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Abstract: Studies and projects in international development increasingly find that capacity development is one of the cornerstones for the viability of sustainable development projects. Recent capacity development approaches have developed an integrative, or integral, approach which includes soft and hard capacities and focuses on the individual and collective (i.e. the organization and/or community) domains. Termed Integral capacity development, this has been used by Canadian organizations such as BC Healthy Communities, other NGOs such as Centro Bartolome de las Casas in El Salvador, as well as in international agencies, such as in the Community Capacity Enhancement in the UNDP’s HIV/AIDS Groups’ Leadership for Results Programme. The NGO One Sky-The Canadian Institute of Sustainable Living is using an Integral approach to capacity development in its CIDA-Voluntary Sector Fund project in Peru, with the goal of increasing the Peruvian NGO Asociacion para la Conservacion de la Cuenca Amazonica’s (ACCA) capacity in sustainable livelihoods and rainforest conservation. In partnership with One Sky and ACCA, this research project by Drishti-Centre for Integral Action sought to develop an Integral Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in association with the CIDA-VSF project. This research project included identifying and field-testing methodologies for measuring subjective and objective change, and developing criteria and indicators for soft and hard capacity development. The project used participatory action research, informed by integral research, resulting in various outcomes in ACCA’s work with sustainable livelihoods and rainforest conservation engagement, and new dialogues on M&E in international development theory/practice.
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Studies and projects in international development increasingly find that capacity development is one of the cornerstones for the viability of sustainable development projects. The trends in capacity development in the larger field of international development depict a story of the maturing of experience towards more complex, comprehensive modes of building capacity. Recent initiatives in capacity development seek to include a focus on both individuals and organizations, as well as the “soft” and “hard” capacities associated with sustainable development work. In particular, the Canadian NGO One Sky-The Canadian Institute for Sustainable Living has used an Integral Approach to capacity development in their three-year CIDA Voluntary Sector Fund project in Peru, with a capacity development focus on the Peruvian partner organization, Asociacion para la Conservacion de la Cuenca Amazonica (ACCA). One Sky’s baseline assessment oriented their Integral capacity development approach in four quadrants, each with several areas of focus. These are depicted in the figure 1.

As the One Sky-ACCA Peru Project began, researchers at Drishti - Centre for Integral Action questioned what type of Monitoring and Evaluation would best be put in place to adequately and rigorously measure and assess change in “all quadrants.” While it is fairly easy to measure objective, observable changes, such as changes in skills, behaviours, and systems functions, the subjective changes are less easily measured. However, this does not mean that those interior changes cannot be measured, but that to do so requires drawing on the insights and research from different disciplines, such as from developmental psychology and social psychology. Many of these have their own sets of validity claims that do indeed provide for rigorous assessment. The general premise behind our thinking was that, if practitioners the field of international
sustainable development want to engage subjective, interior domains of change, such as shifts in awareness, values, and worldviews, in addition to other objective, exterior changes, they will increasingly need rigorous and accessible ways to monitor and evaluate both these interior and exterior changes.

Thus, this project sought to engage in participatory action research with our project partners to identify what array of methodologies would be need to capture subjective, inter-subjective and objective evidence for monitoring and evaluating capacity development. A key part of this included identifying criteria and indicators for integral capacity building. These will be used to evaluate and monitor the One Sky-ACCA integral capacity development approach being for leadership development and capacity building for environmental conservation and sustainable livelihoods for the rural poor in Peru. Since the selection of criteria and indicators, and the methodologies used to assess and evaluate these, are reflective of both the soft and hard capacities sought in this approach, partners of the Peru Project can assess more rigorously the effectiveness of their integral approach to capacity development.

**iii) Objectives**

The Research Objectives were as follows:

1. Using action research and appreciative inquiry to identify criteria, indicators, and a methodological framework to assess, evaluate and monitor an Integral Capacity Development approach using the Peru Project as a case study.

2. To carry out three workshops with partner organizations in Peru about these criteria and indicators, and to begin to collaboratively design an assessment and evaluation plan for the Mapacho River Watershed.

3. To synthesize the results of the project to share with project partners and to disseminate widely with other development organizations.

Our research met all three of these objectives, as will be explained below, with a slight clarification in the second. That clarification reflects an evolution in our own understanding of the research topic. That is, while we could and did design a monitoring and evaluation plan for One Sky-ACCA capacity development project, the timing was not appropriate to do so for ACCA’s other interventions in the Mapacho River Watershed. The timing of M&E is particular to the ebb and flows of a project cycle, and cannot be simply instituted at any point of that cycle. For this reason precisely, our research was immediately useful to the One Sky-ACCA project, having been designed to dovetail with their existing project. However, for that reason as well, ACCA’s other projects were coming to a close in the Mapacho River Watershed region, and having not had this M&E framework from the start, it seemed untimely and inappropriate to bring it in at the end. However, ACCA is interested to continue working with the Integral M&E Framework in their future projects in the area, which will also be explained below.

In terms of objective 1 and 3, we conducted more focus groups, key informant interviews, and workshops than we had anticipated, to develop a clear set of C&Is, as well as to take the time needed to design and field-test a methodological framework that
is accessible and user-friendly for practitioners. Through this process, we disseminated our results in various ways: in discussions, workshops, and written form. In doing so, we found that not only was there great interest in these findings, such as BC Healthy Communities eager interest to read our final research documents, but also that some NGOs, such as Centro Bartolome de las Casas in El Salvador, having heard about what we were doing with One Sky-ACCA, would like us to work with their staff to help them develop an integral M&E approach to their community capacity building work. Our final documents will be uploaded to our website resources page to be openly accessed by other development organizations.

iv) Methodology

Two general streams of research inquiry framed the research methodology, namely, action research and integral research. Action research (Reason and Bradbury, 2001) approaches research in a way to include those who implement and put the results of the study into action. Integral research (Wilber, 2000; Esbjörn-Hargens, 2006; Hochachka, 2008) is a comprehensive mixed methods approach to investigating phenomena, that draws on six lines of inquiry. These two methodological approaches not only oriented how we selected our specific methodologies, but they reflected our assumptions about research, namely that research should be for action and that the most useful research is as comprehensive as possible, thus inspiring us to use mixed methods. In other words, the action research oriented our stance to how, why, and for what we engage research, and integral research provided a comprehensive framework of six lines of inquiry.

These “lines of inquiry” that we engaged in the project explore the four key domains of capacity development described above (i.e., systemic change, behavioral change, cultural change, and personal change):

1. reflective inquiry (which relates with self-reflection and interior dynamics)
2. developmental inquiry (which relates with values, attitudes, and self-identity)
3. interpretive inquiry (which relates with participation, local meaning, and cultural relevance)
4. ethno-methodological inquiry (which relates with social dynamics, social discourse and worldviews)
5. empirical inquiry (which relates with behavioral change and change in land use practices)
6. systems inquiry (which relates to ecosystems, socio-political systems, economic systems, communications systems)

We focused more on the four lines of inquiry that particularly sought to understand cultural and personal change (numbers 1-4 listed above), since our research objective was to particularly investigate how development practitioners can rigorously monitor and evaluate interior changes, in addition to exterior changes that tend to be easier to measure. Our research question carried the assumption that there is sufficient capacity already in international development to measure exterior (behavioural and systems) change using empirical, observation techniques for M&E (numbers 5 and 6 above). Perhaps further refinement of skills to do so are needed, but in general that is less a burning question at present. Our methodology made room for the empirical and systems inquiry, as we do see these to be crucially important, but we did focus our efforts more in the last four lines of inquiry directed towards assessing interior changes.
These lines of inquiry and the specific methodologies depicted in figure 2 and are listed in the table below with examples of methodologies we used and a brief discussion on the particular validity claims for each (for a more detailed description, please see Part Two of I-M&E research documents).

**Figure 2: Domains and Forms of Inquiry included in Integral Research.** This figure explains the refinement of previous integral research (see Hochachka, 2005, 2008), that combined methodologies from Personal, Interpersonal, and Practical domains of community development, to here draw upon six different forms of research inquiry each disclosing unique and nuanced information about these three domains of reality. With more domains included in the focus, and with more forms of inquiry employed, a more complete and balanced understanding of the research topic emerges.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line of Inquiry</th>
<th>Specific Methodologies</th>
<th>Validity Claims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Inquiry (or Reflective Inquiry)</td>
<td>Reflective exercises</td>
<td>(Habermas, 1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Description and examples:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Here we used reflective methodologies such as journaling and mindful inquiry. This type of mindful inquiry becomes a “bearing in mind” of the research questions, such that information on the questions can come forth through reflection. An example of this is how, as both researchers engaged in reflective inquiry during informal moments such as going for walks or having coffee, new insights arose on which direction to take the research. As Gail Hochachka explains further, “Prior to, after, and during research activities, I try to practice mindful inquiry, to notice what is arising in my experience, to reveal assumptions I am holding, and to settle into mindfulness. I then journal or mentally-note my findings. Usually this influences the research process I am engaged in, helping me to ask questions in a new way or to voice what I am seeing to my research partner, for example.”&lt;br&gt;<strong>Further resources:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Bentz, V. M. And J. J. Shapiro. (1998). Mindful Inquiry in Social Research. Thousands Oaks, California: Sage Publications.&lt;br&gt;Reason, P. &amp; Torbert, W. (2001) The action turn: Toward a transformational social science. <em>Concepts and Transformation</em>. 6:1, 1-37.</td>
<td>The validity that these methodologies bring to the research include surfacing assumptions, identifying biases, sourcing qualitative (or “thick”) descriptions, and accessing intuitive ways of knowing (that are then triangulated by methodologies from other zones). This type of inquiry assists in “studying the ways in which things appear to consciousness and, therefore, also the way in which consciousness is structured such that things appear to it in the ways that they do” (Husserl). Finally, research that is paying attention to subjective experience also illuminates a key aspect of this study. For example, this line of inquiry helped the researchers to identify what was challenging about the project and to notice when their own frustrations with coordinating between several organizations were occluding the research process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental inquiry</td>
<td>Developmental Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observation of comments and statements, with attention paid to the possible meaning-making systems that gave rise to them. This was not a structured, formal developmental assessment as found in other research of developmental psychologists, such as Cook-Greuter or Kegan, but useful nevertheless in a fieldwork environment.

**Other resources:**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretive inquiry</th>
<th>Focus groups and key informant interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description and examples:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description and examples:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We conducted four focus groups with the key teams within ACCA, namely: 1) the technical workers (reforestation, microenterprise, agronomists); 2) conservation staff (working directly in communities); 3) key coordinators (Program Coordinator and Communications Coordinator); and 4) leaders (Director and Executive Director).</td>
<td>The validity brought to the project from this set of methodologies is that they give voice to the people working in these organizations and communities, interpretative discussion can also contribute to emancipation (e.g. naming the world is to engage in it), mutual understanding, and “buy-in” from participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We tailored the questions posed in the focus groups to be relevant to their focus and tasks, yet all focus group questions followed this general line of questioning:

- What is your work?
- What domains of change does it involve?
- How do you know you are effecting change in that domain?
- What criteria and indicators might be useful in monitoring and evaluating changes?
  - Specifically, how is your work going in participation with communities?
  - How does your work influence interior changes in individuals, such as values and worldviews?

All focus groups and interviews were recorded, transcribed, coded for main themes, and analyzed. Notes from interviews and focus group sessions were also later analyzed. Using an excel spreadsheet we could extricate key quotes from the main themes, as well as quantify which themes were most pertinent to the research. This use and analysis of focus groups demonstrated how this type of methodology can be used to generate both qualitative and quantitative data.

**Ethnomethodological inquiry**

**Participant-observation**

*Description and examples:*
Being actively involved in ACCA office, discussions, and community visits, we had an opportunity to use participant-observation methodology. Data from this was recorded and shared between researchers, all of which could be triangulated with the focus groups, becoming a key part of the research findings.

**Organizational culture assessment tool**

*Description and examples:*
During our first phase of fieldwork, our research team and

The validity gained from this group of methodologies include the inter-subjective discourse and observation of group dynamics over a developmental spectrum. Engaging this as a discussion gave us the ability to check the meanings of people’s comments and to demonstrate a way to measure and assess interior changes in the culture of an organization over time. It helped us to make explicit and measurable what is arising in the group dynamic, such as the implicit rules, norms, social discourse, politics, beliefs, cultural traits, that are at play.
associates developed a tool for assessing organizational culture. It is based on our collective field experience of working with NGOs and communities over 10-15 years, as well as roughly based on a theory of participation types. Five diagrams represent five stages in how an organization participates with communities; which is also loosely framed on participation typologies described by Pretty (1994) adapted from Adnan et al (1992) and listed here: passive participation; participation in information giving; participation by consultation; participation for material incentives; functional participation; interaction participation; self-mobilization. This five-diagram model was used it in the focus groups to engage a discussion on organizational stages of how ACCA engages participation in communities, as well as to field-test this as an evaluation methodology.

| Systems Inquiry and Empirical inquiry | **Observation reports, mapping, meta-analysis, organizational analysis and/or assessment, library research of previous studies.**  

*Description and examples:*  
This included researching the prior documentation on the organization and thematic areas, doing comprehensive inquiry into the interconnected and mutually-influencing systems in which the organization, and its thematic issues, were woven. In some cases, the use of quantitative Likert scales for organizational performance (such as financial management) and for organizational systems (such as office computer systems and technology). These various modes of meta-analysis are useful to better understand the observable aspects organizational capacity as well as the larger contexts in which the organization is embedded and operates.  

|  | The validity of this included carrying out repeatable, controlled, empirical analysis that helped explain the organizational practices and performance, as well as the “functional fit” of aspects studied (such as, inquiring into whether the current communication system functionally fits with the needs of the organization, having a biological research stations in the cloud forest and community workers in the field every week.) |
**Some Key Characteristics**

There are some key characteristics to our research methods and analytical techniques worth mentioning here.

First, we intentionally employed the very methodologies we sought to include in our Integral Monitoring and Evaluation framework, to field-test these methods and also model their use with One Sky-ACCA. As a result, every methodology we used was later explicated into a larger framework for Integral M&E, and each person involved in the action research had had a chance to see these methodologies used in practice. This was a central aspect to our methodological design.

Secondly, in reviewing the above table, it will become evident that our methodological approach sought to include first-person perspectives (via reflective exercises), second-person perspectives (through dialogue, focus groups and interviews), and third-person perspectives (with observation techniques). We see this to be a strength of mixed methods approaches to research.

Another key aspect of this methodological design sought to debunk the myth that subjective changes cannot be empirically measured, when in fact that is precisely how psychologists carry out assessments. While we did employ reflective methods for subjective assessment, we also sought to use more empirical, observational methodologies to assess subjectivity (that is, using third-person perspectives to understand the first-person experience). This is drawn from psychology’s approaches to measure these interior dimensions of human experience. We did this both in our use of developmental assessments used to assess individuals’ meaning-making, as well as the five-diagram assessment of organizational culture. While we did not heavily use the developmental assessment of individuals’ meaning-making (since that requires more intensive education on developmental psychology), we did use the five-diagram organizational assessment in every focus group. We found that, even though this is obviously one of the more complex aspects of this project, every focus group readily understood the five-diagram assessment tool and were able to assess the organization based on these five stages of participation.

An associated aspect of this included finding a balance and integration of qualitative and quantitative methods. For example, our focus groups drew heavily on qualitative methodology, yet our analysis was both qualitative and quantitative. We mined through the transcriptions, drew out quotations, coded themes, and quantified the most important themes. This enables us to draw from these focus groups excellent qualitative anecdotes as well as hard numbers on what themes were most attended to in the course of discussion.

Please see appendix one for the research instruments used, such as questions used in focus groups and interviews, and five-diagram assessment tool.

**v) Project Activities**

**Phase One – Literature Review**
Both researchers extensively researched the existing approaches and frameworks to M&E used in capacity development. We archived these as an electronic library for others in our organization and in other organizations to use as a reference. This phase helped to orient our research, refine our questions, and design our action research intervention.

Phase Two – Capacity Development & Action Research Peru

Action Resarch (Feb-March 2008, Peru)

Focus Groups:

We conducted four focus groups with the key teams within ACCA, namely: 1) the technical workers (reforestation, microenterprise, agronomists); 2) conservation staff (working directly in communities); 3) key coordinators (Program Coordinator and Communications Coordinator); and 4) leaders (Director and Executive Director).

We tailored the questions posed in the focus groups to be relevant to their focus and tasks, yet all focus group questions followed a general line of questioning, moving from what their work seeks to accomplish in very general terms honing toward more specifically how they hoped to assess “all quadrants” of change in that area.

For example, if the objective was to increase participation between ACCA and communities, what indicators of this could be found in all quadrants. That is, in terms of behavioral change (such as numbers of individuals coming to meetings) and systems change (such as number of new agreements between the community and the organization, number of co-managed conservation concessions, etc.), but also self change (such as individuals’ sense of identity and values in regards to the collaborative conservation project) and cultural change (such as: the communities’ trust in ACCA, ACCA’s inclusion of the communities’ needs and agendas in addition to their own, and the communities’ ability to move beyond assistance to take the lead in their own development).

Interestingly, the participants in the focus groups could readily come up with ideas for this, and intriguing discussions ensued in regards to what would be the most appropriate, measurable C&Is, and also what type or quality of capacity would be needed for staff to carry this out, particularly to include the ‘soft’ or interior C&Is.

All focus groups and interviews were recorded, transcribed, coded for main themes, and analyzed. Notes from interviews and focus group sessions were also later analyzed. Using an excel spreadsheet we could extricate key quotes from the main themes, as well as quantify which themes were most pertinent to the research. This use and analysis of focus groups demonstrated how this type of methodology can be used to generate both qualitative and quantitative data.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, these focus groups also served to open up a dialogue on Monitoring and Evaluation—how it is usually practiced to focus on exterior changes, what interior aspects would also be important to include, and what more potential an M&E process could hold for the organization’s own self-knowledge about the outcomes it seeks.
Key-Informant Interviews:

We met with key individuals, notably the executive director and the anthropologist with key insights into how ACCA works with and could assess more adequately the worldviews and cultural well-being in indigenous communities.

Participant-Observation:

Spending several weeks in the field enabled us to become “part” of the organization in a daily type of way. Over this time during Phase One, using participant-observation methodology, we were asked to participate in ACCA’s strategic planning session, the Director asked our opinions often on various aspects of projects, we were involved in discussing creative ideas for future projects, and visited communities with field staff. This aspect of building relationships and being part of the daily flow of the organization, contributed to our ability to triangulate aspects of the research and also contributed to the degree of trust that has become such a key part of this research project.

Implementation (May-August, Canada):

Upon return to Canada, we transcribed the focus groups and key informant interviews. Then, we analyzed the data by coding key themes, counting frequency of each theme, and evaluating proportions of each theme out of the total number of themes to know what was of greatest importance to ACCA and One Sky at that time. Then, we extricated quotes on criteria and indicators for each theme that had been discussed in the focus groups. This gave us a clear idea of which domains of change and outcomes were of greatest importance in the One Sky-ACCA project, as well as a series of examples of C&Is for each.

The second part of this work involved researching what array of methodologies could be used in M&E. For this, we did research into what were the most accessible, user-friendly methods, considering the capacity building needs of the organizations. From this, we developed a draft framework for Integral M&E.

Action Research (September, Peru)

Returning in September to Peru, we had hoped to share the draft framework for Integral M&E with ACCA. When we got there, the ACCA Cusco office explained that, while they did not have any M&E framework in place and were interested in continuing with our framework, their Washington sister-organization had hired someone to create and institute a data management system and M&E plan across all offices (Cusco, Puerto Maldonado, and Bolivia). Not wanting to interfere with this other process, we suspended our planned activities to share and further develop our draft M&E plan. Instead, we met with this other individual, considering how we might streamline both M&E frameworks into one. In the end, this did not occur for various reasons. Firstly, when he shared the framework he was using, we quickly saw that his approach and methodologies were highly quantitative, and the design was primarily addressing the need for data management. Our approach had taken such a different tack, considering how to measure subjective and objective change, so to more fully capture the many
qualitative and quantitative changes occurring in projects. These two approaches were not easily combined, and nor was he necessarily open to their combination. Secondly, while we were ready to begin capacity building for the methodologies and M&E framework, the other individual was not (and even to this date, has not begun capacity building on his M&E plan). We felt it would be inappropriate if we went ahead with capacity building workshops for M&E, particularly if he viewed this to preempt his work with the Cusco office.

However, what came out of this change in our planned activities was a clear expression from the Executive Director, the Program Coordinators, and Field Staff, that they saw the value in our draft M&E framework, they knew that this was of longer-term value to their organization, and hoped there would be a way to draw from our work as they developed an institutional M&E plan. In other words, top-down decision-making temporarily usurped a bottom-up process that was already underway. I emphasize temporarily because, since then, Drishti - Centre for Integral Action has been asked to continue with ACCA, instituting our Integral M&E Framework into its future projects in the Amazon biological corridor. Further, the Washington sister-organization has also seen the positive results of the integral capacity development in the Cusco office, and has asked for a similar process to occur in the Puerto Maldonado office.

Instead of presenting and sharing the draft framework, at this point in the project, the researchers themselves carried out some monitoring and field-testing of the framework for the One Sky-ACCA project. We circled back to the objectives and baseline data of the Integral capacity development project objectives and used the methodologies from our draft framework to assess changes. This helped us to do two things: firstly, it enabled us to field-test our draft Integral M&E Framework, making minor alternations in the design, and secondly, it enabled us to contribute data to the overall One Sky-ACCA project, helping to refine the RBM table of that project.

**Action Research (October-December, Canada; January, Peru)**

In this third section of action research, we worked in collaboration with ACCA and One Sky to finalize our Integral M&E Framework, we wrote and shared a final research summary written in Spanish to ACCA, and helped One Sky to include more methodologies in how it goes about M&E, including refining the RBM to include more subjective and inter-subjective C&Is to assess changes more comprehensively. This was a key section of the research.

It was also made clear to us on the last fieldtrip to Peru that ACCA was interested and committed to continue with Drishti beyond the dates of this year project, to more fully embed an Integral M&E Framework into their future projects. This took shape immediately with a request for Drishti researcher to work with field staff to design three social forestry projects in the Cusco region using Integral M&E. This interest in Drishti’s research and approach came from all levels of the organization—coordinators and staff in the Cusco office as well as the coordinators of the Washington sister-organization—suggesting that, in these final steps, we managed to link the top-down decision-making with the bottom-up processes. And in fact, the bottom-up, participatory processes that we had carried out in our research were recognized and understood to be the source of better work regarding M&E. The quality of what came out of our action...
research with ACCA-Cusco office called for further attention from all levels of the organization.

**Phase Three – Synthesis and Knowledge Sharing**

In this part of the research, we focused on drawing together all aspects of the research into several key outputs, listed below in detail. In brief, this included: a Research Summary, written in Spanish for ACCA (15 pages); a Booklet on Integral M&E (written in three parts, 75 pages); and recommendations for One Sky on how include more subjective C&Is in their RBM table for the One Sky-ACCA project. The first two of these outputs will be shared in an open-source format on our website for use by other development organizations and environmental NGOs.

We also held an educational workshop in Vancouver with representatives from Drishti, One Sky, BC Healthy Communities, and private consultancies that work in community and international development. At this workshop, we shared the research methods and findings, described the Integral M&E Framework, and facilitated a dialogue on this topic. Participants were intrigued to read more about our research, and also wanted to hold similar workshop/discussions on a more regular basis with Drishti - Centre for Integral Action.

**vi) Results and Discussion**

In this section provides some of the results and discussion from the fieldwork, particularly the objectives for integral capacity development, and their sample criteria and indicators. Other results are written in the larger document *Towards an Integral Monitoring and Evaluation*.

In the One Sky-ACCA integral baselines assessment, and then through the focus groups, seven objectives for integral capacity development were identified. These included:

1. Improve internal organizational dynamics, internal communication, and reflective processes within ACCA. Identified by ACCA

2. Engender great trust and improve ACCA’s image with communities and the public. Identified by ACCA

3. Better understanding worldviews and engaging interior changes (such as awareness, attitudes, empowerment, sense of ownership, knowledge, values, and motivation). Identified by ACCA and One Sky

4. Strengthen participation with communities and other actors, learning new social methodologies. Identified by ACCA and One Sky
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Identified by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Develop gender awareness, and build capacity for Gender Mainstreaming across the organization and in programming with communities and the public.</td>
<td>One Sky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Improve capacity for networking with other organizations (locally, regionally, internationally).</td>
<td>One Sky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Improve capacity for strategic planning</td>
<td>One Sky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In figure 3a-g below, sample criteria and indicators are given for each objective, taking each quadrant into account. These come directly from the focus group and key informant interviews, with some additions from the Drishti researchers.
## Figure 3a-g: Criteria and indicators developed by focus groups in ACCA and One Sky for each outcome for integral capacity development.

### Figure 3a: Criteria and Indicators for outcome: “Strengthening the participation with communities and other stakeholders.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interior</th>
<th>Exterior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UL Quadrant 1:</strong> Experience (I), subjective, qualitative:</td>
<td><strong>UR Quadrant 2:</strong> Behaviour (It), objective, quantitative:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The community people express themselves as protagonists of their conservation work, they identify as leaders of this work.</td>
<td>1. Number of community leaders who formally solicit ACCA’s support and show through meeting actions that they are interested to move ahead with the concession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The community people demonstrate self-esteem and self-confidence by speaking up in meetings, sharing their opinions, and deeply contribute to the dialogue.</td>
<td>2. Numbers of acts and agreements with the communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The quality of individuals’ participation improves from passive to active (eg: just showing up passively in assemblies to actively participating and/or facilitating those assemblies, from wanting hand-outs for firewood to getting actively involved in forestry projects, to generally supporting microenterprise projects when the going is smooth, to leading the microenterprise projects or even starting their own cooperative).</td>
<td>3. Number of instances where ACCA personal sincerely include the agenda of the community by writing proposals and carrying out projects taking into account the perspective of the local community as well as the NGO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LL Quadrant 3:</strong> Culture (We), inter-subjective, qualitative:</td>
<td>4. An increase in the percentage of the community that participates in activities with ACCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Real, sincere dialogue is evidenced in how community people are putting forth their questions and sharing ideas, and in how ACCA staff are listening authentically.</td>
<td><strong>LR Quadrant 4:</strong> Systems (Its), inter-objective, quantitative:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. True participatory collaboration is evidenced in the existence of a conservation concession in the name of the Q’eros indigenous people (not only in the name of ACCA).</td>
<td>1. Number of instances where ACCA’s participatory approach to its projects is being spoken about and replicated in other communities and regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collaboration between ACCA with the community is evidenced in the sharing of responsibilities and co-management practices for the concession.</td>
<td>2. Number of other NGOs in Peru who are soliciting conservation concessions first by working in a participatory way with communities and then putting the concession in the communities name, following ACCA’s lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Local people and communities are approaching ACCA, getting involved with ACCA, and in turn we are getting involved in the community, that communities trust ACCA enough to solicit their support for a conservation concession.</td>
<td>3. Number of communities participating in the entire project cycle, from the idea development through the project elaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collective</strong></td>
<td>4. Number of conservation concessions that are elaborated and managed by both ACCA and the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3b: Criteria and Indicators for outcome: “Understanding worldviews and Engaging Interior Changes, such as empowerment, awareness, knowledge, values, and motivation.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interior</th>
<th>Exterior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UL Quadrant 1</strong>: Experience (I), subjective, qualitative:</td>
<td><strong>UR Quadrant 2</strong>: Behaviour (It), objective, quantitative:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Community people understand the conservation concession and can explain it in reference to their community, forest, and valley.</td>
<td>1. If there were no ACCA tomorrow, it would not impact negatively the work being done by the community in the concession; that they could move on in managing the concession without ACCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community people feel identified with the conservation concession as their community’s project, demonstrated by their ability to explain it to others and their commitment to the project.</td>
<td>2. Number of actions of the community people take that demonstrate self-care and community-care; such as: number of people who have seedlings and forest plantations on their land, number of visits have they made to other communities to share practices, evidence that they are taking better physical care of themselves, dressing better and eating better nutritionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attitudes towards conservation increase from low (i.e. disinterest in or disagreement about conservation), medium (i.e. people demonstrate average interest and commitment mostly when it is agreeable to them and in their favor), high (i.e. people demonstrate high interest and commitment, seeing the larger positive impact of conservation on the whole community and region); upon entering the community, during the project, and at the end.</td>
<td>3. Number of community people who work for the concession; it is not just seen to be a “brochure” but is a key part of the community life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II Quadrant 3</strong>: Culture (We), inter-subjective, qualitative:</td>
<td><strong>LR Quadrant 4</strong>: Systems (Its), inter-objective, quantitative:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Community people demonstrate shared values regarding conservation.</td>
<td>1. Number of community people carrying out ecological inventories of flora and fauna rather than getting ACCA to contract an outside consultant to do this work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indigenous communities feel that conservation is implicit in their culture.</td>
<td>4. Number of instances in which ACCA no longer separates “conservation” from “community development”, seeing that these are interconnected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adults and youth in the Q’eros Nation see and value the long-term employment potential in the concession for tourism, park rangers, and other work options.</td>
<td>5. Number of instances where conservation is being explained and interest is passed on within the family and between families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The community values for their own traditional ecological knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 3c: Criteria and Indicators for outcome: “Improved Internal Organizational Process and Reflective Processes”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interior</th>
<th>Exterior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UL Quadrant 1: Experience (I), subjective, qualitative:</strong></td>
<td><strong>UR Quadrant 2: Behaviour (It), objective, quantitative:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Employees feel heard and feel like they can speak and share in an open way throughout the communication channels in the organization.</td>
<td>1. Number of times staff members share knowledge through internal communication channels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. People in the organization are demonstrating increased self-awareness and self-reflection by noticing their own biases, assumptions, and contributions to the group dynamics in the organization.</td>
<td>2. Number of situations where staff members and coordinators give each other feedback on the work they have done.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Collective                  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| <strong>IL Quadrant 3: Culture (We), inter-subjective, qualitative:</strong> | <strong>LR Quadrant 4: Systems (Its), inter-objective, quantitative:</strong> |
| 1. ACCA staff demonstrates they have gone beyond communication barriers that exist between groups by communicating between groups, such as technical staff and project coordinators, and vice versa. | 1. Evidence of communication flowing horizontally in the organizational system such that the opinions from those “on the ground” is heard by those “at the top,” and these opinions are heard and taken into consideration. |
| 2. ACCA staff demonstrates that they have gone beyond the implicit separation of “people working in their own separate worlds” by knowing what others in the organization are doing, by recognizing individuals’ work for ACCA as part of a larger whole in which they too contribution. | 2. Number of instances where staff members use the internal communication channels to ask questions and inform others about their work. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interior</th>
<th>Exterior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UL Quadrant 1:</strong> Experience (I), subjective, qualitative:</td>
<td><strong>UR Quadrant 2:</strong> Behaviour (II), objective, quantitative:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Community people demonstrate great trust in ACCA by their commitment to continue working with ACCA and their confidence shown in regards to the organization.</td>
<td>1. Number of meetings and length of time ACCA personal take to explain the conservation concession in ways that are clearly understood by communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ACCA personal demonstrate sincerity, objective and realistic attitudes, and patient demeanor in their work with communities and the public.</td>
<td>2. Numbers of invitations ACCA gets from communities inviting them to traditional events and other important cultural moments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of prizes, other awards, and/or public recognition won by ACCA about their work as a leader NGO.</td>
<td>3. Number of prizes, other awards, and/or public recognition won by ACCA about their work as a leader NGO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LL Quadrant 3:** Culture (We), inter-subjective, qualitative: | **LR Quadrant 4:** Systems (Its), inter-objective, quantitative: |
| 1. Communities are open to continue dialogue and collaboration on projects with ACCA. | 1. Number of communities listening and approaching ACCA to work together; that is, number of instances where their work is replicated in other regions around Cusco. |
| 2. Communities show respect for ACCA in their particular cultural ways (such as, cards, visits, gifts, making ACCA in charge of the Virgin of Chanka). | 2. Number of new funding and avenues of financial support attracted by ACCA’s public image. |
| 3. ACCA authentically take into account the 500 years of colonization, realizing the psychological weight of that history and how it would take a long time to recover from it. | 3. Number of new connection with other institutions attracted by ACCA’s public image. |
**Figure 3e: Criteria and Indicators for outcome: “Gender awareness and gender mainstreaming.”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interior</th>
<th>Exterior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UL Quadrant 1:</strong> Experience (I), subjective, qualitative:</td>
<td><strong>UR Quadrant 2:</strong> Behaviour (It), objective, quantitative:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ACCA personal demonstrate the values of gender equality in how they speak about and with women in the organization.</td>
<td>1. Number of policies written regarding gender equality, both for the organization and for their community work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The office carries a welcoming feeling for women, not just in their traditional roles, but to express their ideas and creativity for projects.</td>
<td>2. ACCA personal put the policy into practice and teach new employees about the gender policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IL Quadrant 3:</strong> Culture (We), inter-subjective, qualitative:</td>
<td>3. Number of women in positions of power and decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A different dialogue arises in the organization, one that takes gender into account and has a social impact on the organization.</td>
<td><strong>LR Quadrant 4:</strong> Systems (Its), inter-objective, quantitative:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Women and men both speak highly of the gender equality and can explain clearly the need for this in the organization, communities and larger society.</td>
<td>1. There is a new system for employment that takes a proactive approach to finding equal opportunities for men and women, both within the organization and in communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ACCA is felt and seen to have a culture that is respectful and conscious of gender.</td>
<td>2. There is a communication system that permits women to talk frankly about their ideas and feelings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Figure 3f: Criteria and Indicators for outcome: “Improving Networking”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interior</th>
<th>Exterior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UL Quadrant 1:</strong> Experience (I), subjective, qualitative:</td>
<td><strong>UR Quadrant 2:</strong> Behaviour (II), objective, quantitative:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ACCA personal are able to take different perspectives, beyond that of the organization’s agenda, understanding that their agenda is in fact linked to the agenda of other NGOs, communities, and organizations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LL Quadrant 3:</strong> Culture (We), inter-subjective, qualitative:</td>
<td><strong>LR Quadrant 4:</strong> Systems (Its), inter-objective, quantitative:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The quality of communication between institutions is fluid, respectful, and dynamic.</td>
<td>1. Number of collaborative agreements between ACCA and other institutions, coalitions, or networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UL Quadrant 1:</strong> Experience (I), subjective, qualitative:</td>
<td><strong>UR Quadrant 2:</strong> Behaviour (It), objective, quantitative:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. ACCA personal feel included in the strategic plan, and one can see the individual offerings honored and included within the organization as a whole. | 1. The strategic plan was developed, written, and put into practice.  
2. Number of instances in which ACCA personal referred to the plan to assist in guiding their projects. |
| **LL Quadrant 3:** Culture (We), inter-subjective, qualitative: | **LR Quadrant 4:** Systems (Its), inter-objective, quantitative: |
| 1. The quality of process for developing the strategic plan was participatory and creative. | 1. The strategic plan acknowledges the global reality and the complexity of global issues in ways that draws relevant links to ACCA’s unique offerings toward these global issues. |
While most of the discussion on this research is included in the document *Toward an Integral Monitoring and Evaluation*, just a few remarks can be made on these charts here in this technical report.

Firstly, these charts show that for any of the objectives sought in integral capacity building, an array of criteria and indicators can be developed in all quadrants. Ideally a project team would go over these C&Is to identify those that are most reflective of changes and are most accessible to measure. In this endeavor, an NGO would want to be careful not to over-commit and under-deliver in terms of what is actually possible.

Secondly, one can quickly see the difference in data provided by these subjective and objective indicators. For example, in regards to improving participation (figure 3a), “An increase in the percentage of the community that participates in activities with ACCA,” tells you something very different than: “The quality of individuals’ participation improves from passive to active (eg: just showing up passively in assemblies to actively participating and/or facilitating those assemblies; from waiting hand-outs for firewood to getting actively involved in forestry projects; from minimally supporting microenterprise projects to leading the microenterprise projects or even starting their own cooperative).” Interestingly, both of these indicators rely on observation techniques (third-person perspective), but they are directing that inquiry towards different phenomena, the former quantitative, objective (i.e. percentages of people) and the latter to qualitative, subjective (i.e. quality of participation demonstrated). There are also more truly subjective, qualitative methods for other indicators as well, such as: “The community people express themselves as protagonists of their conservation work and self-identify as leaders of this work” which would in turn require data collection that could draw forth that subjectivity, such as journaling, story-telling, or key informant interviews.

vii) Project Outputs

Research:

Research reports

**Booklet entitled *Toward an Integral Monitoring and Evaluation***

- Includes a three-part overview of the need for an Integral approach to M&E of comprehensive capacity building in today’s development context, a discussion of how we carried out this research in Peru, and a description of a “version one” Integral M&E Framework.
- Please note that this was sent out for review to project partners by Feb. 28th, edits and revisions are scheduled to be completed by March 31st, and uploaded to the website in early April 2009, due to website upgrades currently underway.

**Research Summary in Spanish**

- Includes a 15-page overview of the research project conducted in 2008-2009 between Drishti, ACCA and One Sky in Cusco Peru, with a brief articulation
of the research problem addressed and a rationale for the project, a description of research activities, and a compilation of results and findings.

- *Please note that this is scheduled to be uploaded to the website in early April 2009, due to website upgrades currently underway.*

Technologies (broadly defined, including social processes)

**Analysis and Recommendations for One Sky in VSF Project in Cusco**

- This occurred in Canada and Peru over the final phase of the project, and is an internal document to One Sky.

**Milestones achieved in knowledge-building and networking**

**Memorandum of Understanding with One Sky**

- This MOU is to formally involve Drishti in developing an Integral M&E Framework for its Voluntary Sector Fund Project in Nigeria.

**Articulated interest and committed from ACCA**

- To involve Drishti in embedding an Integral M&E Framework for future projects, particularly in ACCA’s biological corridor project from the cloud forests in the Andes to the Amazon basin, where currently the Brazil-Peru highway is to be built and threatens biological integrity of the surrounding ecosystems.

- Immediate request from ACCA Director for Drishti to assist field staff to design three social forestry projects in the Cusco region using an Integral M&E Framework.

- The Vancouver workshop was found to be so useful to the participating organizations, particularly BCHC and One Sky, that it was requested that Drishti continue to organize such dialogue-oriented workshops that blend research with practice in international development.

**Capacity:**

- 20 individuals participated in focus groups to build the Integral M&E Framework.
- Increase in capacity of ACCA staff for engaging in participatory processes internally in their organization, assisting with better internal communication.
- Increase in breadth and depth of focus brought to ACCA’s design of projects, including and especially how M&E takes place.
- Milestone reached in quality and nature of partnership between ACCA and Drishti, with clear plans for a longer term collaboration in other regions where ACCA is working.
- Increase in individual and organizational capacity (e.g., field staff displaying leadership, better able to conceptualize project design and ask research
questions), on the whole, ACCA as an organization is more effective in making linkages with other stakeholders, particularly local communities.

**viii) Project Outcomes**

The main outcome of the project was a new sense of what is possible in terms of Monitoring and Evaluation. Rather than simply carrying out what is minimally required by donors, M&E was brought alive into a way of working that helps to orient the entire flow of a project to the particular objectives sought. Much like a river flowing to the sea requires banks in order to maintain its route and to arrive at its goal, participants and end-users of this research gained understanding that an M&E process has a similarly exciting role in setting and holding a frame for transformational change. This indeed will be of important use for donors, but it also helps practitioners to know if and how they need to refine their approach as they go along, as well as to be able to really assess what changes occurred.

These changes are not confined to (what we call) “numbers of” data that tends to be the easiest to observe and thus measure, but rather other changes that are more subjective and inter-subjective. For example, while numbers of women present at a community meetings is often used as an indicator of increases in gender equality, an Integral M&E Framework also seeks to know the quality of contributions made by those women, how their sense of self and confidence has changed over the course of the project, to what extent women are involved in decision-making and policy influence, and how they value larger issues of diversity, equality, and conservation. Due to the often elusive nature of subjective changes and a general lack of familiarity with methodologies to assess these, added to pressing work-loads and complicated reporting mechanisms, often development organizations can rely too much on empirical “numbers of” data, even though they clearly and intuitively know that all these changes are critically important for changes to stick (in this case, for gender equality).

Throughout both organizations—ACCA and One Sky—there was an increased understanding of how an M&E approach could find C&Is for both interior and exterior dimensions of change, as well as to identify methodologies to assess these. This research project began a dialogue about the need for, and nature of, an Integral M&E, provided a field-tested Framework for how to go about this, and made available extensive written resources for other organizations to follow. In so doing, the research project has opened the door on new innovations in this important aspect of development programming.

In particular, the project contributed to the areas listed below in the following ways:

- **Knowledge innovations**
  This project resulted in outcomes in knowledge innovations in regards to how development practitioners: a) identify what is valid knowledge to be included in M&E; b) collect knowledge for both interior and exterior changes associated with the project’s objectives; and c) assess that data qualitatively and quantitatively so to know something with rigor about behavioral change, systems change, cultural change, and self change in regards to their project in question. While surely there are refinements to this Framework, we are excited
to have begun the dialogue and hope it will serve to ignite more knowledge innovations in this area in the future.

- **Changes in organizational capacities**
  Beginning the action research with a series of in-depth, participatory focus groups assisted in creating *a capacity-building mood* throughout the organization. Throughout this year, with this openness to ask new questions, inquire more deeply into the nature of the work and the breadth of changes sought, and the encouragement of creativity, the organizational capacities in regards to project design and M&E have shifted and expanded to include more subjective and objective changes. As Cesar Moran-Cahusac, the Executive Director, explained, “Now, we are really including the human dimension of conservation work, such that we are not just trying to keep trees standing but also now seeing that standing trees are a key part of sustainable livelihoods and poverty alleviation.” This shift in emphasis to include participatory methodologies, to better understand local worldviews, and to include these human dimensions in conservation work is noteworthy as an outcome that will surely impact not just M&E within ACCA, but also fundraising, strategic planning, and networking.

- **Relationships of both praxis-based and researched-based non-profit organizations**
  Another outcome of the research is the quality of relationships built through this project between two praxis-oriented organizations (ACCA and One Sky) with a more research-based organization (Drishti), which has inspired all those involved and will continue to be nurtured in the future.

- **Technology development, adoption, and adaptation**
  Defining “technology” broadly, the Integral approach to M&E was beginning to be adapted into project idea development and design, as well as M&E, most immediately in three smaller projects in social forestry that begin in 2009 and most notably in a larger project for the biological corridor planned for later in 2009 or 2010. The research process and outputs informed many of these larger discussions, sufficient to suggest this “technology” was being adapted into how ACCA functions.

**Lessons learned**

Key lessons learned about our approach and broad design of the research were in regards to balancing and meeting the various needs of working with two partner organizations. Our research primarily sought to provide an Integral M&E Framework to the One Sky VSF Project on Integral capacity development. However, since we carried out participatory action research to develop that framework with One Sky and ACCA, we felt compelled ethically to also provide ACCA with some assistance in its M&E framework as well. We had not designed the project with sufficient funds for the workload associated with this. In any case, we did try to assist in this way, and found that it quickly became complicated for several reasons. Among these reasons, we then had to work with ACCA’s strategic plan and align with the other ACCA staff member hired to institute a quantitative data-management system as their organization-wide M&E plan. As mentioned above, we found the timing inappropriate. What we learned,
however, is that it was best to stay with our original plan, and in so doing, emulate and model for ACCA and One Sky an Integral M&E Framework, involving both organizations where possible and making ourselves available to assist in ways that were in close alignment with the central objectives of the research project but that were not anticipated in the initial design.

**Dissemination Plan**

The 75-page document *Towards an Integral Monitoring and Evaluation* has been sent out to Drishti researchers for review, and will then be sent to One Sky and ACCA directors for review. Revisions are scheduled to be integrated by the end of March, and the documents is scheduled to be uploaded to the Drishti website for open-access by early April. Other research documents, such as the *Research Summary* in Spanish has already been sent to ACCA. Potential dates are currently being discussed to hold further dialogues on this topic in Vancouver.

**ix) Overall Assessment and Recommendations**

At the close of this research project, we feel optimistic that while it was a small project, it might be a particularly catalyzing one for innovations in M&E in development. In other research we have analyzed and critiqued the field of development for its often piecemeal approach to an obviously complex and profound endeavor of comprehensive global change. We have pointed out that the methodologies and disciplines exist in this field and can be integrated into a more complete, whole, and integral approach to engaging change. Now, through these research outcomes, we offer development practitioners and organizations a framework for how to orient and design a project to include “all quadrants” of change (behaviours, systems, culture, and self) as well as how to identify C&Is and methodologies to go about rigorous, inclusive monitoring and evaluation.

This was a small yet meaningful project, certainly one that was well worth the time, effort and resources that went into it. We see it is a solid starting point for a longer dialogue and refinement of an integrated approach to measuring change in sustainable development. We have already seen the interest in our research, both from the partner organizations, other community development and environmental NGOs, and even in some CIDA representatives who visited the ACCA-Cusco office, sufficient to suggest that this is an important dialogue to initiate and continue in today’s development context.
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Appendix 1: Instruments for Interviews and Focus Groups

Key themes for Focus Groups and line of questioning in Interviews:

1. Introduction on the action research (Drishti Researchers)
2. A discussion/description on the nature of the focus group participants’ work. This was usually technical but with a learning/consciousness-raising aspect as well. This usually focused the discussion on what was most important to ACCA right now, as well as circling back to the capacity development themes of the One Sky-ACCA project.
3. Discussion on C&Is for their work. This included the various themes for capacity development (from ACCA at present and from the One Sky-ACCA project), such as interior aspects (such as awareness, values, and worldviews), participation with communities, gender sensitivity, internal communications, strategic planning, policy dialogues, and networking.
4. Organizational Assessment—assessing how the organization relates with communities.

Organizational Assessment of Participatory Engagement with Communities

These triangles depict five developmental stages (coming from different altitudes of consciousness) regarding participation between the organization (triangle 1) and the community (triangle 2). We presented these as horizontal types, although through the discussion participants usually noted that they were developmental stages. From left to right, the stage is described by a sample quote that might issue from that stage: egocentric (“my agenda/organization is the only one that counts”), ethnocentric (“our organization has the right way of doing things, but we’ll give hand-outs to the community”); early world-centric (“we can consider and appreciate the community has its own agenda, and we’ll engage in participation, but it is more consultation, since we really don’t give up much of our agenda, being as it is based on true expertise”); late world-centric (“we so consider and appreciate the community’s agenda that we’ll give up our own, in fact, that it itself becomes our agenda which is often imposed on the community”); kosmos-centric (“we see that both the organization and the community have an agenda/perspective that is valid and that the shared terrain does not have to be the lowest common denominator, rather a wider, deeper perspective co-arises that neither individual entity can see on its own.”)

This set of five diagrams was created by the research team and associates in a meeting in Cusco. It is based on our collective field experience as well as roughly based on a theory of types of participation. The typologies are listed here, with their links to our triangle model: passive participation; participation in information giving; participation by consultation; participation for material incentives; functional participation; interaction participation; self-mobilization (Source: Pretty (1994) adapted from Adnan et al (1992)).