ‘what we are doing anyway in The Salvation Army’. Would you agree?**
  - What elements of FBF are the same? What elements of FBF are new or different? How does FBF relate to other Salvation Army ways of thinking or acting? (e.g., integrated mission, human capacity development or community service provision?)
- **Would you say you have an FBF Team in place at the territorial level?**
  - If you answered yes, can you name the members of this team, and briefly explain how/why they became involved? (e.g. did they attend FBF training, is it part of their work portfolio, or were they interested? Do any of these people give dedicated staff time to FBF?)
- **Has there been any FBF training at the territorial level in your country?**
  - If you answered yes, can you briefly describe when this training happened, what activities it entailed, who managed the session, and how many people were trained? (if you are only part-way in the process, please indicate where you are in the process)
- **Has there been any FBF training or discussion at the divisional level in your country?**
  - If you answered yes, can you briefly describe when this training happened, what activities it entailed, who managed the session, and how many people were trained? (if you are only part-way in the process, please indicate where you are in the process)
- **Does anyone in your territory utilise the booklet ‘Building Deeper Relationships’?**
  - If you answered ‘yes’, how widely do you believe it is used? (we are wanting your wisdom on how useful this is as a tool – so we are seeking your guidance on its usefulness, and whether it can be improved)
- **Do you have a local language version of this booklet? (Or other locally-produced facilitation tools or resources?)**
  - If you answered yes, could you list these resources here, briefly describing what they are and how they are used? If you answered no, do you think it would be useful to have this as a resource with local stories, pictures, or in a local language?
- **Would you say that FBF is being introduced during any of the following activities...?**
  - in management and decision-making at a territorial/divisional level?
  - during the education of corps officers, cadets or others?
  - during project or program design or planning?
  - during monitoring or evaluation activities?
  - as an intentional strategy to connect community with Salvation Army activities?
  - for HIV/AIDS-related activities?

in disaster response?

conducting research of any kind?

building collaboration between The Salvation Army and other organisations? (e.g. multisectoral collaboration, program partnerships, or relationships with local government?)

in local corps activities and relationship-building?

other situations for building deeper interpersonal relationships?

- **In the booklet 'Building Deeper Relationships' the *Process Cycle* for FBF is described (a continuous cycle through the identification of an issue; describe/analyse; reflect and evaluate; decide and plan; and action).**

Do you know of any times when you or someone in your territory has intentionally moved through this process?

- **FBF should be a tool for building of trust in many different circumstances. Would you say that it is useful for this purpose?**
- **Would you say that there is sufficient 'reflective practice' about the nature and focus of Salvation Army activities in your territory?** (e.g. time to reflect on whether Army actions match local issues, and to conduct long-term planning)

If you answered yes, would you say that FBF has anything to do with this process of 'reflective practice'? If you answered no, do you think FBF could be utilised to improve 'reflective practice' within the Salvation Army?

- **Do you know if your territory (or division) received any targeted support for FBF activities? (financial, in-kind or other kind of support)**

If you answered yes, can you briefly describe your understanding of what support was offered, what its intended purpose was, and what resulted? (if you are only part-way in the process, please say so). If you answered no, what kind of support would you considered necessary to further develop FBF?

- **Have you been asked to include FBF elements in any funding proposals you have submitted?**

If you answered yes, can you briefly describe what this included and to whom the application was made? If you answered no, have you noticed any opportunities to apply for support (e.g. from regional or international headquarters) which mentions FBF?

- **Do you know who is driving international/regional FBF?**

If you answered yes, who were you thinking of? Do you ever communicate with them with regards to FBF? What kind of communication occurs?

- **Do you know of any knowledge-sharing on FBF that has occurred regionally or between territories? (e.g. sharing of experiences, sharing of materials, meetings, shared correspondence, visits or staff exchanges?)**

If you answered yes, can you briefly describe what kind of knowledge-sharing has occurred? If you answered no, what kind of opportunities for sharing knowledge on FBF do you think might be useful?

- **Faith-based facilitation is designed to infuse good development practice with the Christian faith. Would you say that this happens in your territory/division?**

If you answered yes, can you briefly describe how you personally understand how faith and theology drives your relationships and development activities? If you answered no, would you say that good development practice (such as participatory action research or community development skills) need not be infused with theology or religious language?

- **Does FBF highlight any relational tensions? (e.g. between people of different religions, between Salvation Army and secular partners)**

If you answered yes, can you provide us with an example? In that case, did FBF help ease this tension? Or did FBF create this tension? Do you think FBF is a useful tool for building deeper relationships?

Do you have any suggestions for how faith-based facilitation can be better 'facilitated' in your territory? (e.g. what support, information, communication or strategy would you suggest)

## APPENDIX C: ADDITIONAL GLOSSARY

We provide this additional glossary, in particular for those not familiar with Salvation Army discourse and structure.

<b>Adherent member</b>	A member of TSA who has not made a commitment to soldiership
<b>AIDS-competent church</b>	A church whose teaching and practice indicate clearly that stigma and discrimination against PLWHAs is sin and against the will of God; which, along with its ecumenical partners, has a full understanding of the severity of the HIV and AIDS epidemic in Africa; which reaches out and responds to collaborative efforts in the field of HIV and AIDS; which find its role in prevention of HIV and AIDS, taking into consideration pastoral, cultural and gender issues; and which use its resources and structures to provide care, counselling and support for those affected.
<b>Assets-based approach</b>	An assets-based approach takes as its starting point the concern that people and their communities should be viewed as having assets, which can be effectively mobilised or leveraged in order to empower communities, rather than as having deficits, which hamper their development.
<b>Cadet</b>	A Salvationist who is in training for officership
<b>Chief Secretary</b>	The officer second in command of the Army in a territory
<b>Corps</b>	A Salvation Army unit established for the preaching of the gospel and to provide Christian-motivated service in the community
<b>Community Projects Management and Support</b>	The CPMS system is The Salvation Army's tool for managing and supporting community projects which receive international support
<b>Division</b>	A number of corps grouped together under the direction of a divisional commander (may also include social service centres and programmes), operating within a territory or command
<b>faith-based facilitation</b>	A process or approach for deepening relationships across all levels of Salvation Army operations and programs
<b>International Headquarters</b>	The offices in which the business connected with the command of the worldwide Army is transacted
<b>Local Officer</b>	A soldier appointed to a position of responsibility and authority in the corps; carries out the duties of the appointment without being separated from regular employment or receiving remuneration from the Army
<b>Officer</b>	A Salvationist who has been trained, commissioned and ordained to service and leadership – a recognised minister of religion
<b>outpost</b>	A locality in which Army work is carried out and where it is hoped a society or corps will develop
<b>SALT</b>	Community visitation methodology ( Stimulate, Appreciate, Listen, and Transfer)
<b>soldier</b>	A converted person at least 14 years of age who has been enrolled as a member of TSA after signing the Soldier's Covenant.
<b>Territorial Commander</b>	The officer in command of the Army in a territory
<b>Territorial leaders</b>	A territorial commander and spouse in their joint role of sharing spiritual leadership and ministry, providing pastoral care and exemplifying the working partnership of officer couples
<b>territory</b>	A country, part of a country, or several countries combined, in which Salvation Army work is organised under a territorial commander
<b>The Salvation Army</b>	The Salvation Army is a worldwide evangelical Christian church

## APPENDIX D: FAITH-BASED FACILITATION CHAMPIONS AND DEMONSTRATORS IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

This is not a list of evaluation participants. Rather, we present this as a response to the demonstrated need for some kind of system to keep track of those who have been drawn into the FBF way of thinking and community of practice. A database of 'FBF Champions' would be particularly useful, not only to create a sense of community, but also so that human capacity can be tracked as Salvation Army staff are rotated to different positions (hopefully taking their passion for FB with them). This list is a first step in that direction, made up of those who have attended regional FBF meetings, and those named as part of FBF teams. We do not include all divisional level staff and officers trained in FBF, as it is clear that 'trained' does not necessarily equals 'caught the passion for'. It would be useful if such a list were further developed, cleaned up, and kept up to date, perhaps along with an email communications list. It is especially important that 'natural FB facilitators' are included, that is, those who have not necessarily be trained, but who demonstrate a passion and ability for FBF in their everyday actions.

Name	Title	Country	Attend H.Kong 2008	Attend Geelong 2009	Attend Singapore 2011	Part of Terr. FBF team	Part of Regional FBF team	FBF engagement
Airene M Lozada	Ms	Philippines (left)	X					Projects/Community Services Coordinator: Evans evaluation
Alberth Sarimin	Maj	Indonesia			X	X		
Alistair Herring	Comm	IHQ					X	International Secretary for SPEA (current)
Alistair Venter		BAN						
Amina Nazia Yousaf	Ms	Pakistan				X		
Andrew Kalai	Comm	PNG	X	X				Territorial Commander
Annette Coleman	Maj	Taiwan						Regional President of Women's Ministries
Anthony Yong	Lieut	Myanmar			X			
Asher W. David	Mr	Pakistan			X	X		Sustainable Livelihood Development Director
Barry Pobjie	Comm	IHQ	X					International Secretary for SPEA (retired)
Bernice Rahmat	Maj	Pakistan			X			
Bram Bailey	Mr	SAWSO			X			Program Coordinator
Bryant Richards		NZF						
Campbell Roberts	Maj	NZ (Fiji)						Social programme, Social Policy and Parliamentary Unit
Cathay Aloba	Capt	Singapore			X			
Charlie Clement	Mr	PNG	X					Health Services Manager
Chris Goa	Maj	(PNG) AUS			X			Divisional commander
Christine Gee	Capt	PNG						Div Mission and Resource Director (Moved to Aus. East)
Clive Adams	Comm	Norway		X				Territorial Commander
Colleen Marshall	Maj	Myanmar						Moved back to NZF
Danilo Sampilo	Capt	Philippines	X					
Darrell Thomas	Maj	Singapore			X			
Dean Pallant	Maj	IHQ	X	X	X		X	IntHealth Services Coord./Under Sec for Prog Resources
Diana MacDonald	Capt.	PAK						
Dina Sinagal	Maj	Indonesia						<i>(ID'ed as a natural FBF facilitator, no longer works for TSA)</i>

Name	Title	Country	Attend H.Kong 2008	Attend Geelong 2009	Attend Singapore 2011	Part of Terr. FBF team	Part of Regional FBF team	FBF engagement
Diput Genabe	Maj	Philippines						
Divinia Guerrero	Capt	Philippines						
Donna Barthau	Maj	Indonesia				X		Territorial Compassion in Action Facilitator
Edward Manulat	Maj	Philippines						Divisional Commander
Eirwen Pallant	Maj	IHQ	X	X			X	International Health Services Co-ordinator
Elena Wong	Ms	Myanmar			X			
Emily Pilborough	Ms	IHQ						Programme Resources Researcher
Emma Oyena	Ms	PNG	X					Settlement Ministries
Erwin Tampubolon	Maj	Indonesia	X					Administrator, Woodward Hospital, Palu
Fouzia Mubarik	Lieut.	Pakistan				X		
Gaba Bina	Capt	PNG	X					
Geanette Seymour	Col	IHQ		X				Director of International Social Justice Commission
George William John	Mr	Pakistan				X		
Gerrit Marseille	Comm	IHQ						International Secretary for Programme Resources
VirgilioMenia	Lt-Col	Philippines						Secretary for Programme Administration
Gillian Downer	Col	Singapore	X		X	X		Territorial Commander
Gletie Salegumba	Ms	Philippines			X			Administration Assistant Programme Department
Graeme Rigley	Maj	Australia	X	X	X		X	Zonal Facilitation Resources Coordinator.
Harold Ambitan	Lt-Col	Indonesia	X					Chief Secretary
Lliesa Cola	Maj	NZF						Divisional Commander (Fiji)
Imanuel Supardi	Maj	Indonesia			X	X		Property officer
In-Jae Yoon	Capt	Korea			X			Director of Deployment Department
Iveme Yanderave	Maj	PNG			X	X		Sec for personnel
Alistair Herring	Comm							International Secretary for SPEA Zone
Janneman Usmany	Maj	Indonesia	X					School Administrator, Palu Indonesia
Jarniati Kurnianto	Capt	Indonesia	X					Officer-in-Charge, Muara Mujan Clinic
Jennifer Groves	Lt-Col	IHQ			X		X	Under Secretary for SPEA zone
Jennifer Haroon	Maj	Pakistan			X	X		Divisional Director for Women's Ministries
Jenny Chen	Capt	Taiwan			X	X		Corps officer and Social Programme
Jerry Mua	Mr	Indonesia						Soldier
Jim Knaggs	Comm	Australia	X					Territorial Commander
Jimi Tan	Pastor	Singapore			X			Social Centre chaplain
Joel Ceneciro	Maj	Philippines						Divisional Commander
John Lalrualiana	Mr	Myanmar			X			
Joite Nimbie	Mr	PNG	X					Deputy Principal, CHW Training School, PNG
Joy Agpaoa	Dr	Philippines	X					Medical Practitioner Philippines
Jocelyn Genabe	Maj	Philippines		X				Divisional Commander Northern Luzon Division
Judy Chun	Ms	Myanmar			X			
June Urbien	Maj	Philippines						
Karen Rigley	Maj	Australia		X	X			Zonal Facilitation Resources Coordinator

Name	Title	Country	Attend H.Kong 2008	Attend Geelong 2009	Attend Singapore 2011	Part of Terr. FBF team	Part of Regional FBF team	FBF engagement
Kaye Viney	Maj	Australia	X					Corps Officer – Darwin Corps
Khin Myat Thu Shein	Capt	Myanmar			X			
Khin Thet Mu	Maj	Myanmar			X			
Kyaw Kyaw Oo	Capt	Myanmar						
Lal Beni	Ms	Myanmar2			X			
Lalbiakdika	Capt	Myanmar						
Lalsangliana	Capt	Myanmar			X			Corps Officer
Leanne Duncan	Maj	Taiwan			X	X		Regional Mission and Resources Officer
Lena Jwili	Maj	Southern Africa		X				
Lyndah Soh	Ms	Singapore			X			Social and community services director
Lyndon Buckingham	Lt	NZF, Tonga			X	X		Secretary for Programme
Malcolm Induruwage	Col	Sri Lanka	X					Territorial Commander Sri Lanka
Marguerite Ward	Col	Pakistan				X		Territorial President of Women's Ministries
Marieke Venter	Lt Col	Bangladesh						Command President of Women's Ministries
Michael Parker	Col	Indonesia						Chief secretary
Mike Coleman	Maj	Taiwan						
Mulyati Mitra Sumarta	Maj	Indonesia			X			Spiritual Formation Development Officer
Naomi Lalngaihawmi	Lt-Col	India Eastern						Australia FBF Meeting Oct 2009
Neil Webb	Lt-Col	PNG						Chief Secretary
On Dieu-Quang	Maj	Hong Kong	X					China Development Secretary Hong Kong
P Kunam	Maj	Myanmar			X			
Pamela Waugh	Maj	NZF (Fiji, Tonga)			X	X		Territorial Secretary for Community Ministries
Patricia Kerari	Capt	PNG			X			Training principle
Pauleen Richards	Lieut.	NZF						Regional Director of Womens Ministries
Quang On	Maj	Hong Kong						General Secretary
Raemor Pobjie	Comm	IHQ	X					Zonal Secretary for Women's Ministries, SPEA
Raj Paul Thamalapakula	Capt	India			X			Social, Health & Emergencies, India National Secretariat
Raymond Chou	Capt	Hong Kong						
Rexson Kenimo	Capt	PNG	X					Settlement Ministries
Richard Welch	Maj	IHQ			X			International Finance Trainer
Robert Duncan	Maj	Taiwan						Regional Mission and Resources Officer
Robert J Ward	Col.	Pakistan						Territorial Commander
Robert Wiseman	Mr	IHQ	X					
Robin Forsyth	Comm	IHQ	X					International Secretary for Programme Resources
Ruby Casimero	Maj	Philippines						Training & Dev Secretary, Educational Services Coordinator
Ruth Pascoe	Maj	Singapore			X			Officer
Samuel Pho	Lt-Col	Hong Kong			X			Officer Commanding
Samuel Tari	Maj	Pakistan						Secretary for Programme
Sara Chagas	Maj	Brazil		X				Divisional Leader
Sara Tam	Capt	Hong Kong						Corps Officer



Name	Title	Country	Attend H.Kong 2008	Attend Geelong 2009	Attend Singapore 2011	Part of Terr. FBF team	Part of Regional FBF team	FBF engagement
Sih Sadjiastuti Laua	Maj	Indonesia	X					Medical Services Coordinator Indonesia
Stuart Manning	Mr	IHQ	X					
Susan Ceneiro		Philippines						
Susan Reese	Maj	Australia	X					Asst Territorial Social Programme Secretary
Susan Tandayag	Maj	Philippines			X	X		Territorial Secretary for Social Programmes
Tommy Chan	Maj	Hong Kong & China		X	X			Divisional Commander
Tony Auld	Mr	Australia		X				
Victoria Kwok	Mrs	Hong Kong						Social Services Director Hong Kong
Virgillio Menia	Lt-Col	Philippines			X	X		Secretary for Programme Administration
Widiawati Tampai	Maj	Indonesia		X				Divisional Director Women's Ministries East Palu
William Barthau	Maj	Indonesia						Territorial Projects Officer
Yusak Tampai	Maj	Indonesia	X					Divisional Commander at East Palu Division