

## ANNEX 3b – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Summer School of Development Cooperation

#### Evaluation context

The final report was prepared on the grounds of the order of minor scale *Evaluation of international development aid projects of the Czech Republic realized under the grant heading “Global development education and awareness-raising”*. This report summarizes findings from evaluation of the project Summer School of Development Cooperation, implemented by the Department of Development and Environmental Studies, Faculty of Science, Palacký University in Olomouc. This project has been receiving long term support from the Czech Development Agency (CzDA); the assessment covers the time span of 2014 – 2016. The evaluation was ordered by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic (MFA) and prepared by the research team Evaluation4Action. This evaluation used both criteria of OECD/DAC as well as additional criteria which were selected regarding to general principles and aims of global development education (GDE), particularly in the area of communication and awareness-raising.

#### Aim of the evaluation

General purposes of this evaluation were:

- to provide independent, impartial and coherent findings, conclusions and recommendations, which would be useful in the decision making process of the Ministry and the Agency to in designing its activities of public awareness raising and communication of results of development cooperation in the Czech Republic;
- to provide feedback to implementers of the projects, which they can rely on in their future activities;
- to inform projects’ participants, final recipients and other stakeholders about the project they have been part of.

Specific aims of the evaluation were particularly:

- to evaluate the project, focusing particularly on effects and sustainability of the activities, or assess under what conditions and to what extent this evaluation can be undertaken;
- to evaluate the congruence of the project with general principles and aims stated in the National Strategy for Global Development Education for the 2011 – 2015 framework, and later updated for 2016 – 2017 period;
- to pilot new methodology of cross-cutting principles of Czech development cooperation policy, as developed by the Institute for Evaluation and Social Analyses – INESAN, s.r.o. in the programme Omega of Technological Agency of the Czech Republic.

#### Information on the intervention evaluated

Summer School of Development Cooperation is a project involving both global development education and public awareness. It has been organized by Palacký University Olomouc periodically since 1998, from 2006 with annual support provided by the Czech Development Agency. The evaluation covers mainly years of 2014, 2015 and 2016, which form parts of 2013-2015 and 2016-2018 project periods.

In all years evaluated, the week-long Summer school of development cooperation for university students and the public was organised. In the 2013-2015 project period, this was complemented by Summer school of development cooperation for high school students. This was a week-long stay for high school students followed by a weekend reunion session. In the 2016-2018 project period, Summer school for high school students was replaced by a three day long Workshop of Current

Challenges. In the year of evaluation, this focused on the problems of migration and the target group consisted of university students and general public.

Project documentations for the years and the representative of the project organiser state that the project focuses mainly on enhancing knowledge of development cooperation in both global and Czech context of participation among target groups (these are identical with final recipients in this case). No further level in the logic of the project scheme was clearly formulated in the documentation.

The project's core activities took place in the seat of UPOL (Summer School for university students; Workshop of Current Challenges), or in the area of Vsetín (Summer School for high school students). One partner participated in the projects – ARPOK, o.p.s.; which cooperated particularly with promotion of the project and to a limited extent with lecturing in some of the courses.

### Evaluation team

The research was carried out by Evaluation4Action. The team consisted of the evaluation leader, Anna Kunová, MSc, and two experts in global development education: Mgr. Lenka Sobotová and Mgr. Tomáš Profant, PhD.

## Key findings and conclusions

### Relevance

Two aspects were considered when assessing the relevance of the project: the level of compliance with the National Strategy of GDE and meeting the interests of the participants. Based on all data available, the project was fully compliant with the National Strategy, particularly its sub-objectives of extra-curricular and interest activities for the child and youth and education of adults (public awareness). Activities were rightly adjusted and performed and the objectives were thus adequately met.

All three programmes of the project were also relevant to the interests of their participants; full capacities were more or less reached every year. Both Summer schools were planned and prepared for persons interested, not for specialists, so a general overview was provided. Participants of Summer School for university students were interested mostly in the topic, high school participants usually participated with much broader interests and curiosity. The Workshop of Current Challenges attracted people interested in the specific theme, often alumni of the Summer school for university students. Given the long-term experience from the duration of the project and regular internal feedbacks, organisers had very good understanding of the participants' expectations and adjusted the programme to their needs every year. Absolvents in all programmes mostly expressed their satisfaction in surveys.

Therefore, relevance of the project is evaluated **high**.

### Effectivity

Effectivity is evaluated based on reaching the aims of the project – in this case this means the level, to which participants 1) reached an informed view of the development agenda and 2) reflect their responsibility in the context of global trends. As the aims were defined ex-post, during the evaluation process, previously stated outcomes, which the project team had been focusing to reach, were included and considered in this assessment. The targeted outcome had been formulated as increasing knowledge of the participants in the field of development, or migration (Workshop of Current Challenges).

High increase of knowledge was registered in all three programmes; the most striking was noticed in Summer school for high school students. The lowest change was mentioned by absolvents of the workshop. Participants with the lowest entry knowledge reported the most noticeable increases in all of the programmes.

As regards the competence oriented target, focused on the ability of participants to think over and maintain informed views in the area of development cooperation, the influence was as following:

- participants in Summer school for university students highly increased their interest in the theme and but there was only limited growth in critical thinking;

- participants in Summer school for high school students showed particularly high rise of interest and remarkable growth in critical thinking, yet only limited growth in ability to work independently;
- participants in the Workshop showed rather limited growth of interest and critical thinking.

Representatives of all three groups also declared that they had been inspired to take their own steps based on the experience they had just been through, which is a form of self-reflection of global responsibility. Such activities mostly involved responsible consumption and proactive following of global themes; participants in the workshop wanted to participate in internationally themed events in the future.

There is no evidence of a significant change in groups outside the participants of the three programmes. However, to a certain extent it may have influenced some of the following groups:

- High school students who listened to a presentation about life in one of partner countries of Czech development cooperation. The presentation were 45 minutes long (1 school lesson) and organised to promote enlisting for the Summer school: 546 pupils in 2015, 1030 pupils in 2016
- High school students who assisted their classmates, participants of the Summer school, with preparation of their “microprojects” – in the years evaluated this would involve one or two figured numbers
- High school students and members of the public who saw the outcomes of the “microprojects” – usually presentations or exhibitions
- Professional public, whose members could read “Rozcestník”, proceedings of the summer schools and the workshop

Given the high level of outputs provided and the outcomes, some of them higher, some lower, we assess the effectivity as **rather high**.

## Efficiency

- Altogether, 2 064 092 CZK were spent in the three years of the project, of which 1 775 680 CZK funded through Czech development cooperation. Personnel costs, particularly the management, also administrative staff and experts, clearly represent the vast majority of the expenses. Their commitment and remuneration corresponds to common local relations.
- In the years evaluated, altogether 205 people participated in the Summer School for university students, 39 people in Summer school for high school students and 46 people in the Workshop, i.e. 290 people in total. The programmes differed in their intensity, organisational burden and expenditures; and their outputs and outcomes were different. When stating the average cost of a participant to be 7118 CZK, this should still be kept in mind.
- University facilities (rooms, accommodation, technology) and participants paid some of their expenses during Summer School for university students and the Workshop, which helped to cut costs. (Summer School for high school students took place on other premises and expenses were paid from the project budget.) Post-graduate students and other employees of KRES were asked to work on some of the project activities (school debates, workshop presenters), which is also good practice to improve efficiency.
- All three programmes employed adequate pedagogic and edification methods. Experts were involved in the activities, yet not overused so the aim to provide a general overview was clearly followed. The only constraint seems the focus on Czech development cooperation, international and global perspectives are not clearly embodied.

Based on the above stated, efficiency of the project is evaluated as **high**.

## Impact

The objective of the project was stated as “Contribute to achievement of the objectives of the current Concept of International Development Cooperation of the Czech Republic”. However, the current

Concept for the years 2010 – 2017 cross-refers to the National Strategy of Global Development Education. The document states a range of aims and some are relevant, yet their character requires evaluation through outputs and outcomes. The project sponsor was not able to provide any specific formulation of the impact. During the evaluation process even outcomes needed redefining, so no new objective was given. The level of impact – as stated in the Inception report – was **not evaluated**.

## Sustainability

To assess sustainability of the effects on the target groups both outputs (better overview and knowledge of participants) and outcomes (strengthened competencies, change in values) were considered. Summer school for high school students was followed by a weekend session a couple of months later and the participants were also asked to work on their own, long-term (a few months long) microprojects. The two other programmes did not have similar mechanisms to promote sustainability.

The current level of knowledge of the themes discussed during the summer schools is somewhat lower than immediately after finishing the programmes by their participants; it remained about the same among the workshop participants. The data collected do not show any relevance between the years of participation in the programme (higher level of sustained knowledge of the Workshop participants does not seem to be influenced by the fact it was organised only last year). Especially in the case of Summer school for high school students, it is clear that its absolvents continued to study and some of them keep deepening their knowledge. The slight decrease of knowledge of the whole group thus actually consists of clear decrease of one part of the group rebalanced by high increase of the other, smaller part of the group.

Strengthened critical thinking and interest in development agenda remained similar, or slightly lower than directly after the event, as respondents self-evaluated themselves. There is an exception: participants of the Summer school for university students showed decrease of interest in the development agenda.

As is the effectivity, so is sustainability evaluated as **rather high**.

## Recommendations for project organisers

Recommendation	Importance <sup>1</sup>	PCM phase
Reconsider integration of the Summer School for high school students into the project period 2019+	1	Implementation
Define the aims of all project components and reset the programme so that it is clearly directed towards the aims	1	Implementation
Enrich the programme of Summer school for university students with a perspective from abroad through (personal or videoconference) presentation of guests from abroad	2	Implementation

<sup>1</sup> 1 – high importance, 2 – medium importance, 3 – low importance