

## II. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

### A. Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation

19. This is the second independent evaluation of the SCFMC focussing on the 2013 to 2019 period. The purpose of the evaluation is to enable the Board to assess the performance and impact of the SCFMC, especially the SCFMP, identifying strengths and weaknesses and providing a robust evidence base for determining future strategic, policy and funding decisions. This evaluation primarily focussed on the SCFMP but also covers the Cook Islands' Negotiation Programme and High-Level Forum on Governance and Strategy. The preliminary findings were discussed with the SCFMC executive director. Although the evaluators were contracted by the SCFMC, they had complete freedom to form their own opinions and to reach conclusions based on their analysis. If there were differences of opinion between the evaluators and the SCFMC, the views in the report are those of the evaluators.

#### I Key Evaluation Questions

20. The evaluation was designed to answer one overarching question “*Has the SCFMP delivered an identifiable and sustained improvement in the capacity and performance of individual participants and organisations?*” To help answer this overarching question, the evaluation answered seven more detailed evaluation questions:

- (i) *Are the objectives of the SCFMC clear, consistent with the purpose/objectives of the SCFMC, and relevant to the goals of the participants, institutions, and countries?*
- (ii) *How did SCFMP perform in relation to its stated objectives?*
- (iii) *What was the impact of the Programme on the growth and development of:*
  - (a) *participating individuals; and*
  - (b) *their ability to deliver improvements in their respective organisations and countries?*
- (iv) *What was the quality, relevance and usefulness of what was taught during the SCFMP?*

- (v) *How adequate are the SCFMC's governance and management arrangements?*
- (vi) *What lessons were learned, including gaps and areas for improvement that require particular attention from the SCFMC in the future?*
- (vii) *To what extent is there an appetite and support of participating organisations and countries for the SCFMC to develop activities in the areas of: (a) ongoing engagement with past participants; (b) online learning; and (c) regional and second-generation programmes?*

### B. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

#### I Challenges of Evaluating Executive Training Programmes

21. McKinsey & Company estimates that 70% of learning takes place on-the-job, 20% through interaction and collaboration and 10% in the classroom. While leaders agree that learning and development should be aligned with the priorities of their organisations, that is not always the case. McKinsey's research found that in 60% of the cases studied there was no explicit connection between learning and an organisation's strategic objectives. McKinsey's research has found that assessing the effectiveness and impact of learning is challenging “*Accurate measurement is not simple, and many organisations still rely on tradition impact metrics such as learning-programme satisfaction and completion scores. But high performing organisations focus on out-comes based metrics such as the impact on individual performance, employee engagement, team effectiveness, and business-process improvement.*”<sup>15</sup>
22. The IMF's Institute for Capacity Development also recognizes the challenges related to evaluating training programmes. While information is available on the “league tables” ranking the world's business schools and from forms completed by participants

<sup>15</sup> Introduction: Components of a successful L&D strategy by Jacqueline Bassey, Lisa Christensen and Nick van Dam. Chapter 1 in Evaluating Learning and Development Insights and Practical Guidance from the Field. Edited by Nick van Dam. McKinsey and Company. 2018. Page 26 (see pages 23 to 27)

at the end of the courses, there is little in the way of independent evaluation of such courses in terms of how the skills and knowledge learned are applied on-the-job, the impact on job performance, career progression and promotion, organisational improvements and impacts and the degree that benefits erode with time or because employees find new jobs or retire.<sup>16</sup>

## I Evaluation Methodology

23. The evaluation approach and methodology are detailed in Appendix A, which includes the theory of change used in this evaluation. It illustrates how inputs (e.g., financial resources; time of speakers, participants and SCFMC staff) are translated into activities (e.g., the annual SCFMP; regional programmes) and outputs (e.g., knowledge and skills acquired) to outcomes (e.g., the use of the knowledge and skills on-the-job) and impacts (e.g., changes in the participants' organisations; influence on career paths). Many factors other than the training provided by the SCFMC contribute to the achievements at the outcome and impact levels (e.g., institutional receptiveness to change; support of supervisors; financial and human resources) (Figure A.1). The evaluation methodology was anchored in OECD's<sup>17</sup> five dimensions of evaluation: (i) relevance; (ii) effectiveness; (iii) efficiency; (iv) sustainability and (vi) impact. Kirkpatrick's Four-Level Training Evaluation Model,<sup>18</sup> which is used by the IMF's Institute for Capacity Development, was used as a broad framework to benchmark the evaluation approach and methodology against the assessments used by the IMF and business schools (Table A.1).

## C. Sources of Data and Information

24. The Evaluation Team drew on different sources of information: (i) participant lists, course material and SCFMC administrative and financial data; (ii) online surveys for the SCFMP and the Cook Islands'

Negotiation Programme; (iii) country studies; and (iii) video interviews with key informants including the current and former SCFMC Executive Directors/programme speakers, the former Programme Director, the Board Chair and one other Board member, the local champion of Cook Islands' Negotiation Programme and the IMF staff in the Institute for Capacity Development and AFRITAC West 2. In reaching its conclusions, the Evaluation Team validated conclusions through triangulation using evidence from all sources.

## I Electronic Surveys

25. The ESurvey population for the SCFMP survey had three components: (i) all 169 people who attended the SCFMP from 2013 to 2019; (ii) all 98 participants who attended the SCFMP from 2009 to 2012; (iii) the current heads of organisations; and (iv) supervisors for the 2013 to 2019 alumni. The SCFMP was sent to 318 people — 247 participants, of whom 24 were also supervisors, and 71 other supervisors. A total of 209 responses were received, equivalent to a gross response rate of 66% (Table B.1). These survey results are statistically robust (+/- 5% with a 99% confidence level) and the profile of respondents was not statistically different from the universe of participants in terms of gender, type of employer and position level (Table B.3). The 69 responding supervisors together supervised 176 of the 267 participants (i.e. 66%).

26. The survey population the Cook Islands' Negotiation Programme ESurvey was the 30 people who attended the programme. Their supervisors were not covered because: (i) the SCFMC did not have information on the supervisors; and (ii) many of the participants were heads of government agencies reporting to politicians or Boards or the owner of private companies. There were 18 respondents, equivalent to 60% response rate. The survey results are reasonably robust, given the small population (+/- 15% with a 95% confidence level). The

<sup>16</sup> Paul Melly. The Value of Evaluation. In *Developing Leaders Executive Education in Practice*. Issue 11-2013

<sup>17</sup> OECD. Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management. 2010. See pages 32, 20, 21, 36, 24 and 25 for definitions of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impacts and institutional development impacts respectively. In December 2019 OECD added a sixth dimension of evaluation (coherence) and fine-tuned some definitions. However, by then the second SCFMC evaluation was underway so the methodology could not be changed to assess coherence.

<sup>18</sup> Donald Kirkpatrick first published his Four-Level Training Evaluation Model in 1959. It was updated and published in 1993 as *Evaluating Training Programs*. The four levels are: (i) reaction; (ii) learning; (iii) behaviour; and (iv) results.

characteristics of the survey respondents were not statistically different from the survey population in terms of gender, type of employer and position level (Table H.1).

## I Country Studies

27. The evaluation design included country studies that involved a combination of face-to-face and telephone/video interviews with participants, supervisors and heads/deputy heads of organisations undertaken by members of the Evaluation Team who lived in each of the three regions. These interviews provided information that complemented and enriched the responses to the ESURVEYS. Face-to-face interviews were undertaken in 5 countries (i.e., Cook Islands; Maldives; Samoa; St Vincent and the Grenadines; Tonga) and the rest were remote interviews. A total of 68 interviews were undertaken, covering participants from the 2013 to 2019 programmes, supervisors and heads of organisations. Some of the people were interviewed in more than one capacity: (i) **Caribbean:** 22 interviews with people from St. Kitts Nevis (5), Jamaica (5), St Vincent and the Grenadines (7) and the Eastern Caribbean Central Bank (5); (ii) **Pacific:** 17 interviews with people from the Cook Islands (4), Samoa (7) and Tonga (6) for the SCFMP and 6 for the Cook Islands' Negotiation Programme; and, (iii) **Africa/Indian Ocean:** 23 interviews with people from Botswana (7), the Maldives (10) and the Seychelles (6).

## D. Scoring and Rating System

28. The scoring and rating system used a quantitative approach to assess each evaluation dimension. Consistent with the SCFMC's participant assessment tool, a 5-point rating scale was used. Sub-criteria for each of the five dimensions of evaluation were rated on the 5-point scale, assigned a weight and a weighted score was calculated. The scores for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact were then assigned weights and aggregated to develop an overall evaluation rating for the SCFMC. Considerable judgement was applied, and an iterative approach was used in which the initial scores were considered

and revised to reflect consideration of all information and the balance and consistency across the five dimensions of evaluation. The use of quantitative rating systems improves transparency by forcing evaluators to be clear on how they reached their conclusions.

## E. Evaluation Team

29. The Evaluation Team consisted of:

- **Bruce Murray** team leader, had overall responsibility for preparing the evaluation approach and methodology, designing the online tracer surveys and preparing the report;
- **Ms. Laura Anthony Browne** former Director of Planning/National Authorising Officer of the government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines, former head of the Debt Management Unit in the Eastern Caribbean Central Bank and an SCFMP alumnus (2010) prepared the Caribbean report;
- **Ms. Hilary Leslie Gorman** independent researcher, adviser and development practitioner, prepared the Cook Islands' report;
- **Ms. Siosi Joyce Mafi** former governor of the Reserve Bank of Tonga, prepared the Tonga report;
- **Dr. Mariyam Shahuneza Naseer** Education and Research Consultant and Founding President of ConVEYE Maldives, prepared the Indian Ocean/African report;
- **Kolone Vaai** former Financial Secretary for Government of Samoa and now Managing Director of KVAConsult Ltd, was involved in the 2012 SCFMC evaluation and prepared the Samoa report; and,
- **Ms. Emma Murray** was the survey administrator and undertook the statistical analysis.