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Foreword

The University of the Western Cape (UWC) is a Higher Education Institution, renowned for its activist role in South Africa’s apartheid struggle. With deep roots in the communities, it sees itself as an ‘Engaged University’, facing the future in a way that transcends the past. The complex reality of transformation is embraced in the technological advances which are fundamental in a ‘global village’ that require individuals to have the capacities and knowledge needed to succeed on the international stage. The University is committed to excellence in learning, teaching, research and community engagement, to nurturing the cultural diversity of South Africa, and to responding in critical and creative ways to the needs of a society in transition. The importance of social responsibility and civic engagement, reflected in the strategic decisions made at the University, and is visible in its engagement with various partnership initiatives. The University is fully aware of the distinctive academic role that is inherent in helping to build an equitable and dynamic society through collaborative partnerships. It is in this context of a broadening scope and enhanced dynamics that thirty years ago the University of the Western Cape and the University of Missouri formed their partnership.

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in South Africa are required to engage in a continuous reflective process regarding the effectiveness of their contributions within the context of their existence. Community engagement is a critical element in the achievement of strategic intent; it is conceptualised as a process by which community benefit organisations, community development professionals and other community concerned individuals build on-going relationships for the purpose of applying a collective vision for the benefit of communities. Community engagement deals with facilitating communities towards democratic change from positions of apathy and resource deprivation resultant from a racially divided past. The integration of community engagement into the core areas of learning, teaching and research of HEIs has facilitated the generation of knowledge that is contextually relevant and meaningful. This integration increases the competency of graduates, as they are encouraged to be creative, innovative and proactive within a community setting, a quality that many employers seek in the contemporary place of employment.

This institution also believes in lifelong learning through providing a framework for learners to learn and think continuously and progressively. Lifelong learning enables students to learn in different ways, for different purposes at various stages in their lives and careers. Partnership with several varying sectors is of fundamental importance in the provision of optimal learning opportunities and the creation of knowledge in learners, academics and their respective partners. The University of the Western Cape and the University of Missouri collaboration is a partnership which seeks to reinforce the university’s ethos and tradition, and will provide opportunities to gain unique experiences, as well as facilitate knowledge exchange and acquisition through internationalisation. An international and intercultural dimension is thus incorporated into formal educational experiences and activities which enables students to recognise and work with diversity in the practical application of knowledge gained.

The International Community Leadership Development Programme (ICLDP) of the University of Missouri Extension and the Community Engagement Unit at the UWC provides opportunities to equip community leaders with the knowledge and understanding about international perspectives, particularly within the
contexts of South Africa and North America. This international collaborative programme facilitates and enhances these institutions’ co-existence in a global village. Douglass\(^1\) (2016) presents a ‘Flagship Model’ that HEIs need to embrace; he suggests that research-intensive universities should be replaced with the ‘potential well-rounded engagement and excellence that universities’ can offer to ‘all-level community building and meaningful educational experiences for everyone that universities serve’\(^2\).
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Executive Summary
Thirty years ago the University of the Western Cape (UWC) and University of Missouri (UM) began a partnership with the establishment of the University of Missouri South African Education Programme (UMSAEP), which was formalized with the signing of a Memorandum of Academic Cooperation in June 1986. The purpose of the UWC/MU exchange programme was and is to advance mutual understanding between the two faculties of the respective institutions and promote collaboration in: i) teaching, ii) research and iii) service (also referred to as community engagement), with the aim of benefiting each institution and its broader communities. Over the years, numerous project grants have been awarded by the UMSAEP committee, but not until 2009 was a partnership exchange initiative started with regard to the ‘community engagement’ segment of the two universities; a UMSAEP grant of $27,550 followed, in 2013, for an International Community Leadership Development Programme (ICLDP) pilot project between the Community Engagement Unit (CEU) at the UWC and the University of Missouri Extension (MU Extension). MU Extension contributed match funding to the UMSAEP grant with additional funding, especially with regard to the research of the ICLDP by the CEU. Not only was this project then the first of its kind between the two universities but it also integrated all three legislated segments of higher education: teaching, research and community engagement in one single project – making it the first of its kind in the UMSAEP. This ICLDP partnership entails the co-teaching of the programme to empower community leaders from both countries in bringing about social and economic change through community development in their respective communities; evaluation research would confirm the extent to which the ICLDP was significant and successful.

ICLDP Pilot Project Summary
The overall purpose of the ICLDP pilot project was to collaboratively design and implement an international community leadership exchange programme that would empower community leaders in bringing about ‘change’ (transformation) in their communities towards improved community wellbeing. The ICLDP pilot project partners (CEU & MU Extension) set themselves three goals, related to the establishment of a collaborative programme, that must be based on all scholarships of engagement and, as a result, extend their reach to communities through community leaders. The pilot project goals were translated into three project objectives, with the first objective being to add community engagement, community development and community extension in an integrated manner to the 30-year long UMSAEP partnership. The remaining two objectives relate to the development and implementation of a transformational international community leadership programme.

ICLDP Pilot Project Implementation Evaluation Study Design
The CEU was responsible for conducting the evaluation study of the ICLDP pilot project, with a formative intention due to the pilot project status of the ICLDP. The overall purpose of the study was to evaluate the extent to which the ICLDP project did in fact offer its planned deliverables of providing participants with theoretical knowledge, specific practical skills, attitudes and applied competences to enter communities with leadership that could achieve sustainable community wellbeing. Three study objectives were therefore set to evaluate: i) the planning and design of the programme and its

---

4 See quoted goals in section 3.1 of this report.
5 See quoted objectives in section 3.2 of this report.
curriculum; ii) implementation of the programme curriculum and its exchange component as to the education and training conforming with original planning of the curriculum and exchange visits; and iii) to provide conclusions and recommendations for improvement of the programme curriculum and exchange components.

The research study applied two evaluation designs: i) *clarificatory evaluation* to address objective one of the study, to gain clarity on pertinent concepts and implicit theories underpinning ICLDPs as well as to obtain clarification regarding the programme theory followed for the development of the ICLDP, in order to draw up the overall ICLDP theory-of-change logic model from which to structure implementation evaluation study design data collection and interpretations; and ii) *implementation evaluation* to address objectives two and three which focused on the extent to which the ICLDP was implemented in accordance with the original planning, and the degree to which the programme goals and objectives were attained.

**ICLDP Evaluation Study Concepts**

Several pertinent concepts relevant to the ICLDP study set the stage for this evaluation report. ‘Community Engagement’ (CE) is recognized, across the globe, as a significant role to be fulfilled by higher education institutions (HEIs); they are expected and required to make a fundamental contribution to the development of civil society and human capital, along with the further development of scholarly and academic activities. CE is a term both in flux and in fashion, in the higher education sector as to what it means and involves. This evaluation study has adopted the Carnegie Foundation definition for CE, in that it “....describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities [...] in a mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources...”\(^6\); it emphasizes aspects such as ‘collaboration’, ‘mutual beneficial exchange’ and ‘partnerships’ that must form a collaborative process towards common goals and outcomes.

The concept of ‘Community-University Partnerships’ (CUPs) – is often used in combination with community engagement, service learning and civic engagement. However, there is a distinctive difference which lies within the term ‘partnership’. CUPs appear to simply involve multiple members with a common goal; closer examination indicates that each member enters a partnership with ‘individual’ role-specific interests and expectations that are more specific and important to that individual than to the other partners. Whilst individual role-specific interests are necessary, the levels and types of interest and expectation are what should be present in a ‘healthy’ balance to create and sustain a partnership. No explicit definition exists for CUPs as the relevant literature prefers to rather describe its factors, challenges and characteristics. The most applicable description of CUPs for this report was by Cardoza & Salinas\(^7\) who highlight futures such as ‘open communication’, ‘collaboration’, ‘support’, ‘flexibility’ and ‘shared vision’ as important features for successful partnerships.


‘Community Leadership Development’ (CLD) has received increased attention over the past fifty years. It is based on the notion that although there are leaders everywhere, yet they are needed everywhere because of the decline in civic and social connectedness over the past half century, resulting in communities facing a growing number of challenges. Community leaders are needed to help address local challenges; for this they require training in, and development of, their leadership skills and attributes linked with basic community development skills, in order to bring people together (such as those found in transformational leadership models). Leadership Development Programmes (LDPs) started fifty years ago in Philadelphia in response to more civic and community involvement; today there are more than 750 of these programmes in USA.8 9 There are no recognised theories for leadership development; although much has been published on the various practices of leadership development, to date no universally accepted definition exists for the term ‘leadership’. Leadership development, in general, is mostly concerned with intrapersonal change and growth of individual leaders, as well as with the rational aspects of their leadership process. However, effective leadership development requires attention to both human capital (intrapersonal skills) and social capital (interpersonal skills), even though leadership development programmes most often do not include both. Most Community Leadership Development Programmes (CLDPs) follow a transformational leadership theory model, which encourages input to decision making by citizens at community level. These models require a leadership style based on openness, trust and mutual respect, with an aim to nurture team spirit. The ICLDP pilot project applied the transformational leadership theory model with a programme content that focused on ethics, leadership styles, cultural diversity, emotional intelligence, self-reflection practice and community development planning and process.

‘Transformational (Transformative) Learning’ was developed more than three decades ago from work started by Jack Mezirow, who was influenced by the work of Kuhn’s (1962) paradigm, Freire’s (1970) conscientization, and Habermans’s (1971, 1984) domains of learning10. Constructing ‘meaning’ from one’s own experience is seen as the key notion in the process of transformative learning11 12. Clark (1993) emphasises that transformative learning shapes people in such a manner that they are different afterwards, so much so that both they and others can recognise this change13.

The ability to be ‘critically self-reflective’ is one of two distinctive capabilities of adult learning; the other is ‘reflective judgment’, which is the ability to engage in critical conversations with others that require

assessment of one’s own assumptions and expectations in support of one’s own beliefs, values and feelings. Dirkx (2006) describes transformative learning as “…soul work or inner work…”, which involves focusing on the nature of the self, the different ways we think and come to understand our sense of self, self identity and subjectivity. This perspective of transformative learning is much more integrated and holistic, as it reflects the ‘intellectual’, ‘emotional’, ‘moral’ and ‘spiritual’ dimensions of being. This study applied Dirkx’s notion of transformational learning.

Research Setting and Study Sample
The research setting for this study was set in both the Western Cape, South Africa, and in Missouri, Columbia, with a research study population of nine participants; five selected by the CEU and four by MU Extension. The CEU participants attended ‘classroom’ training sessions of the ICLDP, with CEU selected facilitators, whilst the classroom sessions for the MU Extension participants followed a different teaching approach. All participants were assessed for the ‘practicum’ component of the ICLDP in their exchange visits to the other group’s country.

The five CEU participant profiles for analyses were Coloured and African males (aged 45+ to 60+) and females (aged 25+ to 45+). Education levels ranged from senior certificate to a higher education (undergraduate) qualification; first languages were Xhosa and Afrikaans, but all five could speak, read and write English; all were from urban and mostly impoverished communities in the Western Cape. The Missouri Group consisted of one male and three females (aged 45+ to 68+) from four counties, all speaking English as a first language; all had higher education qualifications ranging from undergraduate to PhD level.

Data Collection and Analyses for the ICLDP Evaluation Study
The ICLDP evaluation study data collection was done over nine months (from March to December 2015), applying multiple methods of data collection: programme document analysis; literature review; unstructured interviews; semi-structured questionnaires; and ‘field’ observations. This consisted mostly of qualitative data, to which grounded theory was applied to present data analyses based on quantitative results with descriptive statistics.

ICLDP Clarificatory Evaluation Results
In conceptualizing the ICLDP pilot programme, in June 2014, the partners set a two-year period for development and implementation, with time-line specific deliverables clustered into three phases: i) planning; ii) implementation; and iii) evaluation. The clarificatory evaluation assessment provided findings for the twelve deliverables indicated by the partners, from which the evaluator could develop a theory-of-change logic model to apply in structuring the implementation evaluation study. Whilst some of the main findings provided evidence that ‘in-house’ experience and expertise did exist in both teams (CEU & MU Extension) to act on the set deliverables, the estimated timeframes set to attain them were not feasible; this resulted in the ICLDP pilot lagging behind schedule, with a knock-on effect on the entire programme implementation time-frame and last phase deliverables. One such knock-on effect resulted in the two groups of participants not being able to form their partnerships as cross-country community leaders until October 2015, whereas this partnership formulation deliverable was set to
happen in March 2015; the last phase of the programme was thus not completed by the end of 2015, as was originally planned. However, despite these delays, the clarificatory evaluation results indicate that the ICLDP was aligned with that of other community leadership development programmes offered internationally, so that this pilot project could attain its goals and objectives as originally stipulated in its funding proposal. The following theory-of-change logic model consolidated and formulated from the data findings of the clarificatory evaluation study, provided the design and logical structure from which to assess the pilot project implementation and from which to monitor and evaluate future implementation cycles of this programme.

ICLDP Implementation Evaluation findings

The use of a combination of data gathering approaches in studying the the ICLDP curriculum (theory) and exchange (practice) components enabled the evaluator to identify and understand the operational links and the crucial decision points in certain ICLDP events and changes, as well as to be able to collect complex data on the group (participants) process and behaviour as the ICLDP beneficiaries. Together with gaining multiple viewpoints from the units of analyses in this study, this enhanced the validity of the study findings in support of the implementation evaluation conclusions and recommendations and avoided adversary explanations.

The research questions were aimed at determining the extent to which the ICLDP achieved its planned goals and objectives, per the MU Extension – UWC partnership funding proposal of 2013, in which specific deliverables (outputs) were set to be achieved with short and medium term outcomes, to bring about the long term ‘change’ (impact) of improved community wellbeing in communities. The implementation evaluation results indicate that: i) the five partnership short-term outcomes set for the partners were largely achieved, but in various stages; ii) the seven participant short-term outcomes set for the participants were achieved; iii) the five intermediate partner institution outcomes were mostly achieved; iv) the five ICLDP participant intermediate outcomes were not yet achieved; v) the five long-
term outcomes set out in the funding proposal could not yet be achieved or assessed; and vi) the seven long-term outcomes to be achieved with the participants also could not yet be achieved or assessed.

It is recommended that: a) for the five partnership short term outcomes an explicit plan be developed, with clear deliverables linked to realistically achievable time frames (as was done for the ICLDP curriculum design and implementation), in order to explicitly state the learning outcomes for the curriculum to be achieved, to serve as a checklist for measuring progress achievement in the future; b) for the seven participant short-term outcomes a quantitative pre- and post-test questionnaire should be developed, to be used with the qualitative data tools during future ICLDP offerings by the partners; furthermore, the ICLDP should always in future: enroll a minimum of 20-30 participants (as was originally planned) to present the training programme, then select 10 participants with the best progress performance on project development plans for application in their communities to participate in the country exchange visits; this should ensure that participants stay focused on the purpose and process of the ICLDP, thus delivering as cross-country partners on its expectations of bringing about the social and economic change in communities; c) for the five intermediate partner institution outcomes, although mostly achieved as the leadership programme curriculum has been developed and presented, the programme content needs to be finalised by addressing the specific related evaluation study recommendations and by developing this for presentation as an 8-module programme as originally planned; the additional training session, as requested by the pilot project participants (2-module programme), should be offered in order to allow for their requested extra time to practice and apply what they have learned, thereby ensuring that their project plans are completed and lead to successful implementation in partnership with their cross-country counterparts; d) for the five ICLDP participant intermediate outcomes project implementation time-frame delays in 2015, due to the delay in starting the ICLDP offering, these outcomes can be achieved when the additional training sessions are being offered; e) the five long-term outcomes set out in the funding proposal relate to the 18-24 months post-programme implementation phase; as some initial evidence from the implementation phase indicates that partnership network development has started towards collectively developing projects, which could then be implemented in the communities to bring about the overall expected impact by the ICLDP, a relationship network matrix should be developed for the ICLDP, with the partner institutions developing national research foundation funding applications in order to access funding for the assessment of the said ICLDP impact, for the last phase measurement in a year’s time; and e) for the seven long-term outcomes achievement of the ICLDP pilot project which will need to be measured in 2-3 years’ time.

Conclusion
The ICLDP pilot project partners (CEU & MU Extension) set themselves three goals\textsuperscript{14} relating to the establishment of a collaborative programme that must be based on all scholarships of engagement and, as a result, extend their reach into communities through community leaders who will be equipped with knowledge and skills to bring about change towards sustainable community wellbeing. The results presented in this report indicate that these initial pilot goals were attained to the extent that sustainability of the programme lies within the implementation of the recommendations made in this report, inclusive of the expressive design of a partnership model for cross-country ICLDPs.

\textsuperscript{14} See quoted goals in section 3.1 of this report.
The partners translated these goals into three project objectives: i) include community engagement, community development and community extension in an integrated manner to the 30-year long partnership between UWC and MU. This objective was achieved and the ICLDP integrated all three responsibilities (teaching and learning, research and community engagement/extension) of universities into a model on how higher education institutions, across the globe, can partner with each other to contribute towards the achievement of their contemporary overall responsibility ‘to bring about ‘change’ for the betterment of society’; ii) develop; and iii) implement a community leadership development programme. The findings presented in this report suggest that the ICLDP has had significant success in also obtaining these objectives, as participants have shown changing levels of self-knowledge, self-image, confidence and willingness to continue in an empowered manner as leaders in their communities. Strong relationships have developed, amongst and between the two participant groups, to partner in making a difference in the wellbeing of communities. This collective effort relates to the last implementation deliverable, still to be achieved, which is to assist these participants in completing their community development action plans for implementation.

Several authors, referenced in this report, have indicated the international need for further research relating to the ‘change in communities’ as a result of community leadership development programmes; this is due to the bulk of research studies only focusing on change in the person (leader) who attended the programme. This CEU-MU Extension collaborative ICLDP has the potential in future to collect data and present research findings in this regard leading to positive development in community wellbeing.

‘Succeeding with developing a culture of transformational leadership and lifelong learning amongst community leaders will be the ultimate act of leadership development’
1. Introduction
Internationally there has been a significant and growing amount of interest and activities in a range of teaching, research and service practices – with ‘service practices’ commonly referred to as ‘community engagement’. Although these practices of community engagement are within the context of the social responsibilities of universities, there has been a growing discourse with regard to community engagement theory, definitions and approaches. Nonetheless, the emphasis of community engagement relates to the overall purpose of community development, namely: achieving improved sustainable community wellbeing by means of integrative community development approaches. Such approaches, together with expanding university engagement in communities, require elaborate and integrative partnerships.

University partnerships have over the years expanded into several forms of community engagement. The potential benefits of these partnerships included: “...opportunities for networking, access to information and resources, personal recognition, learning, a sense of helping to solve community problems, improved relationships among stakeholders, increased capacity for problem solving, and contact with hard-to-reach populations.”16 Successful university community engagement partnerships demonstrate the following key futures: linking of human needs with societal problems, issues and concerns; the direct application of knowledge to human needs, societal problems, issues and concerns; utilisation of professional and academic expertise; the ultimate purpose is for public or common good; the generation of new knowledge for the target groups in the community and the discipline; a clear relationship between programme activities and university’s mission; and a commitment to long-term engagement17. Yet, community engagement partnerships are faced with challenges in many shapes and sizes, such as: diversity, power relations, history, assumptions, time, resources and logistics18 that set the context in which community engagement takes place.

2. Pertinent Concepts for this Study
Several pertinent concepts are applicable to this study. It is thus important to first describe them, in order to set the stage for this evaluation report of the International Community Leadership Development Programme (ICLDP) pilot project between the Community Engagement Unit (CEU) of the University of the Western Cape (UWC) and University of Missouri Extension (MU Extension) as part of the University of Missouri-Columbia. The pertinent concepts are: ‘community engagement’, ‘community-university partnerships’, ‘community leadership development’ and ‘transformative learning’ relevant to the role and functions of community engagement at universities.

2.1. Community Engagement
‘Community engagement’ at universities is a term both in flux and in fashion, with many claims as to its meaning and what it involves. That universities have a constructive – and highly necessary – role to play

---

17 Wilson, D. 2004. Key Features of Successful University-Community Partnerships.
in community engagement is widely recognised across the globe, albeit in varying degrees. By definition, universities have a longstanding tradition of teaching, research and ‘service’ (i.e. community engagement).

In recent years, the role of community engagement has become increasingly highlighted as an overarching strategy in the transformation of higher education in relation to the priorities of community development. Universities are expected and required to make a fundamental contribution to the development of civil society and human capital – along with further development of scholarly and academic activity. Practical community development can be – and is – used as an active method of implementing change. Two overall classifications of community engagement exist: i) the extent to which it features as a core activity across all areas of the university; and ii) the degree to which it is seen as something that needs to be actively designed and fostered versus it being something that ‘just happens anyway’ in all aspects of university life.19

It is important to note the distinction between ‘outreach’ and ‘engagement’ as a result of community engagement’s evolvement at universities over the past twenty years. This distinction relates to the type of relationship of university staff with their community partners. Bruns and Franz (2015) provide the following distinguishing descriptions:

“...Outreach (sometimes called service) is often a one-way flow of information or expertise from the university to the community. Outreach tends to favor the university or university expertise over the community’s knowledge or needs. For example, outreach is often sponsored solely by the university with a focus on what campus experts can provide to the community, such as campus-based educational events, expert services...”

“...With engagement, the community and the university together define the issue at hand, co-develop the methodology to address the issue, collaborate on action, monitor progress, reflect and critique the programming process, and create new questions to research or address in the future [...] The power of this symbiotic engagement is the potential for co-creation of knowledge that informs new research, engaged pedagogy, and community-based programming in an ongoing cycle...”

Both the UWC and MU adopt the ‘engagement’ approach towards community engagement for the purpose of this community leadership development collaborative pilot programme.

2.1.1. Community Engagement in SA

In South Africa, community engagement is recognised and legislated as one of the three core responsibilities (teaching, research and community service) of higher education21. The White Paper on the transformation of higher education, Act 101 of 1997, vol. 390, no 18515, refers to community engagement as an integral and core part of higher education in South Africa. In the White Paper universities are called on to “...demonstrate social responsibility [...] and their commitment to the

---

common good by making available expertise and infrastructure for community service programmes...”

The White Paper further states that one of the goals of higher education is to: “...promote and develop social responsibility and awareness amongst students of the role of higher education in social and economic development through community service programmes.”

The National Plan for Higher Education, of 2001, emphasises the need for “...responsiveness to regional and national needs, for academic programmes, research, and community service...”

The UWC recognises the importance of social responsibility and civic engagement; this is especially reflected in the strategic decisions made at executive level to engage in partnership initiatives that laid the foundation for the development of a community engagement unit. The importance of engaging society and essentially developing a scholarship of engagement that encompasses and facilitates the development of graduate attributes reflects UWC’s history and ethos.

The CEU at UWC sees community engagement as:

“...actively implementing a specific process towards a logical step-by-step activism. Education is a fundamental cornerstone enabling communities to develop [...] Community engagement can be conceptualised as a process by which community benefit organisations, community development professionals and other individuals build on-going relationships for the purpose of applying a collective vision for the benefit of a community...”

The CEU furthermore aligns with Boyer’s (2008) scholarship of engagement, which refers to community engagement as a process that involves an evolution and transformation of knowledge as opposed to the simple transfer of information from one learning partner to another. Boyer goes further to state that the “...process of scholarship should locate third level educational institutions (higher education institutions) at the heart of communities rather than at their margins...” Engaged scholarship consists of all the forms of scholarly activity by the university. It is thus “...processes of mutual engagement which are directed towards the development, improvement and enhancement of both the community and the university through applied scholarship...” The CEU at UWC has selected the following different community engagement streams to categorise the university’s community engagement approach in which its university schools, faculties, units and departments may be involved: i) engagement through teaching and learning; ii) engaged research; iii) engagement with business, industry and professional links (i.e. partnerships); iv) social and cultural engagement; and v) economic engagement. The ICLDP pilot project is unique in that it relates to each of these streams.

2.1.2. Community Extension (engagement) in USA

In the United States of America, community engagement (extension) goes as far back as 1862, when Congress enacted the Morrill Act (also known as the Land-Grant Act) to bring about a different set of...
universities that was to both provide access to higher education for ordinary people and produce research that would help America to develop as a nation. These universities – referred to as Land Grant universities – were established in every state and territory in the United States in order to fulfil their mission of access to higher education in local communities. The Hatch Act of 1887 operationalised the research component of the Land Grant universities – and the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 extended the research and teaching components of these universities into the communities when the Extension Service was established. Much has happened since then; many of these universities, such as the University of Missouri, have internationalised their mission.\(^{29}\)\(^{30}\) The University of Missouri was founded in 1839, and in 1870 land-grant funds were applied to establish the College of Agriculture on the Columbia campus\(^{31}\). Thus, the University of Missouri has recognised the importance of extension since 1912; today the mission of MU Extension is:

“...to improve lives, communities and economies by producing relevant, reliable and responsive educational strategies that enhance access to the resources and research of the University of Missouri...”\(^{32}\)

This mission ties in with their vision which is to be:

“...a valued and trusted educational solution to improve the quality of life in Missouri, the nation and the world...”\(^{33}\)

MU Extension states that engagement should be:

“...demonstrated by a reciprocity and partnership where knowledge and its application are exchanged in an atmosphere of mutual respect. Engagement enriches scholarship, fosters relevant responses and enhances social and economic outcomes...”\(^{34}\)

Thus, in the USA, teaching, research and service, underpins the fundamental purpose of universities – just as in the case in South Africa. The CEU and MU Extension, as described in the previous section and this section, have many commonalities with regard to their conceptualisation of ‘engagement’, especially with regard to the importance of partnerships and scholarship enrichment.

**2.1.3. Definition of Community Engagement for this study**

This evaluation study found the following definition of the Carnegie Foundation for community engagement to be the most suitable and representative for the ICLDP pilot project between the CEU and MU Extension:

“...Community Engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity [...] Partnerships are ongoing long-term relationships in which each partner...


\(^{31}\) MU Extension. n.d.*Building a Bridge to Community Learning*, p.3.


\(^{33}\) Ibid.

\(^{34}\) Ibid.
brings individual goals, needs, assets and strategies, and through collaborative processes blends them into common goals and outcomes...\(^{35}\)

The quoted definitions emphasise several aspects relevant to the ICLDP partnership, such as ‘collaboration’, ‘mutual beneficial exchange’ and ‘partnerships’, which essentially form a collaborative process towards common goals and outcomes.

### 2.2. Community-University Partnerships

Globally, community-university partnership sustainability presents a mixed picture. In both the USA and Australia it is relatively well developed, with university-wide structures that are in place to provide ongoing support for activities intended for improved cultural and social change. In the UK and South Africa it is still quite rare\(^{36}\). This mixed picture is thus linked to a disjuncture in funding opportunities for community engagement/service work. However, much progress has been made in the UK and South Africa in the past ten years; South Africa has set up a National Research Fund (NRF) opportunity for community engagement since 2014.

The concept of community-university partnership is often used in combination with community engagement, service learning and civic engagement. Although they are at large very similar in process, this study argues for a distinction of the ‘community-university partnership’ concept, specifically with regard to the term ‘partnership’, which deserves independent and closer examination. This independent status is justified when examining, for example, the ‘roles’ of the partners.

Generally speaking, community-university partnerships appear to simply involve multiple members with a common goal. However, when examined more closely, it becomes clear that each of these members enters the partnership with ‘individual’ role-specific interests – and with expectations that are more specific and more important to oneself than to the other partners. Individual role-specific interests and expectations are necessary for partnerships, but the levels and types of interest and expectations are what should be in a ‘healthy’ balance to create and sustain a partnership\(^{37,38}\). Cruz and Giles (2000) and Holland (2003) recommend that university-community partnerships itself should be the unit of analysis in community-focused research and not so much the project/intervention, as it is the partnership model that is being followed that brings the successful outcome – not so much the project activities. Partnerships are too often launched with a project specific focus or funding opportunity but little attention given to the actual expectations of the participants in the project – resulting in partners simply assuming they understand each other’s motivations\(^{39,40}\).
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\(^{35}\) The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching “Documentation Framework FAQs” http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/ce_faq.php


Bringle, Clayton and Price (2009) also call for a distinctive focus on ‘partnership’ in university-community partnerships by suggesting a deeper analysis of ‘relationships’ and ‘partnerships’. The authors are of the opinion that it is relationships that become partnerships, due to a ‘closeness’ that develops though interactions amongst the partners – interactions that possess particular qualities such as reciprocity, trust, honesty and good communication. Bringle and Hatcher (2002) and Wilson (2004) highlight the complexity of university-community partnerships due to the cultural differences that exist between higher education and the community in terms of how each generates knowledge and solves problems. The authors make reference to university-community partnerships that are too often rooted in charity rather than justice, due to the ‘expert model’ frequently being applied by university staff. This type of model is characterised by relationships that are elitist, hierarchical and unidimensional instead of being collegial, participatory, cooperative and democratic. Walsh (2006) highlights that even if a ‘justice’ approach to the relationship is followed, the mere order and structure differences of universities and community groups may be in conflict – resulting in role and participation equality challenges. It is these relationship characteristics, as cultural differences, that become significant challenges to effective communication, respect and coordination of activities towards mutual goals and shared visions when striving towards sustainable partnerships.

Thus, ‘relationships’ is proposed as the general and broad term for all types of interaction between persons, whilst ‘partnership’ relates to the relationships in which the interactions possess three particular qualities: closeness, equity and integrity. In order to understand community-university partnerships, it is important to examine the range of the individual interests and types of interactions between the partners which collectively contribute to achieving a common goal. A thorough literature search for a definition of university-community partnerships has been conducted for inclusion in this report. However, no specific definition was available; the authors prefer to rather describe the factors, challenges and characteristics of university-community partnerships. The most applicable description of a university-community partnership for this report was from Cardoza and Salinas, in “New Directions in Civic Engagement” where the authors highlight the following features for successful partnerships:

- **Communication** – must be open, consistent and take place in a space of trust, between the partners, especially with regard to the planning and implementation phases.
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44 Wilson, D. 2004. Key Features of Successful University-Community Partnerships (p.20).
- **Collaboration** – should comprise collective efforts that enhance the efficient use of resources and also broaden the depth and reach of the process towards meeting the expectations of all parties involved.
- **Support** – is required from all stakeholders, especially from the leadership of the university as well as the community; it can be in the form of human resources, infrastructure and finance.
- **Flexibility** – is a very high priority, especially in light of the fact that all parties have their own interests, accountability standards and distinct reporting requirements.
- **Vision** – must be built on a shared “compromise” instead of on collective and shared goals that are often not explicitly indicating self-interest and are thus based on assumptions of interest.

It is recommended (in the last section of this report) that an international community-university partnership framework should be developed by the partners – using the data findings of the evaluation study – to design a model by which to take the ICLDP further between the two partnering universities.

### 2.3. Community Leadership Development

Community leadership has received increased attention over the past fifty (50) years, influenced largely by the notion of ‘servant leadership’ of the seventies. Community leadership is based on the notion that: “...there are leaders everywhere, including civic groups, boards of volunteer agencies, neighbourhood associations, interest groups and self-help organisations...”\(^{47}\) There is a great need for community leadership development especially, as indicated by Putman (2000), in light of the decline in civic and social connectedness over the past half century. This decline puts communities at risk in facing their many challenges. Community leaders are needed to help address the local challenges; for this they will require training in, and development of, leadership skills and attributes linked with basic community development skills, to bring people together.\(^{48}\) \(^{49}\) \(^{50}\) \(^{51}\) \(^{52}\) Effective leadership in a community context requires collaborative leadership skills\(^{53}\), such as those found in transformational leadership models.

Community Leadership Programmes (CLPs) started fifty (50) years ago in Philadelphia in response to more civic and community involvement. Today there are more than 750 of these programmes (formal
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training and informal training) in USA, as well as many others in the UK and Australia. Research of leadership education programmes has been mostly focused on large corporate organisations, government and the military for the past forty (40) years; very little has been done on leadership in the community context. Furthermore, the research on community context leadership has focused predominantly on personal and inter-personal skills and knowledge acquirement, resulting in a lack of research data with regard to the impact of leadership education programmes (post training) in community change. The lack of impact studies is mostly due to a lack of funding, as these studies are extensive and require many resources to conduct. The research conducted for this pilot study could not yet measure the impact made by the participants in their communities as the participants have only completed their training programme in October 2015. Should funding be made available, then CEU at the UWC will be in a position to conduct such research in two years’ time.

Leadership development, in a general sense, is mostly concerned with intrapersonal change and growth of individual leaders, as well as with the rational aspects of their leadership process. There are no recognised theories for leadership development, although much has been published on the various practices of leadership development. The term ‘leadership’ has so far proved impossible to define so that the definition is universally accepted. This is due to the use of a term that could include any of the following, or a combination thereof: different leadership approaches that emphasise specific behaviours, comprehensive leadership styles and related characteristics, the relationship between a leader and a follower. None the less, effective leadership development requires attention to both human capital (i.e. intrapersonal skills) and social capital (i.e. interpersonal skills) concerns – even though most often leadership development programmes do not include both. In other words, “...leadership development must include intrapersonal leader development with network interpersonal leadership development in ways that build both the human and social capital components of leadership...” Rasmussen, Armstrong and Chazdon (2011) in Apaliyah et al. (2012) stress the importance of including both these aspects in community leadership programmes. Research by Putman (1993) and Armony (2004) indicate a strong connection between civic engagement and human and social capital. Community leaders trained in social and human capital skills can assist with achieving civic activity in decision-making processes regarding community development. Leadership is fundamentally linked to networking amongst leaders, followers and the social environment. Thus individual leaders must be
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trained in skills that enable them to communicate, influence and inspire others effectively. Communities are, for example, facing human capital challenges in education levels which relate to skills, knowledge and abilities to address their development challenges. Some of these skills are basic, such as how to conduct meetings and take minutes; other skills involve taking community members through community development planning and decision making processes – and getting stakeholders involved in community development initiatives. Human capital and social capital are closely related, due to social capital relating to both relationship building in the community (bonding social capital) and outside the community (bridging social capital) with, for example, key stakeholders.

2.3.1. Leadership Development Programmes Content

Leadership in a community context relates to egalitarian (reciprocal) leadership, because in communities one person does not control a group. Thus, leadership is shared by several individuals at different times – depending on the situation and the required leadership skills, necessitating the need for a high level of competence and a broad perspective with regard to community development and leadership. This means that leadership development programmes are critical in providing the necessary skills to assist community leaders with the necessary skills to address essential matters in the community.\(^{62}\)

The National Extension Task Force on Community Leadership (1986) defined community leadership as:

“...a process involving influence, power and input into public decision making in organizations, an area of interest, and institution, a town, a county or a region...”\(^{63}\)

Majee, Long & Smith, (2012) state that several leadership models and theories, such as trait theory, situational theory and transformation theory, have been applied to Leadership Development Programmes (LDPs)\(^{64}\). Transformational leadership theory models encourage input to decision making by citizens at community level, stressing the importance of teamwork and social relationships, as well as the importance of individual, group and community networks. The leadership style in this model is based on openness, trust and respect – as well as the development and nurturing of team spirit.\(^{65}\)

The transformational leadership theory model was applied in the programme content developed for the ICLDP offered in partnership between the CEU and MU Extension. The content of the ICLDP is described in more detail later in this evaluation report.

Porr (2011) highlights the importance of leadership skills and leadership awareness that should be inherent in the curriculum of LDPs. However, research has indicated that most LDP content was seen as a second priority by the participants; rating networking possibilities was the most important. This high
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\(^{63}\) Ibid.


\(^{65}\) Ibid.
prioritisation of networking opportunities in LDPs resulted in LDPs mostly being referred to as ‘meet and greet’ events. Networking is very closely related to leadership as it also deals with people who have not direct control over one another. None the less, the basic purpose of all LDPs is to provide participants with substantial knowledge and skills about community development and leadership skills – which could be done via formal or informal training. Academic institutions (e.g. universities) have become more and more involved in LDP offerings, largely due to their ‘community service’ function, and this has resulted in these programmes having the necessary content relevant to skills and knowledge requirements for community leadership development. Porr’s (2011) research findings indicated that the reason for the ‘meet and great’ tag of LDPs was mostly due to these programmes predominantly being offered in the past by the business and commerce sectors. Research done by Pigg (2001) on LDPs indicated the need for a bottom-up view – suggesting that CLP administrators should rather stay with their expertise and leave the CLP content (curriculum) development and delivery of training to the appropriate experts (e.g. academic staff at universities with the necessary experience and research background). Porr’s main recommendation, made from the research findings, was that:

“...the academic community should step up to this challenge by increasing their influence in the process [...of CLPs...as] CLPs need to put “development” back into their program content so that they can be more accurately labelled as Community Leadership Development Programs...”

Almost 85% of all CLPs have a classroom component. However, even though this is very valuable, it is not completely effective, as leadership tends to develop much better through enactment and hands-on experience in the actual everyday mill of life. ‘Multisource feedback’ approaches are also helpful, as they seek to enhance self-knowledge of leadership abilities, roles and characteristics. The content of these CLPs is focused on topics which are similar, such as: cultural diversity, leadership styles, ethics, group dynamics, self-reflection practices, community development planning and process, relationship and team building, as well as conflict mediation. These CLPs average 72 hours of class time stretching over a period of between one to three (1-3) years, with more or less only one contact session per month. A few of the CLPs also include a class project, which participants need to submit, based on
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an identified community problem from their own communities or the ones they have visited during the site visit (practicum) component of the CLP.  

The ICLDP aimed at providing a combination of the classroom and multisource feedback approaches. However, this was a pilot project which went through several amendments with regard to ‘length of classroom time’. What started off to be a training programme of eight modules, five day classroom sessions per module resulted in only two modules with themes/topics striving to cover the same content in a shortened manner presented over only two five day sessions. Furthermore, the MU participants were introduced to the same two modules, but a different classroom approach was followed. More detail of the ICLDP in this regard is provided later in this report, when the programme implementation and main findings are described.

2.4. Transformative Learning

Transformative learning theory, also referred to as ‘transformational’ learning theory, was developed more than three decades ago from the work started by Jack Mezirow; to date it has received more attention than any other adult learning theory. Mezirow is seen as the primary spokesperson for transformative learning, although other models started to contribute to his discussion on the subject. The foundation of Mezirow’s transformative learning theory was influenced by Kuhn’s (1962) paradigm, Freire’s (1970) conscientization, and Habermans’s (1971, 1984) domains of learning.

Constructing ‘meaning’ from one’s own experience is seen as the key notion in the process of transformative learning. Mezirow (1985) identified three learning processes: i) learning ‘within meaning schemes’ – which relates to the learner working with what they already know and then expanding or complementing their current knowledge system; ii) learning ‘new meaning schemes’ – that are compatible with the learner’s existing meaning perspective (viewpoint) and; iii) learning ‘through meaning transformation – which relates to the learner becoming aware of an incomplete learning meaning scheme – e.g. a knowledge challenge which the learner cannot resolve by either one of the first two means of learning. It is this third process of learning that Mezirow (2003) further describes as the ‘highest level of critical self-judgement – which is a critical requirement for transformative learning to take place.

In essence, transformative theory describes the “...approach to learning as ‘change’ – dramatic and fundamental change in the way we see ourselves [...] and the world in which we live...” Clark (1993) emphasises that transformative learning shapes people in such a manner that they are different afterwards, so much so that both they and others can recognise this change. Mezirow (2003) defines transformational learning as:

“...learning that transforms [...] frames of reference – sets of fixed assumptions and expectations (habits of mind, meaning perspectives, mindsets) – to make them more inclusive, [...] open, reflective, and emotionally able to change. Such frames of reference are better than others because they are more likely to generate beliefs and opinions that will prove more true or justified to guide action [...] Taken-for-granted frames of reference include fixed interpersonal relationships, political orientations, cultural bias, ideologies [...] stereotyped attitudes and practices [...] moral-ethical norms [...] aesthetic values and standards...”

Experience is taken as the starting point for the approach followed in transformative learning theory – and becomes the content for reflection. Critical reflection on live experience is what ensures transformation (change). The ability to be ‘critically self-reflective’ is one of two distinctive capabilities of adult learning. The second capability is ‘reflective judgment’, which is the ability to engage in critical conversations with others in a manner that requires assessment of one’s own assumptions and expectations in support of one’s own beliefs, values and feelings. Adult individuals who are at the highest level of personal reflective judgment are able to provide, during conversations, a point of view about their own perceptions whilst making sense of the points of view of others. This ability is essential for transformative learning to take place; some scholars hold the view that more democratic participation by citizens can come from it. This viewpoint is further extended by Warren (1995) who states that “...democratic participation is an important means of self-development and producing individuals who are more tolerant of difference, sensitive to reciprocity, better able to engage in moral discourse and judgment, and more self-reflective...” According to Mezirow (2003), the purpose of adult education should therefore be to assist adults with acquiring the capabilities both to become critically self-reflective and to exercise reflective judgment by means of developing their skills, insights and character to become more critically reflective of their assumptions about their own beliefs and those of others – as a result going through personal change (transformative learning). Brown and Posner (2001) list the following “…key concepts in transformative learning: a) experience – critical incidents or trigger events; b) critical reflection – content reflection, process reflection and premise reflection (examining long held
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beliefs and values about the experience); c) affective learning – feelings play a primary role in triggering reflection; d) dialogue and relationships that are supportive and trusting; and e) individual development...

2.4.1. Relationship between Transformational Learning and Transformational Leadership

Research by Kouzes and Posner (1995) found three activity sources through which people learn to lead – which is also mostly the case with adult learning: i) trial and error; ii) observation of others; and iii) education (training). Brown and Posner (2001) go further in saying that: “...it is precisely because leaders have successfully navigated deep personal change that they are able to create conditions in which [...] can themselves become engaged in the practice of learning...” Furthermore, the research findings published by Brown and Posner (2001) also indicate that adult learners who are deeply engaged in critical reflection – of the self, others and the ‘environment’ in which they find themselves – are much more successful as leaders. The authors continue to recognise that transformational learning concepts offer insights for influencing the effective development of transformational leadership competencies, by describing the following conditions for promoting transformational learning:

“...a) creating a climate of openness, safety and trust, being learner centered and encouraging self-directed learning;  
b) providing learning activities that encourage the exploration of alternative personal perspectives via questioning, critical self reflection and self dialogue;  
c) facilitators who are trusting, empathetic, caring, authentic, with integrity, able to bring forth feelings to promote critical reflection;  
d) providing opportunities for assessment and feedback; and  
e) allowing and/or providing the time necessary for the personal exploration and the intensity of the experience...”

The conditions listed above were measured in this evaluation study by asking the participants in the ICLDP to provide feedback with regard to their learning experiences in this programme. This was done for both groups (SA & USA) by retrieving data from the evaluation questionnaires and unstructured interviews of the exchange visit periods – and some social media text shared amongst the two groups of participants.

2.4.2. Dirkx’s Extra-Rational Notion of Transformative Learning

Diverse theoretical perspective about transformative learning has come to the fore since it was first constructed by Mezirow 37 years ago. This diversity makes for rich and meaningful debate, which has also led to the development of several different approaches that can be followed when applying
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transformative learning in adult education and training. One such alternative approach that is particularly relevant – and which was applied by the evaluator for this evaluation study – is that of John Dirkx.

Stuckey, Taylor and Cranton (2013) lists three dominant notions of transformative learning theory, evidential in all variants of approaches and processes that have since evolved from transformative learning theory. One notion is the “cognitive/rational perspective” of Mezirow (1991) which emphasises rationality, critical reflection and ideal conditions for dialogue, based on the constructivist view of learning. This view of learning emphasises the process of constructing new or revised meaning schemes from one’s existing meaning schemes. Critique of this notion has centred on: “...its minimal attention to other ways of knowing, overemphasis on rationality and lack of attention to power and social change.”

The other notion is referred to as the “extra-rational” perspective – further described by scholars such as Dirkx (1998), Lawrence (2012) and Tisdell (2000) who followed a Jungian approach – to describe how individuals work with unconscious content. This notion emphasises the “...emotive, imaginal, spiritual and arts-based facets of learning, those that reach beyond rationality...” The extra-rational perspective “...recognizes personal, intuitive, and imaginative ways of knowing that lead to individuation (the development of the self as separate from, but integrated with, the collective of humanity)...”

The third and last notion is the “social critique perspective” of Brookfield (2012) and Freire (1970) – which emphasises:

“...ideological critique, unveiling oppression and social action in the context of transformative learning [...] This view emphasize social transformation and is about the individual developing an “ontological vocation” [...] a theory of existence, which views people as subjects, not objects, that are constantly reflecting and acting on the transformation of their world so it can become a more equitable place for all to live.”

The goal of this notion is to foster emancipatory transformative learning which, according to Stuckey et al (2013), is based on the following four broad methods: i) critical reflection – as the centre method to “rediscovering power” and thus help learners develop an awareness of how to transform society and their own reality; ii) a “liberating teaching approach” – as a method not to ‘teach’ but to ‘facilitate’ learning by thinking, discovering and reflecting; iii) a “problem posing and dialogue” method to learning;

and iv) a “horizontal student-teacher relationship” approach – where both parties work on an equal footing with each other.  

Dirkx (2006) describes transformative learning as “...soul work or inner work...” which involves focusing on the nature of the self, the different ways we think and come to understand our sense of self, self-identity and subjectivity. This perspective of transformative learning is thus much more integrated and holistic as it reflects the ‘intellectual’, ‘emotional’, ‘moral’ and ‘spiritual’ dimensions of being. This integrated perspective aims to assess the ways in which the ‘social’, ‘cultural’ and the ‘deep personal’ and ‘embodied transpersonal’ aspects of the self-being influence the process of transformative learning. Put differently, it seeks to understand how existing personal ‘meaning schemes’ (described earlier) are influenced, when adult learning takes place, in order to achieve transformative learning. Stuckey et al, (2013) states that Dirkx (2012) bases his understanding of transformative learning on:  

“...depth psychology, especially a Jungian approach, and often refers to it as nurturing soul or soul work. As such he is interested in the psyche and bringing the unconscious to consciousness (increasing self-awareness and development of more open perspectives)...”

This interest of Dirkx (2006) in bringing the unconscious to the consciousness relates to the author’s description of transformative learning, which is that it should revolve around a type of learning that will integrate a person’s experiences of the “outer world” (text and subject matter – i.e. everyday life) with experience of a person’s “inner world” (emotions, personal -beliefs, -values, thoughts of self – i.e. inner voices). Participation in group work, listening to lecturers or facilitators of learning, reading and studying collectively all contribute to a better understanding of one’s inner world in relation to what happens in the outer world. Transformative learning as an outcome (not as a process) is what contributes to a deeper appreciation of our purpose in life, giving it meaning – a sort of ‘renewed and/or enhanced self-discovery’. Put differently by Dirkx (2006):

“...we are deeply connected, not just through our common intellectual heritage, but through deep emotional and spiritual bonds that seem part of the very fabric of our being [...] to connect with the whole, we need to know ourselves, who we are and what we are about. Our relationships with others are only as strong and deep as the relationship we have with ourselves.”

Several factors contribute to the learning process, including the characters of the facilitator (lecturer) and fellow participants, the ambience of the learning venue or setting, the content scope being covered
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in the training, the training approach being followed by the facilitator – and, most important, the ‘self’ of the learner. This evaluation study incorporated the factors in the design of the evaluation questionnaires that had to be completed by the participants after the ‘theoretical training’, as well as the practicum components of the training programme. The overall purpose in measuring these factors in the questionnaires was, ultimately, to determine what participants found to be meaningful. Research has shown that the more an experience tends to relate to what one already has to some extent ingested in the ‘inner world’, the more meaningful the experience. However, more meaningful experience can also be more challenging – due to existing beliefs, opinions and inherent attitudes that might already exist, thus expecting a transformative learning ‘process’ from the person in order to achieve transformative learning as an ‘outcome’ – should the ‘radical shift’ in opinion and beliefs take place. Radical shifts create deep emotion and powerful feelings which, in the beginning of the shift, could fluctuate between positive and negative emotion; this is referred to by Mezirow (1991) as a ‘disorienting dilemma’, which offers us opportunities to deeply reflect and re-examine aspects of one’s life that one has not thought of for many years, if ever. Thus, learning experiences always capture both one’s intellectual and emotional attention – and most often at the same time.

3. Project Context and Overview

Thirty years ago the University of the Western Cape (UWC) and the University of Missouri (UM) began a relationship, after the Board of Curators of the University of Missouri authorised the establishment of the University of Missouri South African Education Programme (UMSAEP). This relationship was formalised with the signing of a formal Memorandum of Academic Cooperation in June 1986 – the first ever signed between a ‘non-white’ South African university and a United States university. The purpose of the UWC/UM exchange programme was to advance mutual understanding between the faculties of the respective institutions and to promote collaborations with regard to: i) teaching, ii) research and iii) service (community engagement) to the benefit of each institution and its broader communities which it serves. To date more than 500 faculty exchange visits have taken place between the two institutions, predominantly relating to teaching collaboration. Numerous grants relating to research collaborations have been awarded in recent times by the UMSAEP committee – consisting of three representatives from each of the respective institutions.

Until late 2009 no explicit community engagement relationships have been built, nor have any exchanges taken place between the two institutions in this regard. However, during the 25th anniversary celebration of the UMSAEP at the UWC in May 2010, three MU Extension administrators comprised the visiting UM delegation. It was during this visit that the community engagement partnership started.

100 University of Missouri System Website, http://www.umsystem.edu/president/southafrica Date retrieved 23 Dec ‘15.
101 Michael Ouart, Vice-Provost for MU Extension, Beverly Coberly, Associate Vice Provost and Mary Leuci (CD program director and asst dean in College of Agriculture Food and Natural Resources).
to develop between the CEU of the UWC and the MU Extension. This partnership has since grown from a visit in 2012 of a regional MU Extension faculty member and MU Extension State Council member, regular conversations and planning sessions, via web-based conferencing and four jointly sponsored webinars on key topics relevant to community engagement and extension, to the design, implementation and evaluation of this ICLDP pilot project – made possible after submission in 2013 of a successful funding proposal by MU Extension for $27,550. MU Extension contributed match funding to the UMSAEP grand with additional funding, especially with regard to the research of the ICLDP by the CEU. The ICLDP pilot project is thus the first of its kind between the two institutions, since 1986, relating to community engagement (‘service’) – and which also holds a co-‘teaching’ component, as well as a research (formative process evaluation) component. This pilot study has integrated all three legislated responsibilities of universities worldwide.

3.1. ICLDP Pilot Project Goals
The MU Extension – UWC Partnership funding proposal (2013) stated the following ICLDP pilot project goals to be attained for the ICLDP pilot project:

“...Mutually developed goals by UWC and MU Extension include:

- Establishing a rich, sustainable collaborative learning program that includes outreach, engagement, and applied research.
- Broadening the UM-UWC partnership to include our constituents and community leaders, following a partnership model.
- Focusing on areas of mutual interest and priority such as: community leadership and engagement, youth development, health, food systems, entrepreneurship and economic development, sustainability, environment—to name a few...

3.2. ICLDP Pilot Project Objectives
These goals were then translated into the following project objectives as follows:

1. “...To add components of community engagement, community development, and extension to the long-standing relationship between the two universities. The relationship will also be expanded to include key non-profit organizations/NGOs in each country.
2. To use our collective knowledge and resources to create an innovative leadership program with a curriculum that is strengthened by the international partnership.
3. To facilitate the development of effective community leaders (both emerging and existing) that have sustainable, positive impacts on their home communities...”

The extent to which the above quoted project goals and objectives were attained is discussed in the ‘Evaluation Conclusions and Recommendations’ sections of this report.

---


The project team was to share equally the planning responsibilities, with the CEU wanting to:

“...extend its outreach and engagement with communities, neighborhoods and townships in Western Cape, positively affecting community leaders in a sustainable way. MU Extension want[ed...] to provide global understanding and experiences for community leaders that help meet emergent needs for leadership in local contexts. UWC and MU Extension are not identical, but are compatible...”

3.3. Three-stage ICLDP Implementation.

The project team envisaged the ICLDP implementation to take place in the following three-stage manner as stated in the MU Extension – UWC Partnerships funding proposal (2013):

- “...Stage One: An approximately six-week educational program in the home country. Both programs will take place simultaneously, with at least two sessions held jointly via internet conferencing. Communications technology and social media will be used to build relationships, share information, and hold discussions [...] Through the course of this first stage program participants will be expected to begin developing goals for using their newly acquired learning.

- Stage Two: Program participants will visit the other country; this exchange will add depth to the lessons learned, showcasing the concepts in action and in context of community. This stage, which will not occur simultaneously, will include site visits to NGOs and community organizations, meetings with faculty and administration [...] Each participant will develop an action plan with timeline, either alone or as part of self-selected teams with other program participants...

- Stage Three: Designated liaisons from the planning team follow program participants to aid in completing action plans and commitments that resulted from the delegation visit. A follow-up session will be held via Internet conferencing four months after each exchange to assess the sustaining impacts of the program on participants, the progress on their action plans, and any needs for additional resources or information...”

3.4. Planned Curricula Themes

During a June 2014 visit by the South African project team members to Missouri, the ICLDP project team agreed on the following eight (8) planned curricula themes for the programme – and the curriculum development responsibilities (indicated in brackets) between the two partners:

1. “...Theories and principles of leadership (MU) – covering the meaning of leadership and leadership styles, the scholarship of engagement and the development of positive aspects of traditional and modern leadership.

2. Communication (MU) – focusing on partnership principles, community driven processes following a strengths based approach, celebrating success, developing a vision and mission and principal leadership tasks.
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4. *Transformational leadership* (MU) – incorporating topics such as the guiding principles for people-centred (transformational) leadership, leadership versus management, infused principle of conflict management, coalition building of Butterfoss to also integrate with partnerships building.

5. *Ethics* (UWC) – to include topics such as Ubuntu, social responsiveness, civic engagement and people first (‘Batopole’) principles.

6. *Diversity* (UWC & MU) – had to be developed with the underlying value or infused principle of the ICLD programme in mind; covering topics such as ‘Ubuntu’, people first, solidarity within a global context and self-reflection.

7. *Project management* (UWC & MU) – to include topics such as SWOT analysis, strategic planning, monitoring and evaluation through logic models; inclusive of facilitation of equitable sustainable partnerships.

8. *Sustainable community development and mobilization* – (UWC with a bit of support from MU re the sustainability component) – would address the theories of Paolo Freire, and topics such as cohesiveness, accountability, economic, environmental and social sustainability, collective impact, social capital and social justice and the community capitals framework...

These curricula themes agreed between the two partners were set for development and completion between March and July 2014, after which the programme marketing materials, communication plans and participants recruitment criteria had to be submitted for peer review. Programme marketing and recruitment were set for August to September 2014, in order to be able to start stage one of the programme over a six week period, in both countries. Two presentation sessions of the stage one programme content were set to be held jointly via internet conferencing.

**3.5. Planned Teaching Approach**

The ICLDP was set to follow a blended teaching and learning approach over a period of sixteen (16) weeks, consisting of one hundred (100) hours – made up 50/50 of equal hours contact (teaching) and practicum time; contact time was split on an average of five (5) hours contact time per theme. The ICLDP was to be offered on the E-learning platform at UWC, with participants expected to build a portfolio of evidence throughout the programme offering – which includes their tasks, exercises, reflective journal sheets and any personal notes taken during the training and field trips.

As part of the induction of the participants to the course and to one another, the project team envisaged the development of a ‘manual’ in which they wanted to include:

- “...Rules of engagement and leadership code of ethics
- Participants decide rules, we suggest and fill in any glaring gaps
- Agreement that needs to be signed by participants.
- Contact details and short biography (including picture) of each participant
- Contact details and facilitator contact information
- Module descriptors

---
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The project team planned to assess ICLDP participants by following the learning ‘evaluation’ style of MU Extension – which is done at three levels: i) learning ‘impact’ in the short-term; ii) intermediate ‘impacts’ from learning through action; and iii) long term learning ‘impacts’ after conditions have changed in the communities through processes started by the participants – two to three years following completion of the ICLDP programme training and exchange.

4. Overview of the Evaluation Purpose
The CEU took on the responsibility for the evaluation of the ICLDP pilot project, thereby obtaining ethical clearance for conducting this study from the UWC Department of Research Development, as well as ensuring registration as a research project entitled: “Process Evaluation of a Training Programme in Leadership for Sustainable Community Development”.

The overall purpose of the evaluation study was to evaluate the extent to which the ICLDP pilot project actually offered its planned deliverables (outputs) by providing participants with theoretical knowledge, specific practical skills, attitudes and applied competence to enter communities with leadership towards achieving sustainable community wellbeing.

4.1. Evaluation Study Objectives:
The project purpose was translated into the following three study objectives:

1. To evaluate the planning and design of the programme and its curriculum.
2. To evaluate the implementation of the programme curriculum and its exchange component with regard to the education and training being coherent with the original planning of the curriculum and exchange visits.
3. To provide conclusions and recommendations for adjustment and/or improvement of the programme curriculum and exchange components for the ICLDP between the two partner university entities.

5. Research Designs, Purpose and Methods
Programme evaluation methodology was applied in the ICLDP study through following two evaluation designs: i) clarificatory evaluation; and ii) process (implementation) evaluation design with a formative purpose; case study design was applied to collect the data for the purpose process evaluation design.

The purpose of implementation (process) evaluation design is to improve on the ICLDP pilot project before conducting a comprehensive implementation of it. Herman, et al. (1987) emphasise the
necessity for pilot programmes to undergo improvement evaluations. During these evaluations it is important to understand how well a programme is moving towards its objectives, in order to bring about the recommendations for change. Improvement orientated evaluation studies therefore have a “formative-learning” purpose\textsuperscript{110} which could inform programme staff about the strengths, weaknesses and challenges faced by the programme to be improved.

Implementation evaluation studies are suggested by Chen (2005) to have an enlightenment strategy and a theory-driven (programme logic) approach. For the purpose of this study the conceptual model of Chen (2005) was applied in order to assess the ICLDP. In short, Chen’s model indicates the programme theory of all interventions – which is based on appropriate implementation of the ‘action model’ to activate the transformation process in the ‘change model’\textsuperscript{111}. A theory-of-change logic model (developed during the clarificatory evaluation study) formed the backbone of the ICLDP pilot project implementation evaluation study.

5.1. Clarificatory Evaluation Design Applied in the ICLDP study
The clarificatory evaluation design was used to address objective one of the study – addressed, in part, by means of a literature review context assessment specifically with regard to the pertinent concepts and implicit theories underpinning ICLDPs. Objective one was further assessed by obtaining clarification of the programme theory that was followed for the design of the ICLDP and its curriculum – inclusive of the goals and objectives of the overall programme, with its related outputs and expected outcomes linked to each of the module themes offered in the ICLDP. The end result of the clarificatory evaluation was an overall ICLDP theory-of-change logic model which contributed towards assessing and indicating the relationship between the action model and change model of the ICLDP.

5.2. Implementation (Process) Evaluation Design Applied in the ICLDP study
A process (implementation) evaluation design was applied to address objectives two and three. Objective two assessed the extent to which the curriculum correctly served the right target group and stakeholders, produced its expected deliverables (outputs) – and achieved its intended goals, objectives and set outcomes as indicated in the MU Extension – UWC Partnership funding proposal of 2013. Objective three measured the extent to which the planned outcomes were attained with the curriculum content offered and the exchange visits in the ICLDP – i.e. assessing the relationship between the action model and change model of the ICLDP. Objective three also assessed whether the participants (community leaders) felt that they received the outcomes they expected. The strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum and the indication of areas that required improvement in the curriculum were also assessed during this stage of the evaluation.

5.3. Research Setting/location
The research setting for the study was in the Western Cape at the UWC CEU; the community leaders were the five participants selected for the study who attended the ‘classroom’ training sessions of the


ICLDP, offered by facilitators selected by the CEU. The same participants were assessed for the ‘practicum’ component of the ICLDP, which was the exchange visit to Columbia, Missouri in the USA.

Five participants attended ‘classroom’ sessions, following a different presentation of ‘teaching’ approach in Missouri, Columbia at MU. Four of the five participants (community leaders) participated in the exchange (‘practicum’) and thus assessed for this component of the ICLDP during their visit to South Africa, in the Western Cape.

5.4. Target Group and Sample

The target group for this ICLDP pilot project was to be persons working as community leaders in their respective communities. No sampling was done for the pilot project due to the small number of participants selected for the pilot project. The total study population for the study was nine (9) community leader participants. The partner universities formulated specific selection criteria for selecting the pilot target group (project participants) for the study.

The study population (unit of analysis) profile of the nine (9) participants was as follows: The Western Cape group consisted of one (1) Coloured and one (1) African male (2 males) aged between 45+ and 60+, together with one (1) African and two (2) Coloured females (3 females) aged between 25+ and 45+. The education level of the participants ranged from having a senior certificate to a higher education (undergrad) qualification as the highest level of qualification achieved thus far. Two participants were Xhosa speaking first language, whilst the remaining three participants were Afrikaans speaking as a first language. All five (5) participants could speak, read and write English – and all were from surrounding communities in the Cape Peninsula region of the Western Cape Province; all five (5) communities in this region can be classified as urban and mostly impoverished.

The Missouri Group consisted of one (1) male and three (3) females, all speaking English as a first language and aged 45+ to 68+. All participants had higher education qualifications ranging from undergrad to PhD level with English as first language and one participant with French as an additional language. Each of the four participants were from different counties, all of which can be classified as more rural than urban.

5.5. Data Collection and Analyses for the ICLDP Evaluation Study

Data collection for the ICLDP study was done over nine (9) months from March to December 2015, applying multiple methods of data collection: programme document analysis; literature review; unstructured interviews; semi-structured questionnaires; and ‘field’ observations. This consisted mostly of qualitative data, for which grounded theory was applied for data analyses, in order to provide quantitative data presentations where needed. Predominant qualitative data is a typical requirement with small sample pilot project improvement orientated process evaluation studies that typically make use of ‘embedded case study’ design.
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The collection methods used to address objective one and part of objective two consisted of programme document analysis, such as Skype notes and correspondence – for the purpose of ‘conceptualising’ the programme. Data was furthermore collected through a literature review, for the purpose of gaining insight from existing literature on pertinent concepts relevant to the programme – as well as for extracting strengths, limitations and challenges faced by similar programmes. These data findings were consolidated in the description of the data findings and theory-of-change logic model presented later in this report. The third and last part of the data collection method for the remaining evaluation objectives consisted of ‘field’ observations of the programme implementation, unstructured interviews (conversations) and semi-structured course and practicum evaluation questionnaires.

Methodological data collection triangulation was applied in this study to increase the credibility and validity of the results. Both Punch114 (2005) and Neuman115 (2006) state that reliability and validity are central concepts/issues in all measurement. In short, reliability means consistency/dependability and validity that proclaim truthfulness – and concern connecting measures to constructs. In quantitative research, reliability means *measurement* reliability: “…The dependability of consistency of the measure of a variable…” (Neuman, 2006: p.189). Qualitative researchers question the quantitative-positivist ideas of replication, equivalence, and subpopulation reliability (‘fixed measures’) because they see data collection as an “…interactive process...” within a context that dictates a *unique mix of measures* that cannot be repeated. Validity for qualitative researchers is therefore seen in the context of *authenticity* (‘truthfulness’), rather than in the idea of a “…single version of truth...” repeated116. There are different types/levels of reliability and validity for qualitative and quantitative research, as suggested by Mouton117 (1996) in his framework for validity. These suggestions were integrated in each part of the research study respectively.

6. ICLDP Clarificatory Evaluation Results

This section presents the clarificatory evaluation results relevant to the description of the ICLDP pilot project deliverables, as per its funding proposal – and inclusive of the theory-of-change logic model derived from the data findings of the clarificatory evaluation. This theory-of-change logic model was applied to the ordering of the data analyses and findings of the implementation evaluation design.

6.1. ICLDP Background

During the conceptualisation phase of the ICLDP pilot programme in June 2014, the partners set out to develop and implement an ICLDP over a two-year period – planned to include:

i) a collaborative design of the programme training material in year one (2014) between the CEU and MU Extension in partnership with the South African NGO Coalition (SANGOCO); and

ii) implementation of the programme in year two (2015), which had to involve a ‘classroom’ training component with an online electronic platform exchange between the community leaders (ICLDP

---
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participants) from the two respective countries – followed by ‘practicum’ exchange visits by the participants between the two countries.

The exchange visits entailed the group of five (5) South African community leaders (ICLDP participants) visiting Columbia, Missouri towards mid-2015, followed by the group of four (4) Missouri community leaders (ICLDP participants) visiting Cape Town, South Africa towards the third quarter of 2015.

The overall purpose of the pilot programme was to:

“...To collaboratively develop a community leadership program curriculum and seed the first exchange of community leaders from Missouri and the Western Cape Province ...”118

### 6.2. ICLDP Two-year time-line specific deliverables

The parties developed time-line specific deliverables for the two-year ICLDP process. These deliverables can be clustered into three phases: i) ‘planning’; ii) ‘implementation’; and iii) ‘evaluation’. The data analyses findings of phase one – the planning phase – are presented in this section; they represent the clarificatory evaluation study findings.

These time-line specific deliverables were stated in the funding proposal as follows:

- **January-May 2014**: In-country planning team members solidified. Potential team members identified. Planning process outline developed. Communication structures developed and put in place that will allow for sharing of documents and photos, and for program participants to engage with each other.

- **June 2014**: Leadership team members from South Africa visit Missouri for planning and discussions with key partners (10 days). Existing leadership studies and program curricula from both countries will be finalised with regards to identification of components and resources relevant to the purpose of this project. Visits to lynchpin communities will solidify commitments with community partners, further planning, and identify potential challenges. Delegation will likely consist of Prof. Daniels, Researcher Tracey-Ann Adonis, and Community Liaison Damaris Kiewiets.

- **March-July 2014**: Curricula completed -- including learning objectives, participant recruitment and program marketing materials, communication plan, and evaluation tools -- and submitted for peer review.

- **August-September 2014**: Program marketing and participant recruitment.

- **September-November 2014**: Stage One of program delivered over approximately six weeks in both countries. At least two sessions will be held jointly via internet conferencing.

- **January-February 2015**: Stage Two for Missouri delegation, visit to South Africa to engage with their program participants and learn about community development and leadership in the South African context.
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• **March - April 2015**: Debriefing session held jointly with all program participants and planning team members. Planning team evaluates the visit by the Missouri delegation and makes adjustments for the South African delegation visit. Potential improvements to the curricula noted. Designated liaisons from the planning team follow program participants to aid in completing action plans and commitments that resulted from the delegation visit.

• **May – June 2015**: Stage Two for South African delegation, visit to Missouri to engage with their program participants and learn about community development and leadership in the U.S. context. This portion of the program will include site visits to NGOs and community organizations, and meetings with MU Extension faculty and administration (and potentially students). Each participant will develop an action plan with timeline, either alone or in collaboration with other program participants.

• **June 2015**: Stage Three for Missouri delegation, participating in a follow-up session to assess the sustaining impacts of the program on participants, the progress on their action plans, and any needs for additional resources or information.

• **July – September 2015**: Planning team reviews preliminary evaluation data, begins adjusting curricula and developing sustainable funding plan. Program participants continue to be tracked.

• **October 2015**: Stage Three for South Africa delegation, participating in a follow-up session to assess the sustaining impacts of the program on participants, the progress on their action plans, and any needs for additional resources or information.

• **November-December 2015**: Evaluation completed, final adjustments to the curricula and program funding plan, and production of final report."

6.3. Planning Phase: Content Analysis Findings for the ICLDP Deliverables

The planning phase deliverables relate to the period January 2014 to September 2014 – quoted above:

“...January-May 2014: In-country planning team members solidified. [...] (i) [...] Potential team members identified. [...] (ii) [...] Planning process outline developed. [...] (iii) [...] Communication structures developed and put in place that will allow for sharing of documents and photos, and for program participants to engage with each other...”

The three deliverables which had to be achieved for this stage are indicated in [...] in the quote above followed by the findings for it below.

(i) The potential team members were identified in South Africa and Missouri during the period January to May 2014; hence the South African team having visited Missouri in June 2014 to plan the ICLDP to be implemented by CEU and MU Extension.

(ii) Several communications and programme documents – especially the progress report of 16 September 2014 indicated that the planning process outline did start during the visit of the South African partners in Missouri and continued until post September 2014, when the

---

team members realised that the content development relating to the developed outline was not yet completed and UWC had to register and accredit the ICLDP.

(iii) The communication structures were established within this period and the progress report of 16 September 2014 indicates this, as well as the subsequent communication which followed between the team members ever since the project was conceptualised:

“...June 2014: [...] (i) [...] Leadership team members from South Africa visit Missouri for planning and discussions with key partners (10 days). [...] (ii) [...] Existing leadership studies and program curricula from both countries will be finalised with regards to identification of components and resources relevant to the purpose of this project. [...] (iii) [...] Visits to lynchpin communities will solidify commitments with community partners, further planning, and identify potential challenges...”\(^{120}\)

Three deliverables had to be achieved during the June 2014 visit stage by the South African team at MU Extension indicated in [...] in the quote above followed by the findings below.

(i) The team members did conduct planning sessions and discussions with key partners during the visit by the South African team in Missouri during June 2014.

(ii) Explicit evidence was not available at the time of this evaluation study with regard to existing leadership studies and programme curricula from both countries. However, the assumption can be made that such literature and documents for this ICLDP did exist and was exchange amongst the two partners, due to the “planned curricula themes’ document that was drafted and agreed to by the parties during the June 2014 visits. Reference was made to this document earlier in this report in section 3.4 with the listing of the planned eight (8) curricula themes for the ICLDP to be developed and implemented. The curricula contents of these eight (8) themes are presented in the next section of this report.

(iii) The team did visit lynchpin communities between 26-30 June during their visit in Missouri from 24 June to 2 July 2014 to assist the partners to identify potential challenges that would feed into the planning of the ICLDP.

“...March-July 2014: [...] (i) [...] Curricula completed -- including learning objectives, [...] (ii) [...] participant recruitment and [...] (iii) [...] program marketing materials, [...] (iv) [...] communication plan, and [...] (v) [...] evaluation tools – and [...] (vi) [...] submitted for peer review...”\(^{121}\)

Six (6) deliverables had to be achieved between the period, March – July 2014. The participant recruitment, marketing materials and communication plan (deliverables ii, iii, & iv) was covered in the previous section, as it was listed in the funding proposal for the previous time-frame as well as this

\(^{120}\) ibid.
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March – July 2014 timeframe. However, these deliverables were also not yet completed in this period and no mention of it was made in the 16 September 2014 progress report. The remaining deliverables are indicated in [...] in the quote above followed by the findings for it below.

(i) The curricula outline with responsible authors assigned to the programme did take place during June-July 2014. Those themes (modules), for which the CEU (SA Team) were responsible, were completed by September 2014. Evidence for this was found in correspondence, dated 12 September 2014, between the partners stating the following:

Team member 1:
“...We have been working on the outline for the courses that we are responsible for as per our agreement. Attached please find the module outlines for emotional intelligence (12 credits), ethics (4 credits), project cycle management (6 credits) and sustainable community development and mobilisation (10 credits). The last date for the registration of courses [...] at UWC Division of Life Long Learning in order to be accredited to offer the programme... is in October however we have to submit documentation by the 22 September. We therefore would appreciate your comment on the attached outlines...”

Team member 2 (response):
“...We have the module outlines you sent earlier. Do you have a complete (or nearly complete) module that we could see” We want our materials to be structured similarly [...] is there anything we need to know for our sections of the curriculum, such as specific indicators of learning [...] Do we want to have a consistent ‘look’ for this curriculum? Same font, spacing, etc.? We can glean much of this from your sample modules [...] do we want to use the same PowerPoint template for all our presentations? Have you developed one, or would you like us to do that...”

The evidence quoted above indicates strong commitment and equal participation by both teams at this point. However, some evidence from the above quotes suggests some team member ‘misunderstandings or interpretations’ between the partners with regard to the programme module titles, as well as their respective curriculum (course) outlines and related assessment criteria – for the outcomes to be achieved by the participants in each module. More evidence justifying this finding is provided further below.

The following communication during a Skype session, dated 18 March 2015, provides evidence that the team had to change the initial programme and curricula time-frame in light of the ICLDP roll-out falling behind schedule. The programme was changed from an eight module offering to that of two modules consisting of eight themes, consolidated as shortened versions from the original eight modules:

Team member 1:

---
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“...going to become too difficult to finish in the timeline, suggested we model the course after [...] another programme for which we had to at the time do the same...]. Essentially the course will be divided into two. This first one would be introductory level, structured as 5 days, exchange 10 days (‘practicum module’), and another 5 days in the second semester [...] Four themes in one course, four into another. Outcome stays the same. Not doing it as in-depth as we initially thought, still meet the criteria that we set [...] “...Necessity is the mother of innovation...”

Following this agreed ICLDP change, the team agreed to a new order in which to offer the course themes in each module and in the Schedule of Learning (SoL) – and new dates with regard to when curricula content developments must be completed, inclusive of dates when the curricula must be presented, and by whom, to the participants of the two groups. The partners were, at this stage, still of the opinion that the amended eight to two modules ICLDP could continue as an ePlatform offering or implementation. This was in light of the ePlatform design being completed by the ICS team at UWC, so that the facilitators from the two respective partners could thus upload their curricula, tasks and the activities to be completed by the participants and assessed by the facilitators from the two different countries respectively.

Team member 10:
“...the design and development of the online environment [...] included face-to-face consultations; and train-the-trainer sessions, including aspects related to eAssessment; content development; effective communication; and the selection of relevant eTools [...] A dedicated server was provided by ICS to host the CEU database. The current Leadership course is hosted within this database (built on the Sakai platform) [...] The Leadership Course is available and accessible (for UWC and Missouri stakeholders). Please go ahead and access the environment (from various geographical sites - ‘home/work or at play’)...

Evidence of correspondence from the end of February 2015 until mid-March 2015, some of which is quoted below, indicates that the partners had to reorder the themes that were going to be offered in module one and the team members responsible for developing the content of the themes, as well as having to postpone the commencement date from March to April. Amendment was due to the curriculum content development not being completed for every theme by the originally agreed due date of 20 January 2015, as well as the CEU at UWC being obligated to start the course in the first semester, as per UWC policy requirements. However, four themes had been developed by then and, as such, could be offered as module one, in order to provide time for the remaining themes to be ready when module two would commence – scheduled for June 2015, prior to departure for the Missouri exchange visit at the end of July.

Team member 1:
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“...I hope you do not mind but for the purposes of registering the courses on time, we started with the transformational leadership and theories of leadership modules.”

Team member 1: 
“...I am following up on the first 2 [...themes...] that we need to complete so that we can commence the upload of the courses [...on the ePlatform...]. If I recall, we said it would be received by 20th Jan.”

Team member 1: 
“...We are a bit concerned that we are missing our deadlines with regard to implementation as the programme was supposed to commence in March and we have not loaded the courses onto our e-platform...” We would therefore like to propose [...] That the modules get reshuffled...

Team member 3: 
“...thank you [...] we agree with the modified timeline...”

Below is a sample section of the amended Sol, at the time, as evidence of the then agreed new roll-out themes, times and respective deliverables by the partners regarding curriculum content development and facilitation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module 1: Introducing Leadership Types, Styles &amp; Qualities for Transformational of Community Wellbeing</th>
<th>Course Delivery Dates</th>
<th>Learning Material Due Dates</th>
<th>ePlatform upload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1: Concepts, approaches and models for ethics</td>
<td>4 May ‘15</td>
<td>13 Apr ‘15</td>
<td>27 April’15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2: Leadership &amp; management theories &amp; styles &amp; related advantages and disadvantages</td>
<td>5 May ‘15</td>
<td>14 Apr ‘15</td>
<td>28 April’15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3: Principles, concepts and techniques of emotional intelligence &amp; self-reflective practice</td>
<td>6-7 May ‘15</td>
<td>15 Apr ‘15</td>
<td>29 April’15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4: Concepts of empowerment, coaching &amp; coalition building for stakeholder mobilization</td>
<td>8 May ‘15</td>
<td>16 Apr ‘15</td>
<td>30 April’15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ePlatform Activities</th>
<th>Delivery Dates</th>
<th>eTools Due Dates</th>
<th>ePlatform upload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1:</td>
<td>11-15 May</td>
<td>13 Apr ‘15</td>
<td>27 April’15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2:</td>
<td>18-22 May</td>
<td>14 Apr ‘15</td>
<td>28 April’15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3:</td>
<td>25-29 May</td>
<td>15 Apr ‘15</td>
<td>29 April’15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4:</td>
<td>1-5 Jun ’15</td>
<td>16 Apr ’15</td>
<td>30 April’15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Application/Exchange</td>
<td>24 Jul–8 Aug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 2: Introducing Leadership Types, Styles &amp; Qualities for Transformational of Community Wellbeing</td>
<td>Course Delivery Dates</td>
<td>Learning Material Due Dates</td>
<td>Due Dates: ePlatform upload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-8 May ’15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 2: Sustainable Community Development Process for Improved Wellbeing</td>
<td>Course Delivery Dates</td>
<td>Learning Material Due Dates</td>
<td>Due Dates: ePlatform upload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-12 Jun ’15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1: Origin, dimensions, characteristics and approaches of CommDev</td>
<td>8 Jun ’15</td>
<td>18 May ’15</td>
<td>1 Jun ’15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2: Facilitator roles &amp; communication skills within a variety of group dynamics</td>
<td>9-10 Jun ’15</td>
<td>19 May ’15</td>
<td>2 Jun ’15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3: Project cycle management &amp; Logical Framework Approach</td>
<td>11-12 Jun ’15</td>
<td>20 May ’15</td>
<td>3 Jun ’15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ePlatform Activities</td>
<td>Delivery Dates</td>
<td>eTools Due Dates</td>
<td>Due Dates: ePlatform upload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Jun – 3 Jul ’15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1:</td>
<td>15-19 Jun</td>
<td>18 May ’15</td>
<td>1 Jun ’15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2:</td>
<td>22 Jun – 3 Jul</td>
<td>19 May ’15</td>
<td>2 Jun ’15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3:</td>
<td>6 Jul – 17 Jul</td>
<td>20 May ’15</td>
<td>3 Jun ’15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Application/Exchange</td>
<td>4-17 Oct ‘15</td>
<td>Different Time Module 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, evidence in correspondence of May 2015, quoted below, necessitated that the team would not be able to make use of the ePlatform to roll-out the ICLDP.

Team member 5:
“...Starting the course two weeks late would mean that the two groups will then also not be able to communicate online for module 2 either – just as been the case now for module 1 already...”
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Content analysis findings of the ICLDP documents indicate that the curricula development phase was not completed until March 2015, resulting in the partners having to make further amendments to the ICLDP roll-out plan. Quoted correspondence data below, derived from the programme content analyses, provides evidence that the partners effected another change – from jointly developing and presenting the curricula to the CEU team presenting ‘formal’ theory training sessions only to the South African participants:

Team member 5:
“...we take cognisance of the challenges you are facing [...] we would like to propose a few suggestions [...] that still might work for all of us and which could deliver research data that speaks to the funding proposal objectives [...] UWC will continue with the face-to-face (formal training) of the Leadership course as per the registration that we had done with our five participants. UM could agree to not follow the ‘formal’ training programme [...] Thus your group will not have to go through the same theory and application ‘training’ as our group ...”

(v) The evaluation tools were not yet completed at this stage, as UWC had not yet at the time appointed an evaluator onto the task team. Furthermore, the tools for knowledge and skills transfer could not be developed until such time as the curriculum content was completed. MU Extension did however provide documentation of short, medium and long-term outcomes to be achieved, which could thus be evaluated in the ICLDP. This information was provided as supplementary information in August 2013 to the UMSAEP prior to the final decision to fund the project. This supplementary information with regard to outcome measurement has been taken into consideration, where possible, for this evaluation study by the evaluator and will be specifically reported on in the last section ‘Conclusions and Recommendations’ of this report.

(vi) The curriculum content development was not completed at this stage and subsequently could not be sent for peer review.

Although ‘in-house’ experience and expertise may have existed in both teams, the estimated deliverables which had to be achieved were not feasible in the planned short time-frame; this resulted in the ICLDP planning lagging behind schedule, with a knock-on effect on the entire programme implementation time-frames. This knock-on effect was, for example, evidential in having the curriculum and marketing material not completed on time – resulting in the recruitment of participants only taking place in March 2015, on the South African side, and in August 2015 on the Missouri side, – after the planned Sept-Oct 2014 start date of the first training component in the ICLDP. No evidence was available with regard to collective marketing material being developed between the partners to recruit participants for the ICLDP, as time did not permit it.

The effect of the delayed recruitment having been completed at different stages by the partners resulted in the programme participants not being able to participate and
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communicate with each other simultaneously on the ePlatform as planned. More detail of the effects of this delay is provided in the next section of the report, inclusive of feedback from the two groups of participants – who all expressed their need for meeting and communicating with each other at the same times since they started with the ICLDP; this would have, in their opinion, built faster and stronger relationships and networks from a very early stage of participating in the programme.

The following quotes from correspondence between the team members serves as example evidence that the team members came to realise that there were several differences between the two partners’ interpretations regarding the design and roll-out of the ICLDP – most importantly with regard to the policy requirement differences by the two partner universities in offering certificate courses, as well as in the availability of participants.

Team member 3:
“...our participant list has been up and down. Unfortunately at the moment it’s down [...] I was afraid that was going to be an issue. [...] Naturally, I am actively seeking additional participants, even if they have to join the program late and catch up. So we find ourselves with two options, neither of which is ideal. Either we begin the program on Monday as planned with two, possibly three participants [...] or we move the whole thing back two weeks, which would put us out of synch with the UWC program but will still start before the delegation visit...”

Team member 5:
“...we will have to go for your suggestion of pushing your training on by two weeks [...] and then ensure for the interaction [...] between participants [...] to take place face-to-face with the exchange visit...”

Team member 3:
“I agree [...] I do think we should keep the travel plans since that is what the UWC participants agreed to when they signed up [...] Unfortunately hindsight is 20-20, and I think this program is just too ambitious for a first multi-session program collaboration, and it is more rigorous than people expect from Extension programs here. Nevertheless, we shall endeavor to make it work. It is a good curriculum, and the amount of time that you all have put into this is noted and appreciated...”

The quote below, from correspondence dated 16 September 2014, indicates that a suggestion was made at this point already to postpone the implementation time-frame of the ICLDP by one year – and having the Missouri participants travel to South Africa first, followed by the South African delegation visiting Missouri the following year (2016).

Team member 3:
“...we need to reconsider our timeline and approach the UMSAEP committee with a new suggested timeline. We need some input from those of you at UWC. Our timeline in the original proposal is off by a couple of months, we had
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initially...and ambitiously...planned for our first program to be held this fall. We've made significant progress building something new and exciting, and I believe we can make a good case for a year's extension. If we hold the first program beginning somewhere between March and June, 2015, the Missouri delegation could travel to South Africa in September, and the South African delegation to Missouri in May or June, 2016. Let's start there and see if that will work with those of you at UWC...”

No explicit evidence could be found at the time of the evaluation data analyses relating to the reason for not following through on the suggested extension of time. The assumption made from the evaluation data analyses is that it might have been due to the challenges experienced regarding the recruitment of participants to roll-out the ‘theory’ (classroom) component of the ICLDP in Missouri, which would have resulted in this group not being able to travel ‘post training’ to South Africa in September 2015.

“...August-September 2014: [...(i)...] Program marketing and [...(i)...] participant recruitment...”

Two deliverables had to be achieved for this stage and are indicated in [...] in the quote above followed by the findings below.

(i) No programme marketing materials were collectively developed by the partners, nor was it possible to develop any marketing materials during these months, in light of the fact that the project was then starting to lag behind in so far as curriculum content development and exchange dates between the countries were concerned; both were needed for marketing purposes.

(ii) Recruitment of participants did not start during this period due to the marketing materials not being completed on schedule. However, the teams did start sharing ideas with regard to selection criteria of participants for the leadership programme – as indicated below. During unstructured interviews with team members from both countries, it became clear that assumptions were being made with regard to the actual profiles of the participants relevant to the selection criteria – for example regarding age and education levels (for the latter only a minimum requirement was set: i.e. Senior Certificate – Matriculation). The literature review for this study indicated that participants in leadership development programmes in the USA (and even in Australia and England) are at graduate level, with the majority at postgraduate level. This is over and above the fact that the concept of volunteerism is much more embedded in the USA context than in the South African context – which could be due to the economic profiles and poverty status of these countries. It is thus recommended that, in future, more explicitly designated time be spent on clarification of interpretation with regard to participant profiling between the partners:

135 Ibid.
136 MU Extension-UWC Partnership Funding Proposals, pp.5-6.
“...Applicants will be selected to the programme based on the following criteria:

- Individuals must be volunteers/community workers who show potential to fill leadership positions or who are existing leaders in a community project. This could also include Community Workers, Lay counsellors, Community Practitioners, Community based organizations, Non-profit organization, and Faith based organizations, Sport coaches, Parents and Teachers.

- Individuals who volunteer at a community organisation, NGO, Faith-based organisation etc; need a letter from the organisation to indicate involvement.

- Individuals must commit to completing the programme and sign a contractual agreement specifying this commitment.

- If funding allows, individuals should be prepared to travel to Missouri for a period of 7 – 10 days.

- Individuals should therefore be able to obtain a US visa.

- Be able to have good communication as well as basic writing skills

- Individuals must commit to deliver on the course requirements with regard to:
  - Reflection journals and assignments handed in on time as specified
  - Active Participation in the courses (group work and presentations will be required) through face to face facilitative processes and via the online platform – this therefore implies that participants should be able access to internet.
  - A practical component forms part of the course and participants are required to complete 25 hours of community service in a leadership position.
  - Completion of relevant monitoring and evaluation tools

- On completion of the course, participants must be prepared to transfer knowledge and skills through training and mentoring potential leadership candidates.

- Application to the course will be considered on the receipt of curriculum vitae as well as a one page motivation, letter of recommendation and two references...

This concludes the main findings for the planning phase of the ICLDP roll-out, derived from the content analysis during the clarificatory evaluation study. The theory-of-change logic model for the ICLDP is presented in Figure 1 below – derived from the data analyses of the clarificatory evaluation. This model was used for the data analyses of the implementation evaluation to structurally order the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Figure 1: ICLDP Theory-of-Change Training Logic Model.
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The next section presents the main findings related to the planned deliverables for the ‘implementation’ phase of the ICLDP.

7. ICLDP: Implementation (Process) Evaluation Findings

This section presents the implementation evaluation findings with regard to the ICLDP curriculum (theory) and exchange (practice) components. The data findings relate to the proposed time frame deliverables that were set out in the funding proposal for ‘phase 2 – implementation phase’. It is important to note that the time frame deliverable relates, in this section, to the actual period May 2015 to October 2015 – and not as originally indicated in the funding proposal as September 2014 to June 2015. This is due to the project team having had to amend the time frames for implementation during the planning phase – phase 1 of the ICLDP, as indicated in the previous section of this report.

7.1. Implementation Phase: Process Evaluation Findings for the ICLDP

The implementation evaluation findings presented in this section involve five (5) time frame deliverables derived from the funding proposal; the following first time frame deliverable relates to the presentation of the ICLDP curriculum content to the participants:

“...[May – June 2015] September-November 2014: Stage One of program delivered over approximately six weeks in both countries. At least two sessions will be held jointly via internet conferencing...”

The clarificatory evaluation findings in the previous section have indicated that the programme was in the end not delivered: a) over a six (6) week period – due to the programme having been shortened
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from eight modules to two modules; and b) jointly via internet conferencing – due to a recruitment of participants that could not be successfully synchronised. However, the programme was delivered face-to-face by both partners in their respective countries.

7.2. MU Extension ICLDP Curriculum Delivery

The face-to-face session presented by MU Extension, at their Boone County Extension office, to the USA participants took on the following format – in light of the earlier mentioned challenges experienced with regard to recruitment and availability of participants:

Team member 3:

“...We will be offering [...] hours of classroom instruction, plus a full day [...] of orientation and visit preparation, and will significantly reduce the homework currently in the curriculum. However, I will be adding a few assignments (readings, movies) related to becoming more familiar with South Africa. I will still expect the group to develop action plans and deliver a presentation at the end...”

The first session presented by MU Extension was from 3 - 5 September 2015, of which the 3rd of September was a two and a half (2 ½) hour evening session (18:00 -20:30); the 2nd day was a full day session from 9:00 - 19:00, whilst the 3rd day was from 9:00 – 15:00. The second session took place from 17-19 September, with the same time-slots as per the first session. The pre-travel orientation session was on 25 September from 17:30 - 10:30. The post exchange visit debriefing and graduation was held on 9 November 2015 from 16:00 – 18:00. The Missouri Extension participants did not work with the learner guides for the two modules, as the ‘teaching’ approach that was followed was not one of ‘formal’ training and, as a result, the participants were also not required to complete all the tasks and assignments for each module. The participants were however expected to still:

Team member 3:

“...develop action plans and deliver a presentation at the end...”

Also, the MU Extension participants did not complete daily reflection sheets, except for during their exchange visit to South Africa. MU Extension did however use some of the PowerPoint presentation slides in the training, to ensure that the theme presentations in the two sessions would more or less include the same content as developed by CEU for each of the themes. MU Extension has, on the other hand, made use of their own literature – where they felt it to be more appropriate to the profile of their participants; they thus presented the community development, facilitation and project management themes differently. The following two examples of such differences could be retrieved from the participants’ evaluation questionnaire responses: i) mindfulness was presented; and ii) a cultural induction in preparation for the trip to South Africa. ICLDP video recordings of the sessions were taken for the purpose of assessing the teaching approach that was followed, the actual content that was presented – and the responses from the participants during the sessions. These recordings were not yet available at the time of this evaluation report; as a result more concrete examples of differences and/or add-ons in the theme content and presentation approach could not be included in this report. The
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recordings, when they become available, can however still be utilised for the purpose of contributing to any ICLDP amendments and/or improvements that the partners would need to apply before offering the programme again.

The MU Extension participants did complete evaluation questionnaires for each of the two sessions presented to them and the results are presented comparatively with the CEU participants further below. Bearing in mind that the questionnaire was a standardised questionnaire designed to be the same for both partners – i.e., even though there was a difference in the end with regard to content being presented to the two groups participants by the partners.

7.3. CEU ICLDP Curriculum Delivery

The CEU face-to-face sessions, presented at UWC to the South African participants, consisted of two five (5) day sessions. The first session (module 1) was presented from 4 - 8 May 2015, scheduled from 8:30 – 16:30 every day. The second session (module 2) took place from 8 - 12 June 2015, scheduled for the same times as for module 1. Travel orientation took place informally throughout the face-to-face session, as and when participants had questions and/or when facilitators felt it important to highlight the exchange visit requirements. A formal travel orientation briefing took place on 22 July 2015 from 10:00 – 15:00, during which participants were presented with some gifts from the CEU to take along on their trip, as well as vital information sheets with regard to packing requirements by airlines and customs, the difference in electrical sockets and power voltage between SA and USA, which power adaptors to take along – and what to expect when travelling internationally.

Learner Guides were developed by the CEU for each of the two ‘theoretical’ modules, as well as for the ‘practicum’ (exchange model). These Learner Guides provided participants (learners) with information pertaining to the programme content, together with the knowledge and skills they would gain to apply as community leaders. The Guides also provided them with details of the tasks and assignments they would be expected to complete for the programme, together with the specific outcomes in which they needed to become competent for each of the themes in the two modules – and for which they would show their competence by means of completing the related tasks and assignments. The learning assessment methods applied in the ICLDP were: class activities, two (2) theoretical assignments (1 case study assignment and 1 project plan), self-reflective journaling, a formal project presentation – and a practicum report141. The project presentations made by the SA participants in Missouri were recorded and applied as a means of assessing the extent to which knowledge and skills integration did take place with regard to the themes presented in the two modules; this integration is important for the application in practice of the theory of the themes presented in the two modules of the ICLDP. Findings on the extent to which this did take place are presented further on in this report.

The CEU participants were expected to complete daily reflection sheets during the theoretical and practical components of the ICLDP. Each of the theoretical sessions were video recorded for the same purposes as the recordings made by MU Extension of the USA participants. The CEU recordings were also used by the evaluator to validate some of the evaluations questionnaire responses from the CEU
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participants, for example with regard to the topic contents and the facilitators of each session. Evaluation questionnaire responses are presented further below, each pertaining to the relevant module as well as to the exchange visits.

A second curriculum framework was developed for the ICLDP, accredited by the Division of Life Long Learning (DLL) at the UWC. This was the two (2) module framework, consolidated from the originally planned and designed eight (8) module framework – a decision taken by the partners after not being able to meet all the time frame deliverables for the planning phase of the ICLDP. The title of the second framework was: *Transformational Leadership for Sustainable Community Development*, with a total of fifty (50) continuous education credits with a notional five hundred (500) hour value (i.e. 10 notional learning hours for each credit). These credits are linked to programmes that are not based on any formal South African Qualification Authority (SAQA) accredited learning programmes and qualifications. A certificate of compliance will be awarded by the UWC to candidates who successfully complete the programme. The following purpose statement was provided in the ICLDP accreditation application to DLL:

“...To empower people to work and act as transformational leaders in cross cultural community development contexts in order to contribute towards the achievement of sustainable community wellbeing by those with whom they work...”

The entry level requirements for the programme required from participants are to be either in possession of a National Senior Certificate (Matriculation) or to have a least five (5) years working experience in community development or in the NGO sector. Participants would gain the following competencies from completing the ICLDP:

1. “...Conceptualize and apply leadership ethics within a community development context
2. Explain and differentiate between leadership and management
3. Understand and apply principles and concepts of emotional intelligence
4. Understand and apply transformational leadership for key stakeholder involvement
5. Explain and integrate the dimensions and approaches for community mobilization
6. Describe the role of the facilitator and apply a variety of facilitation styles and approaches
7. Integrate approaches & principles to design, implement, monitor and evaluate community development interactions...”

The following content was included for *Module 1: Introduction Leadership Types, Styles and Qualities for Transformation of Community Wellbeing* – consolidated from four of the initial eight module ICLDP curriculum framework:

i. “...Concepts, approaches and models for ethics
ii. Leadership and management theories and styles and related advantages and disadvantages
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iii. Principles, concepts and techniques of emotional intelligence and self-reflective practice
iv. Concepts of empowerment, coaching and coalition building for stakeholder mobilization..."\(^{144}\)

The following content was included for Module 2: Sustainable Community Development Process for Improved Wellbeing – consolidated from the remaining four of the initial eight module ICLDP curriculum framework:

i. "...Origin, dimensions, characteristics and approaches of Community Development
ii. Facilitator roles and communication skills within a variety of group dynamics
iii. Project cycle management and logical framework approach..."\(^{145}\)

7.4. ICLDP Module Objectives Attainment Results

The following charts indicate the extent to which the MU Extension and CEU participants felt that they had attained the seven course objectives of the ICLDP relative to the two modules of the ICLDP. The results are presented as a collective population opinion measurement (i.e. both USA & SA participants) for the purpose of having enough subjects (with 9 participants) to obtain statistical significant variances. Extent measurement is presented on a scale of 1 (very low) to 5 (very high).

![Chart 1: Objectives Attainment for Module 1](image)

Chart 1 indicates an 81% overall achievement rating by the participants for the objectives in module 1 of the ICLDP. Each of the indicated objectives relates to a specific theme in module 1. Participants rated Objective 4 (Theme 4) the highest as 86% achieved by the participants followed by Objective 2 (Theme 2) with 82% achievement. The literature review referred to studies done by Porr (2011)\(^{146}\) who highlights the importance of leadership skills and leadership awareness as fundamental to the curriculum of LDPs. Themes 4 and 2 of the ICLDP are evidential in the research of Porr (2011), further supported by ratings in charts 3 and 5 (further below) which correlate with chart 1 regarding the ICLDP.
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participants’ opinion ratings as to whether or not they are sufficiently equipped with the skills and awareness of transformational leadership. Additional and elaborative percentage ratings in support of each theme (objective) in the ICLDP, with supporting questionnaire descriptive response quotes (qualitative data) by the participants, are also presented further below in this section.

CHART 2: OBJECTIVES ATTAINMENT FOR MODULE 2

Chart 2 indicates an 80% objectives attainment by the participants – an overall 1% lower attainment than that indicated for module 1. This could be due to the curriculum of module 2 consisting predominantly of required skills for practicing transformational community development as community leaders. Qualitative data gathered from the participants indicated that they were of the opinion that these skills were very appropriate and much needed; on the other hand, they required additional training with more practical application time to become fully competent in these skills. In the following example descriptive reasons were provided by the participants in the questionnaires and unstructured interviews in this regard:

CEU Participant 2:
“...we need follow-ups especially with the facilitation and logical framework themes. We want those facilitators to train us some more so that we can do it perfect in our communities where this is so much needed. We must do practice in the classroom and then with facilitators later in the community to then be assessed again and more training till we are perfect to make change...”

CEU Participant 3:
“...the skill in this course is needed by everybody in our communities especially to develop and prepare our youth for good leadership and have skills to develop the communities. I can bring as easy as 60 people and more immediately tomorrow who will want to come for this training. We need to be good at our practice to transfer our skill to our people in the community so we need more time with you in the communities to work with us until we ready to stand alone and do it perfectly...”
The six-construct measurement formulation was founded on the suggested conditions for ‘promoting transformational learning’ by Brown and Posner (2001)\(^{147}\) – as indicated in the literature review section of this report. These authors proposed that conditions be created for: i) a good, safe and trusted learning environment; ii) learning activities that encourage the participants in self dialogue and critical self-reflection; iii) facilitators that are trusting, authentic, with integrity and an ability to promote critical reflection; iv) opportunities to practice, for assessment and feedback; and v) allowing enough time for personal exploration into the intensity of the experience, so as to materialise with the participants.

Chart 3.1 indicates the results of the six constructs assessment amongst all nine (9) participants for modules 1 and 2. Two constructs show some regression from module 1 to module 2. The ‘general (semi-specific)’ measurements of the two modules (detail is presented in chart 5 below) indicate a 4.8% regression from module 1 to module 2; ‘facilitation theme 3’ has a 1.4% regression. Themes 1, 2 and 3 were selected as constructs for comparison between the predominantly ‘knowledge’ themes in module 1 versus the predominantly ‘skills practice’ themes in module 2. The following descriptive quotes examples from the qualitative data retrieved provide possible grounds for the regression between the constructs of the two modules:

CEU Participant 2:
“...we need follow-ups especially with the facilitation and logical framework themes. We want those facilitators to train us some more [...]I think we must be called again even if we back to do practical part of it [...]I love to invite the facilitator to my area so that there will be monitoring and evaluation of what I receive...”

CEU Participant 4:
“...On facilitations I would have wanted some more time [...]This complete course is very useful for us in the communities – so many good projects start out good but most times fall by the waste line. With this logic model you cannot go wrong...”

Of importance is the difference in results of the six-construct measurement when comparatively assessed between the two countries – i.e. USA versus SA participant specific opinions. The following two charts: chart 3.2 module 1 country constructs measurement and chart 3.3 module 2 country specific constructs measurement indicate these differences in results.
The chart 3.2 results add up to an average success measurements for module 1 of 85.6% by the SA participants and 80.4% by the USA participants. These percentages indicate that the SA participants’ construct measurement is 3.7% higher than the collective measurement, as indicated for module 1 in chart 3.1, as against 1.5% lower by the USA participants. A further significant difference is to be found in respect of the country specific percentage measurements with regard to the module specific objectives attainment: chart 3.1 indicates a collective 67% attainment of the objectives for module 1, whilst chart 3.2 indicates an 86% attainment measurement from the SA participants, which is 19% higher than the collective measurement. Only a 1% higher measurement with regard to objectives attainment for module 1 is indicated for the USA participants. The last significant difference in overall measurement for module 1 versus country specific measurements between SA and USA is to be found in the construct for ‘module general’ opinion amongst participants. An overall measurement of 74.9% is derived from chart 3.1 for module 1, whereas an 82.8% measurement is indicated by the SA participants – 7.9% higher – and a 67% measurement by the USA participants, which is 7.9% lower.
The results in chart 3.3 indicate average success measurements of 86.6% for module 2 by the SA participants and 82% by the USA participants. These percentages indicate that the SA participants’ construct measurement is 1.8% higher than the collective measurement of 84.8% indicated in module 2 in chart 3.1, as against a 2.6% lower measurement by the USA participants in respect of the collective measurement. A significant difference in respect of country specific measurement as against collective measurement was also found in the construct measurement of training ‘facilities and administration arrangements’, where a collective measurement of 86.1% from module 2 in chart 3.1 is comparable to only a 60% measurement by the USA participants in chart 3.3 – which is 34.4% lower than the collective. The SA participant measurement in this regard was only 3.1% lower than the collective measurement – a not materially significant difference.

The collective measurement of 80% for attainment of module 2 objectives did not change as between either one of the country specific measurements – making it the only construct measurement that did not change in this respect.
It is recommended that further data correlation and interpretation should be done by the ICLDP team members with regard to the above stated significant differences between charts 3.2 and 3.3 as compared with chart 3.1, as some of these differences might be related to perhaps the difference in course material that was presented (to be retrieved from the presentation videos), as well as the difference in participant profiles between the two countries (to be retrieved via follow-up semi-structured interviews).

Chart 4: Change in the overall percentage success of the ICLDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Module 2</th>
<th>Module 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 4 indicates an overall 83.4% success rating for the ICLDP. This average percentage was derived from Chart 3.1, which measured the six constructs of the ICLDP. The 2.9% lower success rate for module 2, indicated in blue in this chart, correlates with the reasons mentioned above.

7.5. ICLDP Aspects Evaluation Results

A semi-structured questionnaire was designed to assess the opinions of the participants with regard to the three main general indicator measurements to be applied in all training programmes, namely: learning content, -mode and -environment. These three measurements were further expanded to gather descriptive data with regard to: i) the applicability or relevance of the curriculum content – inclusive of the exercises and tasks for each theme; ii) the approach followed by, and the capacity of, the facilitators/presenters – inclusive of examples being used; and iii) the administrative arrangements with regard to the training offered. The explorative data responses from the participants were analysed using descriptive statistics – and the findings are presented below. Additional information was also received (via email) from participants who wished to add more detail to the course evaluations and/or who had special requests. During the unstructured interviews more detail was gathered and offered with regard to the ICLDP implementation. This additional data, together with the statistical data, were collectively applied to arrive at the data findings validations indicated below, as well as justifications for the conclusions and recommendations presented in the last section of this report.

Chart 5 presents a comparative analysis of participant ratings for module 1 versus module 2 - indicating the scores for the above-mentioned general indicators measurements for training programmes. Participants gave module 1 an overall 84% rating, which is 6% higher than their overall rating of 78% for module 2. Participants were however of the opinion that module 2 was more logically sequenced, with
(for this opinion) a rating of 84% versus the rating of 80% for module 1. Of importance is the equal 80% rating in both modules with regard to the extent to which the participants felt that they could apply the knowledge and skills presented in ICLDP in their communities. The 8% higher rating for ‘material and handouts’ in module 2 versus module 1 was because participants felt the tools (skills) - especially from theme 2 – facilitation skills and theme 3 – logical framework development – will be applicable every day in their roles as community leaders. The following example quote was from a participant indicating what was most valuable in module 2:

CEU Participant 2:
“...listening skills [...to apply during facilitation...] that I have learned [...] and concepts and logic techniques [...] that can really make me a transformational leader...”
CHART 5: GENERAL TRAINING INDICATORS MEASUREMENTS (USA & SA)

- Applicability of the practical/group activities: 4.0/4.0
- Extent to which the course was logically sequenced?: 4.0/4.2
- The length of the module & its themes: 3.8/4.0
- To what extent would you recommend others to attend this module: 3.9/4.4
- What is your overall rating of the module: 3.9/4.2
- To what extent have you learned on the course about non-verbal communication: 3.9/3.6
- To what extent did the training contribute to you achieving your personal and professional...: 4.2/4.0
- To what extent do you feel you have had previous learning (perhaps some you have...: 3.8/4.2
- To what extent have you learned in the module about your behavioural skills?: 4.2/3.9
- To what extent can the knowledge and skills be applied to practice which you received from...: 4.0/4.0
- To what extent have your skills in the themes of the module improved/increased as a result of...: 4.2/3.6
- To what extent has your understanding of the topics improved/increased as a result of this...: 3.8/4.0
- Pace of the themes presentations were adequate: 3.6/4.0
- The material, handouts & online tasks were adequate: 3.3/4.1
- The length of the module was adequate: 3.9/3.9
- The module content met my needs: 3.7/4.1
7.6. ICLDP Module Themes Specific Evaluation Results

Specific assessment of the ICLDP module themes incorporated, for measurement, the suggested five conditions for ‘promoting transformational learning’ by Brown and Posner (2001)\(^{148}\) – described in the literature review, as well as in the previous section with reference to it as a construct in the measurement charts 3.1-3.3. Charts 6 and 7 indicate the collective responses of the nine (9) participants (5 from SA and 4 from USA) to the themes in modules 1 and 2 respectively.

---

**CHART 6: MODULE 1 - COLLECTIVE THEMES MEASUREMENT (USA & SA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of subject matter/theme</th>
<th>Teaching aids/audio visuals were used...</th>
<th>Obvious preparation</th>
<th>Style/delivery</th>
<th>Responsiveness to participants...</th>
<th>Producing a good learning climate</th>
<th>Content was presented within an...</th>
<th>Balance between input sessions, activities,...</th>
<th>How effective were the practical activities?</th>
<th>How did you feel about the length of the...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did you feel about the length of the session?</td>
<td>How effective were the practical activities?</td>
<td>Balance between input sessions, activities, discussions and videos?</td>
<td>Content was presented within an appropriate timeframe</td>
<td>Producing a good learning climate</td>
<td>Responsiveness to participants questions/ comments</td>
<td>Style/delivery</td>
<td>Obvious preparation</td>
<td>Teaching aids/audio visuals were used effectively</td>
<td>Knowledge of subject matter/theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in chart 6 indicate an 89.8% overall measurement for the extent to which transformational learning was promoted in module 1. Participants found the practical activities for themes 3 and 4 more effective – i.e. 90% effective for each and 7.5% higher than those of themes 1 and 2. Participants rated facilitator knowledge of the subject matter that was presented for themes 1, 3 and 4 at 95% – and at 90% for theme 2. Participants rated theme 1 at 89% for the extent to which the theme promoted a transformational learning environment, theme 2 at 87%, theme 3 at 91% and theme 4 at 92% – thereby indicating that theme 4 was rated the highest for transformational learning environment promotion in module 1.

![Chart 7: Module 2 - Collective Themes Measurement (USA & SA)](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of subject matter/theme</th>
<th>Teaching aids/audio visuals were used effectively</th>
<th>Obvious preparation</th>
<th>Style/delivery</th>
<th>Responsiveness to participants questions/comments</th>
<th>Producing a good learning climate</th>
<th>Content was presented within an appropriate time-frame</th>
<th>Balance between input sessions, activities, discussions and videos?</th>
<th>How effective were the practical activities?</th>
<th>How did you feel about the length of the session?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>86.25</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>86.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>86.25</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>86.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>86.25</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>86.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in chart 7 adds up to a 91.7% overall measurement for the extent to which transformational learning was promoted in module 2, which is 1.9% higher than module 1. Participants found the practical activities for theme 2 (facilitation skills) the most effective at 88.6%, which is 2.3% higher than those of themes 1 and 2. Participants rated facilitator knowledge of the subject matter that was presented for theme 1 at 98%, theme 2 at 91.3% and theme 3 at 93%. Participants rated theme 1 at 83.9% for the extent to which the theme promoted a transformational learning environment, theme 2 at 91.9%, and theme 3 at 89.3%, thereby indicating that theme 2 was rated the highest for transformational learning environment promotion in module 2.

### 7.7. ICLDP Exchange Visits Delivery Findings and Evaluation Results

The ICLDP exchange visits implementation evaluation results involved four (4) time frame deliverables, as stated in the ICLDP funding proposal – two (2) of which were relevant to the MU Extension participants and two (2) to the CEU participants. It is important to note that the order of the participant exchange visits was swapped around; as a result, the CEU participants went to Missouri first instead of last. The time gaps between these visits were also considerably shorter than originally planned. Reference was made to these changes in the clarificatory evaluation section of this report, as well as in the beginning of this implementation evaluation section.

The funding proposal indicated the following order of events for the exchange visits and respective deliverables:

> "...[October 2015] January-February 2015: Stage Two for Missouri delegation, visit to South Africa to engage with their program participants and learn about community development and leadership in the South African context...”\(^{149}\)

This visit would then be followed by the MU Extension ICLDP participants and project teams reflecting on the visit, in order to make improvements to the curriculum and contribute further to the action plans to be finalised with the CEU participants – inclusive of the commitments (cross country networks or partnerships required for the action plans) to be finalised during the following visit by the CEU participants to Missouri. This was stated in the funding proposal:

> "...[November – January 2015] March - April 2015: Debriefing session held jointly with all program participants and planning team members. Planning team evaluates the visit by the Missouri delegation and makes adjustments for the South African delegation visit. Potential improvements to the curricula noted. Designated liaisons from the planning team follow program participants to aid in completing action plans and commitments that resulted from the delegation visit...”\(^{150}\)

The CEU visit to Missouri had to involve the following:

> "...[July – August 2015] May – June 2015: Stage Two for South African delegation, visit to Missouri to engage with their program participants and learn about community development and leadership in the South African context...”

\(^{149}\) MU Extension-UWC Partnership Funding Proposals, pp.5-6.

\(^{150}\) MU Extension-UWC Partnership Funding Proposals, pp.5-6.
development and leadership in the U.S. context. This portion of the program will include site visits to NGOs and community organizations, and meetings with MU Extension faculty and administration (and potentially students). Each participant will develop an action plan with timeline, either alone or in collaboration with other program participants..."151

After the visit by the CEU participants to Missouri the following activities were set to take place with the MU Extension participants:

"...[November 2015] June 2015: Stage Three for Missouri delegation, participating in a follow-up session to assess the sustaining impacts of the program on participants, the progress on their action plans, and any needs for additional resources or information..."152

The evaluation assessment of the ICLDP documents and the correspondence between the two partners indicate a different time-frame and order of events for the above quoted planned deliverables to be achieved. The original plan for the ICLDP implementation (phase 2 of the ICLDP) was set for a ten (10) month period from August 2014 until June 2015. August – September 2014 was set for the marketing and recruitment of participants for the ICLDP, followed by a six (6) week ‘theoretical’ training component, offered simultaneously, in both countries from September – November 2014. January – February 2015 was allocated for the MU Extension participants to visit South Africa, in order for them to further engage with their South African counterparts (CEU participants) in the ICLDP and – more importantly – for the MU Extension participants to learn more about community development and leaderships in the South African context. The SA context orientation was to inform the contributions to be made by the MU Extension participants to the community development project action plans, as suggested by the CEU participants and collectively agreed to and finalised by the two participant groups. Development of the action plans was set to take place from March – April 2015. The action plan projects ideas would then have contributed to the planning and selection of sites to be visited during the CEU participants’ exchange visit to Missouri, set to take place in May – June 2015. The purpose of the site visits during the CEU participants exchange visit to Missouri was to inform the completion of action plans amongst the nine (9) participants during June 2015.

Actual implementation of the ICLDP started only in May 2015, with only training of the CEU participants taking place (for reasons mentioned earlier in this report); this was followed by the CEU participants then going to Missouri first – before meeting their not yet recruited MU Extension counterparts. As a result, a much short training programme (i.e. two modules instead of eight) was presented following different approaches and at different times by the two partners – and the developed ePlatform for the ICLDP was not utilised, due to the programme not being synchronised between the two groups of participants.

A further and more complicated result developed from the change in time frame, order of events and unsynchronised training – implementation of the community development action plans by the participants in their communities. As a result of the action plans not yet being completed – and due to

151 MU Extension-UWC Partnership Funding Proposals, pp.5-6.
152 MU Extension-UWC Partnership Funding Proposals, pp.5-6.
the participants also not yet implementing their projects in their communities – the last stage of the programme evaluation, as per the funding proposal, cannot yet be conducted. The last part of this report makes recommendations with regard to completing stage three of the ICLDP – i.e. complete action plans for implementation – which could then provide the basis from which to start some preliminary assessments towards change being effected with the projects in the communities of the participants.

Even though the ICLDP has not been implemented as originally planned, the following evaluation results for the country exchange visits indicate positive results for the participants from both countries. Chart 8 indicates an average of 88.6% success in the exchange visit by the MU Extension participants to the Western Cape in October 2015 – and an average of 89.7% success for the exchange visit by the CEU participants to Missouri in July 2015. The success percentage was calculated as the average of all the scores of all six constructs together, for the USA exchange, and the RSA exchange separately.

![Chart 8: Average Percentage Success of Practicum Exchange Visits]

The average percentage success of the ICLDP exchange visits is further indicated in the results shown below in chart 9, which presents the extent to which the participants felt that the exchange visits contributed to their development in the ICLDP. This was measured against ‘general specific items’ applicable to each exchange visit.

The data in chart 9 indicates an 85.4% capacity development contribution measurement by the SA participants and an 82.6% contribution measurement by the USA participants – a 2.8% higher rating by the SA participants. These percentages indicate that both SA and USA participants felt that the ICLDP contributed significantly to their capacity development as community leaders. The USA participants rated the recommending of the exchange visits to others as 100%, followed by a 96% recommendation rating by the SA participants. The SA participants rated the exchange visit to have met their needs at 92%, followed by an 86% rating by the USA participants – which collectively contributes towards the validation of the success measurement rating presented in chart 6.

Both participant groups rated their non-verbal communication learning and experience development at 86%. This factor measurement relates to transformative learning indicated, in the literature review, by
Dirkx (2012)\textsuperscript{153} to be “...soul work or inner work...”, which is to focus on bringing the “...unconscious to the consciousness (increasing self-awareness and development of more open perspectives)...” Dirkx (2006)\textsuperscript{154} is furthermore of the opinion that we are all deeply connected, not just through our common intellectual heritage but through deep emotional and spiritual bonds – all of which contributes to relationship development. This was a critical component required for the success of the ICLDP amongst the participants; the following example quotes from participants provide further support:

MU Extension Participant 4:
“...The openness & generosity & hospitality of all we met who was overwhelming and profound. I feel I fundamentally changed within as a result of this experience....”

MU Extension Participant 2:
“...The experience helped me to see and understand the importance of creating policy WITH people it affects, rather than FOR people. Buy-in and engagement are critical [...] By encountering a newly born free country and all of the passion and engagement present there, I am less quick to speak and I listen longer [...] Exposure to new cultures and new political systems, and the ability to gain insight on my own country through the eyes and minds of the SA participants and program presenters. The friendships made are priceless...”

CEU Participant 5:
“...I had the opportunity to see other projects being efficiently run by committed passionate and dedicated leaders. I realised and witnessed the importance of good organisation and the power of collaboration / partnerships [...] I have a better understanding of other cultures [...] I have become more tolerant towards others. I have a better insight of project management! [...] I honestly thoroughly enjoyed every moment of this exchange though energy sapping and challenging at certain stages!! Overall I would say I have been transformed and inspired to do BETTER!! [...] Thank you so Much to ALL OF YOU [...] for all your efforts since way back from the initial planning to Date!!! Special thanks to the Funders and Team Mizou in Columbia!!!! [...] Between Team UWC and Team Mizou you make a powerful women’s team of power, influence, vision, and transformational attributes!!! Viva for Women Strength During Women’s Month...”


The practicum content met my needs

The length of the practicum was adequate

To what extent would you recommend others to take part in a practicum exchange

What is your overall rating of the practicum exchange

To what extent have you learned & experience in this practicum exchange about non-verbal communication

To what extent did the practicum exchange contribute to you achieving your personal and professional goals

To what extent do you feel you have had previous learning (perhaps some you have forgotten) confirmed in this practicum exchange?

To what extent have you learned in the practicum exchange about your behavioural skills?

To what extent could you apply in practice the knowledge and skills which you received from the two theoretical training modules

To what extent have your skills in the themes of the modules improved/increased as a result of the practicum application activities you had to... To what extent has your understanding of the theory module themes improved/increased as a result of this practicum application exchange

Pace of the topic presentations were adequate

The topics, sites & handouts were adequate

The length of the practicum was adequate

The practicum content met my needs
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Applicability of the topic presentations & site visits to your practical group activities

Extent to which the practicum exchange was logically sequenced?

The length of the practicum exchange, its topic presentations and site visits

To what extent have you learned & experience in this practicum exchange about non-verbal communication

To what extent did the practicum exchange contribute to you achieving your personal and professional goals

To what extent do you feel you have had previous learning (perhaps some you have forgotten) confirmed in this practicum exchange?

To what extent have you learned in the practicum exchange about your behavioural skills?

To what extent could you apply in practice the knowledge and skills which you received from the two theoretical training modules

To what extent have your skills in the themes of the modules improved/increased as a result of the practicum application activities you had to...

To what extent has your understanding of the theory module themes improved/increased as a result of this practicum application exchange

Pace of the topic presentations were adequate

The topics, sites & handouts were adequate

The length of the practicum was adequate

The practicum content met my needs
8. Study Conclusions and Recommendations

The use of a combination of data gathering approaches – in studying the same phenomenon (ICLDP) – enabled the evaluator to identify and understand the operational links and the crucial decision points regarding certain events and changes to the ICLDP, as well to be able to collect complex data on the group (participants) process and behaviour as the beneficiaries of the ICLDP. This, together with gaining multiple viewpoints from the units of analyses in this study, enhanced the validity of the study findings in support of the conclusions and recommendations in this section – and avoid adversary explanations.

The data collection methods used to gain multiple viewpoints from all concerned were by means of semi-structured field observations and unstructured interviews (discussions) at different stages of the programme activity – involving project team members and participants actions, attitudes and perceptions of the ICLDP planning and implementation. These data findings supplemented the content analyses findings from the programme documents and correspondence – thus providing greater depth of knowledge about the deliverables set for the ICLDP – and allowing for alternative interpretations to the findings from the descriptive statistics. Research questions in the study covered subjects such as the ICLDP activities, the planned content for the prospective ‘change’ (transformation) in the participants – and their suggestions for programme improvement.

The research questions were aimed at determining the extent to which the ICLDP achieved its set goals and objectives as per the MU Extension – UWC partnership funding proposal of 2013, in which specific deliverables (outputs) were set to achieve the short and medium term outcomes for the long term change (impact) in communities. The conclusions and recommendations (which follow in the next section) are accordingly presented using the three levels of ‘impact’ indicated in the supplementary section to the MU Extension and UWC funding proposal. Following on from this section will be the ‘overall’ conclusions and recommendations of the study.

8.1. Short-term Learning Outcomes: Conclusions & Recommendations

The short-term learning outcomes described in the ICLDP proposal were divided between outcomes for:

i) the partner institutions – i.e. MU Extension and CEU; and ii) individual ICLDP participants and their communities. The conclusions and recommendations of each are presented below.

8.1.1. Partner institutions short-term outcomes: conclusions & recommendations

The following five learning outcomes were set to be achieved by the partners – MU Extension and CEU:

- “...Shared knowledge developed about community leadership principles, concepts, and roles, in the context of Western Cape and Missouri
- Formation of additional strategic partnerships and the identification of additional areas for potential collaboration
- Expanded and more productive communication between partners through enhanced communication infrastructure and practices
- Increased knowledge about effective education strategies in a cross-cultural context
- Increased understanding about effective partnering across time, distance, and cultures...”
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Conclusions:
The five learning outcomes were largely achieved, but each in various degrees; this was evidential during the unstructured interviews with team members in both countries. However, these outcomes, except for one – “...identification of additional areas of potential collaboration...” have not been explicitly attended to as yet. One of the team members from MU Extension has taken some initiative with regard to addressing the remaining outcomes by starting with an “International Exchange: Lessons Learned” document, which will contribute to ICLDPs in the future – and more so with regard to reflections specifically relevant in the South African context for the continuation of the MU and UWC partnership. The following example quote provides evidence of early achievement of the identification of additional areas of collaboration:

“...There have been other activities, while not part of the UMSAE P project directly, have nonetheless served to further develop and build the partnership [...] a joint webinar (our fifth in the series) [...] a poster about the webinar series, “Developing Shared International Learning Experiences for Community Engagement” [...] a scholarly paper on this same topic...”

Recommendation:
Develop a plan with clear deliverables – linked to realistically achievable timeframes – as was done for the ICLDP design and implementation itself, in order to explicitly address the learning outcomes and be able to use it as a ‘checklist’ for measuring progress achievement.
This is especially needed with regard to those outcomes which relate to “...additional strategic partnerships...” and to “...expanded and more productive communication between partners...”. This recommendation therefore requires the assignment to it of two task team members (one from each institution) to start developing the plan and facilitate the involvement of the other team members for their respective inputs before consolidation of such a plan. Alternatively, it could be done by one team member to coordinate such a process from the CEU, due to the CEU having taken the responsibility of the evaluation of the project since its inception.

8.1.2. ICLDP participants’ short-term outcomes: conclusions & recommendations
The following seven learning outcomes were set to be achieved by the individual ICLDP participants and their communities:

- “...Increased knowledge and skills relative to community leadership, including dealing with local conflict and complexity, inclusivity in multicultural settings, planning and goal-setting
- Deeper knowledge about broad issue areas affecting communities, and the global context of local issues
- Active engagement in a community issue of interest
- Increased understanding on how to work effectively as a team leader and member
- Willingness and ability to include diverse opinions and cultures in discussions and projects

---
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- Relationships formed between program participants in both the home country and abroad, serving as a basis for future collaboration
- Identification of personal and professional leadership goals...”

**Conclusion:**
These seven learning outcomes were achieved; some evidence validating this conclusion was provided in the previous section.

**Recommendation:**
Develop a pre- and post-test questionnaire to also have a quantifiable measurement of these outcomes.

A thorough literature review was conducted for this evaluation study; the summative version presented in the beginning of this report dealt with the pertinent concepts for the study. Furthermore, the review aimed to assess research findings from other similar ICLDP projects. The four research studies that are comparatively most relevant to the MU & UWC ICLDP for development of the pre- and post-test questionnaire design are those done by: i) Apaliyah, Martin, Gasteyer, Keating & Pigg (2012); ii) Langone & Rohs, (1995); iii) Majee, Long, & Smith (2012); and iv) Vincent, Ward & Denson (2014).

It is very important that the original ICLDP concept idea of selecting 20-30 participants for the training component be adhered to in future, not only to ensure for the participants’ commitment and performance in the programme but also for the purpose of statistical analysis. In the current study the small numbers made it very difficult to determine statistically significant variances from the collected data – i.e. the stats were too “thin” to search for correlations, and chi squares. A bigger sample will be imperative for future quantitative and qualitative pre- and post-test assessments as well as for the measurement of transformative learning levels amongst the participants. Furthermore, the initially planned time-frame of 18 months for the programme should result in the ICLDP achieving all its outcomes as participants would start their action plans during the first part of implementation and be able to complete it in the second half of implementation – during and immediately after the exchanges – with the ‘change-phase’ starting by the participants during the last six months of implementation.

---
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8.2. Intermediate Term, Action Outcomes: Conclusions & Recommendations

The intermediate term action outcomes listed in the ICLDP proposal were again divided between outcomes for: i) the partner institutions; and ii) individual participants and their communities. The conclusions and recommendations of each are presented below.

8.2.1. Partner institutions intermediate outcomes: conclusions & recommendations

The following five intermediate action outcomes had to be achieved by the partners:

- “…New leadership development curriculum developed and tested for grassroots community leaders. Program will incorporate global dimensions and concepts, building off the strengths of both universities.
- Relationships built between Missouri and Western Cape communities and grassroots leaders, with MU and UWC serving in a facilitative role
- Strengthened engagement in communities, and a visible commitment to Broader Impacts for the two partner institutions
- The partners’ track record of engaging and educating community leaders is strengthened, enhancing the ability to leverage funding for this and future collaborative programs
- Scholarship is advanced with the global community development community through producing at least two papers for peer-reviewed publications, and by presenting during at least two international conferences in the U.S. and South Africa.

○ Targeted organizations include: The Engaged Scholarship Consortium; the Community Development Society; the International Association for Community Development; the South African Association of Health Educationalists; AMEE: An International Association for Medial Education; the Journal of Research on Adolescence; the African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance; Health and Quality of Life Outcomes Journal; the National Association of Community Development Extension Professionals; and the Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems and Community Development.”

Conclusions:

Most of the five intermediate action outcomes were achieved – although not to the extent originally set out in the funding proposal action deliverables. The new leadership development curriculum has been developed for a two-module short course, not yet for the originally planned eight modules course. The two partners have furthermore changed and presented some of the contents differently between the two groups. Contact has been kept intact with the participants from both countries by the respective partner institutions, as well as between both groups collectively – the latter via social media. However, in light of the additional requirements stated by the course participants with regard to extended training and application of some of the ICLDP themes, as well as not achieving the long-term condition outcomes yet of the programme, a more structured approach would be required – focused specifically on the “how” to continue with the facilitative role in relationship building between the participants and their communities. At the time of this report, there were already two abstract submissions of presentations at two international conferences about the ICLDP. The data set of this project – collected for the purpose of evaluating this project – will also ensure that the two peer-reviewed journal publications can be written between the two partners.
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**Recommendations:**

**Develop final two (2) and eight (8) module leadership programme curriculum and practicum contents.**

The video recordings of the training sessions presented by the two partners, as well as the module evaluation questionnaire qualitative data feedback from the participants, should be used towards the amendment that will be required for the ICLDP content development. This would require at least a three to five (3-5) day workshop session between the partners – which can be done due to the strong partnership relationship that has come from the ICLDP implementation and the evaluation findings which have provided clarity with regard to the amendments that would be required.

**Develop a follow-up training session and programme for the SA participants**

This would address the participants’ requests made during the unstructured interviews and in the responses to the evaluation questionnaires. This will also contribute towards ensuring attainment of the remaining intermediate participant action and long-term condition outcomes, as quoted above and further below from the funding proposal.

**Conduct follow-up sessions with the USA participants to attain the remaining outcomes of the ICLDP**

The follow-up sessions should follow after the follow-up training and support programme has been developed and presented to the SA participants; this programme should provide for the corrected measures of programme implementation, as originally planned for the ICLDP: e.g. SA participants to develop project proposals for community development projects in their communities – and then be partnered with the USA participants to collectively roll-out the projects.

**Write two peer-reviewed journal publications about the ICLDP**

The partners need to select the topics for these publications and link them with an action plan for delivery.

---

**8.2.2. ICLDP participants’ intermediate outcomes: conclusions & recommendations**

The following five intermediate outcomes had to be achieved by the individual ICLDP participants and their communities:

- “...Increased involvement in community activities, civic affairs, and volunteer work
- Demonstrated commitment to inclusivity, recruiting and involving a diverse range of community members when implementing projects and policies
- Accessing and applying data, tools, strategies, and other resources effectively to affect positive change in communities
- Program graduates are recognized as effective leaders in their home communities
- New and innovative projects undertaken in the community that affect positive change...”

**Conclusions:**

These participant intermediate outcomes have not yet been met due to the project implementation time-frame adjustment, with the result that it is too soon to assess the extent of achievement of these intermediate outcomes by the participants. This is over and above the fact that the course content ended up being considerably different in presentation to the time-frame originally planned. Some of the

---
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data collected from participants immediately after each training session has indicated that they were of the opinion that the training did bring about their ‘transformation’ – which was the overall aim of the ICLDP. However, the extent to which this transformation has taken place and the lasting impact of it on the participants both still need to be measured – as part of the intermediate outcomes assessment that still needs to be conducted. The following example quotes provide evidence of the opinions of participants with regard to the ‘change’ (transformation) the ICLDP brought about in them:

SA Participant 2:
“...knowledge on my Transformational Leadership and my ethics has really improved my attitude of doing things in a right way...”

SA Participant 4:
“...It has changed my mindset and way thinking and to work better with my leadership skills by empowering myself and others - by assisting them to grow as individuals...”

USA Participant 1:
“...I better understand why I do things certain ways and how I can become a more effective leader by adapting my leadership to incorporate characteristics of other styles and better utilize the skills I have...”

USA Participant 2:
“...The module brought about reflection and gave me a lens through which to view not only my leadership strengths : weaknesses, but also those of my organization members...”

The SA participants made several requests during the unstructured interviews, as well as in all the evaluation questionnaires, for the need to have extended time for the themes presented – as well as between presentations of the themes, as this would provide them with an opportunity to practice and present first before continuing on to the next theme. Should the ICLDP be presented as the originally planned eight (8) module programme, then the possibility exists that these requests would not be made by future participants.

Recommendation:
Develop a follow-up training session and programme for the SA participants
This recommendation (already made further above) is that the partners need to develop a follow-up programme to address the requests made by the participants and, as a result, complete the roll-out of the ICLDP pilot project for achievement of the outcomes per the funding proposal.

8.3. Long-term Condition Outcomes: Conclusions & Recommendations
The long-term condition outcomes set for the partner institutions and the individual programme participants and their communities, together with their respective conclusions and recommendations, are presented below.

8.3.1. Partner institutions long-term outcomes: conclusions & recommendations
The following five long-term condition outcomes were to be achieved by the partners:
• “...An expanded network of institutional and organizational relationships will provide MU and UWC with increased visibility and opportunities for creating new and different social and economic linkages
• The commitment of both universities to the principles of engagement and engaged scholarship is visibly strengthened
• Relationships exist that provide opportunities for new revenue streams
• The partner universities are viewed as leaders in cross-cultural education
• The partnership and its program(s) are viewed as an effective catalyst for social change...”

Conclusions:
The five condition outcomes show initial evidence towards their achievement, as the relationship networks have indeed already expanded – both between the partners and especially with those organisations (projects) that are linked to the participants in the programme. As soon as the project plans (key deliverable set for the ICLDP) component of the ICLDP pilot project is completed with the participants during the above-mentioned SA follow-up training sessions, then the opportunities will open up for funding applications and thus access to new revenue streams. The partner institutions will also be able to apply to their respective National Research Fund entities for funding, as their research relates in both countries to the contemporary trend for community engagement research and funding – see article by Bruns & Franz, (2015) Cooperative Extension Program Development and the Community-University Engagement Movement: Perspectives from Two Lifelong Extension Professionals. The remaining two long-term condition outcomes could only provide evidence towards their achievement once the previous three are put in motion.

Recommendations:
Develop a relationship network matrix for the ICLDP
This matrix can be used to compile profiles of the areas and sectors in which the partners and organizations are involved that could then contribute towards a baseline data measurement after which the ‘change’ measurement to be brought about by the impact of the ICLDP and its participants in the respective communities and related projects can be measured.

Apply for National Research Foundation Funding
The results from the current study and the recommendations for amendment and improvement of the ICLDP together with the initial data being gathered for the past year provides a strong justification for research grant applications.

8.3.2. ICLDP participants’ long-term outcomes: conclusions & recommendations
The ICLDP participants and their communities had to achieve the following seven long-term condition outcomes:

• “...A cadre of networked program graduates leaders are affecting positive, sustainable change in communities
• Community leadership principles, knowledge, and roles are being transferred to future leaders

---
161 Supplementary Information: MU Extension-UWC Partnership Funding Proposals, p.2.
Greater collaboration among key individuals, organizations, and institutions
All segments of the community feel represented in community decision-making, and in addressing community issues
Community strengths are understood and used to develop community-relevant solutions
Trust among community members exists
Community organizations are better able to leverage existing resources to attract new resources...”

Conclusions:
These outcomes cannot be assessed at such an early stage of the project. However, the above-mentioned could provide direction with regard to what the partner teams need to work towards, and also on what to prepare the participants with regard to expectations of them post their participation in the ICLDP.

Recommendation:
Develop research projects for the measurement of these outcomes
Each of the listed long-term outcomes can be developed into different research proposal and for which funding could be obtained. As a result – this study recommends these seven outcomes for future research to be done with regard what should be the purpose and overall outcome of ICLDP.

9. Report Conclusion
This formative implementation (process) evaluation study used case study design with document analysis, unstructured interviews and field observations to explore the extent to which the ICLDP has brought about change in the programme participants – with a focus on comparing the planned ICLDP versus the manner in which it was actually implemented by the CEU and MU Extension.

The ICLDP pilot project partners (CEU & MU Extension) set themselves three goals relating to the establishment of a collaborative programme that must be based on all scholarships of engagement and, as a result, extend their reach to communities through community leaders that will be equipped with knowledge and skills to bring about change towards sustainable community wellbeing. The results presented in this report indicate that the goals were attained and the sustainability of the programme lies within the implementation of the recommendations made in this report inclusive of the expressive design of a partnership model for cross-country ICLDPs.

The partners have translated the pilot project goals to three project objectives, with the first objective being to add community engagement, community development and community extension in an integrated manner to the 30-year long partnership between UWC and MU. This pilot project has integrated all three responsibilities (teaching & learning, research and community engagement/extension) of universities into a model on how higher education institutions, across the globe, can partner to contribute towards the achievement of their contemporary overall responsibility

---

162 See quoted goals in section 3.1 of this report.
163 See quoted objectives in section 3.2 of this report.
‘to bring about ‘change’ for the in betterment of society’. The remaining two objectives set by the partners for this pilot project related to the development and implementation of a community leadership programme. The findings presented in this report suggest that the programme has had significant success in obtaining these objectives, as participants have shown changing levels of self-knowledge, self-image, confidence and willingness to continue in an empowered manner as leaders in their communities. Strong relationships have developed, amongst and between the two participant groups, to partner in making a difference in the wellbeing of communities. This collective effort relates to the last implementation deliverable of the ICLDP, which is to assist these participants in completing implementation of their community development action plans.

What remains to be assessed is the extent to which the participants in the ICLDP are going to actually bring about change in their communities with their action plans; this relates to phase three of the planned ICLDP pilot project, for which support and research should start from 2016-2018 to conduct a summative outcome evaluation study of the ICLDP. Several authors, referenced in this report, have indicated the international need for further research relating to the ‘change in communities’ as a result of community leadership development programmes, because of the bulk of research studies only focusing on change in the person (leader) who attended the programme.
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