LIBERIA UNITED METHODIST DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Prepared By:

TAABCO Research and Development Consultants
Saachi Plaza Block A6, 3rd Floor Argwings Kodhek Road
P.O. Box 10488-00100 Nairobi Kenya
Cell No: +254-721948813/+254-726164625
Email: taabco@taabco.org / taabco@gmail.com

December 2020

Authors

This report was written by Alice Achoki and John Okanga, the two consultants assigned by TAABCO Research and Development Consultants for the mid-term evaluation of the Community Development Program (CODEVPRO) implemented by Liberia United Methodist Development Services

Acronyms

COBIP	Community Based Integrated Program Volunteers
CODEVPRO	Community Development Program
EAT	Empowerment Assessment Tool
ET	Evaluation Team
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GOL	Government of Liberia
HFDC	Health Facility Development Committee
IGAs	Income Generating Activities
IP	Implementing Partner
KII	Key Informant Interview
LAC/UMC	Liberia Annual Conference/United Methodist Church
LD	Liberian Dollars
LUMDS	Liberian United Methodist Development Services
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NPSPHP	National Policy and Strategic Plan on Health Promotion
OD	Open Defecation
ODF	Open Defecation Free
OECD-DAC	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development- Development Assistance Committee
PID	Partnership in Development
PTA	Parents Teachers Association
PWD	People with Disabilities
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time bound
TAABCO	Transforming Analyzing Accompanying and Building Change Organizations
TOR	Terms of Reference
UMC	United Methodist Church
UMCN	United Methodist Church of Norway
USD	United States Dollars
WARC	West Africa Regional Centre
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WHO	Health Organization World

Table Content

Contents

List of Tables

Executive Summary

Overview of the mid-term evaluation

This report presents the findings of the mid-term evaluation of the third five-year phase of the Community Development Program (CODEVPRO) (2018-2022), implemented by Liberia United Methodist Development Services (LUMDS). The goal of this evaluation was to sum up the experiences, lessons learnt, and results achieved during the last 2.5 years of implementation. The evaluation also sought to present recommendations for the sustainability of the programme and how it can target impact on a higher level of the Liberian authority system through advocacy. Further, the evaluation aimed to serve as a learning opportunity for UMCN, LAC/UMC/LUMDS staff and communities involved, in order to enhance their understanding and participation in the programme. A final purpose of the evaluation was to enable UMC/LAC LUMDS to use its findings to inform adaptive management of new design of future strategy and programme.

Evaluation Objectives and intended audience

As outlined in the Terms of Reference, the objectives of this mid-term evaluation were to:
- Examine the CODEVPRO's Partnership in Development Model and its relevance,
- Assess the effectiveness of the program according to the development goal,
- Identify results and lessons learned from implementation and provide recommendations,
- Conduct a short assessment of the ownership role of the Government and the community in the life of the projects and beyond and,
- Conduct a short assessment of the Partnership in Development Regional Competence Centre focusing on progress made and its future direction.
- Assess the risks met in the programme, on local and national level.
- Present recommendations for future programme or collaborations.

Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation employed mixed methods approach designed by both LUMDS and TAABCO Consultants, based on the project outcomes and the OECD-DAC criteria of (strategy design, target population, implementation effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability). The mixed- methods included documents review, primary data collection through participatory qualitative methods, observation and the Digni Empowerment Assessment Tool as key approaches used.

Key findings and conclusions
- **Strategy Design**

The evaluation team (ET) observed that the Partnership in Development (PID) Model is based on assumptions of empowerment, information, mind molding and capacity building of communities to take lead in addressing own needs sustainably. The model places the community at the center- and has been able to mobilize communities to initiate and participate in own development. The PID model is also contributing to the achievement of four Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), being SDG 1- End poverty, SDG 3- Good health and well-being, SDG 4- inclusive and equitable quality education and SDG 6- Clean water and sanitation – through implementation of current activities.

- **Target Population**

The ET observed that for many Liberians, CODEVPRO remains a beacon of hope especially in these times of national reconstruction. For the period under review, the evaluation established that the projects were mainly concentrated in the remote rural parts of Liberia. There is enough evidence attesting that the programme is reaching the right cohorts of needy deserving populations consisting of both LAC/UMC congregations and the wider community. It was also established that the programme consistently focuses on communities with poor or non- accessibility to urgent felt needs in areas of WASH, Health, Education, and Capacity building.

- **Implementation**

Throughout the evaluation process, it was established that the PID model places beneficiaries at the center and values participatory processes with a bottom-up principle. With this, the model strengthens community organizations and leadership structures through democratic processes and lets them play a leading role in decision making and implementation of projects – particularly in allowing the planning and monitoring be a central role of local project committees.

- **Effectiveness**

The project continues to attain its primary objective of improving living conditions in the thematic areas of education, water and sanitation, health, economic empowerment, capacity building and other infrastructure development. Generally, the assessment of activities conducted have positive impacts. The ET notes that some of the communities have observable change such as improved schools, improved health centres, water points and enhanced capacities. There was also behavioural change witnessed in some communities such as through construction of family latrines and establishment of clothes lines and dish racks. However, although extensive capacities were built for many groups, utilization of some of those skills is still a challenge – especially in embracing general behavioural change and advocacy. Some communities and schools visited still practice open defection which poses a major risk of disease outbreaks.

- **Efficiency**

Through the review of project documents and interviews conducted, the evaluation established that the financial resources allocated to the realization of the project were used prudently. This is despite costs incurred due to staff stay in communities and high transport costs due to poorly serviced roads. Overall, the mid-term evaluation findings and analysis demonstrate staff professionalism, proactive pre-planning and dynamic approach in improving the living conditions of needy target populations through CODEVPRO's prioritized activities.

- **Sustainability**

To ensure sustainability of the supported activities in the target communities, CODEVPRO facilitated a number of tailored capacity building initiatives with different but inclusive community representatives for committees, PTA boards, and general community members. The county Government representatives also sensitized these committees to ensure increased participation and ownership. Some committees have also developed by-laws, collect levies and institute penalties aimed at ensuring compliance and sustainability. However, the ET noticed challenges on momentum and commitment for infrastructural projects where community enthusiasm diminished shortly after commencement leaving a few to continue to completion.

Main Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusion 1: It is evident that CODEVPRO is significantly contributing to provision of basic services such as safe drinking water, conducive learning environments, WASH, and capacity transfers to vulnerable communities through previous and current phase. This conclusion is based on findings 2, 4, 9 and 12 which refer to the achievement of programme objectives, unintended outcomes, and contribution towards Liberia poverty reduction and in meeting SDG targets.

Conclusion 2: CODEVPRO, through its strategic PID model is delivering set objectives. The positive changes are demonstrated in the empowered, informed, mind molded and capacity-built communities taking lead in addressing own felt needs sustainably. This conclusion is based on findings 1, 5 and 6.

Conclusion 3: CODEVPRO largely reached target communities in Liberia including LAC/UMC congregations and beyond in the remote needy areas of Liberia with urgent need for basic social services. This conclusion is based on finding 5.

Conclusion 4: There is enough evidence to demonstrate the effort of staff to deliver all CODEVPRO program outcomes and outputs within specified timelines and budgets. This conclusion is based on findings 11 to13 where all worked together for the satisfactory results, professionally utilizing available limited resources (both technical and financial). However, the poorly serviced county road network and vastness of communities has strained program finances.

Conclusion 5: There is evidence of sustainability of programme activities beyond implementation period. The measures taken include placing beneficiaries at the center through the PID model. The program is also forming and revitalizing non-functional community management structures, imparting new skills and promoting gender parity in community decision making. This is based on finding 15-16.

However, for the initiatives to achieve sustainable behavioural change and gains made from programme activities, there is need for county representatives and volunteers to change tact from current practice to one that continuously reminds them of the reality of program exit and the dangers that come with dependency.

Empowerment Assessment Tool (EAT)
The ET using the EAT process, grades the overall performance of the programme at level 3. There is evidence of gained power over decisions and resources amongst beneficiaries and other stakeholders. The communities are able to make strategic life choices between competing needs and identify own priorities- thus exercising the power to make choices, through democratic processes and enjoyment of outcomes through accessing urgent basic social services.

Recommendations

Based on the findings in section three, the ET presents the following recommendations:

Recommendations	Party Responsible
There is need to ensure that the renovated /constructed schools adhere to WHO guideline of 1 toilet door per 50 students for boys and one door for 25 girls. This can be achieved by investing in pit latrines rather than the current modern washrooms – with few doors.	LUMDS/ PTA
Consider documenting feedback from stakeholders, the effects of programme activities on community and government. This may inform future adjustments and design of new programs. This can be published for learning purposes and also as a fund-raising document from like-minded donors.	LUMDS,
There is need to strengthen the coordination and cooperation with government authorities in an effort to operationalize the MOU and future sustainability of the programme activities. This can be achieved through invitation of senior government leaders and decision makers to high-level meeting of LAC/UMC and LUMDS.	LUMDS
WARC is academic based with focus on research and value-based leadership. It will be prudent to re-locate the Centre to the United Methodist University Campus for proper supervision and utilization by students. LUMDS can continue to be a source of information and facilitate student practical knowledge on the PID model and field support for research.	WARC Task Force & LUMDS
Invest in more capacity within programme staff, community leadership and project management structures on policy lobby and advocacy to mobilize masses to lobby government for improved basic services such as roads, deployment of teachers to remote schools and prioritization of basic social services to communities.	LUMDS
Empower communities to appreciate spreading out from current town/villages settings to sufficiently create space and facilitate adoption of WHO water and sanitation health habits. Most of the towns are crowded with no space for structures such as pit latrines.	LUMDS
There is need to encourage and support Peer-to peer learning through exchange visits among community leaderships and project management teams. Such visits should be designed in a manner that supports evidential and practical learning.	LUMDS
Develop a community weaning strategy a head of project exits to new programming that would include "changing from being heavy in "hardware" to more in "software" (skills).	LUMDS

Best Practices

The PID model that is at the center of CODEVPRO programming has demonstrated capacity to promote and enhance inclusivity, participation and accountability among key stakeholders. It has led to empowerment of structures at the community level that promise sustainability of initiatives with extra capacity building.

Challenges

In the Results Framework, the ET established that some outcomes and some key performance indicators were not SMART (properly identified and articulated). In some cases, not all baseline data was available, for example, Outputs 2.1, 5.3, 5.8, 5.12 and 6.8. This made it a bit difficult to track the results and rate them accordingly. The evaluation team had to use observation and

methodical judgment to assess and rate such indicators. For instance, indicators such as 1.1, 3.2, 8.1 and 5.12 was difficult to comprehend what was being measured.

Self-reliance and sustenance of the West Africa Regional Competence Centre is weak with no clear or proper funding channels. The Centre has a three-year Strategic Plan which is due to end in one year's time and some aspirations of that strategy are yet to be met.

Low uptake of knowledge and use among project community beneficiaries. The program has been in existence for just over 12 years, and yet staff are still struggling to attain the expected community behavioural change. During interviews, it was not clear why communities cannot appreciate, adopt and sustain good hygiene practices.

LUMDS is experiencing sustainability challenges. The Government working style and attitudes have not been fully proactive to support this agenda. They continue to offer minimal support in routine monitoring and deployment of both trained and volunteer teachers. Consultations with government respondents indicated challenges of limited resources from central government. One officer said, "we are forced to tailor our work-plans to align with development partners – in order to utilize their transport and any other necessary support."

Community attitudes and practices demonstrate heavy dependency on external support, a factor connected to post civil war, when international community came in to support with much needed community supplies. Transition from this has remained difficult for communities to change and steer own development – without support from development partners.

Lessons Learned
Women leaderships have demonstrated to be more effective, on average, and attract more community participation and sustained commitment to community project initiatives.

Change is a process. It requires sustained efforts to get communities that have been trapped into vicious cycles of conflict and poverty onto the path of development and place them into the driving role towards self-sustainability.

CODEVPRO target communities have structures that can be turned around into great assets for local development. Structures such as clan/town chiefs are strong entry points for community mobilization and organization. Continuous capacity building for these structures and adequate preparation for exit - remains an important and immediate task for program staff.

1.0 Introduction

This report summarizes the process, findings and recommendations of the mid-term evaluation of the third phase of the Community Development Program (CODEVPRO), implemented by Liberia United Methodist Development Services (LUMDS) with funding support from the United Methodist Church in Norway (UMCN). LUMDS is the development arm of the Liberia Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church.

1.1 Background about Liberia

Liberia is located in West Africa and bordering the Atlantic Ocean. The country attained its independence in 1847. Political instability in the past plunged the country into civil war which lasted fourteen years and the outbreak of the Ebola virus and poor governance have all contributed to a stagnation of the economy leaving majority of Liberians, especially those in the rural villages in abject poverty.

Despite being endowed with rich natural resources including rich soils for agriculture and natural tropical forests, poor infrastructure such as bad road network and poor electricity connection has made it difficult for Liberians to optimally exploit this potential. The Government depends heavily on development partners to fund social services including education, health, water and sanitation. This support, although currently being provided by many development partners is not sufficient to meet all the demand.

1.2 Thematic Areas

It's against this backdrop that the Liberia Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church (LAC/UMC) through its development function, the Liberia United Methodist Development Services (LUMDS) and in partnership with the United Methodist Church in Norway (UMCN) Board of Global Ministries designed CODEVPRO to provide access to some of the basic social services. The basic services provided include education, WASH, health and infrastructure.

1.2.1 Health

The healthcare delivery system in Liberia has seen tremendous development in the post-war and post-Ebola period with a number of health facilities being established through support from Government and development partners. However, despite this development, there exist serious gaps that make access to healthcare services by a large proportion of the Liberian population a daily struggle. Shortage of healthcare workers, medical supplies and poor infrastructure are some of the major drawbacks to sustainable healthcare delivery.

The findings from the Liberia Demographic Health Survey 2013 Report stated that 1 in every 11 Liberian children dies before reaching his or her fifth birthday. A significant number of these children die as a result of preventable diseases. The same survey also noted that almost two-thirds of women (62%) in Liberia suffer at least one problem accessing health care for themselves. Nearly half (47%) have concerns about getting money for treatment. Four in ten women are concerned about the distance to health facility. One quarter of women are concerned about not wanting to go alone. These factors create more complications in addressing health issues. Additionally, health care development improvement experienced in 2014 was tragically retarded by the Ebola pandemic. Even-though Liberia is implementing National Policy and

Strategic Plan on Health Promotion (NPSPHP) 2016 – 2021, it still suffers from institutional, capacity, funding and accessibility challenges.

1.2.2 Education

Liberia's education system has been one of the weakest in Sub-Saharan Africa due to lack of adequate resources, poor infrastructure, and inadequate expenditure from national budgets[1]

In 2016, The Ministry of Education (MoE) developed a four-year education sector plan (ESP) to address the most urgent challenges facing the education sector in Liberia: Getting to Best Education Sector Plan (G2B-ESP). The G2B-ESP was based on the priorities identified in the Getting to Best Roadmap and Priorities 2015-2017 (2015) and built on the achievements and learning from the previous Education Sector Plan 2010-2020. However, the education sector still faces a complex series of interrelated challenges, mostly related to the rebuilding and recovery from civil war, constrained national finances, poor infrastructure and, more recently, the Ebola epidemic. There is an increasing demand for education at all levels, particularly for quality livelihoods education for young girls and boys.

1.2.3 Water and Sanitation

Liberia's water and sanitation sector are, like any case for many underdeveloped economies, characterized by poor access to clean portable water especially in the rural communities where majority rely on open creeks for their daily supplies. These creeks also serve livestock and are used for bathing and drawing water for domestic consumption.

WaterAid, in its document entitled "Inside Liberia Counties: A Glance at the WASH Situation" published in 2013 reported that 60% of Liberians cannot access sustainable safe drinking water supply. In Liberia, unclean water, unsafe toilet disposal and poor hygiene cause almost 80% of all diarrheal. As per Joint Monitoring Programme 2017, sanitation in Liberia is very poor, with the vast majority of people in rural areas lacking decent toilets and latrines and defecate in the open instead. About 42 percent of the population practice open defecation.

1.2.4 Infrastructure development through mini bridges

The African Development Bank views poor infrastructure as a critical barrier to reducing poverty and accelerating growth on the continent. Liberia's new poverty reduction strategy, the Agenda for Transformation recognizes that economic growth and development cannot be achieved without adequate infrastructure. A report by the Africa Infrastructure Index, AfDB 2013, concluded that Liberia's infrastructure is in a woeful state in all of the sectors reviewed as compared to other countries in the continent.

Roads: Liberia's public road network falls short of the country's needs both in coverage and quality. The domestic network remains largely underdeveloped and access to the isolated parts of the country is particularly limited.

Power: Energy infrastructure is also one domain where Liberia is vastly disadvantaged relative to the rest of the sub-Saharan Africa and the world. Mt. Coffee hydroelectric plant was destroyed

---

[1] Liberia Agency for Community Empowerment (LACE)

during the conflict and in mid-2011, Liberia's rate of access by the population to publicly provided electricity was close to zero with Liberia Electricity Company effectively serving about 1% of the Monrovia urban population. However, since 2005 steps have progressively been taken to restore the electricity grid.

1.2.5 Community empowerment through support to Income Generating Activities.
The plundering of the Liberian economy during the conflict resulted in excessively high levels of unemployment, particularly amongst youth, internally displace persons, and refugees. Formal sector employment is currently estimated at 120,000 or just 4% of the population, and nearly 50% of these workers are employed by the public sector. The dominance of the informal economy means that the majority of workers are employed in low-income or non-income generating activities such as agriculture or subsistence farming, petty production and trade.

1.3 The PID Methodology
Liberia United Methods Development Services adopted the Partnership in Development (PID) model for implementation of its programs from Angola. The model was later adopted by UMC in Zimbabwe and then Sierra Leone, who was trained by CODEVPRO. This model transcends engagement with all partners at all levels of program delivery including the donor (UMCN), Government of Liberia and beneficiary communities. The PID model seeks to leverage on partners and stakeholders' capacities and unlock everyone's potential for sustainable development. It stresses the notion of "working with" as opposed to "working for" and draws from the belief that everyone has some potential, unique to them that if tapped and utilized for synergy building contribution to greater good. At the beneficiary level, this approach has informed the critical mass of community members that voluntarily participate in projects implementation.

The model places the community at the center and motivates them to take a leading role in their development. This enables them to actively engage in planning, implementation and monitoring of their initiatives. In all this, their contributions largely involve supply of unskilled labor and contribution of local construction materials and sustainability roles and responsibilities. The approach thus places project beneficiaries at a very core and creating strong community management structures to manage the project after completion. Although most communities visited during evaluation demonstrated the desire to continue drawing support from LUMDS. It was clear that considerable level of capacity development through the model, has enabled them to manage their projects to some degree.

1.4 Purpose of Evaluation and Use
The main purpose of the mid-term evaluation was to sum up the experiences, lessons learnt, and results achieved during the last 2.5 years of implementation which marks the mid-term of the third five-year phase of the project. The evaluation is also expected to present recommendations for the sustainability of the programme, and how it can target impact on a higher level of the Liberian authority system through advocacy. Further, the evaluation aims to serve as a learning opportunity for UMCN, LAC/UMC/LUMDS staff and communities involved - to enhance their understanding and participation in the programme. The evaluation will finally, enable UMC/LAC LUMDS use findings to inform adaptive management of new design of future strategy and programme. It is also hoped that the evaluation will be useful to the Government of Liberia relevant ministries and departments of Health, Education, Environment, WASH and the

academia particularly research in the area of community development – fronted by West Africa Regional Centre.

1.5 Scope of the evaluation

The scope of the mid-term evaluation spanned 2.5 years of implementation of programme activities. The evaluation sought to assess the achievements gained according to set objectives described in the Terms of Reference, documenting best practices and lessons learnt in the program during this time. The evaluation considered selected areas of project interventions in five communities within three counties (Grand Bassa, Bong and Montserrado).

1.6 Objectives of the evaluation

The evaluation sought to achieve the following objectives:

i. Examine the Community Development Programme taking into consideration the Partnership in Development Model and its relevance, including all its constituent activities and progress toward the achievement of the Project objectives.

ii. Assess the effectiveness of the program according to the development goals. Are the activities strategically contributing to Project Purpose and plan in the most effective way, examining the progress, synergies, and sustainability at all levels of the program?

iii. Identify results and lessons learned from implementation and provide succinct, actionable recommendations to inform development of future Partnership and Community Development design.

iv. Examine the status of completed or finished projects and its quality and usages.

v. Conduct a short assessment of the ownership role of the Government and the community in the life of the projects and beyond; including the impact and outcome made by the programme towards the authorities and in the lives of the beneficiaries.

vi. Conduct a short assessment of the Partnership in Development Regional Competence Centre (Regional Centre) considering what has been done, where we are now, and where are we going.

vii. Assess the risks met in the programme, on local and national level

viii. Present recommendations for future program or collaborations.

2.0 Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The evaluation employed a mixed-methods approach to data collection and analysis - which included: desk review of available online and offline literature, projects documents, four key informant interviews, (3male and 1 female), sixteen focus group discussions with 153 beneficiaries' respondents (69 were women and 83 men) – two were with the children, a participatory approach – where substantive consultations were held with LUMDS senior project

management team. Other respondents were WARC taskforce chair, and county government representatives.

In addition, the evaluation team also used observation methods to complement the qualitative methods and applied the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of strategy design, target population, implementation, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

Following the desk review, the consultants conducted 5 days of field work within Grand Bass, Montserrado and Bong counties. The fieldwork was preceded by a brief kick-off meeting with the LUMDS's senior management to understand the TOR and fieldwork schedules. The meeting was held at LUMDS office in Monrovia.

This mixed methodological approach included development of gender inclusive tools for LUMDS staff, government representatives, WARC, teachers, PTA boards, children and community level beneficiaries.

2.1 Review of documents
The evaluators received and reviewed several program documents– for the last 3 years of implementation. These included the last evaluation reports, the program description document, annual program plans and narrative reports, program budgets, the program results framework and the West Africa Region Competence Centre Strategic Plan 2019-2021, among others. The product of this desk review was an organized summary of findings that assisted to formulate and expand the evaluation questions.

2.2 In-depth Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)
The evaluation team conducted one – in-depth interview with LUMDS senior staff, and four KIIs. The KIIs aimed at obtaining primary data from different levels of stakeholders of the Community Development Program. Key informants were purposively sampled through consultations between the consultants and LUMDS management team based on the role they played within the programme. They included:
- LUMDS senior staff, two government officials, a representative from the management of the West Africa Regional Competence Center and, Caretaker of the Community multipurpose Guesthouse.

2.3 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)
The evaluation process also involved collection of primary data from 18 FGDs of which 14 were mixed groups (men and women), 2 were with children and 2 with women. All the groups were purposively sampled through consultations between the consultants and LUMDS staff using a combination of stratified and convenience sampling methods.

2.4 Digni Empowerment Assessment Tool
The Digni Empowerment Assessment Tool (EAT) was also used to analyze the level of empowerment achieved by the programme on the beneficiaries in respect to resources (being able to make own decision and prioritize), agency (ability to participate in projects) and achievements (capacity to enjoy the results or outcomes).

2.5 Data Analysis
The evaluation team carried out content, pattern and comparative analysis of the data collected using simple Microsoft tables which effectively enabled data triangulation from all the different data sources. It is on the basis of this triangulation and analysis that findings and recommendations presented in this report were arrived at.

2.6 Ethical considerations
The evaluation involved human subjects and thus required consent approval before data collection. This was administered by explaining the purpose and objectives of the evaluation and seeking their acceptance to participate. Every effort was made by both the consultants and CODEVPRO staff to ensure that the process was transparent and accountable explaining how the results would be utilized after completion. Overall, evaluation adhered to the quality standard of evaluations, including giving opportunity to respondents to ask questions and seek clarifications where necessary.

2.7 Limitations of the evaluation methodology
The evaluation faced some limitations, notably selection bias for non-random samples, restricted generalizability and un-availability of some respondents which could, to some extent, affect the findings. The evaluation team considers these not very critical as to adversely affect these findings and the recommendations especially given the broad sources of data used for triangulation and the extensive probing done during interviews. In addition, for efficiency, the actual budgets were examined alongside activities implemented. Desk review findings from programme documents were documented and triangulated with KII/FGD data.

3.0 Evaluation Findings
This section provides summarized overall findings of the evaluation. The actual detailed achievements of the programme are provided in Annex 2.

3.1 Current Strategy Design
3.1.1 Introduction
This section attempts to answer the questions listed in the TOR on current strategy design.

3.1.2 To what extent did the programmatic and contextual assumptions of the PID Model used for Community Development address the underlying barriers?
Finding # 1

The PID model seeks to leverage on partners and stakeholders' capacities and unlock everyone's potential for sustainable development. It stresses the notion of "working with" as opposed to "working for" and draws from the belief that everyone has some potential, unique to them that if tapped and utilized for synergy building can contribute to the "greater good". At the beneficiary level, this approach has informed the critical mass of community members that voluntarily participate in projects implementation.

In an effort for the model to be successful in addressing underlying barriers, CODEVPRO usually starts with and ends with the communities. In this process, the underlying barriers to community development, such as poor community organization, limited capacities, poor

resource mobilization, low pace in behavioural change, low functional literacy and high levels of poverty, are addressed through rigorous and periodic trainings for different community segments as key stakeholders of the projects.

CODEVPRO staff applied the PID approach to development rather than implementing interventions as charities which will not leave communities sustainable. Findings from the evaluation show that this approach was consistent in empowering, informing and capacity building communities to take charge of their own development.

Determined to empower, the programme team implemented the projects to a large extent through existing structures within the counties, local communities (town) and local leadership structures such as development committees, PTAs and HFDC among others. This approach is different from what some other development partners do in provision of basic services. Some outsource contractors or through boardroom decisions which may probably not match the community felt needs.

Of great mind-molding was the introduction of resource mobilization strategy through cost sharing model. The target communities contribute approximately 5% of total coast. Of which, 60% of that contribution has to be in place before any project can start.

In addition, for the PID model to succeed, functional literacy was critical at least for the management structures. This was achieved through several training workshops with tailored topics such as project management, conflict resolution, gender equality and empowerment, advocacy skills, financial management, environmental protection and reporting.

However, behavioural change still remains a challenge for majority of community members.

3.1.3 Did the Community Development Program improve basic social services?
Finding # 2
For decades, Liberia has ranked low on the United Nations Development – Human Development Index (HDI) tallying at 175 out of 189[2]. Key indicators for Liberia in the HDI include high poverty levels and life expectancy standing at (62.9)[3], education – adults' illiteracy (48,3%)[4] health and WASH among others ranking low. Findings from this evaluation shows that the majority of households have accessibility to essential social services for instance, elementary schooling is pegged at approximated 44%[5]. This vulnerability is linked to their main source of income – being substance farming with over 70%, poor infrastructure such as road network and electricity connectivity which are key in spurring local economic growth.

Despite these vulnerabilities the CODEVPRO program has greatly improved accessibility and provision of such basic services. The ET therefore, notes that CODEVPRO has greatly contributed to the SDGs in Liberia.

---

[2]UNDP HDI Report 2019
3 WHO 2018
4 World Data 2017
[5] The world Bank data 2017

3.1.4 How well did the strategy adapt to Liberia's changing context and capitalize on needs and opportunities?
Finding # 3
The republic of Liberia was founded in 1847. The country was relatively calm until 1980 that marked the beginning of the 14-year civil war. The coup marked the end of dominance by the minority Americo-Liberians, who had ruled since independence. By the late 1980s, the militia controlled much of the countryside, entering the capital (Monrovia) in 1990.

In 1995 a peace agreement was signed, followed by another Agreement in 2003 when the state suffered yet another collapse. In 2005, a transitional government was instituted to steer the country towards elections. President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf won the democratic election in 2005. While there have been huge efforts made towards overall reconstruction by the Government and through the support of international partners, Liberia is still among the poorest in the world with more than 64% of the population living on less than a dollar per day, out of which 1.3 million are in extreme poverty conditions[6].

It is against this backdrop that CODEVPRO, using the PID model stressed the involvement and participation of target communities to improve accessibility of basic services – thus adapting to the changing context and capitalizing on needs and available opportunities to reach thousands of disadvantaged rural communities in hard-to-reach places. The evaluation process further established that the GOL on its own, lacks the resources both human and financial needed for full reconstruction especially in provision of essential basic services.

3.2 Target Group
3.2.1 Introduction
This section attempts to answer the question on how the project targeted the deserving populations for interventions.

3.2.2 To which extent has the programme successfully reached the stated target beneficiaries?
Finding # 4
For many Liberians, CODEVPRO remains a beacon of hope especially in these times of national reconstruction. For the period under review, the evaluation process found out that the sub- projects were mainly concentrated in the remote hard-to-reach parts of Liberia.

Through, the documents review and field visits conducted – there is enough evidence attesting that CODEVPRO reached the right cohorts of needy deserving populations. These populations consist of both LAC/UMC and non-LAC/UMC congregations. The ET found out that most targeted beneficiaries are poor and living in remote rural areas – with very poor road network and no electricity connectivity. Some communities like Klehn town were completely cut off from the rest of Liberia with a huge river. It was also established that the programme consistently focuses on communities with low or non-accessibility to urgent felt needs in areas of WASH, Health, Education, and Capacity building - as shown in the progress towards achievement of expected outcomes annex 1 and results in Annex 2. In two separate interviews, respondents

---

[6] World Food Program, Annual Report 2013-2017

including government officials said, *"Without this program, these people would have perished,"* thus confirming the value and timeliness of the programme interventions to targeted beneficiaries. For instance, communities of Velleyta, and Boegeeze had never had a government sponsored school since independence in 1847 until CODEVPRO came in to meet that need. The targeting of beneficiaries was also demonstrated by the distances covered from Monrovia to these sites testifying the remoteness and the urgent need to improve provision of basic services to these communities.

3.3 Programme Implementation
3.3.1 Introduction
This section attempts to answer the questions on how the programme implementation was conducted.

3.3.2 How much has the Partnership In Development model contributed to more effective community Development programming? What elements worked or have not worked, and why?
Finding # 5

> The concept of "Partnership in Development" was developed as an innovative alternative to traditional development cooperation. The main objectives of the model were:
> a) *That the main focus of future development work shall be at the local level of civil society (congregation) and that the work contributes to the strengthening of the civil society and to the development of democratic organizations.*
> b) *That the responsibility for planning, implementation and evaluation of development projects rests with the local partner.*
> c) *To simplify the process of application and reporting at all levels of the chain from the local civil society level through the local/national partner to the Norwegian partner and finally to BN and NORAD.*
> d) *To improve the quality of the development work carried out by churches and Christian organizations with increased focus on sustainable impact in the local society.*

During the previous evaluations some of these objectives were changed to allow benefits to reach both LAC/UMC congregations and non-LAC/UMC members within the target communities as established by this mid-term evaluation of November 2020.

Through the documents review and in-depth consultations – the ET established that PID is quite complex and grounded on elaborate community entry processes. It places community at the center and values participatory procedures with a bottom-up principle. In this way – the model ensures communities are empowered, informed and capacities enhanced to take lead to address own felt needs sustainably.

The evaluation team established that these processes have contributed to more effective community programming - by letting local communities play a leading role in decision making and implementation of projects – particularly in allowing the planning and monitoring be with local project committees. This creates empowerment for development of other initiatives in the future.

At the project sites there were observable capacities built. For instance, the communities were able to organize themselves into various committees, mobilize local materials (land, sand, timber, water), participate in construction through provision of unskilled labour and locally available materials, and perform project management duties such as inventory/ record keeping, reporting and budget tracking. These are skills needed for any effective community development programming.

Capacities like advocacy have facilitated communities as right holders to engage duty bearers to be accountable. For instance, leaders of St. John Community School and Frank Diggs used the transferred skills to advocate for extra teachers in their respective schools. They each got two teachers including a principle for Velleyta School.

Further, two schools have been able to mobilize parents to start a plantain farm and construct an extra block of latrines for students. The plantains also support the schooling feeding program, and the surplus is sold to pay volunteers teachers.

At national level, CODEVPRO staff, through the tripartite agreement is entrenching a bit of advocacy. The senior staff join other high-level stakeholders' meetings discussing issues of national importance and making decisions on some of CODEVPRO's thematic areas such as education. In these forums programme staff utilize the opportunity to share the PID process and how it is contributing to sustainable community development programming.

The other way in which the PID model has contributed to more effective community Development programming is through its process of inclusivity. The process involves all community segments including women – who have proved to be very influential in committee leadership and support to sustainability of projects. These are skills that will be beneficial to any future community programming. For instance, John Dean community is using the skills acquired during the school construction to mobilize parents to dig a well for the school community.

Even though the PID model has made all these achievements, there still remains a challenge to the optimal utilization of these skills. The communities still feel vulnerable and look out for external support – ignoring the huge potential internally. More advocacy coupled with motivational talks is still needed to jump-start these communities to self-empowerment and self- reliance.

What has worked (supplementary question)
Finding # 6
Consultations at community level revealed that the programme has built local capacity, especially where they were involved in installation and management of all infrastructural projects. Their active participation allowed them to be equipped with knowledge on how to carry out own work through project reporting, advocacy, monitoring, leadership selection, networking, gender integration and environmental conservation.

In addition, the PID model worked very well with the local structures such as town chiefs' who now, schedule meetings that provide spaces for community mobilization and motivation towards involvement and participation in community projects.

The evaluation team further observed that there is good collaboration and participation among community members as evidenced by the willingness to join committees, and voluntary honor of duty rosters. Good example was gravelling of the road in John Dean School to ease transportation of materials and KI. Diabolo where communities had started mining sand and brick making.

The communities also offered security to materials and passed by-laws. For example, in Ki. Diabolo school communities passed a by-law not to purchase similar materials like those in construction sites – to prevent possible theft and sale of materials on construction sites. This same community went an extra mile to use radio to mobilize other surrounding communities to join hands. This strategy worked very well with many turning out to help.

The ET also observed some level of sustainability at work. After completion of each project, a management committee is put in place. For instance, the WASH committee and PTAs take over immediately after dedication – to continue to oversee and safeguard projects for future generations. This committees then develop by-laws guiding maintenance and how to raise money for future repairs when needed. For big investments like income generating initiatives – Land is secured through provision of Tribal certificate.

What has not worked?
Finding # 7
In terms of what has not worked, the ET found the following:
The sharing of proceeds from the community-empowerment projects has not picked up very well. The income from Gbecohn-Guest House was to be shared as follows: salary to the care- taker, guest house operations, local church/community, and some % paid back to programme office in quarterly basis. The ET established that in 2019 a total of LD 65,115 was collected. Forty percent went to the local community, and 60% to quest house operations. Nothing was shared to the caretaker. The Caretaker at the time of the evaluation had only received an allowance of LD 5000 about ($33) at the beginning of January 2020, several months after the dedication of the Guest house in September 2018. All this time the services rendered were voluntarily. On close examination of the super-structure - the doors were found to be infested with termites, some locks not functional and floor mat damaged.
KII # 4 said verbatim:
"I have never been paid. I only volunteer my services".

The evaluation questions the validity and practicability of such voluntary services in a business undertaking which is not sustainable and reduces levels of commitment.

In addition, documents reviewed and primary data collected attest to many trainings (326 persons trained) conducted to various groups on advocacy as a means to engage the Government to fulfil its obligation as duty bearer. The two instances, the skills were used to engage the Government to be more accountable on improving accessibility of basic services were requests to provide teachers in Valleyta and Diggs schools.

The ET further, established that the PID model has a system of providing programmatic feedback upstream structures such as, Bishops' office and other relevant government.

ministries/departments. However, this yet to be fully utilized and capacities harnessed sufficiently for programme improvement.

The PID model still faces challenges of weaning communities of donor dependency. There was enough evidence of communities wanting to continue relaying on donor support – despite the 12 plus years of support. This was a trend picked after the internal civil war- when international community responded to their plight.
The tripartite agreement has also not worked very well. The Government has not kept fully her side of commitment to supply teachers and conduct routine supervision/monitoring to supported projects as a way of ensuring sustainability and ownership.

Furthermore, the model has not been able to solve the issue of behavioural change. People have the knowledge but there is a big disconnect between knowledge and practice – which to some degree affects sustainability of the completed projects for future generations.

While the PID model is very effective in program delivery, at the community level it has not been fully embraced with the letter and spirit for which it was intended. There exists a risk of compromising ownership and sustainability of the initiatives. It has not proactively addressed community vulnerabilities that come with mindset, attitudes and practice.

3.3.3 To what extent have the activity-level objectives contributed to the broader objectives aimed at increasing community access to essential basic services in the target areas within Water, Sanitation, Health and Education thus contributing towards Liberia poverty reduction program in meeting SDGs targets?
Finding # 8
Through the documents review and field consultations, the ET found out that all activity-level objectives and indicators were aligned to broader CODEVPRO programme objectives. All the community requests and proposals were in line with increasing community accessibility to essential basic services such as safe water, sanitation, self-empowerment, infrastructure and education within programme target areas. None of the implemented activities was outside the portfolio of LUMDS' mandate of improving access to essential basic services. All the sub- projects are greatly contributing towards Liberia's poverty reduction program and meeting SDGs targets in SDG 1- End poverty, SDG 3- Good health and well-being, SDG 4- inclusive and equitable quality education and SDG 6- Clean water and sanitation – through implementation of current activities.

3.3.4 Were there missed opportunities? (Supplementary question)
The evaluation process did not quiet find any substantial missed opportunities. All project interventions responded to the plight of local community's needs. For example, in education outcome "the education projects have reduced future illiteracy and high school drop-out levels. Which the ET learned are due to teenage pregnancies, distances to schools, influence of quick money by harvesting palm oil, motorcycle riding – especially for boys, some parents prioritizing farm-work against education and some children feeling over-grown for their current respective classes.

The missed opportunity would be the lack of mobilization and participation of government officials during the summary evaluation workshops to clearly understand the impact of LAC/UMC/ LUMDS investment in improving accessibility to basic services. The ET notes that if they were present, they would probably make decisions on the floor and which can be an opportunity for LUMDS staff.

It would be also an opportunity for Government to hear the challenges faced by their officers from the county through an external source – and possibly respond to their plea. The other opportunity probably missed is the invitation of senior ministry level officers to the Annual Conference as keynote speakers. This would be an opportunity for them to listen to communities and appreciate LAC/UMC interventions through CODEVPRO activities.

3.3.5 What have been the unintended outcomes – positive and negative – of the model, if any, and how have these influenced the progress?
Positive unintended outcomes
Finding # 9
Interviews with both key informants and community groups indicted that the PID model is creating positive impacts in more communities than original planned. When requests for support are made, it is normally a single community that tenders. But during implementation and use – more communities' benefit. For instance, John Dean School serves 7 communities, Ki-Diabolo school, the only school with senior high serves 13 communities, Klehn Town Bridge, serves 3 counties. All these projects are benefiting communities far and wide.

The ET also found out that the initiatives have opened communities to access other services. For instance, the Klehn Bridge has become a gateway to other services such as communication masts and solar systems including a paved all-weather road to the community and surrounding villages. The town also received a hand pump courtesy of another development partner -thus expanding the accessibility to safe drinking water.

In John Dean School, through the skills imparted using the PID model of self-empowerment, the school management is exploring the possibilities of converting un-used structures in the school compound to dormitories to accommodate students from far flung communities at a small fee including accommodation for teachers. This will be an income generating activity for the school – an element of self-reliance.

Negative unintended outcomes
The evaluation team observed and witnessed overwhelming demand for services.
It was established that some communities have not been honest in presenting their requests for support and have kept crucial information from development partners in order to secure support. For instance, there were cases where communities requested and received support in sectors that had already been supported before, but due to negligence the infrastructure had broken down. This trend has the potential to sustain dependency and kill local initiatives.

The current settlement plan for rural Liberia – where communities live in cross-net structures crowned together calls for better planning to allow construction of facilities such as toilets. As

much as the PID model advocates for total sanitation in communities it has not been able to address town planning issue, which affects achievement of community led total sanitation.

3.4: Programme Effectiveness

3.4.1: Introduction
This section attempts to answer the questions in the ToR on programme effectiveness. Which basically presents and discusses progress towards the achievements of set outcomes and outputs. The focus is to determine the effectiveness of CODEVPRO interventions in improving lives of the beneficiaries and whether communities are more sustainable, leading to improved living conditions.

3.4.2: To which degree has the programme achieved its objective as stated in the programme plan? In terms of the Long-term overarching development goals: ("Improved lives and sustainable communities.")
Finding # 10
For decades going back to 1847, Liberia has been struggling with the provision of basic social services to its people especially after the 14 years of civil war - which had a huge negative impact on the lives of many Liberians, particularly in the rural areas.

The urgency to support improved lives and sustainable communities was evident throughout the evaluation process. The programme is progressively achieving its overarching goal of improving access of basic services to needy communities, as evidenced from project documents reviewed and field consultations. The programme has tremendously contributed to improved lives and created sustainable communities through access to safe drinking water in seven communities, improved access to elementary, junior and senior high school learners through five school projects, improved infrastructure to eight communities through provision of culverts and bridges and capacity built 25 communities in areas of project management, conflict resolution, gender equality and empowerment, advocacy skills and environmental protection all aimed at achieving overarching development goal of improved lives.

To which degree has the programme achieved the programme objective as stated in the programme plan, On Outcome/immediate objective of the programme :(Improved living conditions for people in communities where there are UMC congregations and communities with urgent need.)
Finding # 11
The evaluation process recognizes that the objective of the programme to improve living conditions for people within UMC congregations and beyond is on positive progress. In 2019 the project beneficiaries reached were approximately 26,500 both direct and indirect. For instance, in Kiammie, the residents consumed unsafe water from the creeks. The creek water sources are neither treated nor protected. They are used for fishing, washing and bathing thus causing more danger to downstream communities. In addition, this exposes downstream communities to water borne diseases.

Economically the programme has reduced the expenses for treating water borne diseases. Before the programme, on average 3 children would be taken to the clinic which is 3-hour walk. Due to

the programme the rate has dropped to about one or non in a month hence saving the treatment costs. The programme has put in place a mechanism of purchasing chlorine from the monthly household payment levy. This mean all the water is treated and safe for drinking and cooking – thus improving living conditions through water quality.

Further, easy access to water has also created extra time for women to engage in other productive economic activities that include soap making, bread - baking and threshing of rice. Some of the women said, "We just relax to re-energize for next day's work".

A married woman at Kiammie said:
"The hand pump has helped women to access water near homes. This has provided time to do other economic activities unlike before when we were collecting water from the creek. Even the water borne disease incidences have greatly reduced leaving the community healthier".

These positive effects are also felt among the school going students, particularly girls. They observed, they no longer take long time to access water, leaving more time for their studies and other educational activities.

In education, the ET found out that these five schools are strategically positioned and centrally located in the communities to serve multiple communities with similar challenges. The schools in particular have extremely reduced congestions in pre-existing facilities, creating more room for more students to learn with a multiplier effect of reducing future illiteracy and massive drop- out.

In John Dean community the adults are excited about the opportunity presented for the evening and weekend adult literacy classes. The modern school is attractive complete with solar power installation. The school management is exploring possibilities for accommodating students and teachers from far who cannot commute on daily – following overwhelming requests. The school has created room for 12th Grade students from within and neighbouring feeder schools.

A respondent in FGD # 17 said:
"I have received many requests for vacancy, and many more are coming".

The ET further, realized that most school in rural Liberia offer elementary education upto grade six. In K. Diabolo School, once completed, will serve other 13 feeder schools to access grade 12. This will tremendously reduce the previous costs associated with grade 12 students attending county head-quarters schools – which also required them to pay for own accommodation and commute costs.
Training on environmental protection has equipped communities for safe disposal of garbage, use of underground water, forest management and conservation. The training on advocacy laid a lot of emphasis on communities as right-holder to lobby for action from duty-bearers. The trainings also empowered them to empress democracy and accountability as foundational principle for electing representatives.

In response to the question on what could have happened if LUMDS did not intervene in these communities, the respondents who included government representative, IP and community used strong statements such as "we will perish as a nation," – "many people will be sick," "women in Boyee will experience high maternal mortality rates," "we will be drinking our own human

waste, sickness will have persisted," and "there would be many dropouts, many students will retrieve to farm work."

The infrastructure projects consisting of community guest house, bridges and culverts which are changing the local economies and providing employment. The surrounding communities are now self-empowered to some extend and are using the income (case of Gbecohn guest-house) to renovate and repair old community infrastructures.

All these interventions have profoundly improved the living conditions of local communities and empowered them towards own community development.

However, during Focus Group Interview # 4, they said:
"The bridge has opened up our community to risks such as insecurity. The bridge currently serves seven communities, three counties of Bong, Grand Bassa and Nimba and links up to the republic of Guinea. With this flow of people, some may harbor ill motivates hence exposing us to security issues".

To mitigate the security issue – the GOL have deployed police officers in Klehn Town

To which degree has the programme achieved the programme objective as stated in the programme plan, on anticipated results (outputs) for the entire period- *"Implementation of a variety of sustainable community projects in accordance with the programmes priorities.*
Finding # 12
Under the review period the programme has to-date achieved the following:
- Approximately 26,500 people reached with program interventions in immediate and surrounding communities.
- 7 communities received WASH intervention (wells with hand-pumps)
- 3 Communities received infrastructure support (bridges, culverts and guest house)
- 5 communities received educational support renovations, extensions and annexes complete with teachers' staff room, desks, blackboards, library with reading materials, modern washrooms – some school like John Dean has three teachers' offices fitted with cabinets)
- 2 communities received support with health facilities

The inclusion of modern washrooms in the newly renovated/constructed schools is excellent. However, as per WHO guidelines one-toilet -door is to serve 50 students, for case of boys, and 25 for girls, and at separate washrooms for teachers. This has not been achieved in CODEVPRO supported schools. For instance, John Dean School does not have a hand pump in the school compound thus presenting a challenge of accessing water in the modern flash washrooms. Currently the students are using water from the nearby creek or community pump while in school – which are both a distance.

Intermediated outputs of these interventions

Health Clinic Specific interventions
- 125 persons per day case load (on average);800 persons were sensitized on health-related issues;8,600 people benefitting from health care services (2018 data);2 health facilities that have core essential medicines available and affordable on a sustainable basis.

Education Specific interventions
- 5 New schools were constructed;300 students received health club training; 5 PTA boards trained on their roles and responsibilities; 40 new PTA board members recruited and trained; 29 teachers trained on pedagogical techniques assigned to schools and 28 teachers deployed to programme supported schools.

Capacity strengthening interventions
- 18 women in strategic decision-making positions; 254 persons (male) trained on organizational skills and leadership; 220 persons (women) trained on organizational skills and leadership ;2 persons with PWD trained on organizational skills and leadership.
- 200 male volunteers engaged by communities; 100 female volunteers engaged by communities; 476 persons sensitized on women role in society; 15 women taking lead to inspire other women to get involved with community and societal matters and 20 rights holders holding duty bearers accountable.

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
- 7 Hand water pumps installed, and 7 WASH committees trained.

3.5: Programme Efficiency

3.5.1: Introduction
This section attempts to answer the questions on efficiency. Project efficiency refers to the extent which the various activities transformed the available resources (both human and financial) into intended outputs in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness.

3.5.2: Make an assessment about the efficiency of the resources used in the programme in relation to the conducted activities.
Finding # 13
The total 5-year programme funding from UMC Norway is USD 1,659,000 - disbursed through UMC Liberia conference down to programme office. At the time of programme assessment, the disbursed funds to LUMDS were USD 1,001,689 for the 3-years of project implementation (See Annex 3). From the analysis and observation of the activities conducted, the ET found out that most projects were of good quality and usability as per the GoL standards -thus correlating with the money spent.

However, there could have been some saving if projects were in communities well serviced with good road network and close availability of building materials. Because of current situation, costs on transport and vehicle rental to transport materials across the projects was high and use of portable electricity for welding purposes during construction.

The infrastructural projects such as schools, guest house, bridges, hand pumps and clinics were worth the value spent. For instance, John Dean School has 8 new classrooms, 25 desks, 85 armchairs and benches – with each bench seating 3 students- while arm chairs are for 7-8 grade, 3 teacher offices, 2-door modern washrooms for males and females, 8 teacher table plus chair, 3

wooden cabinets, teacher's offices are finished with ceramic tiles, new 8 blackboards and mini equipped reading library with tables, shelves, books and plain wooden chair.

Table 1 below tabulates the total money allocated and spent on each community project. In reality, the project's cost more money than allocated, whereby about 5% came from community contribution in form of land, sand, water and unskilled labour.

Accredited auditors report gave the programme a clean bill of health and indicates the funds have been efficiently utilized as per planned activities.

The quality of conducted activities was also found to have a correlation to the technical support provided. LUMDS, using resources assigned, employed qualified technical staff for CODEVPRO (2 engineers, and 4 programme staff) who continue to offer various technical support to the communities. Documentation and discussions with various participants indicated that retention of the professionals throughout implementation period was an advantage.

In addition, the resource of time used in the programme in relation to the conducted activities was adequate. The management, coordination and coherence within CODEVPRO human resource is largely effective and leads to the achievement of results. The programme has a board of directors whose roles and responsibilities included.
- Oversee the overall implementation of the programme
- Provide strategic direction
- Review and decide on the recommendations made by the technical team
- Approve implementation reports, work plans and budgets
- Undertake advocacy for programme and resource mobilization

At the community, there were project development committees whose role and responsibilities included: community mobilization; facilitate community contribution; coordination of project activities; development of work schedules; supervision of works; management after dedication; foster community net working with other partners and make sure that projects are sustained beyond donor support.

While LUMDS head office staff back-stopped the entire process and were in-charge of developing MOUs with Government and community representatives, all these worked in a symbiotic manner to see initiated activities came to completion in good time. However, the programme could have increased information sharing with other NGOs, to avoid duplication of projects within same communities and collaborate more for synergy building.

Table 1: Budget Distribution

J.S Pratt United Methodist School	total budget
assorted building materials	87,103.39
contractors labor	11,239.00
fuel/transportation	2,987.50
v. rental/transportation of materials	6,750.00
food for workers	2,465.65
accommodation/mobilization/communication	1,850.00
grand total	**112,395.54**
Klehn's town bridge	**total budget**
assorted building materials	39,129.10
contractors labor	5,600.00
fuel/transportation	1,620.90
v. rental/transportation of materials	3,450.00
food for workers	1,550.00
accommodation/mobilization/communication	650.00
grand total	**52,000.00**
John Dean Town United Methodist school	**total budget**
assorted building materials	78,450.38
contractors labor	9,460.00
fuel/transportation	2,139.62
v. rental/transportation of materials	4,250.00
food for workers	1,660.00
accommodation/mobilization/communication	540.00
grand total	**96,500.00**
Gbecohn Guest house	**total budget**
assorted building materials	24,115.48
contractors labor	3,820.00
fuel/transportation	1,150.52
v. rental/transportation of materials	2,650.00
food for workers	690.00
accommodation/mobilization/communication	400.00
grand total	**32,826.00**
Decousey Mini Bridge	***total budget***
assorted building materials	*17,994.06*
contractors labor	*2,960.00*
fuel/transportation	*560.94*
v. rental/transportation of materials	*900.00*
food for workers	*385.00*
accommodation/mobilization/communication	*200.00*

Should the activities have been carried out in another manner? Supplementary question
Finding # 14
Through discussions with various respondents, the ET found out that almost all activities implemented will not have been carried out in any other way. Projects like K-Diabolo senior high school for instance, although started by communities with support of county government at approximately USD 666, had barely left the ground. In June 2018, a funds drive was organized by the said county education office committee where each parent was to pay about $1.5 to support the project, but at the time of the evaluation very few parents had paid. Other forms of support such as pledges to procure cement was also very slow.

KII #1, said, the project would have been completed – after many years.
FGD 3, Said there is no way we would have completed the project.

The FGD, however added, that the PTA, and older students in the school were able to bake over 1500 pieces of bricks – which were added to the foundation. (The ET notes that the involvement of students in construction infringe on their rights and may amount to child labour)

In relation to other activities - wells, other schools, clinics, bridges capacity building etc, little and next to none could have happened according to those interviewed. However, the ET also found out that communities relaxed and embraced the culture of being supported by development partners whenever their requests were accepted.

A responded in FGD # 3 said:
"Since the donor took over, we have little to do. The Donor brought everything".
This statement was however, contested by other respondents who said, "communities normally play their role as enshrined in the signed MoU with LUMDS".

Could the same activities have been achieved with the use of less costly resources? Supplementary question
During observations and community discussions with project development and management committees and general community representatives, it was clear that projects would not have been less costly. This was evidenced by distance covered from LUMDS head office to communities, poor road network and no electricity connection. As per FGD #3, K. Diabolo senior high school- would have taken 5-10 years to complete – without external support.

The ET found out that the main source of livelihood in these communities is substance farming, production of palm oil and sale of charcoal. But due to the bad state of most roads - the communities cannot get their wares to the markets in good time and condition. Their main mode of transport includes carrying their produce on their heads for over 3-4 hours in some target communities to the market or reach a vehicle pick-up point. But the question is- how much can one carry on their heads – to sale and make profit for themselves and a contribute to community development! In reality communities have no extra income to invest in development work of any serious magnitude.

On further triangulation with programme management team, they observed "in all projects, communities raise approximately 5% of total cost". And to some communities, they take long to

reach this contribution. At times CODEVPRO staff are forced to use some pressure, ultimatums and threats to cancel projects to push the community to raise that contribution at roughly 60% for project to start. This is particularly critical for bigger and high value projects like clinics and schools. The ET therefore, established that even small projects like wells – would not have costed any less. Although it is doable – if only communities were committed to change and be development minded.

However, Communities can be sensitized to change their mind-set of vulnerabilities to positive engagement through peer learning, motivational speakers and more training in advocacy and positive thinking.

3.6 Empowerment Assessment and findings

This section of the report assesses the level of empowerment achieved through project interventions, guided by the Digni Empowerment Assessment Tool (EAT). Specifically, it looks at this empowerment both at the implementing partner (LUMDS) level and the target beneficiary level (target communities in Liberia)

Empowerment
Empowerment is the process by which individuals and groups are enabled to achieve their potential and utilize this potential to change and/or influence systems and structures that impede realization of their dignity. It is therefore simply put, a process of enabling individuals and groups to live dignified lives. Every development support is aimed at achieving this goal and it is against this background that Digni considers empowerment assessment an integral part of its development support.

The Evaluation Team assessed empowerment of the CODEVPRO interventions across six (6) thematic areas indicated in the assessment table below and established that the level of empowerment achieved ranged between Level 2: Output: Individual or community and Level 4: Outcome: Community and/or Society.

	DEGREE AND LEVEL OF EMPOWERMENT					
	Thematic Areas	Level 1: Output: Individual or community	Level 2: Output: Individual or community	Level 3: Outcome: Individual or Community	Level 4: Outcome: Community and/or Society	Level 5: Impact: Community/Society/ Structural
	Strengthening Civil Society (mandatory)				X	
	WASH services			X		
	Environmental stewardship		X			

Quality education				X	
Economic Empowerment			X		
Gender Equality (mandatory)				X	
Total assessment of project			X		

Strengthening Civil Society

The evaluation rates empowerment for this thematic area at level 4: Outcome: Community and/or Society.

The transformation that is recorded at the partner level demonstrates great strides in empowerment through CODEVPRO and other Digni funded interventions. The implementing partner has over the period under review, changed from a department under the Church (Department of Community Services-DCS) to an independent entity (Liberia United Methodist Development Services-LUMDS) with its own Board of Management that bring to the management relevant and varied skills and experience much needed for the operations of the partner. Staff capacity building has enhanced service delivery and by the time of evaluation, the partner had secured spaces in national government decision making forums such as the Education Stakeholders Forum. Even though the impact of their participation in this forum is yet to be fully felt, the progress so far is indicative of possible future influence in the area of education in the country. The partner is also in the process of seeking and negotiating for more spaces within other sectors of the economy. Memorandums of Understanding are developed between the partner and duty bearers even though the evaluation established a lapse in commitment on the part of duty bearer in most sectors. These memorandums still remain a strong basis for advocacy and other forms of engagement to get the duty bearers to act especially in scaling up social services delivery to the project beneficiaries.

At the beneficiary level, communities are organized with project management structures and through CODEVPRO, these structures have received training in relevant areas that have improved management of education, WASH and economic initiatives such as community income generating activities like the Community Guest House. Many beneficiary communities through this organization are making effort in local resource mobilization even though not much. However, while substantive training has been provided to these structures, utilization of these capacities is still below optimal and there is need to move from local focus to utilization of knowledge gained to advocate for increased support from duty bearers and build more strategic partnerships that can transform current local initiatives into viable avenues for dignified lives.

WASH Services

The Evaluation team rated level of empowerment for WASH services at level 3: Outcome: Individual or Community.

Local initiatives in water, sanitation and hygiene are evident in all the project locations visited. Community knowledge on WASH has greatly improved and there is strong organization on the

management of WASH initiatives including the water hand pumps installed through CODVEPRO. Disease prevalence has drastically reduced in target communities and local populations are contributing to the sustenance of WASH initiatives through local contributions from water users. Empowerment in this area has also translated to better use of time saved by reducing distances women and girls spent previously fetching water from creeks that was also unsafe for human consumption. A gap however still exists in the disposal of human waste with many of the communities still practicing open defecation which places them at risk of contracting disease. The tendency to revert to open defecation after being declared Open Defecation Free was established to be high among communities, implying that immediately their toilets collapse, many do not construct new ones and opt to go to the bushes, which places them at risk again.

Environmental stewardship
Environmental stewardship is rated at level 2: Output: Individual or community, the least among all the thematic areas.

The evaluation established that although some knowledge on environmental stewardship was passed on to the communities through CODEVPRO initiatives, target communities like all other neighboring rural communities in Liberia, have a land use pattern that does not pay much attention on environmental protection. There is rampant clearing of bushes and forests that has seen many indigenous trees cut down. Whereas the settlement pattern provides for people to live in same locations called "towns" and live the rest of the areas for forests to thrive, these same spaces left for forests to thrive are cleared without regard for regeneration and currently the survival of these natural forests depend on the fact that population densities are still low in most parts of rural Liberia including CODEVPRO beneficiary communities. The two chiefs control utilization of the forests by allocating individual families with sections of community land for tilling but what is lacking in all these initiatives is intentional and planned reforestation and protection of natural water catchment areas. The level of logging by huge timber companies is also on the increase and it is common to see timber along the paths as one enters the communities that is either being transported out of these communities or awaiting transportation. Communities are aware of these activities and have complained in some incidences but not much attention is paid to slow down the pace of deforestation.

Quality Education
Like civil society strengthening, education ranks level 4: Outcome: Community and/or Society according to the evaluation.

Liberia's history has frustrated education and many of the older population are highly illiterate because of prevailing circumstances during their school going ages. War and conflict frustrated education by destroying infrastructure and keeping people in closed settlements for fear of attacks. It is still common to see even in the now established schools, learners who are past school going ages or in grades way below where they would be without such disruptions. This notwithstanding, the evaluation established that CODVEPRO had heavily invested in education in the remote target communities through physical infrastructure development that has enabled many learners to access this basic need. Further, teacher and PTA training has enhanced management and delivery of education programs in these schools. Literacy levels are suddenly

and fast changing in a context that has been characterized by illiteracy. The demand for education is increasing as teachers reported overwhelming requests from learners in far places willing to join CODEVPRO supported institutions. With developed infrastructure the ministry of education is deploying teachers even though this process is still slow. The commitment and participation of local communities in the development of education is demonstrated in their contribution of non-monetary items such as unskilled labor and local building materials like timber, sand and water.

Economic Empowerment
Another area of consideration for the empowerment assessment by the evaluation was Economic Empowerment and for this the evaluation team assessed changes brought by interventions in oncome generating activities. The evaluation rated empowerment under this thematic area at level 3: Outcome: Individual or Community.

Target communities are keen to hold one another and improve their plight through community income generating projects. The evaluation also established that capacity exists within these communities for large economic empowerment projects. This capacity is evidenced in the request by one of the communities to be supported to put up a multi-purpose guest house which through CODEVPRO has been built and is generating income already. A structure is in place for the management of the project and communities appreciate the benefit of having the project. This project is however underutilized and is currently making minimal profits. It has the potential to generate much more income and turn around the economic capacities of the community. A gap exists in marketing and diversification of services offered. The evaluation established that management has endeavored to market the facility and its services through local radio stations but more needs to be done to turn it into a viable investment for the community. Participation of the community members also needs to be encouraged in its marketing as currently the few member committee is the one doing everything. Opportunities exist to broaden its services, but this can be better harnessed by inclusion and invitation of the rest of the community members to play an active role. The same spirit the community had at the construction of the facility should be sustained through its management.

There is need too, to consider other ways of empowering the community at family levels in a structured manner. Currently it is entirely dependent on individual initiative with no platforms for experience sharing and mutual support for improvement of livelihoods at the family level. Such initiatives motivate community members to support community level projects.

Gender Equality.
The last thematic area assessed under empowerment was Gender Equality. The Evaluation Team rated this area at level 4: Outcome: Community and/or Society.

CODEVPRO target communities are largely patriarchal with clear male and female roles which place women in the traditional vulnerable domestic roles, denying them opportunities into ownership and control of property at the family and even limiting their participation in decision making spaces at the community or societal levels.

This state of affairs has been greatly challenged through CODEVPRO initiatives in the communities visited during the evaluation. Women are active participants in decision making processes on community project management committees and even in local administrations within these communities and are making a great difference in promoting the plight of local people. The evaluation indeed established that projects with women leaderships were performing better on average than those led by their male counter parts. In all communities visited, there were no visible contentions on having both men and women on the leaderships and management of projects and although all were achieved through voting, women found themselves into leaderships alongside men. As it was shared, this did not just happen but took months and years of training and sensitization of local communities on gender equality.

More however needs to be done in placing the women leaders into policy advocacy roles in so far as this will enhance responsiveness of duty bearers on the social needs and requests from the communities.

Overall, the Evaluation Team rated CODEVPRO empowerment at level 3 and hopes that with scaling up of ongoing intervention and placing emphasis on capacity in policy advocacy and lobby for all levels of project implementation, this can drastically shift to 4 or even the maximum score of 5 in the coming years.

3.7 Sustainability

3.6.1 Introduction
This sub-section assesses the extent to which the Community Development Program is building the individual and collective capacity of Community Based Organizations and structures to sustain their work beyond project support. And the extent to which, interventions are having impacts on the authorities and/or contribute to the Government Strategic goals, and what structures and systems are in place at the level of the LAC/UMC, LUMDS to ensure sustainability of services beyond project?

3.7.2 To what extent is the Community Development Program building the individual and collective capacity of Community Based organizations and structures to sustain their work beyond project support?
Finding # 15
Through documents review and discussions with key stakeholders, the ET found out that individuals and committees have not only been effectively included in the programme design, implementation and monitoring - but also have had their capacities strengthened through various tailor-made trainings. Sustainability was more explicit in WASH, management committees and environmental conservation. The equatorial forests are fast disappearing to charcoal burning and rotational farming. This was observed to be the commonly practiced economic activities across rural Liberians.

To what extend did these interventions have an impact on the authorities and/or contribute to the Government Strategic goals – Supplementary question

Based on programme documents reviewed and discussions with key informants, the ET established interventions which would have impact on authorities and contribute to government strategic goals that include:

- Inclusive operative partnership, collaboration in project designs, synergy building and sharing during trainings and learning from one another. This was especially evident during the identification, planning and execution of projects. All projects were in consultation and aligned to government strategic goals in relevant ministries and departments. The government representatives were actively involved during capacity building workshop - as trainers of facilitators.

What structures and systems are in place at the level of the LAC/UMC, LUMDS to ensure effective delivery of services beyond project? Supplementary question
Finding # 16
The evaluation processes identified the following structures and systems at the level of **LAC/UMC** that will ensure delivery of services beyond project phase out. The church is strategically organized into district organizations and fellowships to facilitate the active participation of every person, irrespective of age, tribe, social or economic status. These include:

- Twenty-one (21) Districts of the Conference; The Conference United Methodist Women Organization (CUMWO); The Conference United Methodist Men Organization (CUMMO); The Conference United Methodist Young Adult Fellowship (CUMYAF); The Conference United Methodist Youth Fellowship (CUMYF) and The Conference United Methodist Children's Ministry.

The church also has departments and agencies like Connectional Ministries, Human Rights Monitor, and the newly established agency- Liberia United Methodist Development Services which will continue to fund raise and offer services to vulnerable communities.

Some of the services like education will continue through its network of 130 schools comprising of primary, secondary and tertiary as well as through its 3 mission stations of Ganta, Gbanga and Camphor. Besides, the church has also strong bearing in healthcare delivery services including sustainable agriculture, environmental protection, community development, and peace building, and gender advocacy. All these institutions and agencies have inbuilt structures and systems supporting sustainability.

The church is passionate and promotes gender equality and empowerment. Through this structure it ensures women continue to be included and involved in community leadership and play key roles in community service delivery.

Structures and systems at the level of LUMDS
Participation of LUMDS staff in national and county level strategic round table discussions will continue to be a reminder of the projects mission of improving accessibility of basic social services to vulnerable communities. The different programme activities such as capacity building imparted such as financial keeping, record keeping and inventories for both cash and materials, and periodic progress reporting are key assets to sustainability upon project phase-out.

Furthermore, the Programme did not only allow local communities to participate in planning, but also take lead monitoring, security of materials, overseeing financial management and accountability and project work plans. This was meant to increase their sense of ownership and built a strong internal mechanism to safeguarding projects for future generations.

Liberia United Methodist Development Services in addition, encouraged resource mobilization strategies upon completion of projects. Communities are asked to pay some dues/levies to cater for repairs whenever it may occur and organize themselves to do extra projects in school like farms and larine blocks. However, experiences from previous dedicated projects showed that management of that levy is still an issue with a lot of mistrust within some communities.

4.0 Assessment of the West Africa Regional Centre

Finding # 17

The West Africa Regional Centre is an entity established for the purpose of academic research on Partnership in Development projects in Liberia and Sierra Leone UMC conferences - to promote research and documentation of best practices from community development for replication and scale-up.

The cooperation between UMC in Liberia and UMC-Norway started in the early 1970s when the two collaborated on several issues of mutual interest. In 2013, the partners from Norway and church leaders from both conferences (Sierra Leone and Liberia) after seeing the many achievements and results they, agreed to document them for purposes of present and future learning. The WARC was therefore, conceived to facilitate documentation, conduct educational research through three Universities cooperation (The United Methodist University (UMU) in Liberia, UMU of Sierra Leone and the Diaconal University College of Norway) with emphasis in Value based leadership. One other out-standing gap that needed to be addressed was the lack of capacities to evaluate comprehensively the impacts of Partnerships in Development model.

The center therefore, assists students to conduct research in Community Development using the PID methodology, produce publications on local community initiatives and share learnings widely.

4.1.1 What has the Centre achieved?

The ET established that following had so far been achieved by WARC:

- There is an established academic cooperation between the three institutions of United Methodist University (UMU) in Monrovia, Liberia, Sierra Leone and VID Specialized University in Oslo, Norway.
- A strategic Plan for 2019-2021 developed and rolled out.
- Sensitization and awareness creation about the Centre– through workshops, radio-talk shows and development of a journal on Value-based leadership.
- The Center has a well-established leadership structure in place consisting of a steering committee, a taskforce, academic coordinators and a research coordinator for the regional center.
- There is also stimulation of academics from the south/south and south/north cooperation through using VID interns and other universities as catalysts. There have been two Master students one from UMU Liberia, and another from VID who come to Regional Centre in Monrovia to conduct research on PID projects. Their dissertations were on women leadership and girls' education.

- The Centre serves as an academic resource under the UMU for master's students and acts as liaison office between universities in Liberia, Sierra Leone and Norway. This liaison includes other universities in the region in areas of community development research.

- At United Methodist University, programs for development in organizational leadership at undergraduate and master level are complete and operational.

4.1.2 Where is the Centre Now?

At United Methodist University, more Masters' students are being encouraged to carry out in-depth research using knowledge of PID and information materials at the Centre. One such student has been cleared by UMU to do research on the "Impact of Community Ownership on Sustainable Development: A case study of Boeggzaye and St. John community."

There are plans to use the Annual Conference Session to market and funds raise for the Centre and extend the same to other horizons and UN Agencies and other like-minded donors.

4.1.3 Where is the Center Going?

The Center currently receives interns from the United Methodist University, specifically through the Social Work Department thereby providing additional manpower needed at the Center.

The center management continues to make fundraising plans and through the annual conferences of Liberia, Sierra Leone and Norway to enable it to deliver its objectives.

It is also developing income generating programs through support to students in partnering universities and beyond on thesis writing process – to be taught at the Centre.

There are plans to relocate the Center to a more spacious place either at UMU or any other place which can be suitable for hosting such higher learning institution. This will enhance productivity and conducive work environment.

Renewal of the WARC coordinator contract is ongoing. The previous contract was on part-time basis. Hopefully - the next contract will be fulltime.

There are plans to secure scholarships for research on PID projects for Liberian, Sierra Leonean and Norwegian students.

5.0 General Challenges and Lessons Learned

Challenges

In the Results Framework, the ET established that some outcomes and some key performance indicators were not SMART (properly identified and articulated). In some cases, not all baseline data was available, for example, Outputs 2.1, 5.3, 5.8, 5.12 and 6.8. This made it a bit difficult to track the results and rate them accordingly. The evaluation team had to use observation and methodical judgment to assess and rate such indicators. For instance, indicators such as 1.1, 3.2, 8.1 and 5.12 was difficult to comprehend what was being measured.

Self-reliance and sustenance of the West Africa Regional Center is weak with no clear or proper funding channels. The Center has a three-year Strategic Plan which is due to end in one year's time and some aspiration of that strategy are yet to be met.

Low uptake of knowledge and use among project community beneficiaries. The program has been in existence for just over 12 years, any yet staff are still struggling with community behavioural change. During interviews, no concrete convincing response was given as to why communities cannot appreciate and adopt WHO recommendations on good hygiene practices.

LUMDS is experiencing sustainability challenges in some of the schools they have improved through the programme. The Government working style and attitudes have not been fully proactive to support this agenda. They have continued to offer minimal support especially in routine monitoring of projects and deployment of both trained and volunteer teachers. Consultations with government respondents indicated challenges of limited resources from central government. One officer said, "we are forced to tailor our work-plans to align with development partners – in order to utilize their transport and any other necessary support."

Local UMC pastors have not been fully incorporated into CODEVPRO activities in some areas, yet they remain a strategic partner at the community level to ensure community support and ownership of initiatives through mobilization of congregations towards community development.

Community attitudes and practices demonstrate heavy dependency on external support, a factor that is associated with the period immediately after the civil war when international community came in to support with much needed community supplies. Transition from this has remained difficult for development partners to facilitate as communities still perceive external support is majorly the way to community development.

Lessons Learned
Women leaderships have been more effective, on average, in attracting more community participation and sustained commitment to community project initiatives than is the case with male leaderships.

Change is a process. It requires sustained efforts to get communities that have been trapped into vicious cycles of poverty onto the path of development and place them into the driving role towards self-sustainability.

Identifying the real need and priority of the community is key for securing their participation and ownership of development initiatives. This calls for going beyond the gatekeepers and elites' views and involving the real voices of respective communities. It further goes beyond what may appear obvious to external development workers.

LUMDS target communities have structures that can be turned around into great assets for local development. Structures such as clan/town chiefs are strong entry points for community mobilization and organization. Continuous capacity building for these structures and adequate preparation for exit - remains an important and immediate task for CODEVPRO staff.

6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations
Conclusions
Based on the evaluation findings the below are the conclusions

Conclusion 1: Evidence from the evaluation process indicated that CODEVPRO is significantly contributing to provision of basic services such as safe drinking water, conducive learning environments, WASH, and capacity transfers to vulnerable communities through previous and current project. This conclusion is based on findings 2, 4, 9, and 12 which largely address the achievement of programme objectives, unintended outcomes contribution towards Liberia poverty reduction and in meeting SDG targets.

Conclusion 2: CODEVPRO, through the PID model in its strategic design is delivering set objectives. The positive changes are demonstrated in the empowerment, informed, mind molded and capacity-built communities taking a lead to address own felt needs sustainably. This conclusion is based on findings 1, 5and 6.

Conclusion 3: CODEVPRO largely reached target communities in Liberia including LAC/UMC congregations and beyond in the remote needy areas of Liberia with urgent need for basic social services. This conclusion is based on finding 5.

Conclusion 4: There is enough evidence to determine the effort of CODEVPRO to deliver all program outcomes and outputs within specified timelines and budgets. This conclusion is based on findings 11 to13 where all worked together for the satisfactory results, professionally utilizing available limited resources (both technical and financial). However, the poorly serviced county road networks are having a strain on finances and long distances covered to target communities.

Conclusion 5: There is evidence indicating sustainability of project activities beyond implementation period. The measures taken include placing beneficiaries at the center through the PID model. The program is also forming and revitalizing non- functional community committees, imparting new skills and including women in community decision making structures- who have thus far proved to be useful. This is based on finding 15-16.

However, for the initiatives to achieve sustainable behavioural change and gains made from project' activities, there is need for county representatives and volunteers to change tact from current practice to one that continuously reminds them of the reality of program exit and the dangers that come with dependency.

Recommendations

Based on the findings in section three, the ET considers the following recommendations:

Recommendations	Party Responsible
There is need to ensure that the renovated /constructed schools adhere to WHO guideline of 1 toilet door per 50 students for boys and one door for 25 girls. This can be achieved by investing in pit latrines rather than the current modern washrooms – with few doors.	LUMDS/ PTA
Consider, collecting and collating feedback from stakeholders to assess the effects of all activities conducted on community and government. This may inform future adjustments and design of new programs. – The feedback can be a published information for learning purposes and also as a fund-raising document from like-minded donors.	LUMDS,
There is need to strengthen the operative, coordination and cooperation with government authorities in an effort to honor the MOU and future sustainability of the projects. This can be achieved through invitation of senior government leaders and decision makers to high-level meeting of LAC and LUMDS.	LUMDS
WARC is academic based with focus on research and value-based leadership. It will be prudent if the Centre can be re-located to the United Methodist University Campus for proper supervision and utilization by students. LUMDS can continue to be a source of information and facilitate students who desire to use PID model and activities to do their thesis and other forms of research.	WARC Task Force
Invest in more capacity within LUMDS staff, community leadership and project management structures on policy, lobby and advocacy to mobilize masses to lobby government for improved basic services such as roads, deployment of teachers to remote schools.	LUMDS
Empower communities to appreciate spreading out from current town/villages settings to sufficiently create space and facilitate adoption of WHO water and sanitation health habits. Most of the towns are a bit crowded and do not have space for structures such as pit latrines.	LUMDS
There is need to encourage and support Peer-to peer learning through exchanges visits among community leaderships and community project management teams. Such visits should be designed in a manner that supports evidential and practical learning.	LUMDS
There is need to develop a community weaning strategy a head of project exits to new programming – "changing from being heavy in "hardware" to "software" (skills based).	LUMDS

The ET presents the following proposals for looking forward:
Consider designing a program that will amplify the progressive achievements of communities through the peer-to-peer learning and exchanges interventions. The West Africa Regional Competence Center presents a great avenue through which such learning can be achieved.

In enhancing advocacy work. Programme staff could consider strategically engaging government authorities and especially those in high decision-making positions by inviting them to public functions and events where they show case their community work and present gaps that arise out of low participation and support from Government. This kind of advocacy should not be combative but rather one that seeks mutual understanding and collaborative support for community development. It may require therefore that LUMDS develop a clear advocacy strategy that guides its work in this area and which should be owned and practiced by all relevant staff and community volunteers. This may call for targeted capacity building in the area of advocacy for staff, Church leadership and Community leadership structures.

At the community level, staff should facilitate and promote citizen participation in their own development agenda and related affairs. This could include use of town hall meetings where local citizens are invited to table their development priorities and challenges in the presence of strategic government authorities responsible for the various development sectors.

It is also important that LUMDS utilizes existing avenues and opportunities such policy lobby and advocacy work that include mass media. The United Methodist Church of Liberia has a radio station which presents a unique opportunity to host community leaders to discuss issues that concern them and whenever possible invite representatives from Government to respond to some of these issues.

7.0 Annexes

Annex 1: Progress towards Achievement of Expected Outcomes and Results

Results	Key Performance Indicators	Target communities	Progress towards Achievement of results
Outcome 1: Civil Society Strengthening	# of persons organized from both direct and indirect beneficiaries (leaders organized) # of persons trained in organizational skills # of persons trained in leadership skills # of groups organized with women in leadership	List examples of these 12 Communities 1. Gorblee 2. Kleh Town 3. Kammie Town 4. Johnny Fineboy 5. Yarkpolala 6. Tormue 7. Tolomani 8. Decoursey 9. John Dean 10. John Dean 11. JS. Pratt 12. K. Diabolo	To-date the program has targeted 84 persons (84%) within 2018-2020 from 12 communities, with a selection of 7 persons by a community. This was to strengthen and accelerate community ownership, participation, advocacy amongst others. These groups were organized using permanent leadership structure approach; such as development committees and Parent, Teacher Association (PTAs), Community Health Volunteer Committees and WASH Committees within their communities to help them find solution to some of the challenges they face. These groups consist of women, men and youth representatives. Thus far, all the communities have established and accountable leadership in place and have the skills of empowerment. Additionally, these skills have tremendously helped communities to set own achievable milestones e.g., mobilization of the 60% requirement of community contribution before start of any initiative, acquisition of Tribal certificate for hardware projects like schools, clinics and guest houses, and proper identification and selection of both project and management committee persons – ensuring gender inclusivity.
Outcome 2: Local communities are able to identify and solve their challenges together	# of volunteers mobilized to serve local communities solve challenges together	1. Gorblee 2. Kleh Town 3. Kammie Town 4. Johnny Fineboy 5. Yarkpolala	The establishment of these various committees have enhanced community member's participation in project implementation, strengthen community ownership, gained leadership skills, and advocates on behalf of the larger community. They also help communities identify and implement some self-help initiatives for themselves. As a result, projects like bridges and culverts have had huge

		6. Tormue 7. Tolomani 8. Decoursey 9. John Dean 10. JS. Pratt 11. K. Diabolo 12. Harrison Grisby 13. Gbasson Town 14. Whiteplains 15. Fanti Town 17. Dementa 18. Velleyta Vartekeh Ta	impacts and had multiplier effects on local economies such as extending working hours in the farms, accessing markets, reduced fatalities, and opened up the communities to access other services from investors (communication mast and solar system in Klehn town) and enabled other development partners to come and provide basic services like hand pump, facilitating safe drinking water.
Outcome 3: Communities provide equal opportunities for women and men	# of women in decision making bodies # of persons sensitized on women role in society	Vartekeh Ta Tormue Tolomani Yarkpolola Fanti Town John Dean J.S. Pratt \Valleyta Johnny Fineboy	To-date 44 women are in leadership positions which is 115% against baseline of 38 women. And 43% (1071) have been sensitized on women role in society. Before CODEVPRO interventions, women voice in these communities were never heard, especially among their male counterparts. They never participated in decision making. The program has however, turned this around through constant engagement on gender inclusivity -through capacity buildings, advocacies, encouragement, to speak in public gatherings etc. They are playing key leadership roles in their communities and are working closely with their male counterparts. Women are also serving as pump mechanics in most of the WASH communities. In addition, the impact of women in leadership continues to be felt.
Outcome 4: Rights holders are holding duty bearers	# of persons trained in advocacy initiatives	Harper Kiammie Town Decoursey Klehn Town	326 persons from baseline of 711 (45%) including male, female and PWDs from five communities were trained in advocacy and 11% (37) continues to volunteer their time, services and serve as liaisons between the communities and their leaders

accountable	# of persons participating in advocacy initiatives	Johnny Fine boy John Dean Town	However, the huge difference between training and utilization of skills is something for further investigation e.g., delivery and contents of the trainings.
Outcome 5: Students in target communities acquire relevant education of high quality	# of students enrolled in school # of trained teachers in classroom # of schools constructed # of classrooms constructed # WASH facilities constructed # of WASH facilities rehabilitated # of trained teachers in pedagogical techniques # of educational services available for students # of persons serving as PTA Leaders # of PTA sets trained	Valleyta, Vartekeh Town, Dementa, Frank Diggs and Boegeezayee schools PTA set were (John Dean Town And one combined for Vartekeh, valleyta, Dementa Frank Diggs, Mufeeta).	The programme thus far has conducted health club trainings and health check for the students, joint capacity building workshop for student leaders, refresher training for teachers, school construction including classrooms, pumps, latrine and hand wash station Prior to the above interventions, all of the above schools were in a makeshift kind of buildings (initial photos depict this). There were no teachers in those schools, PTA organizations were also not functional, and retention rate for students was very low. After intervention, all the schools have been transformed to modern structures with enough space; disable friendly, latrines, reading rooms with books and safe drinking water. The PTAs have been re-organized trained and strengthened, the enrollment of students also increased and the GOL through the Ministry of Education has be able to assigned 2-3 new teachers to each of these school and community leadership have continued to recruit volunteer teachers to beef up the teaching staffs. Some schools benefited from solar lighting systems to enable communities them conduct adult literacy programs for mature boys and girls who dropped out of school for other reasons and are mature for current classes.
Outcome 6: Communities have access and make use of improved and quality health care for their personal well being	# of persons benefitting directly # of persons benefitting indirectly # of Community health Sensitizations training conducted at the community level # of persons sensitized/informed on	Gorblee Dementa Klehn Town Frank Diggs Boegeezayee Valleyta Vartekeh Ta	Accumulatively people benefiting directly from health centre is 25,111 up from 12,002 at baseline. And indirectly it is 11,709 against 2150 at baseline. In order to improve the health care delivery services in some of these communities, the program worked with the GOL and the community members and constructed a health centre that is presently catering for more 3,500 people in District #3, Grand Bassa County.

	health-related issues # of people accessing health care		The program through the health authority has also provided series of health-related trainings for midwives, Traditional Birth Attendance, (TBA) and created awareness on communicable deceases such as HIV/AIDS, TB, and Malaria. Community members are also trained on best behaviour change practices that led to some construct own family latrines (e.g., Kiammie 23 HHs), constructed dish racks, cloth lines, cleaning their surroundings, and constructed hand wash stations. All of the above interventions have brought great change to these communities.
Outcome 7: Communities have access to improved institutional sanitation and safe drinking water	# of water points available # of households accessing safe water	Kiammie, Johnny Farm, and Weala	To-date the programme has constructed/rehabilitated 10 water points against 7 at baseline. About 2500 community members are now accessing safe water.
Outcome 8: Economic Empowerment	# of self-help initiatives undertaking by communities # of community members trained in income generating activities	Valleyta and Frank Diggs, Gbamokollie and vartekeh towns	After the Liberian civil crisis ended, much support from international community particularly development partners came in to assist in re-construction. However, this much need support has over the years, had negative influence to some level on local citizens - who have gotten used to receiving support from NGOs or GOL. This has affected communities not to take on self-initiative to develop. The CODEVPRO interventions have continued to educate and engage with communities like Frank Diggs and others to break this barrier. Frank Diggs community and the PTA have used this effort to construct self-help latrine and school farm. The plantains from the farms are used to feed the students while some are sold, and proceeds used to pay volunteer teachers in the school. Whereas Vartekeh Ta took self-help project to construct a kitchen now used to prepare food for the students.

Annex 2: Annual and Total Results of the CODEVPRO Programme

Result description as per project document		Period						All-2018-2020
Strengthening civil society/capacity building								
	2017	**2018**		**2019**		**2020**		**Totals**
	Baselines	Output Target	Actual Achieved	Output Target	Actual Achieved	Output Target	Actual Achieved	
Outcome 1: Civil Society Strengthening								
Output 1: Communities are organized for civil society engagement that leads to positive change	100	20	21	*35*	35	35	50	106
People Organized	7,775	20	21	35	41	35	49	111
Persons trained in organizational skills	1,337	300	269	525	476	525	350	1095
Persons trained in leadership skills	1,337	300	267	525	476	525	49	792
Groups organized with women in leadership	19	4	3	7	3	7	7	13
Outcome 2: Local communities are able to identify and solve their challenges together								
Output 1: Volunteers mobilized to serve local communities	0	280	245	525	300	**525**	**425**	**970**
Outcome 3: Communities provide equal opportunities for women and men								
Women represented in local decision-making bodies over total decision makers	38	8	12	14	21	14	11	44
Persons sensitized on women role in society	2,488	280	245	525	476	525	350	1071
Outcome 4: Rights holders are holding duty bearers accountable								
Persons trained in advocacy initiatives to influence decision makers	711	45	269	80	22	85	35	326
Persons participating in advocacy initiatives to influence decision makers	711	45	15	80	22	85	35	72
Education								
Outcome 5: Students in target communities acquire relevant education of high quality								
Students in school	750	425	426	165	245	**295**	845	1516
Qualified teachers in schools' classrooms	0	9	24	6	28	**5**	30	82
Teachers trained in pedagogical techniques	0	6	24	2	28	**3**	6	58
Educational services rendered to students	0	3	0	3	2	**3**	6	8
Schools constructed	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
Organization of PTA/School Board	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	5

Training for PTA members	0	5	2	5	2	5	3	7
WASH facilities constructed	13	2	2	3	3	4	5	10
WASH facilities rehabilitated	4	1	0		1	0	1	1
Classrooms provided for learners in schools	0	13	5	13	9	**7**	**8**	**22**
Outcome 6: Communities have access and make use of improved and quality health care for their personal well being								
Persons benefitting directly from health centres	12,002	11,000	7,111	0	5,000	4,500	13,000	25,111
Persons benefitting indirectly health centres	2,150	5,500	1,109	0	3,600	3,000	7,000	11,709
Community health Sensitizations	0	2	1	2	2	2	2	5
Persons sensitized/informed on health-related issues	0	240	250	420	400	675	500	1,150
People visiting healthcare per day	3,200	0	0	150	125	150	110	235/300
Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH)								
Outcome 7: Communities have access to improved institutional sanitation and safe drinking water								
Water points available in selected communities	7	2	2	3	3	3	5	10
Number of communities accessing water	3	2	1	0	3	4	5	9
Economic Empowerment								
Outcome 8: Economic Empowerment								
Self-help initiatives undertaking by communities	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	4
Community members trained in income generating activities	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Please Note: Some of the below indicators and others in the log-frame are not clear.

- 1.1 # of persons organized over direct beneficiaries and # of direct & indirect beneficiaries (leaders organized per community members /year)
- % of community leading their initiatives and change
- 3.2.4# of persons setting themselves apart as pace setters for women participation (ave of 3 pers / community)
- 8.1# of men with increase income (60% of community members with income related activities)
- 4Percent increase in students overall average academic performance
- 5.12.5# and results of partnership/ stake holder's advocacy for the assignment of trained teachers to schools

Annex 3: CODEVPRO Budget 2018-2022

Budget						
Name of Organization: Liberia Annual Conference of The United Methodist Church						
Budget year 2018 -2022						
Project number	**community Development Program**					
Date of contract with BN						
Budget	Budget 2018	Budget 2019	Budget 2020	Budget 2021	Budget 2022	Total
Currency						
USD						
Exchange rate (1NOK)						F11
Project income:						
Recurrent grant NORAD (90 %)						0
Norwegian partners grant (10%)						0
National organizations grant						0
Local income	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other income						0
Interest income						0
Total Project income	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Project cost						0
Investment:						0
Office equipment etc.	0	0	2,500	0	0	4.2
Vehicles		40,000	0	0	0	22
Other Investment	0		2,500	0	0	1.25
Total Investment						**27.45**
Recurrent cost:						0
salaries expatriate	0	0	0	0	0	0
salaries national staff	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	21

National social Security	2,832	2,832	2,832	2,840	3,600	
consultants / auditing	8,000	8,000	8,000	10,000	8,000	10
Training	9,000	9,000	10,000	13,492	9,000	44
Temporary Lumpsum	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	
Administrative cost	16,568	16,568	17,000	17,000	17,000	15.7
Transport costs/travel	20,000	20,000	21,000	21,000	18,800	13.668
Sub Total	**122,900**	**162,900**	**130,332**	**130,832**	**122,900**	
Community projects	**183,900**	**158,900**	**185,968**	**188,968**	**168,900**	483
Support from Norway	-		-			226.587
Evaluation						21
Competence development	**25,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**12,000**	**30,000**	71.424
Regional Center	?	?				0
Evaluation			5,500		10,000	0
Total Recurrent cost	**147,900**	**172,900**	**145,832**	**142,832**	**162,900**	**772,364**
						0
Total Project cost	**183,900**	**158,900**	**185,968**	**188,968**	**168,900**	**886,636**
Project result	**331,800**	**331,800**	**331,800**	**331,800**	**331,800**	**1,659,000**
Key figures application						-933.829
Recurrent grant NORAD (90%)						-840.446
Adm. support Norway (8%)						-67.236
Total application						-907.682

Annex 4: Evaluation Respondents

Community & Project	Group/Individual	No. of persons interviewed		Total
		Males	**Females**	
Weinsue (Bong County)- K. Diabolo school	Teachers	6	0	6
	District Education Officer	1	0	1
	PTA Committee	8	3	11
	Students	1	0	1
Yarkapolola (Bong County)-WASH	WASH Management Committee	5	3	8
	General Community	13	20	33
	County WASH Officer	1	0	1
Gbecohn (Bong County)-Community IGA (Multi-purpose Guest House)	Project Management Committee	3	1	5
	General Community	6	2	8
	Caretaker	0	1	1
Klehn Town (Grand Bassa County)- Community Bridge	Management Committee	2	0	2
	General Community	8	2	10
	Women	0	7	7
John Dean Town (Grand Bassa County)- John Dean School	Community members	5	4	9
	PTA Committee	4	0	4
	Teachers	5	0	5
	Students	3	3	6
Kiammie Town (Montserrado County) WASH project	Project Management Committee	4	2	6
	Women	0	6	6
	General Community	6	14	20
CODEVPRO- Technical Team	Senior Program Management staff	1	1	2
CODEVPRO- West Africa Regional Competence Center (WARC)	Chairperson of the WARC taskforce	1	0	1

Annex 5: Reviewed Documents
- Project Document
- Project Annual Plans
- Annual reports
- Past Evaluations
- WARC Reports and documentations including strategic plan 2019-2021
- Digni Documents

Annex 6: Evaluation Tools
<u>**Strategic Design**</u>
1. What is the mandate of your department and how does this fit with the LUMDS Program objectives?
2. To what extent has LUMDS goal and objectives been aligned to GOL, strategies/Policies/improving accessibility of basic services related initiatives
3. How the strategy is used by LUMDS (PID) support Liberia changing context and capitalize on its needs and opportunities?
4. How has county or national government portrayed ownership of the project? Pro how the program has worked to achieve desired ownership from the Government

Target Group
Target group: To which extent has the programme successfully reached the stated target beneficiaries?

"*The programme will be directed at the general population where there are local churches of LAC UMC and communities with urgent need. This will therefore include women and men as well as young people and children. The specific local project plans will specify the target group included in each local project.*"
5. How are the project beneficiaries and counties identified? Probe for UMC congregation %, participation of church leadership in projects
6. What % of local community members use this project?
7. How was advocacy for the projects planned and /or carried out?
8. What needs to be done more on advocacy?

Implementation
9. How is LUMDS strategy of PID contributing to community development?
   (b) What has worked and why?
   © What has not worked and why?
   (d) What are the unintended outcomes (positive and negative) of PID if any
   (e) How has this affected the progress?

10. How is the project contributing to accessibility of essential basic services in the target communities?
   (b) How is it contributing to SDGs targets?

Effectiveness
11. What has the project achieved this far? Between (2018-2020)
12. What behavioural changes have taken place due to the project?
13. What could have been the situation if the project was not implemented?
14. In your opinion, what is the quality of the project? And usage?
15. How does the project integrate with other aspects such environmental conservation, gender, PWDs?

Efficiency
16. How are the financial resources allocated to each activity conducted?
17. Did the project experience serious delays and how was it mitigated? Probe for community contribution.
18. If LUMDS could not have supported the project! How else could have the community need realized? Probe for less cost.

Sustainability

19. How is the project contributing to capacity building initiative at county level?
20. What systems and structures have LAC/UMC, put in place to ensure sustainability of the project? Probe involvement of other stakeholders?
21. What constraints/challenges have you faced in the implementation of this project? Probe how they were mitigated
22. What programmatic risks have been met?
23. Are there any lessons learned or best practices that can be up-scaled?
24. How would you want similar projects planned and implemented in future for success?

LUMDS Staff
Relevance

1. What is CODEVPRO all about -Goal and objectives?
2. What are the constitute components of PID?
3. To what extent has LUMDS goal and objectives been aligned to GoL, strategies/Policies/improving accessibility of basic services related initiatives?
4. How is the strategy used by LUMDS (PID) fitted adapted into Liberia changing context and capitalize on its needs and opportunities?

Target Group

5. How are the project beneficiaries and counties identified? And role of the church in identifying communities and counties?
6. What % of local community members use this project? Probe each visited projects.
7. How was advocacy for projects planned and /or carried out? Probe for CSOs /CBOs or any community structure strengthening, involvement of the local church structures and leadership?
8. What needs to be done more on advocacy?

Implementation

9. How is LUMDS strategy of PID contributing to community development?
   (b) What has worked and why?
   (c) What has not worked and why?
   (d) What are the unintended outcomes (positive and negative) of PID, if any?
   (e)How has this affected the progress?

10. How is the project (WASH, bridge, Guest House, Schools) contributing to accessibility of essential basic services in the target communities?
    (b) How is it contributing to SDGs targets?

Effectiveness

11. What has the project achieved this far? Between (2018-2020) disaggregate by project, training get the # and types of people trained.
12. What behavioural changes have taken place due to the project?
13. What could have been the situation if the project was not implemented?
14. How does the project integrate with other aspects such environmental conservation, gender, PWDs?

Efficiency

15. How are the financial resources allocated to each activity conducted? Probe what

guides them?

16. Did the project experience serious delays and how was it mitigated?

17. If LUMDS could not have supported the project, how else could have the community need realized? Probe for less cost.

Sustainability

18. How has the county/national government /local communities portray ownership of the project?

19. How is the project contributing to capacity building initiatives at county and community levels?

20. What systems and structures have LAC/UMC, put in place to ensure sustainability of the project? Probe involvement of other stakeholders?

21. What constraints/challenges have you faced in the implementation of this project?

22. What programmatic risks have been met?

23. Are there any lessons learned or best practices that can be up-scaled?

24. How would you want similar projects planned and implemented in future for success?

25. How was the restructure from DCS to LUMDS done – how does affect project sustainability? Probe for advocacy role of the Bishop and the 7-member supervisory role?

WASH Committee /PTA

Relevance

1. When was this committee formed?

2. What is your role in the project?

3. How were the project needs identified or selected?

Target Group

1. How was this community identified as a beneficiary of LUMDS initiative?

2. What % of local community members use this project?

3. What advocacy mechanisms were used to mobilize and how effective were they?

Implementation

4. How did the project approach and work with the committee? (Assess the functionality of the committee

(b) What has worked and why?

(c) What has not worked and why?

(d) What are the unintended outcomes (positive and negative) of PID if any?

(e) How has this affected the progress?

5. How is the project contributing to accessibility of essential basic services in the target community?

6. Have you participated in any capacity building initiative? If yes how has it supported your work? And how are using the knowledge?

Effectiveness

7. How has LUMDS initiatives contributed to community development plans?

8. What behavioural changes have taken place due to the project?

9. What could have been the situation if the project was not implemented?

10. How does the project integrate with other aspects such environmental conservation, gender, PWDs?

Efficiency
11. How are the financial resources allocated to each activity conducted?
12. Did the project experience serious delays and how was it mitigated?
13. If LUMDS could not have supported the project! How else could have the community need realized? Probe for less cost.

Sustainability
14. How has the county government and local community portrayed ownership of the project?
15. How is the project contributing to capacity building initiatives at the community level?
16. What systems and structures have LAC/UMC, put in place to ensure sustainability of the project? Probe involvement of other stakeholders?
17. What constraints/challenges have you faced in the implementation of this project?
18. Are there any lessons learned or best practices that can be up-scaled?
19. How would you want similar projects planned and implemented in future for success?

General Community
Relevance
1. Why was this community chosen to be a beneficiary of LUMDS initiative?
2. How was the community need(s) identified or selected?

Target Group
3. Who are the most beneficiaries of the project and why?
4. What % of local community members use this project? Hard data e.g. children crossing to school
5. What advocacy mechanisms were used to mobilize and how effective were they?
6. What needs to be done more on advocacy?

Implementation
7. How is the project implemented (Assess the functionality of PID approach and the committee?
   (b) What has worked and why?
   © What has not worked and why?
   (d) What are the unintended outcomes (positive and negative) of the approach used?
   (e) How has this approach affected (influenced) the progress of the project?

8. How is the project contributing to accessibility of essential basic services in the target community?
9. Have you participated in any capacity building initiative? If yes how has it supported your work?

Effectiveness
10. How has LUMDS initiatives contributed to community development plans?
11. What behavioural changes have taken place due to the project?
12. What could have been the situation if the project was not implemented?
13.
14. How does the project integrate with other aspects such environmental conservation, gender, PWDs?

Efficiency
15. Did the project experience serious delays and how was it mitigated?
16. If LUMDS could not have supported the project! How else could have the community need realized? Probe for less cost.

Sustainability
17. How do you (local community) portray ownership of the project?
18. What systems and structures have LUMDS, put in place to ensure sustainability of the project? Probe involvement of other stakeholders?
19. What constraints/challenges has the community faced during implementation of this project?
20. Are there any lessons learned or best practices that can be up-scaled?
21. How would you want similar projects planned and implemented in future for success?

Teachers and COBIP
Relevance
1. Why was this community chosen to be a beneficiary of LUMDS initiative?
2. How was the community need(s) identified or selected?
3. How is the strategy used by LUMDS (PID) adapted into Liberia changing context and capitalize on its needs and opportunities?

Target Group
4. Who are the most beneficiaries of the project and why? Before and now
5. What % of local community members use this project?
6. How was the advocacy for the project planned and /or carried out?
7. What needs to be done more on advocacy?

Implementation
8. How is the project implemented (Assess the functionality of PID approach and the committee?
   (b) What has worked and why?
   © What has not worked and why?
   (d) What are the unintended outcomes (positive and negative) of the approach used?
   (e) How has this approach affected (influenced) the progress of the project?

9. How is the project contributing to accessibility of essential basic services in the target community?

Effectiveness
10. How has LUMDS project contributed to community development plans?
11. What behavioural changes have taken place due to the project?
12. What could have been the situation if the project was not implemented?
13. How does the project integrate with other aspects such environmental conservation, gender, PWDs?

Efficiency
14. Did the project experience serious delays and how was it mitigated?
15. If LUMDS could not have supported the project, how else could have the community need realized? Probe for less cost.

Sustainability
16. How do your school community portray ownership of the project?
17. What systems and structures have LUMDS, put in place to ensure sustainability of the project? Probe involvement of other stakeholders?
18. What constraints/challenges has the community faced during implementation of this project?
19. Are there any lessons learned or best practices that can be up-scaled?
20. How would you want similar projects planned and implemented in future for success?

Students
Relevance
1. What difference has LUMDS project had on (i) you, (ii) family (iii) community?
2. How was this school before the project?

Target Group
3. Who are the most beneficiaries of the project and why?
4. How did you participate in project mobilization?
5. How was it done, how else could it have been done?

Implementation
6. How is the project implemented (Assess the functionality of PID approach and the committee?

   (b) How has this approach affected (influenced) the progress of the project?

7. How is the project contributing to accessibility of education in this community?
8. What could have been the situation if the project was not implemented?

Effectiveness
9. What behavioural changes have taken place due to the project?
10. What could have been the situation if the project was not implemented?
11. How does the project integrate with other aspects such environmental conservation, gender, PWDs?

Efficiency
12. Did the project experience serious delays and how was it mitigated?

Sustainability
13. How do you as students own the project?
14. What systems and structures have LUMDS, put in place to ensure sustainability of the project? Probe involvement of other stakeholders?
15. What specific challenges has the community faced during implementation of this project?
16. Are there any lessons learned or best practices that can be up-scaled?
17. How would you want similar projects planned and implemented in future for success?

West Africa Regional Competence Centre

1. Why was the Reginal Centre started?
2. what has been done?
3. where are we going?

4. What % of local/national/international members use this Centre? And for what?
5. What systems and structures have put in place to ensure sustainability of the Centre?
6. What constraints/challenges has the Centre faced since initiation?
7. Are there any lessons learned or best practices that can be up-scaled?
8. What could you recommend being done on this Centre moving forward?

Annex 7: Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE
LIBERIA-NORWAY PARTNERSHIP
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM,CODEVPRO
INTEGRATED INTERMEDIATE ASSESSMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background

This Statement of Work (SOW) describes the terms of reference for an external integrated intermediate evaluation of the Liberia–Norway Partnership In Development Program (CODEVPRO) of the United Methodist Church/Liberia Annual Conference, a partnership with The United Methodist Church in Norway, Board of Global Ministries, hereafter called UMCN. The Programme allows for the provision of integrated development services in Income Generating Activities, Education in Broad Terms (Capacity Buildings), Infrastructure Development (Education, Health, WASH and Mini Bridges) amongst others for communities, using the Partnership in Development model. The program was last evaluated in 2017 after being implemented for two five-year's circles. The program intervention's aim is to provide comprehensive and sustainable development and strengthening of civil society for Liberians no matter your tribe, color, sex, or location, providing basic social services and thereby improving their livelihood.

In February 2020, Digni, the back donor in Norway, visited Liberia. Digni's main purpose for the visit was to learn about the UMCN – UMC Liberia – CODEVPRO cooperation, including way of working, decision making systems, roles and responsibilities, capacity, results, challenges and future plans for CODEVPRO. Their main conclusion for the way forward was:

- Digni will not approve a program application containing only targets at local community level like this last period of the CODEVPRO. Digni will consider a new program application from the UMC Liberia only if the strategy and plans contain new elements. More specifically, Digni recommends the UMC Liberia to target impact on a higher level of the Liberian authority system through advocacy in a possible future program application to Digni.

In 2019 there was a change of status for the Department of Community Services, UMC Liberia DCS. Through legal accreditation DCS was registered as a Non-for-Profit Organization in the Republic of Liberia to operate as a legal entity in Liberia. The new name as registered by the Government of Liberia is now Liberia United Methodist Development Services (LUMDS). The Liberia Annual conference of the United Methodist Church through the office of The Bishop constituted and appointed a seven-member supervisory board to work alongside the Director, staff and partners of the Liberia United Methodist Development Services, LUMDS to ensure that the Department achieves its goals.

Purpose of the evaluation

The program has been implemented over 2,5 project periods of 5 years and has been assessed several times. The reports have showed good results and given important recommendations for improvements. The main purpose of this evaluation will be to sum up

the experiences, lessons learnt, and results achieved during the duration of this period. The evaluation will also present recommendations for the sustainability of the programme in the future and how the programme can target impact on a higher level of the Liberian authority system through advocacy. An additional aim of the evaluation is to use it as a learning opportunity for UMCN, LAC/UMC/LUMDS, CODEVPRO staff and communities involved, in order to enhance their understanding and participation in the programme. The UMC/LAC LUMDS will use findings from the evaluation to inform adaptive management of

new design of future strategy and programme.

The scope of the evaluation
The evaluation shall be carried out based on the evaluators' best professional judgement and according to accepted best international evaluation practices and Digni's governing document "Policy for evaluation" and "Empowerment Assessment tool".

The scope of the midterm evaluation spans 2,5 years of implementation of programme activities. The evaluation will assess the achievements according to set objectives described in the Terms of Reference, documenting best practices and lessons learnt in the program during this time.
The evaluation will consider selected areas of CODEVPRO project interventions in eight communities within five counties where LUMDS has been engaged with CODEVPRO activities.

Objectives of the evaluation
The evaluation will

- Examine the Community Development Programme taking into consideration the Partnership in Development Model and its relevance, including all its constituent activities and progress toward the achievement of the Project objectives.

- Assess the effectiveness of the program according to the development goals. Are the activities strategically contributing to Project Purpose and plan in the most effective way, examining the progress, synergies, and sustainability at all levels of the program?

- Identify results and lessons learned from implementation and provide succinct, actionable recommendations to inform development of future Partnership and Community Development design.

- Examine the status of completed or finished projects and its quality and usages.

- Conduct a short assessment of the ownership role of the Government and the community in the life of the projects and beyond; including the impact and outcome made by the programme towards the authorities and in the lives of the beneficiaries.

- Conduct a short assessment of the Partnership in Development Regional Competence Centre (Regional Centre); what has been done, where are we now, and where are we going.

- Assess the risks met in the programme, on local and national level.
- Present recommendations for future programme or collaborations.

Evaluation Questions
1. **Current Strategy Design**: To what extent did the programmatic and contextual assumptions of the Partnership in Development Model use for Community Development address the underlying barriers?
   a. Did the Community Development Program improve basic social services?
   b. How well did the strategy adapt to Liberia's changing context and capitalize

on needs and opportunities?

2. **Implementation**: How much has the Partnership in development model contributed to more effective community Development programming? What elements worked or have not worked, and why?

    c. To what extent have the activity-level objectives contributed to the broader objectives aimed at increasing community access to essential basic services in the target areas within Water, Sanitation, Health and Education thus contributing towards Liberia poverty reduction program in meeting SDGs targets?

    d. Were there missed opportunities?

    e. What have been the unintended outcomes – positive and negative – of the model, if any, and how have these influenced the progress?

3. **Sustainability:** To what extent is the Community Development Program building the individual and collective capacity of Community Based organizations and structures to sustain their work beyond project support? To what extend did these interventions have an impact on the authorities and/or contribute to the Government Strategic goals and what structures and systems are in place at the level of the LAC/UMC, LUMDS to ensure effective delivery of services beyond project?

4. **Target group:** To which extent has the programme successfully reached the stated target beneficiaries?

   "The programme will be directed at the general population where there are local churches of LAC UMC and communities with urgent need. This will therefore include women and men as well as young people and children. The specific local project plans will specify the target group included in each local project."

5. **Programme efficiency:** Make an assessment about the efficiency of the resources used in the programme in relation to the conducted activities. Should the activities have been carried out in another manner? Could the same activities have been achieved with the use of less costly resources?

6. **Programme effectiveness:** Make an assessment about the effectiveness of the programme. To which degree has the programme achieved the programme objective as stated in the programme plan?

   Long-term overarching development goals:
   - *"Improved lives and sustainable communities."*

   Outcome/ immediate objective of the programme/ programme for the entire period:
   - *"Improved living conditions for people in communities where there are UMC congregations and communities with urgent need."*

   Anticipated results (outputs) for the entire period:
   - *"Implementation of a variety of sustainable community projects in accordance with the programmes priorities. The output of the programme will be the number of sustainable local*
   - *projects that are being planned, implemented and operated by the local*

> *communities and local churches. The second output is the number of trained communities".*

Evaluation Methods

The methodology used by the evaluation team shall be participatory and beneficial to creating a "sharing, learning, and competence building" environment for LAC/UMC, LUMDS, including the board and programme staff and members of the project communities. At time of project visits, in addition to program staff, the voice of rights holders will be heard, as well as interviewing relevant stakeholders in the context.

The evaluation is expected to apply both quantitative and qualitative methods for data collection and analysis. The evaluation Consultant will conduct a desk review of available literature including activity and project documents.
In addition, the Consultant will collect primary quantitative data through mini surveys.
It is expected that the Consultant will use data provided by the implementing partners in regular quarterly and annual reports, performance reporting, and studies for supplemental quantitative data.

The UMC/LAC LUMDS will provide documents for the desk review, contact information for prospective interviewees, and innovative case study options for Evaluation Question. The Consultant will be responsible for identifying and reviewing additional materials relevant to the evaluation, as well as additional contacts.

To engage the key evaluation users in analysis of the preliminary findings and help shape the recommendations, the evaluation team will facilitate the debriefs in a more collaborative, half or full-day session. During the session, preliminary findings will be shared, and the
evaluation users will add interpretation to the "so what" and "now what" of the evaluation results. This can also help the evaluation team identify areas where more information is needed (e.g. through additional document review or remote interviews). This will take place separately with LAC/UMC officials, Board, Government representatives in charge of project areas and LUMDS Staffers who are working directly with the program and lead actors within the community.

The preliminary findings from the evaluation team shall be shared and discussed in a meeting with UMC/LAC LUMDS, including the board and programme staff, members of the project communities and other relevant stakeholders after the field visits. This is to secure the dialogue and the participatory process of the evaluation and strengthen the learning process for all parties. If possible, UMCN will attend the meeting online.

The Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will be selected based on the following criteria:
- Credibility – team members should be accepted and respected by central parties
- Professionalism – the team should have a combination of relevant special expertise, professional evaluation competence and knowledge of the country and culture
- Independence – consultants must not have bindings to the project or the project workers subject to evaluation
- Suitability – consultants must have capacity and will to understand and communicate their findings and conclusions with persons from other cultures

- Gender balance – the team should consist of both men and women

Deliverables and Timeline

Evaluation deliverables include:

a. Planning Meetings
b. Kickoff meeting with UMC/LUMDS
c. Inception Report with work plan and data collection instruments
d. Formal Debrief – Presentation to LAC/UMC LUMDS team.
e. Draft Evaluation Report - A draft report should be submitted to UMC/LAC-LUMDS for review, within three weeks after work is conducted. The written report should clearly describe findings, conclusions, and recommendations. LAC/UMC LUMDS will provide comments on the draft report within five working days of submission.
f. Post Evaluation Meeting
g. Final Report – Consultant will submit a final report that incorporates comments no later than ten days after final, written comments on the Consultant's draft report have been submitted.

Report

The draft evaluation report should meet the following criteria:

a. A written report in English shall be prepared based on the Terms of Reference and Digni's Empowerment Assessment tool.
b. The report should be no longer than 30 pages, excluding executive summary, table of contents, and annexes.
c. The report should include a three-to-five-page Executive Summary highlighting findings and recommendations.
d. The report should represent a thoughtful and well-organized effort to objectively respond to the evaluation questions.
e. The report shall address all evaluation questions included in the SOW (Statement of Work).
f. Evaluation methodology shall be explained in detail and all tools used in conducting the evaluation such as questionnaires, checklists and discussion guides shall be included in an Annex in the final report.
g. Limitations to the evaluation shall be disclosed in the report, with particular attention to the limitations associated with the evaluation methodology (selection bias, recall bias, etc.).
h. Evaluation findings and conclusions should be specific, concise and supported by strong quantitative or qualitative evidence.
i. Recommendations should be action-oriented, practical, specific, and evidence-based.

The report will be submitted electronically.

Timeline

The evaluation should follow the timeline for producing deliverables outlined in the Gantt chart below. The evaluation is estimated to begin from November 7-Dec 15. 2020 for final conclusion.

Performance Evaluation Gantt Chart

Activity	# of days	Oct 12	Nov 8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Nov 25
LAC/UMC LUMD shares the statement of work, SOW with the Consultant	1	✓									
Desk Review	1		✓								
Planning meeting – internal	1		✓								
Planning Meetings with LAC/UMC, LUMDS BOARD											
Submit draft Inception Report to LAC/UMC, LUMDS	1		✓								
Prepare for field work	1		✓								
Field Work and preliminary analysis	4			✓	✓	✓	✓				
Analysis and report drafting	3			✓	✓	✓					
LAC/UMC, LUMDS review the draft report	1						✓				
Consultant incorporates comments and feedback	1							✓			
Meeting to discuss preliminary findings from evaluation	1							✓	✓		
Submission of final report online								✓	✓		✓

Logistics and Level of Effort

It is anticipated that the Consultant will visit and conduct consultations and data collection visits primarily in different projects location. LAC/UMC-LUMDS can assist in providing contact information. LAC/UMC, LUMDS is responsible for making meeting and logistical arrangements for the Consultant including hotel, and local transportation arrangements.

Consultant is authorized and expected to work a six-day week. Travel over weekends may be necessary. Preliminarily work will commence beginning Oct 15 online while the practicable will start on November 8, 2020. For planning purposes, Consultant should be aware of Liberian holidays during the evaluation time frame.

Operational Work plan

Date	Activity	Place/Location	Persons/Groups involved/interviewed
9/11/2020	Kick off meeting	LUMDS offices, Monrovia, Montserrado County	Consultants, LUMDS Staff and Senior Management
	Visit Education project- Ki. Diabolo school	Weinsue, Bong County	Consultants, Teachers, PTA, District Education Officer, Students
	Visit WASH project- Hand pump, general community hygiene and sanitation	Yarkapolola, Bong County	Consultants, WASH Committee, General community members.
10/11/2020	Visit Community IGA project-Multi-purpose Guest house.	Gbecohn Town, Bong County	Consultants, Project Management Committee, Elders, Caretaker.
	Visit Infrastructural project- Community Bridge	Klehn Town, Grand Bassa County	Consultants, Project Management Committee, General community, Women
11/11/2020	Visit Education project- John Dean School	John Dean Town, Grand Bassa County	Consultants, Teachers, PTA, Students, Community members.
12/11/2020	COVID 19 Testing	COVID Testing Centre- Montserrado	Consultants. (This was a requirement pre-arrival and pre-departure)
	Visit WASH project- hand pump and general community hygiene and sanitation	Kiammie Town, Montserrado County	Consultants, WASH Committee, women and general community.
	Visit and interview County WASH Officer	Bong, Bong County	Consultants, County WASH Officer.
13/11/2020	Interview with Senior program staff	Bong Town, Bong County	Consultants, CODEVPRO Senior management staff.
	Interview with Taskforce Chair, West Africa Regional Competence Centre	Monrovia, Montserrado County	Consultants, Taskforce Chair, WARC.
	Preparation of preliminary report	Monrovia, Montserrado County	Consultants
14/11/2020	Presentation of Evaluation preliminary findings	LUMDS Offices- Monrovia, Montserrado County	Consultants, LUMDS Staff, LAC/UMC representatives, UMCN Representatives (following online from Norway)