



Project funded by:

Grand Challenges Canada™
Grands Défis Canada^{MC}



Cultivating Civic Champions: Evaluating leadership capacity development among elected, local-level government representatives in rural Cambodia.

Prepared by Sovatha Ann
With the Assistance of Sochet Ky and Bunsour Heng

October 2014



Executive Summary

Civic Champions is a proof-of-concept project designed to transform leadership amongst elected local government representatives in rural Cambodia. Developed by international consultants, Leadpreneur, and implemented by WaterSHED, the project set out to demonstrate the feasibility of influencing and catalyzing development through local government leadership development. WaterSHED chose to be bold and provocative by pioneering innovative and unconventional mechanism in achieving development goals. The leadership development project was designed so as not to simply spoon-feed participants with ideas and instructions. Instead, WaterSHED opted for an iterative model of “discover, develop, deliver” where self-selected participants were given opportunity to ‘discover’ leadership skills through a series of conferences, to ‘develop’ those skills between conferences, and to challenge themselves and others to ‘deliver’ results. In order to understand individual change and provide a common reference point, a shared development challenge to increase access to and use of improved sanitation was set for all participants. It was understood that such a bold approach was going to push people who are used to conventional development interventions out of their comfort zone.

This study evaluates the Civic Champions Project in terms of its influence on participants’ leadership capacity and their ability to influence change. It also assesses whether this project, as a concept, has further potential. To achieve these goals, this study conducted focus group discussions and key individual interviews with commune councillors who are both participants and non-participants of the Civic Champions project. Commune Councillors (CCs) from nine communes in two treatment districts and from three communes in the control district were interviewed. Communes in the treatment districts were divided into three categories of High, Medium, and Low depending on both the percentage increase of latrine coverage and their performance qualitatively assessed through ‘coaching’ visits throughout the project. In addition to interviewing CCs, the team also studied video footage of interviews with six CCs compiled by WaterSHED into a film documenting how these CCs have felt about themselves and their leadership before, during and after the Civic Champions project and other videos taken at some of the conferences. The team also talked to Civic Champions project staff and trainers, project consultants, and members of the Advisory Group (AG). The study also reviewed Civic Champions project background documents and other relevant documents.

The study has found that the project has made a substantial contribution to improving participants’ leadership capacity and increasing sanitation coverage in their communities.

Significant increase in latrine uptake: Communes visited in treatment districts all reported positive increase in latrine uptake and sales. Across the two treatment districts an average of 217 new latrines were purchased each month. This is roughly a 400 percent increase in the sale of improved sanitation when compared with an average of 55 latrines sales per month in the same period across the eight provinces where WaterSHED implements its *Hands Off* sanitation marketing program (WaterSHED data). One treatment district experienced a 10 percentage-point increase in improved pour flush sanitation coverage while the national annual average increase was 1% for all latrine types.

Leadership development bridges party lines: Their newly acquired leadership skills are useful in maintaining relationships across political party lines. Where there might have been friction or awkwardness in the relationships with councillors from different political parties, Civic Champions has been able to put them to work together. A councillor who was new in the council reported that he was able to collaborate with another councillor from a different party who has served on the council for many years. They had been able to set out their plans in visiting different villages and collecting reports on numbers of latrines. This collaborative work attests to their improved leadership skills

Better Sense of leadership: Councillors felt that they have a better sense of their leadership roles in implementing their everyday work. The project has compelled these elected representatives to work more proactively on increasing access to sanitation. This evidence is clear when we compared the responses from the control and treatment districts. Participants in the treatment district reported having more confidence in their public speaking and leadership capacity and better sense of direction in achieving their goals in water and sanitation, whereas participants from control district do not seem to have specific action plans or proper strategies to achieve goals in water and sanitation.

Transition from follower to initiator: Many councillors reported an increase in their frequency of visits to the village after being part of Civic Champions. Many participants agreed that they have been able to take their own initiatives and are being proactive in their work after joining Civic Champions. This indicates that the project has been successful in motivating these leaders to do their job better.

Emergence of model leaders: The project has enabled the participants to establish their name among the villagers as a recognized brand, being a proactive leader in water and sanitation. One participant, for example, was known among people in his community as 'uncle toilet'

Emerging indicators of sustainability: The participants expressed determination to continue to make a positive impact in their community, at least in terms of hygiene and sanitation.

People will pay for quality programs: Participants discovered that the fee was worth it and felt satisfied paying it. Many did say they took a bit of a risk in the beginning to pay. Those who were not prepared to take the risk, the fee might have been a reason they did not participate. For those who did join and pay the fee they believed they received more than what they paid for.

Significant staff capacity building: The project has also proved to be an excellent capacity building experience for the staff of WaterSHED. The project staff and training team members interviewed for the study expressed consistent positive feelings not only in their own capacity in delivering the training contents and materials, but also in their own leadership skills.

With some adjustment, the project has the potential for scaling up. The following recommendations are provided to guide the future program iterations going to scale:

Introduce an applicant screening mechanism: WaterSHED should develop an application screening mechanism. Whilst the program is designed to democratize leadership rather than reserving it for the educated or elite, the participants would benefit more if the majority were committed to their own development.

Engage with decision makers at ministry level: WaterSHED should more specifically seek to engage decision-makers at the ministry level and those who can influence the direction of decentralization reforms policies. The opportunity to work closely with the Ministry of Interior and Ministry of Rural Development or specifically with the working groups that determine which agency functions will be transferred to the sub-national level, in order to streamline their work with the ongoing decentralization reforms process. WaterSHED should identify how its activities complement or contribute to the process of informing policy makers. The project should take into account how it can fit with previous training to CCs by the government.

Publicize good practices: WaterSHED should work closely with the National League of Local Councils (NLC) to document good local government practices in the Civic Champions project and share them with other communes. This could not only motivate the commune council to be effective in promoting development, but could also serve as another form of incentive to acknowledge those who deliver significant results. The NLC with its members of all sub-national councils has the great potential to highlight and publicize such good practices.

Encourage broad participation from commune chiefs and across political parties: WaterSHED should encourage commune chiefs and councillors from different political backgrounds to participate. As the one with more leverage in making decision in the council, the chiefs have the potential to be a more powerful agent of change. Coming from different political backgrounds, the participants' voice could resonate better among villagers of different political alliances, thus expanding the impacts of the project.

Identify a transitional bridge between adhering strong cultural norms and engendering the ability to respond to the new development agenda: It is difficult to be bold and provocative, while trying to adhere to the long-established local norms and traditions. Social hierarchy is profoundly embedded in Cambodia society, and compromising this in exchange for being different might be counter-productive. Even the change from open defecation to fixed place improved sanitation goes against current social practices but the change is necessary and the benefits significant. The leadership program exposed participants to new and unfamiliar learning. In this challenging situation, WaterSHED through the proof-of-concept pilot has the opportunity to bridge the two elements together through further refinement of training material content and training approach for the participants, while at the same maintaining the approach that encourages being different.

In short, the Civic Champions project has fulfilled its role in being a pioneer of bold and provocative leadership training and, with minor adjustment, does have huge potential for scaling up.

Contents

Executive Summary	2
I. Introduction: WaterSHED and Civic Champions Project	6
Background	6
Terms of Reference	8
Evaluation Methodology	8
Fieldwork	9
Challenges and Limitations	9
II. Civic Champions: Activities, Achievements and Challenges	10
Activities	11
Achievements	13
Challenges	15
III. Assessment of Project's Influence on Leadership Capacity	16
IV. Assessment of Project's Impact on Sanitation Coverage	19
V. Compilation and Analysis of Feedback	20
Advisory Group (AG)	20
Behavioral Change	21
Award	23
Training	25
Trainers	27
Fees and Per Diem Payments	28
VI. Recommendations and Conclusion	29
Our Impressions	29
Recommendations	30
Conclusion	31
References	33
APPENDIX 1: Terms of Reference	34
Appendix 2: Interview Guides	37
Advisory Group Member	37
Project staffs	37
Commune Councillor (Civic Champions)	38
Commune Councillors (non-Civic Champion)	38
APPENDIX 3: List of Communes Visited	40
APPENDIX 4: Civic Champions Intentional Design Framework	41

I. Introduction: WaterSHED and Civic Champions Project

Background

With a steady annual economic growth of around 7% in the past decade, Cambodia has almost reached the threshold between low income and lower middle income country. Despite such progress, there are challenges still to be addressed. About 80% of the total population in Cambodia live in rural areas and among them, 66% still practice open defecation (MRD, 2012). Water sources and sanitation are directly affected by such practice, which has direct economic implications. Annual economic loss due to poor sanitation and hygiene, estimated by the World Bank Water and Sanitation Program (WSP) to be USD 448 million at 2005 prices or 7.2 percent of gross domestic product (Heng et al., 2011), puts a considerable burden on overall economic growth. To address this, the Royal Government of Cambodia, in line with its commitment to achieve the Cambodian Millennium Development Goals, has prepared a strategy to achieve 30% sanitation coverage by 2015 and 100% coverage by 2025 (MRD, 2012).

Taking into account this government strategy, WaterSHED's vision is to empower everyone "to adopt appropriate water, sanitation, and hygiene related behaviors" and mission is to "engage local enterprises and government in the development of sustainable market-based approaches that empower households to be active and informed consumers of water, sanitation, and hygiene products and services."

WaterSHED's sanitation marketing program employs a *Hands-Off* approach that builds local capacities and achieves financially-sustained operations of private sector latrine suppliers. By working behind-the-scenes as facilitators to consumers, businesses, and local government, WaterSHED helps to overcome specific market failures preventing uptake of products and services without creating new dependencies. This approach is distinct from the conventional 'hands-on' role typically played by NGOs in which the external organization takes the lead in key activities, which achieves quick short-term results but compromises sustainability.

During WaterSHED's development of the market-based approach in rural Cambodia, some communities were identified as accelerating sanitation coverage at a faster rate than others. Whilst some factors such as non-seasonal income, off-farm income and access to markets play a role, one qualitative difference in communities with high and low levels of change stood out – local leadership. This has further been borne out by the recent World Bank WSP study (Chase, 2014) on the drivers for latrine uptake in rural Cambodia that had the following findings:

"Communes with high latrine take-up often have the following features:

- Strong commune leadership in setting sanitation shared vision and strategies for the commune
- Existence of demand creation activities in the commune
- Regular follow-up activities by the commune in sanitation activities
- Commune councillors and village chief play good coordination and enabling role among other partners such as NGO and private sector

- Relationship of private sector and local government well established”

The report concludes amongst other things that “having strong local government leadership in enabling the private sector to operate in the communes is also necessary in enhancing sales function”. WaterSHED’s civic leadership project was designed to develop leadership capacity and at the same time leverage this capacity to accelerate sanitation coverage. Intentionally, the project was not designed to develop sanitation promotion skills but to enable leadership potential to be developed amongst elected local government representatives. This level of government was chosen as the representatives are elected by popular vote and not government appointed and commune councils are responsible for development within their commune area.

In-line with WaterSHED’s mission which recognizes the vital role government plays in enabling the private sector to reach consumers, the Civic Champions Project was piloted among these elected commune councillors in two districts in Kampong Speu province. The pilot project was designed to establish the feasibility of a leadership development program to influence elected local leaders to enable meaningful changes in their community. The Civic Champion leadership development program was developed by Leadapreneur a prominent international leadership development firm with 10 years of experience including Cambodia and accredited by the London-based Institute of Leadership Management.

According to Leadapreneur’s philosophy, people are defined by their challenges: the greater the challenge the greater the opportunity to grow. Leaders unite people to work together to achieve a common goal and cope with the changes and challenges that emerge along the way. They are responsible for ensuring the performance and success of their team. Leaders cannot succeed by following theories and instructions; they must create their own authentic leadership identity. Leadapreneur (Bartscht and Macias 2012) emphasizes “Your leadership identity emerges out of the way you lead in the context of your environment. Instead of learning about leadership, we develop your ability to actually *be* a leader. We don’t want to teach theories and nice ideas. We want our students to develop a personalized leadership identity that empowers them to be confident, competent leaders who have the character to do the right thing.”

The Civic Champions project’s monitoring mechanism was designed using Outcome Mapping, methodologies. These methodologies help to understand the influence that the leadership development project had on participants behaviour and the influence the participants had on bringing about the targeted change (Earl, Carden, & Smutylo, 2001). Smutylo describes Outcome Mapping as “a methodology for planning, monitoring and evaluating development initiatives that aim to bring about social change” (Smutylo, 2005). The process of outcome mapping helps a project team or program to be specific about the actors it targets, the changes it expects to see and the strategies it employs. Results are measured in terms of the changes in behavior, actions or relationships that can be influenced by the team or program. The methodology is comprised of several tools, which can be adapted to different contexts. It enhances team and program understanding of change processes, improves the efficiency of achieving results and promotes realistic and accountable reporting”

Terms of Reference

The purpose of this study is to assess whether the Civic Champions leadership development proof-of-concept has potential for further scale up. It evaluates the program's influence on participants' leadership capacity and on sanitation coverage in treatment districts.

The specific objectives of the study are:

1. To understand the ability of participants to inspire and motivate their peers and constituents to engage in community level change;
2. To assess the role of the pilot project in developing the participants' ability to inspire and motivate their peers and constituents and assess the participants perceived change in self-efficacy;
3. To determine whether change in sanitation coverage in treatment districts can be attributed to the leadership of members of the civic leadership cohort;
4. To assess the cost-effectiveness of the program in terms of changes in sanitation coverage;
5. To provide recommendations for future iterations and as appropriate, for scaling up the project.

For comparison purpose, the changes in sanitation coverage in the treatment districts were examined alongside a district in the same province that did not participate in the Civic Champions project. This allowed an insight into the effectiveness of the methodology of this project in influencing behavior and enabling a concomitant increase in sanitation coverage. As this project focused on the leadership development of commune councillors (CCs), the scope of the evaluation rests within this sphere of local leaders, both those as participants and non-participants. The extent to which the CCs are able to influence people at higher levels or their constituents is elaborated further below.

Evaluation Methodology

This qualitative study employed focus group discussions and individual interviews with CCs who were participants and non-participants of the Civic Champions project. CCs from nine communes in the two treatment districts and from three communes in the control district were interviewed. Communes in the treatment districts were divided into three categories of High, Medium, and Low depending on both the percentage increase of latrine coverage in their commune and their leadership performance qualitatively assessed through 'coaching' visits throughout the project. This stratification was provided by the project staff who had been working closely and coaching all the participants and the evaluator randomly selected communes based on such stratification. The plan was to interview councillors from three communes from each category. Due to logistics and communication difficulties, three in the High, four in the Medium, and two in the Low category were interviewed. Findings from the study, however, did not indicate a significant difference in the responses from participants by strata.

In addition to interviewing CCs, the team was also able to access video footage of interviews with six CCs made by WaterSHED that at the time of writing was being compiled into a short video documenting how these CCs felt about themselves and their leadership ability before, during and after the Civic Champions project. Three of the CCs featured in the film were interviewed for this study. The team also talked to Civic Champions project staff and members of the training team, project consultants, and members of the Advisory Group at the ministerial, provincial and district levels. Conversations and interviews were conducted with one project consultant, four project trainers, and five members of AG including two from the ministry level, one from civil society, one from the provincial level, and one from the district level. As part of the pre-fieldwork preparation, the lead consultant also attended the final leadership conference held in Siem Reap. This enabled the lead consultant to get to know the participants of the project and observe how the training was conducted and the interactions between participants, and participants and trainers were. Another important part of the pre-fieldwork preparation was the desk review of the Civic Champions project documents and other relevant documents.

Fieldwork

Fieldwork for this study was conducted over four days during the second week of September 2014. The stratification of participants based on categories of their performance was made available to the consultants prior to the fieldwork. Having met the participants during the leadership conference in Siem Reap was a big help for the lead consultant in scheduling appointments with them. However, as the stratification of participants was not given to the consultants well in advance of the fieldwork, the scheduling of appointment had to be made with rather short notice. The list in Appendix 3 includes all the communes visited for this study.

Challenges and Limitations

Civic Champions was a proof-of-concept project, designed to test a hypothesis that local leaders could become important catalysts in bringing about meaningful changes in water and sanitation in their community. The 'develop' component of the project was designed to influence behavior and perception which are very subjective and therefore a qualitative change framework based on Outcome Mapping approach was applied. This proves to be a major limitation for this study because duration and scale of the project had been limited. In addition, there are many factors that could influence perception. Communicating or transmitting such perception to the evaluator is therefore affected by personal rapport between the evaluator and the participants. The absence of rapport between the team of consultants and the participants could hinder a comfortable exchange of information and conversation. Attending the final 'discover' conference and being introduced to the participants there was helpful for the lead consultant.

A logistical challenge was the fact that fieldwork was conducted during raining season. Participants of Civic Champions are from rural Cambodia and most are rice farmers. The short notice to schedule an interview added to this problem, as it was not possible to inform the participants well in advance. Most informants were contacted about the interview just

one or two days before the planned visit to the commune. This presented a possibility of CCs not being able to make it to the time proposed. Although all CCs contacted made their time to talk to the consultants, it was understood that they lost their time from working in the field. Such feeling or sentiment of time loss was not evident during the meetings, but it is a lesson for future study to not schedule fieldwork during rice planting season. Related to this timing issue, the original plan was to ask CCs to introduce the consultants to the village chief for an interview. But this was not possible in the first few communes as village chiefs were also busy working in their field. Therefore, to ensure consistency, decision was made to not interview village chief all together.

While some meetings were conducted at the CC's residence, most of the meetings were done at the commune office. This was a challenge in that it was not possible to separate individual CC from the rest of the group, as there was no separate room where each CC could talk comfortably about the rest of the commune council. Therefore, it was only when there was only one CC present at the commune office was an individual interview possible. The rest of the interviews were all conducted in the presence of other CCs, commune chief, commune clerk, or commune police. Despite these challenges and limitations, the participants showed great enthusiasm in talking to the consultants and in sharing their commentaries and feedbacks about the project, which were diligently noted.

II. Civic Champions: Activities, Achievements and Challenges

Civic Champions project is a component of WaterSHED's *Hands-off* Sanitation Marketing program. In this approach, private enterprises are encouraged to be proactive in marketing and selling latrines by reaching out to consumers through village-based sales event. From 2011 to September 2014, over 88,000 latrines were sold by the private sector to rural consumers. Early results from this *Hands-Off* approach showed that a significant change in sanitation coverage was happening in places which were not necessarily wealthier, closer to markets or with better economic situations. These results encouraged WaterSHED to pilot the Civic Champions project in order to determine whether leadership could be the catalyst to enable meaningful change. The program intended to put local leaders in proactive roles to encourage consumers and educate them about the disadvantages of not having latrines. Intended as not just another development intervention, the Civic Champions project pioneered innovative and unconventional ways to achieve development goals. In this sense, WaterSHED chose to be bold and provocative in approaching leadership development in that it was designed to not simply spoon-feed training to participants. Instead, WaterSHED opted for an iterative model, developed by Leadpreneur, of "discover, develop, deliver". It was understood that such a bold approach was going to push people who are used to conventional development interventions, out of their comfort zone. Civic Champions provided a series of conference-style learning events to elected local leaders at the commune level. Outcome Mapping (OM) framework was used to develop qualitative indicators to monitor influence on behavioral change.

Activities

An 'Intentional Design' Workshop was conducted with WaterSHED staff to determine the project vision and mission (See Appendix 1). In addition, the workshop also produced a series of statements of anticipated behavioral change for different levels of stakeholders or "boundary partners" including Ministry of Interior, Kampong Speu's governor's office, Kong Pisei and Oudong district offices, and the commune councillors in these two target districts. A series of progress indicators were developed for each boundary partner categorized into level 1 through 3, corresponding to the OM's "expect, like, and love to see" change categories. These behavior change statements served as a guiding framework for monitoring the extent of change over the period of the project (See Appendix 4). A comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation (M & E) framework incorporating quantitative indicators was also developed. This M & E strategy, designed to record both quantitative elements of the project, and qualitative change amongst participants, encompassed five tracks: 1) documenting participation and attendance; 2) tracking quality of learning and behavior change; 3) capturing participants' individual goal setting and recording of achievements; 4) multimedia documentation of events; 5) and tracking of sanitation and related socioeconomic data.

A Civic Champions Advisory Group (AG), established to provide guidance and advice for the project, was designed to be composed of "inspirational leaders from the government, the private sector, and the non-government sector." The AG served in an advisory capacity and supported the strategic and operational decisions of the project. A Terms of Reference was developed and the Kampong Speu Provincial Governor's nominated representative chaired the AG. The Ministers of both the Ministry of Interior and Ministry of Rural Development were formally invited to nominate a representative from their ministry to serve as members on the AG. WaterSHED felt obliged to accept the representatives nominated by the Ministers. The Ministry of Interior nominated two representatives and both nominations were accepted. Members of the AG attended quarterly meetings where presentations on achievements, challenges, and future plans of the project were delivered and members were asked to provide advice and support for the next phase. In addition to participating in meetings, members of the AG were also invited to attend each 'discover' conference. Membership of the AG was voluntary while expenses associated with travel to the meetings were covered by WaterSHED.

Invitations to CCs to participate in the leadership development project were extended at two district meetings. WaterSHED staff informed the CCs about the project and provided informational brochures with attractive designs and catchy phrases such as "Golden Opportunity for Leaders," "Hurry Up, Limited Space," and "You Will Become a Hero for your Community." These brochures and information attracted huge interest from the CCs including Commune Chiefs. Each CC who wanted to participate in the project was required to fill in an application form and pay the USD 30 fee to participate in the training. The idea of the fee was to promote investment and to deviate from the idea of providing something for free. On the application form, in addition to the basic biographic information, each participant had to answer a few questions about leadership. This process reflected the philosophy of Leadapreneur, that leadership development does not have to be a piece of pie only for the educated and the elite. At the same time, the fee and self-nomination in the application were designed to encourage participation by people truly committed to improving their leadership.

After the applications were accepted, 65 participants were enrolled in the program and invited to the first 'discover' conference in Sihanouk Ville in October 2013. There were a total of four 'discover' conferences organized every three months. Each conference focused on key themes and topics on leadership such as what leadership means, roles and responsibilities of a leader, choosing the right style of leadership, fighting fears, identity of a leader, and SMART principles in planning. These were some of the main things that the participants 'discovered.' The idea was that the conference posed questions to participants and encouraged them to 'discover' answers themselves by working and discussing with other participants. Specific yes/no answers to the questions were not provided. This is one of the ways the training was unconventional. The content was delivered in Khmer by a Khmer training team drawn from WaterSHED's staff. The training team included some staff with extensive training experience and one staff certified as a trainer of trainers. The content and materials for the conference were adapted from the Training of Trainers (TOT) provided by Leadapreneur in English to the Khmer team. There were games and exercises to engage and inform participants, keeping them active throughout the day. This constituted the 'discover' stage.

Except at the first 'discover' conference, each conference had an award ceremony where participants competed for a trophy, cash prizes, and certificates of recognition. After the second discover conference, a minimum increase in latrine uptake to be eligible to compete for awards was introduced, as the participants had set such a low bar to compete for the awards in the first round. Participants were given time in the morning to prepare their presentations with guidance and support from the training team. Presentations were delivered to their peers in small groups. The CCs voted for the best leadership presentations. Winners progressed to the next round until a final vote for the gold and silver medals. In the final voting round, each participant and the AG members voted for the commune they thought demonstrated the best leadership since the last conference. The voting by AG members was introduced after the first round of voting to overcome the district allegiance voting by participants. The commune with the highest votes won gold, and the subsequent communes won silver and bronze accordingly. The participants who had outstanding performance in leadership and increasing latrine access were eligible to compete for a trophy, cash prizes, and certificate. Cash prizes were provided from the leadership program registration fee of USD 30 paid by each participant. Each conference dedicated one full day to presentation preparation, several rounds of presentations, voting and the awards ceremony. This was a critical element in inspire and reward outstanding achievement.

At each conference, strict rules and regulations were established. In addition to the basic rules such as turning off or making silent cell phones and no chatting during session, there were other rules with vocabularies such as "Must Be Active", "Must Pay Attention", "Must Answer the Questions", and "Must Take Notes of Important Points." Enforcement was closely implemented. These 'rules' were developed from the experience in the first 'discover' conference to help participants understand that leadership development comes through hard work and attention to detail. Most participants were older and the training team was younger, so these tough requirements sometimes rubbed against social norms. Every participant interviewed shared that they were uncomfortable with these rules and how they were enforced.

At the end of each conference, participants were asked to evaluate the conference. They rated their satisfaction of the contents and the time management of the training, the award procedure, the quality and services of the venue and the like. It should be noted that the results from the evaluation were, of necessity, compiled after the end of each conference but were not shared with the participants. At the final 'discover' conference, no results from the evaluation of the third discover conference were presented. At the first 'discover' conference the Chairman of the AG provided feedback on a number of issues raised such as why there were no 'answers' provided, why there was no written manual and why the sessions were different from what participants had previously been used to. In short, at each conference, the participants were able to discover new lessons on leadership, interact with other participants to share and exchange their experiences in very new ways, and compete for the leadership awards.

After each conference, coaching staff from WaterSHED made follow up visits to each commune. The coaching sessions were "to provide an opportunity to participants to reflect on the program and to share their engagement" (Civic Champions Coaching Plan). At each coaching session, the participants shared with the coach their experience in implementing what they learned. Important concepts discussed in the training were reviewed, and questions about participant's implementation plan were asked. On average, participants met with their coach twice during each 90-day cycle. Performance and the number of latrines each participant was able to promote were recorded but not judged. Coaching provided an opportunity for participants to ask questions they might have after the training and offered a platform for participants to voice what they want to learn in the next conference. It was also an opportunity for the staff to build good rapport with the participants. Informants found coaching very helpful and useful and really appreciated the efforts to follow up with them. During this time, their plan of implementation began to more fully develop.

Equipped with new knowledge and skills from the conference, participants reached the 'deliver' stage. They held meetings in villages in cooperation with the village chief, private provider or sales agent, and in some cases a local MFI loan provider to promote latrine use or to encourage villagers to build or purchase latrines. Villagers were encouraged to make pledges for purchase either with their own cash or with the loan made available to them by microfinance institutions such as VisionFund. Depending on the distance of the village to the location of the latrine producer, it sometimes needed at least five pledges to have the provider deliver latrines (a full truck load) to the village for no additional fee. These meetings constituted the implementation of what the participants learnt from the conference. This cycle of discovering new things at the conference, developing action plans on return to their community, and delivering those plans was repeated every 90 days.

Achievements

Civic Champions project has achieved a number of positive outcomes among different levels and different boundary partners. Most important of all are the number of latrines sold and the leadership knowledge and capacity change among CCs. Communes visited in treatment districts all reported positive increase in latrine uptake and sales. Across the two treatment districts an average of 217 improved pour flush latrines were purchased each month (Jan

2014-Sep 2014). This accounts for about a 400 percent increase in the sale of improved pour flush latrines when compared with an average of 55 latrine sales per month in the same period across the eight provinces where WaterSHED implements the *Hands-Off* sanitation marketing program (WaterSHED data). In one treatment district this represented a 10 percentage-point increase in improved pour flush sanitation coverage over nine months, compared to the national annual average increase of 1% for all latrine types.

The chair of the AG, the deputy provincial governor and representatives from the districts participated actively in almost all discover conferences. Representatives from the Ministry of Interior and Ministry of Rural Development or their nominees were present at many conferences, as well as AG meetings although the level of participation was variable.

The communes selected across different strata for the study did not differ much in terms of change in leadership. Councillors felt that they have a better sense of their leadership roles in implementing their everyday work. One commune councillor who is serving her first term on the council reported that before participating in the program, she was just tagging along with other more experienced councillors in doing what she was supposed to do. But after attending the conference, she felt more confident in doing her job by herself. In addition to giving councillors more confidence in themselves, the project has compelled these elected representatives to work more proactively on hygiene and sanitation. Another CC said that “before, we just followed our habit and our leader. Whenever there was any event to talk to villagers, we were not courageous. Our capacity before was not as tight. Before when we did water and sanitation work, we just disseminated information and encouraged people to understand what it is. Now it is our responsibility as a participant in this project.” Having understood such responsibility, the participants expressed a determination to continue to make positive impact in their community, at least in terms of hygiene and sanitation. These are the fundamental testaments that speak volumes to what the project has achieved.

The project has enabled the participants to establish their name among the villagers as a brand in promoting latrines. One councillor in Oudong district reported this sentiment: “now when we go around in the village, people call us ‘uncle toilet’”. This echoes the fact that the participants of Civic Champions have been able to make more frequent visits to the village to talk about latrines. They visited and talked about latrines so often that people gave them this brand, and associated their name with latrines. It is not known why in the past people did not do that while these councillors were doing the same thing, but this goes to show that the participants have demonstrated great efforts in making frequent visits and making a change when they are part of Civic Champions. As a proof-of-concept project, this is a positive aspect that it has been able to be achieved.

The project has proved to be an excellent capacity building experience for the staff and the training team at WaterSHED. The project staff and training team interviewed for the study expressed consistent positive feelings about their own capacity in delivering the training contents and materials. “Learning by Doing” would be an accurate description of what the staff and the team went through with the project. Many of the training materials and concepts were new to the staff who had to digest them as the project rolled forward. The same was true with the coaching visits where WaterSHED staff worked closely with the Leadpreneur consultants to understand the coaching role and shape the visits. At the end of 12 months, all the staff and the training team were able to run everything, from putting the training

together to making coaching visits, with minimal guidance from the consultants. The professional experience from this proof-of-concept project will definitely be beneficial to WaterSHED as it looks to expand the project further.

The project was able to make each conference a non-financial incentive for participants to attend. Each conference was like a retreat where participants were accommodated together for each conference. The first discover conference, designed to pique excitement, was held at a coastal city of Sihanouk Ville. The final conference as a major reward event was held in Siem Reap near Angkor Wat temple, chosen for its significance as an example of great Khmer leadership. Conferences in these two cities definitely served as non-financial incentives for every participant in the project. All expenses for travel and accommodation were paid for by the program. One councillor in Oudong district was so proud of the fact that he had just come back from Siem Reap. He said when he returned home from the trip, his grandson asked him from where he had just returned. He replied he had just come back from Angkor Wat. The grandson then asked what Angkor Wat was like. He felt a sense of pride to be able to describe what Angkor Wat was like to his grandson. His face was filled joy when he smilingly told the story. In short, there was evidence of having conferences at a resort or a tourist site served as a non-financial incentive for participants.

Challenges

A number of challenges were faced during implementation. Firstly, the training concepts were conceived in English and they had to be interpreted by the Khmer training team first before the training could be conducted. Some essence of those concepts may have been lost through this transfer, as interpretation especially of difficult concepts could never achieved 100% equivalence in both languages. As a result, some training materials and lessons did sound like a direct translation from English. These translated concepts are not only difficult for some of the training team members whose English is limited, but also for the participants whose average age is 50 years and whose education is low (many had not graduated from primary school). For example, it was observed through participants' presentation at the final discover conference that the word 'teamwork' might have been understood by some participants as sharing knowledge and experience together, instead of working together as a team. While such misunderstanding could be trivial, this shows that when the concepts were conceived in one language and is operationalized in another, there is potentially room for error.

The project has been able to get the CCs out of their chairs to encourage villagers to purchase latrines, and they were doing this without any financial incentive. It is the idea of the project to train participants to be leaders with the limited resources at their disposal, but many participants complained about the absence of financial incentive. Despite such complaints, all participants we talked to reported that they went to the villages to promote water and sanitation regardless. Despite not receiving any financial incentive, we did not hear of any commune using the government provided development budget to support water and sanitation work. As of writing, the roles of commune councillors in promoting water and sanitation are still based on a permissive mandate, not an obligatory mandate. In other words, their work in water and sanitation is not required in their job description. Some 'High' communes we talked to reported that there is a possibility of using the commune fund, but

they will need to include it in the annual plan and to file complicated paperwork, which discourages many councillors from pursuing it. No such comments were heard among the 'Medium', 'Low' or the communes in control district. So far, they have only used their development budget on physical infrastructure projects, with very little on non-tangible or social infrastructure.

In rural Cambodia where development interventions have been present for decades, people have developed a mindset of "attending meetings to receive gifts." They have become used to people coming into their community and giving them 'stuff'. When people invite them to attend meetings, they automatically have such an expectation. This could be a challenge because Civic Champions do not give any gifts to the villagers. Some councillors reported a level of difficulty in mobilizing villagers for meetings. This is an external factor that is beyond the control of WaterSHED or the councillors.

Last but definitely not least, there is the question of continuity of leadership if these CCs who are participants of Civic Champions are not reelected in the council in the next term. By working with elected commune councillors, the project could target their resources effectively to impact change, but by default there is a degree of uncertainty built into the program because elected officials are not going to hold their job permanently. One possible argument for this could be that although when they are no longer serving on the council, they are still a member of the community and will continue to work for the well-being of the community regardless. That is not an invalid argument, but it is difficult to measure how effective they could be in promoting hygiene and sanitation when they are no longer in official leadership position. Therefore, the project has a challenge in ensuring that the momentum established at the beginning could be maintained in the long run.

III. Assessment of Project's Influence on Leadership Capacity

"The previous terms, we just followed the leader, the commune chief. Now we can take our own initiatives," a commune councillor in Oudong district.

Cambodia first embarked on decentralization reforms with the first commune / sangkat election in 2002. With a five year term, the elected commune councils are currently in their third term. Although there are councillors who are newly elected to the council, many have been in the commune leadership long before decentralization reforms. However, it does not mean that those occupying leadership roles are active and charismatic leaders. They became councillors through the political party who put them on the candidate list for the election. Their education level is low because the law only requires them to be able to read and write. Therefore, such low level of education may have implications on how much they were able to absorb the contents of the trainings provided to them.

In this context, Civic Champions project has identified a good target group to work with. Although these CCs have been able to perform their everyday tasks, how effective their performance is, is still a question. Just as one CC quoted earlier said, there are CCs who just tagged along with other experienced colleagues. After participating in the Civic

Champions project, many participants reported they gained more confidence in leading meetings and talking to villagers. We heard many stories of them feeling almost like being 'enlightened' about leadership and that they could perform their everyday tasks better. One CC in Kong Pisei district shared this feeling below:

"I find it exciting to be in the project. I can see I have more courage and know that I need to spend time talking to villagers. Before, I never received any training on this. Now I understand some time I need to sacrifice my own time to work for community. The training has helped my capacity in this work. Before, I didn't know how to implement my roles."

Many councillors also reported an increase in their frequency of visits to the village after being part of Civic Champions. Like the councillor quoted in the beginning of this section, many participants agreed that they have been able to take their own initiatives and be proactive in their work after joining Civic Champions. This indicates that the project has been successful in motivating these leaders to do their job better.

Along this line, their relationships with other councillors have also improved. Informants reported that after the conference they shared knowledge, experience, and materials from the training with the rest of the commune council through their monthly meetings. A commune chief in Kong Pisei district reported that he had learned about the pounding nail to overcome fear and trying to lift a car to determine who the real hero is. Interestingly, the car lifting activity was designed to demonstrate that with team work, tough challenges such as lifting a car are possible and it is not about creating a hero. Nevertheless, stories and experiences like these could be easily shared among peers once participants returned back to their community. However, they were not required to do so and there were no agreed upon standard or instruction on how the lessons and knowledge should be further shared with others. The absence of a physical manual or textbook added to this lack of consistency in knowledge sharing. However, this reflects the philosophy of the project which is that leaders do not just wait to follow instructions, but seek to inspire and motivate others using the knowledge and experience gained. It was a deliberate approach to enable great leaders rather than good followers to emerge through this process. That is why the project intentionally did not have a 'how-to' manual and no instruction on teaching or sharing. It is not clear as to what extent other commune councillors or commune chief who did not attend the training were able to grasp the knowledge shared to them by the councillors who participated in the training. Despite that, the project has been able to increase interactions not only between councillors and villagers, but also among councillors themselves.

Their newly acquired leadership skills are also useful in relationships across party lines. Where there might have been friction or awkwardness in the relationships with councillors from different political parties, Civic Champions has been able to put them to work together. Although how deep their relationships are is not known, they are now better able to work together. A councillor who was new in the council reported that he was able to collaborate with another councillor from a different party who has served on the council for many years. They had been able to set out their plans in visiting different villages and collecting reports on number of latrines. Their collaborative work attests to their improved leadership skills. Despite such positive collaboration, the division of responsibility between the CCs also means that there is a chance people only focus on what they are doing. In some communes, only the councillor responsible for water and sanitation work knows all the information and

statistics. The rest of the council and the chief received verbal reports during meetings. That is why they do not usually know all the detailed achievements and challenges. Despite that, those other councillors who are not responsible for water and sanitation did also report that they took the chance to mainstream the idea of latrine use whenever they had meetings in the villages as well.

The Civic Champions program was found to have improved CCs' leadership capacity, but during interviews some participants noted the absence of physical tools provided. After each conference, participants were not given such tools as posters or flip charts that could serve as visual aids when presenting to villagers about sanitation. Instead, they were given handouts from the power point slides and they took notes of important points from the training. The conferences were focused more on changing the mindset of the participants toward their leadership roles and behaviour, not on providing toolsets that participants could use to assist in their work. For instance, the exercise on fighting fear where each participant was asked to pound a nail with their tight fist broke the norm for them in terms of fighting fear, and thus giving them new experience that could change their mindset. Along the same line, at the conferences the participants gained tips and resources on how to effectively deliver presentations, thus equipping them with necessary skill set to be a good leader or facilitator of a meeting. The participants were not trained to develop materials or to make posters to promote latrine use. It is understood that this is the intent of the project as offering such tools would risk locking the participants into a mindset of sanitation, rather than a broader application of their leadership ability. That some participants expressed a desire for such tools reflects a challenge in changing the mindset from local officials wanting to receive instructions and tools before implementing, to taking initiative and then drawing on existing resources and people to make it happen. This mindset shift is one of the areas that will need ongoing attention in future iterations of the leadership development program.

Communes in the control district visited expressed a mixed level of confidence in their leadership capacity. Councillors in two of the three communes reported positive feeling about their leadership capacity, but councillors in the other commune reported limited capacity although they had served a long tenure on the council. Although we did not know if the councillors in the control district were actively seeking opportunities to improve their leadership, we have seen instances of improved leadership capacity among the councillors in the control district as well. This is the case where other NGOs might be doing similar work to WaterSHED. The difference is that the councillors in the control district thought that their face was too well-known among villagers that they cannot influence anything else anymore. They thought someone educated outside and new to the village would be able to influence the villagers more effectively. In contrast, councillors in Civic Champions were confident to talk to villagers and influence them to purchase latrines. In the control communes where there are no other NGOs working, we did not see evidence that the councillors were actively seeking positive change in the council's regular meeting agenda or actively seeking opportunities to improve their leadership, the two points we commonly heard in WaterSHED treatment communes. This highlights a point that even in places where Civic Champions project operates, the improved leadership capacity might be due to a combination of factors, and not attributed to one project alone.

IV. Assessment of Project's Impact on Sanitation Coverage

Substantial progress in terms of sanitation coverage has definitely been made in the target districts of the project. Among the treatment communes selected for this evaluation, there was an average increase of 12 percentage points in the rate of sanitation coverage; equivalent to 2,054 new latrines. One commune had 59 percent latrine coverage – the highest among the 9 selected. Another commune had the highest number of latrines built during the project, 349 latrines. Whilst none of the communes visited had achieved 100 percent access, three villages have been reported to have achieved 100 percent access during the timeframe of this project. Across the two treatment districts an average of 217 new latrines were purchased each month. This represents an approximate 400 percent increase in the sale of improved sanitation when compared with an average of 55 latrines sales per month in the same period across the eight provinces, where WaterSHED implements its *Hands Off* sanitation marketing program (WaterSHED data). In one treatment district, there was a 10 percentage-point increase in improved pour flush sanitation coverage over 9 months, compared to the national annual average increase of 1% for all latrine types.

It is positive to note that every councillor interviewed was aware of the national goal of achieving ODF by 2025 in line with the government's strategy. Participants we talked to offered strong optimism that the skills and knowledge they gained from Civic Champions have been able to – and will continue to – help them achieve this goal. On the other hand, the fact that there are many other NGOs promoting hygiene and sanitation as well in the target districts makes establishing a definitive linkage between Civic Champions and the improved sanitation coverage a rather complicated task. Despite the attribution problem, the findings from this evaluation clearly indicate that Civic Champions has a huge influence in impacting the significant increase mentioned above. In the case of one NGO, its work is considered a negative influence on this program and the government's drive for total sanitation coverage by 2025 as the NGO is promoting very high subsidies which reportedly mute demand by non-recipient households.

There are other external factors contributing to latrine sales, or lack thereof, including the number of factory workers in the village and the availability of credit. One common comment from almost every councillor interviewed was the change in attitude of those villagers who went to work in garment factories in the city. It should be noted that this point is not necessarily applicable across all target communes. One informant said: "there are more and more young people in the village going to work at a factory. Those young factory workers always bring their friends to the house during important festivals and other special events. One of the reasons why they need to install a latrine is because of their guests. When the children go to work in the factory, those families have better income. It enables them to pay the installment for a latrine." These are key opportunities that the leadership project is encouraging councillors to take advantage of. Conditions that enable immediate purchase and installation and growing demand for improved sanitation are important factors. However, recent evidence from the World Bank Water and Sanitation Program suggests that these factors alone are not sufficient to increase sanitation but that leadership plays a key role (Chase, 2014). Availability or access to credit was another factor identified. There is only so much that councillors could do to promote latrine adoption. If the villagers had already

borrowed a lot of money and can no longer take out loans, there will be a limit to the potential change in water and sanitation through improved leadership of the local officials.

One commune in the control district had a positive increase in sanitation coverage comparable to communes in treatment districts. In that commune, there is an NGO providing cash incentives to people who purchase a latrine. Villagers are paid 100,000R (US\$ 25.00) for each latrine built of any kind. Councillors who work on promoting latrines also get paid a small per diem by the NGO whenever he holds meeting in a village. One village out of the 15 villages in that commune has achieved 100 percent ODF. One of the councillors said that “we have achieved that because of a combination of NGO support and the efforts from councillors to disseminate information to villagers.” A few kilometers west of this commune, another commune without a subsidy intervention has latrine coverage of only 20 percent among the 1,721 households in that commune. In another commune also in the same district, there is only 10 to 15 percent latrine coverage among the 1,864 households. This reiterates the point that there has been a lack of accelerated growth in latrine coverage in places where leadership of local leaders has not improved.

V. Compilation and Analysis of Feedback

Advisory Group (AG)

An independent member of the AG served as chairman. He conducted the meetings and the members were invited to share their ideas. The main question of this evaluation related to the Advisory Group is about the impact or influence they had on the direction and quality of the project. Interviews with members pointed to a limited influence. Among the five members interviewed for the study, all except one questioned the effectiveness of the AG in making meaningful changes to the project. They felt that their comments and feedback were not taken into serious consideration. In addition, a few members thought that meetings focused on results reporting and would have preferred a platform in which everybody could make meaningful comments, feedback and constructive criticism for improving the project. One member felt that the meeting facilitator sometimes did not accept the comments made. This might be explained by the fact that the facilitator of the meeting and the implementer of the project was the same person.

The composition of AG was found not to be ideal. The members might not have the right technical expertise, or decision-making responsibility to make meaningful changes within their respective institution. WaterSHED needs to be able to say no to the people nominated by the ministry, and look for the right people to sit on this committee. One member commented: “I don’t understand how I can help as an AG member since I did not attend enough meetings but my presence might at least put all those councillors on alert since I am their higher up from [a ministry].” This comment might reflect that some AG members did not take their roles seriously, which points to the need to have committed people on this committee.

Although the terms of reference for the AG did not intend for members to be training experts, some AG members said they could have made a better contribution if the training materials

were shared with them before the training. It was reported that the meeting minutes were not provided to AG members and training materials and powerpoint slides were not sent to the AG before each conference. One AG said they could at least proof read or edit some vocabularies before the actual training, but they had never received the materials in advance of the conference. The focus of some members on the physical training tools, and their view that their contribution might be in proofreading powerpoint slides, again point to the leadership challenges that permeate multiple levels of government. The Advisory Group was formed to provide strategic-level advice on formulating the Civic Champions program, and also to create an opportunity to influence government members about the importance of local leadership for further program expansion.

One member, a district authority, expressed her lack of clear information about her participation. At the final discover conference, she complained that she was still not clear on why she was attending the conference and had to participate. She felt awkward because she was not implementing the project or promote latrine sale like other participants. During group discussions about what the participants have done or what the issues/difficulties are, she claimed to be unable to contribute meaningfully as that was not what she did.

Although many members of the Advisory Group actively interacted with participants and contributed meaningfully during the conferences, this member's comments reveal that not all are comfortable in a leadership role. Her comments are highly indicative of the change in mindset that is needed – not just among commune participants but also in other levels of government. This case represents an official who occupies a post above the level of commune councilor, and who was unable to participate constructively in discussions with commune councilors. Her view of the leadership development program as a discrete project – and one that she was not implementing – coupled with her need for explicit instructions on how to participate, highlight important barriers of the sort that this evaluation set out to identify. WaterSHED may need to consider cultivating leadership behaviors at other levels in future iterations of the program in order to foster sustained change and create support for emerging champions.

Behavioral Change

The Civic Champions project aimed to influence the participants to become effective leaders on important social issues, including changing the social norm related to open defecation. Despite all the positive changes the project has achieved, some of the participants still possessed an attitude that it was acceptable to urinate in the bush. During a fieldtrip to a temple in Angkor Wat compound, some male participants did not wait till we found a proper restroom. As soon as the van pulled over, they simply jumped out of the van and walked toward the bush to relieve themselves. It was done so instinctively that nobody even had a second thought about it. This is interesting because when asked at an interview, this is what a commune councilor said: “before we had the mindset that it is ok to defecate anywhere we want; not a problem; wash hands or not, it's not an issue. Now we can see that these are the issues, so we have changed our mindset”. Although this was not defecating, this observation simply shows that there is a long way to go in terms changing ingrained social norms in rural Cambodia. People still have this mindset that it is not a problem to defecate in the open. In a control commune where latrine coverage is only 15%, a commune councillor told me that it is

not uncommon that people have this belief: “1 person, 30 grams of feces, but after we left, pigs, chickens or dogs would eat it all. In their mind, they still believe latrine is stinky.”

The Outcome Mapping Intentional Design Framework set out clear progress indicators for the district and provincial levels, but the main attention of the project was on the elected commune councillors. Although both of these levels were represented in the AG and participated in meetings and conferences, little attention was paid to empower them to be more important agents in supporting, advising, or monitoring the commune councils. At the ministry level, the framework was designed to influence Department of Local Administration (DoLA), but it was not necessarily what happened. There were two nominees from DoLA in the AG, but their participation had not been very active. The Ministry of Interior’s representative in the AG was from Department of General Administration, rather than from DoLA. Although DoLA and Department of General Administration are in the same ministry, it is not known how much information about the achievements of Civic Champions has been passed to DoLA. Neither was it reported that information about Civic Champions project has been included in their regular meetings. At the last AG meeting, there was a representative from the National League for Local Councils (NLC).

For the provincial governor’s office, Civic Champions has achieved most progress indicators in level 1. It was observed that the provincial deputy governor was actively supporting the project by participating in the discover conferences and chairing the AG meetings regularly. Progress beyond level 1, such as sharing success stories with the national level, or establishing a scheme of awards to encourage local councillors to promote water and sanitation, was not evident. WaterSHED should work together with the National League of Local Councils (NLC) to publicize success stories at the national level to ensure the positive outcomes of the project could be shared among wider audience. Having a representative from NLC sitting at the AG meeting was a good sign that WaterSHED is moving in the right direction.

Progress in terms of behavioral change at the district level was not as favorable as expected. It was observed that little progress has been made at the level 1 goals, such as seeking training to develop their leadership capacity, let alone level 2 and 3 such as seeking mechanism to map key issues and change in the district and promoting outstanding change in their communities through media. As an upper level authority that manages and supports the communes in its territory, district has always been traditionally like a leader to the commune level. Despite having no decision on how the commune budget is spent, the two levels maintain constant and regular communication throughout their work. Instructions and communications from the national level pass through the district which still functions as the gate-keeper of information to the commune.

It was mentioned earlier that one of the project’s achievements was to enable the commune councilors take ownership of the promotion of hygiene and sanitation. However, one councillor viewed this task as a gift back to WaterSHED. He said “spending time meeting with villagers is like our contribution to the training. They spend a lot of money providing us training, so we need to give something back.” Another offered this view: “if according to my salary, I am not really motivated to do this work. But I feel like if I don’t do any work, it’s like wasting money of WaterSHED. That’s why I just keep trying, no matter what.” This demonstrates a sense of obligation to reciprocate WaterSHED for what it has been given to

the councillors. Perhaps worse, it may show that some participants think they are doing this work for WaterSHED, not for themselves or their own communities, which was not the goal of the Civic Champions program. It may take time for these shifts in mindset, but in future iterations it is recommended that WaterSHED continue to explore ways to help participants see that they are not being asked to work as part of an NGO-led initiative.

It was interesting to find that some commune councillors in the control district thought that changes in their community could be more effectively made by external factors while the common thoughts among commune councillors who participated in Civic Champions thought they could make changes. One commune councillor from the control district thought that in order to change people's mindset, it needs to be coming from someone new or some agency with authority or knowledge. He said that "when it comes to meeting with villagers, my face has been too familiar with them that they won't listen anymore. If we can have you or the outside people with higher education and knowledge, people will listen better." He, like a few other commune councillors in the control district, felt that they have been doing this work for a long time that they might have already reached a saturation point in terms of what they could achieve. This is an important finding that illustrates a difference in the mindset of Civic Champions participants and non-participants.

Award

Competition for awards at the conferences motivated participants to work hard so that they would be eligible. Some participants thought that being able to compete with other communes for award gives them motivation and pride to be a better leader, leaving their mark for the next generation. The project intended to experiment with both financial and non-financial incentives. Recognition seemed to be a compelling incentive. One participant claimed

"we want our name known, and want to compete with other communes. Competition is an encouragement. We want to have '*sna-dai jia nak deuk-nom*' (achievements as a leader), and to leave our name for the next generation as a good leader in the community even though we don't get any personal benefit, but just only receiving knowledge."

WaterSHED adapted the awards scheme over the course of the program. Prizes included bronze, silver, and gold medals awarded to councillors who were voted by participants after making presentations about their achievements. There were also awards for the highest number of latrines built and the biggest change achieved in sanitation coverage. In theory, the selection of councillors for medals reflected not only the true achievements of the councillors but also how they were presented. The sanitation awards were objective and awarded following coverage data surveys implemented by WaterSHED. It should be noted that to compete for medals, councillors had to qualify with a minimum level of toilet adoption in their respective commune.

The competition for awards gave a platform for participants to evaluate themselves against others, and promoted inter-commune interactions and communications. At the same time, it risked confusing participants about the objective: to improve their leadership behavior, or to maximize the number of latrines that were installed.

One member of the AG shared his perspective on this: “I think the provision of award can be a problem because it could demotivate councillors who did not win. You know the ones who are good at speaking would have more chance to win. I think that will make some commune councillors lose their willingness to join the program.”

It is interesting that this member of the AG could not see the link between the skill that enables a councilor to be good at presenting his/her achievements in front of a group and attracting votes, and the skill of rallying councilors, village chiefs, and others in general in making social changes. Being charismatic, persuasive, and/or good at speaking is normally regarded as an important attribute in good leaders.

We also heard that competition could be a double-edged sword, where the winners feel motivated and others are demotivated. Awards were meant to reward those who were outstanding and able to deliver significant changes in their community. But some participants mentioned that no one wants to lose in a competition, and they felt that the actual cash prizes should spread among more participants so as to avoid making people feel like they did not win. In light of that it should be noted that many participants reported that losing or not qualifying to compete did not deter them from their work.

A member of the AG questioned the effectiveness of the incentive system:

“If the incentive mechanism was not there, it is unclear if the momentum would be the same or not. The competition for awards played important role in motivating participants. What if there was no medal? What are the government’s potential roles in the incentive system? One recommendation is to have a look at having government playing the role of providing incentives. After all, these commune councillors are public civil servants under the payroll of the government anyway.”

Involving the district and/or the provincial level to play more active roles in incentivizing their commune councilors for good practices in water and sanitation is an idea that WaterSHED should test in the future.

To qualify for the medal competition, the required level of toilet adoption within a commune was proportional to the number of councillors participating from that commune. It was set at 60 latrines per councillor. If one commune had one participant and more than 60 toilets were installed, then that councillor would qualify regardless of how many households were in the commune. If the same commune had four participants, 240 would need to have been built. This means that the councillors who qualified may not have been from the communes with the highest absolute numbers of toilets built, but there was a separate award category for the commune with the highest overall latrine sales.

To replicate the incentive system established by the Civic Champions project, one commune councillor said that they could implement a similar scheme in his commune,

“We had a discussion among the commune councillors to set out strategy to encourage village leaders in promoting water and sanitation. We came up with the idea that if we won the gold medal, which has \$400 cash prize, then we would divide the award for the village leaders as follows: if the village chief can get 9 to 14 in a village in 3 months, he’ll get a \$10 award; 15-19, will get \$20; more than 20 will get

30\$. After calculating, we found that we might only need around \$200 for such award system, which means we would still have \$200 to do something else or buy other gifts. I don't know if other communes came up with the same idea or not.”

It is encouraging that the councillors took their own initiative to come up with this scheme. As a proof of concept, the Civic Champions project has shown that incentives are challenging to calibrate and to perfect for desired outcomes. Rewarding outstanding participants could marginalize those who did not win, but could also motivate them to work harder. Non-financial incentives based on recognition appear to be effective.

Training

According to Leadpreneur, the training was designed to “create a learning space and culture that is focused on working hard and fast in the pursuit of achieving great performance”. The program was meant to encourage thinking ‘outside-the-box’ and not spoon-feed the participants. Each ‘discover’ conference focused on key themes of leadership such as what it means, roles and responsibilities of a leader, choosing the right style of leadership, fighting fears, identity of a leader, and SMART principles in planning. Specific yes/no answers to the questions or instructions were not provided. This is one of the ways the training was unconventional. Instead, participants were encouraged to discover new things through examples and exercises. For instance, in order to show participants that fear can be overcome through pushing oneself out of the comfort zone, the training asked the participants to pound a nail into a piece of wood using their fist.

The evaluation forms submitted after each ‘discover’ conference showed the overall level of satisfaction among participants was fairly high at D1: 79%, D2: 76%, and D3: 91%. Participants, in general, were satisfied with the conferences. However, many participants said that the training contents, especially at the first discover conference, were too difficult for them. One participant who was a former soldier and had not received a lot of education said that his brain was overheated at D1. He thought that both the content and speed of delivery did not fully take into account the situation of the audience. Many participants complained about the training being delivered too fast. One commune councillor in Oudong said she could not remember the materials as her “brain is old”. Every time she wanted to recall something from the conference, she had to check her notes. The frequently stated fear about ‘brain overheating’ and the complaint regarding the need to check notes are telling for a group of civic leaders. That the Oudong councillor is practicing to take – and refer to – notes could be part of a good outcome from the program.

Another commune councillor commented that, “the style of delivery was designed more for the young generation, not elderly people like many of us. That might be the reason why after D1, there was a drop in number of participants.”

While attending the last ‘discover’ conference, the lead evaluator observed the above-mentioned style. There were instances when the participants were asked to *hi-five* or shout out “*I am a Civic Champion*”. Some of the elderly participants, who are typically subtle, solemn, and humble, are unaccustomed to such exercises. For WaterSHED, there is a tension between, on the one hand, being innovative, different, and by pushing people out of

their comfort zone, and on the other hand, risking discomfort and pushback from participants.

One aspect that made the program different from the perspective of the participants is that it refrained from giving instructions to the participants on how to do things. Instead, it pushed them to discover new things by themselves. On this approach, one commune councillor commented that,

“This training did not train us exactly how to do anything, no specific instruction, for example, like to raise livestock or to grow plants. It was just to share experience from other participants. If other participants had higher education or more experience from more developed places, this would not be a bad thing. But everybody was pretty much on the same level in terms of education and experience. So we didn’t learn many things new. If there were National, Ministerial, and Provincial representatives with higher education, that would be good too. Then we could get some new knowledge.”

Although this view might not be uniform across all participants, it does highlight a common expectation of being taught specific knowledge rather than discovering and developing one’s own leadership potential. It is good that the councillor quoted above recognized that the program was different than training on specific tasks, but it appears he failed to see the opportunity of the program to find his own initiative. As a participant screening tool, WaterSHED might explain to future applicants that the program is not designed to be rote learning and that it will be very different from activities with which they are familiar.

Commenting on the session about fighting fears, one councillor said:

“They told us to be courageous as a leader and to try to eat some [wasabi]. It was so bitter it almost gave me a heart attack. On another instance, they told us to pound a nail with our fist as a way to fight fear. We thought it was something else, so many people hesitated. But they forced us to do it anyway, saying it’s a way to fight fear. But implementing our plan is not a fear, so the example did not make sense. They should not do that; it was not to fight fear, but to create more fear. They said if one commune councillor could do it, anyone else could do it too, putting a lot of pressure on us.”

Another commune councillor echoed a similar sentiment, saying that the “pounding nail should just be taught as a theory. There is no need to do it.”

Such a concept was new and likely none of the participants had pounded a nail with their bare fist before. However, it did push people out of their comfort zone and many thought that it was not necessary. Although everybody did it, we get a sense some did it because of their sense of saving their own face, saving themselves from embarrassment. They might not want to be seen as a failure in front of other people. Although such view did not compromise the training, it illustrates the tension mentioned earlier between the program trying to be provocative and doing what the participants are comfortable with.

The trainers established strict rules for the participants during the sessions of the conferences. Commenting on these rules, one AG member thought that,

“Punishment is not a bad thing, but it could affect commune councillors’ psychology. Some trainers blamed [participants] in front of everybody for such little things as asking their peers for clarifications or even picking up the phone. I think they felt very ashamed for that. The way the trainers did that indicated a lack of respect and looked inappropriate. As you know, most of the trainers were young and the participants were a lot older. Trainers should speak properly and politely.”

This raises an important question for a program that targets government officials. It is unusual for a young group of trainers to lead sessions for older government officials, let alone to chastise them for answering their phones or for chatting during sessions. Participants who prioritize decorum over substance (or in the case of the comment above, a government official who was part of the AG) may object or even disengage. On the other hand, if a program conforms with all established norms of government training and discussion, then it follows logically that the outcomes of the program would be no different than those of previous programs. The current living situation in rural Cambodia – with indicators ranging from sanitation to education – are abysmal and in many cases place Cambodia at or near the bottom of regional rankings. For this reason, WaterSHED wants to push local officials in rural Cambodia to do things differently, and there is bound to be resistance by many of the incumbents.

In future iterations, WaterSHED will need to examine how to balance the comfort of participants and advisors with its intention of making the program different. The evaluation team heard strong complaints from some participants about being pushed out of their comfort zone. According to WaterSHED staff, this was designed from the beginning in order to achieve something different and to reflect the bold and provocative model. How much effectiveness will be lost if the trainers reduce their level of boldness is unknown, but WaterSHED should continue to seek the optimal balance with the goal of maximizing results and effectiveness. WaterSHED might also strive to explain more clearly such intents to the participants from the beginning. It should be noted that the program had been continually adjusted throughout the four conferences in response to participants’ stated needs and using the results of participants’ evaluations after each conference. For instance, after the first discover conference, longer breaks were introduced so as not to wear participants out.

Trainers

Trainers for the Civic Champions project were young and energetic university graduates with an average age below 30. The training team was drawn from a mix of WaterSHED senior and junior staff and included a highly experienced trainer. This mixture of experience was reflected in the way participants felt about the trainers. Almost every councillor interviewed felt that some trainers might have not performed in a way that inspired confidence right from the beginning. One councillor said,

“We were hesitant in the beginning because the trainers were young, and appeared to be not confident in what they were doing.”

Another also echoed this by saying,

“WaterSHED trainers are young, so they delivered the trainings in the ‘young’ ways, not flexible or accommodating their audience who are older and less educated. They

were taught to pound nail with their fist, and they taught us to do the same too. I think those who are experienced trainers, would '*chnai pro-dit*' (adapt) the contents of the training to fit better with us. For example, if district talked critically or berated us, it would be okay. But we could never do the same thing to the villagers. We would not be a commune leader or would no longer able to walk in that village. We need to adapt our language accordingly. The same goes to this training too.”

Some participants reported a lack of respect for the participants who were older. The comments above (and other similar comments by participants) may have been genuinely related to a perceived lack of experience, but they also might simply have been due to the age of the participants. One AG member questioned the qualification of trainers, asking whether they were “qualified to teach professionally”. If some participants were put off by the age of the trainers and by exercises that required active participation, it could easily have been reported as the trainers’ lack of experience, lack of respect for participants, and/or lack of decorum. It is worth noting that the participants were elected officials and their constituents are increasingly young. The most recent election in 2013 was the youngest in Cambodia’s history: about 3.5 million of the 9.5 million registered voters were between the ages of 18 and 30 years – more than one-third. It may be important for leaders now and in the future to become familiar with the “young” ways.

On the other hand, perhaps the interaction between trainers and participants could be somewhat softened without sacrificing the boldness and effectiveness of the program. One informant said the some trainers had “*samlot*” (threatened) or “*bongkhom*” (forced) participants when asking them to do something. One trainer reportedly said during a session: “I invited you here to learn, not to sit and do nothing”. Such a comment was considered to indicate a lack of respect toward the elderly. Comments about trainers using inappropriate words or not speaking politely were heard multiple times during interviews with the participants.

Resistance to change and a focus on top-down ‘training’ as opposed to peer-supported, self-driven leadership development is persistent within government. The government member of the AG who questioned the trainers’ qualification also speculated about the cost-effectiveness of the program, saying “there are too many staff, trainers, like ants. If government wanted to adapt, we do not have that many members of staff. If [WaterSHED] wanted to transfer the program to the government, they would need to involve staff from ministry level in the providing training.”

Fees and Per Diem Payments

Despite being enthusiastic, people were initially skeptical about paying a fee to attend the program because this was unusual – they are usually paid to join. By the time of this evaluation, many participants said it was well worth the fee and felt satisfied paying it. Many said they took a bit of risk in the beginning to pay, which might have been the reason that some did not choose to participate. The fees collected were pooled to provide the cash awards. One informant recommended that the fee should be eliminated, especially if the same thing is implemented in a location where people are new to WaterSHED. He asked how applicants would know if the NGO would abscond with their money, and suggest that

many people were hesitant to join because they were unsure if the NGO was trustworthy. For those who did join and pay the fee, they thought they did receive more than paid for. One commune councillor said “as a leader, we want our community to be healthy. We want to have pride as leaders, pride to get to know the ocean, Siem Reap, and Angkor Wat. So the \$30 fee was well worth it.”

The Civic Champions program did not pay a per diem to participants when they attended the conferences. These are some comments about this issue:

“WaterSHED spent too much money on arrangement and logistics, but no money for participants. We requested per diem, but they did not listen to us. They should have given per diem for food. Accommodation is okay, they can arrange it. When we have meetings in the village, it’s okay that we didn’t get paid. But attending training, they should have ‘encouragement’ in terms of money. If they give us some money from hotel and food, it would be better.”

Another informant also shared this similar sentiment, asking,

“If [the program] was originally planned for 100 participants and the expense for each participant was planned to be more than \$1,000 from the beginning, what happened to the money when there were only 40 participants at D4? WaterSHED should have used the money saved from those missing participants to give us some financial incentive.”

It is not surprising that some civic officials would expect to receive per diem payments from an NGOs as this practice is common. Such comments from a few councillors highlight an unfortunate focus of many government officials on extracting rents in the form of cash payment, rather than pursuing an opportunity to enhance their leadership capacity. WaterSHED deliberately decided against making such payments in order to reinforce the self-screening of participants who would be motivated primarily by per diem payments. Despite explaining its per diem policy from the beginning, there were still some councillors who commented about wanting payments.

Instead of paying per diems, the design of the conferences was very much centered on providing an extraordinary experience for participants, especially to build a real sense of pride in participation and sense of achievement at the end. The design and budget allocations were based on some participants dropping out during the course of the program and the final event was able to include other incentives such as a guided tour to the historical Angkor Wat and the additional day stay for the tour after the training was concluded. The accommodation was mid-range, and participants shared rooms and meals in order to promote and reinforce a sense of community among the cohort.

VI. Recommendations and Conclusion

Our Impressions

The Civic Champions project has been successful in bringing about changes in the attitudes and behaviors of the participating commune councillors. As it was a proof of concept, it is still not known whether those positive results will continue to prevail in the long run. When asked what they are going to do after the end of the project, participants said they were determined

to continue the momentum and aim to achieve targeted rates of sanitation coverage within specific timelines. Determination is easier said than done. Maybe they are determined now, but it is unclear if they will still be in six months or a year. Some participants may lose their elected seats in the next term, which may necessitate another training to improve the leadership capacity of the newly elected commune councillors. There may be an expectation for the NGO to come back and do it again. WaterSHED hopes that the participants will encourage other civic officials – sharing and modeling their new leadership behaviours. It is hard to ensure continued motivation to be model leader. All are determined to continue the momentum, but having the determination and actually doing it are different. Only time will tell.

A member of the AG shared that,

“Those who dropped out did so because of family issues or their commune work that they cannot put aside. Maybe the reward is not as much compared to what they can earn at home.”

We were told that a female commune councillor in the control district was more occupied with her own business than her work for the commune council. It appears that councillors who have their own business in addition to their government post typically prioritize their personal benefit. An important finding of the evaluation was that commune councillors who participated in the program felt that they were better at implementing their roles, especially in promoting water and sanitation. It was common to hear participants interviewed for this study say that their work in promoting water and sanitation before the Civic Champions program were more laissez-faire. After being a participant, they had to make specific action plans and strategy in achieving those plans. This gave the evaluators an impression that the project has been successful in inspiring participants to be more proactive in working on water and sanitation.

Recommendations

Introduce an applicant screening mechanism: WaterSHED should develop an application screening mechanism. Whilst the program is designed to democratize leadership rather than reserving it for the educated or elite, the participants would benefit more if the majority were committed to their own development.

Engage with decision makers at ministry level: WaterSHED should more specifically seek to engage decision-makers at the ministry level and those who can influence the direction of decentralization reforms policies. The opportunity to work closely with the Ministry of Interior and Ministry of Rural Development or specifically with the working groups that determine which agency functions will be transferred to the sub-national level, in order to streamline their work with the ongoing decentralization reforms process. WaterSHED should identify how its activities complement or contribute to the process of informing policy makers. The project should take into account how it can fit with previous training to CCs by the government.

Publicize good practices: WaterSHED should work closely with the National League of Local Councils (NLC) to document good local government practices in the Civic Champions project and share them with other communes. This could not only motivate the commune

council to be effective in promoting development, but could also serve as another form of incentive to acknowledge those who deliver significant results. The NLC with its members of all sub-national councils has the great potential to highlight and publicize such good practices.

Encourage broad participation from commune chiefs and across political parties:

WaterSHED should encourage commune chiefs and councillors from different political backgrounds to participate. As the one with more leverage in making decision in the council, the chiefs have the potential to be a more powerful agent of change. Coming from different political backgrounds, the participants' voice could resonate better among villagers of different political alliances, thus expanding the impacts of the project.

Identify a transitional bridge between adhering strong cultural norms and engendering the ability to respond to the new development agenda:

It is difficult to be bold and provocative, while trying to adhere to the long-established local norms and traditions. Social hierarchy is profoundly embedded in Cambodia society, and compromising this in exchange for being different might be counter-productive. Even the change from open defecation to fixed place improved sanitation goes against current social practices but the change is necessary and the benefits significant. The leadership program exposed participants to new and unfamiliar learning. In this challenging situation, WaterSHED through the proof-of-concept pilot has the opportunity to bridge the two elements together through further refinement of training material content and training approach for the participants, while at the same maintaining the approach that encourages being different.

Conclusion

Civic Champions as a pilot project has made substantial contributions to improving the leadership capacity of those commune councillors who participated in the program and to an increase in the sanitation coverage in their respective communities. With some adjustment and modification, the project does have potential for scaling up. However, it is clear from the findings of this study that after more than three decades of development interventions, rural Cambodia is trapped in a mindset of spoon-fed development. This is a challenging environment to pilot anything bold and different. Participants of Civic Champions, although satisfied with the project, had a rather strong reaction to the bold and provocative approach the project was undertaking. They expected the training to be delivered in a manner coherent with local social norms and tradition, enabling them to learn new things in their own comfort zone. Although they said they understood the concepts and implemented the activities the project expected them to, all were complaining about the absence of regular financial incentive or having to spend their own resources for pocket money when attending trainings. They expected to be 'encouraged' with financial incentive when attending trainings or implementing activities. This reflects the legacy of the three decades of conventional development interventions in Cambodia.

Regardless of how the program could be refined in the future, there is no question that Civic Champions has been a ground breaking and innovative project in that it let the commune councillors discover the potential leader in themselves. There is a good system of encouragement, motivation, and monitoring. Commune councillors previously worked without encouragement, motivation, reinforcement or strict monitoring and evaluation. They

knew what they were supposed to do, but just performed their duties whenever, however they wanted without specific guidelines. One commune councillor put it this way: “*tver tam hai-er*” (do just like whatever one feels). The training gave them a self-discovered experience, and the award system did help too.

What is also unique about Civic Champions is that it showed the participants the paths to walk and let them discover how to walk those paths themselves. A commune councillor in Oudong commented on what is different about Civic Champions this way,

“Before there was [an NGO] donating concrete slab and rings for latrines, but some people just used those rings as storage for hay. That created difficulty for us as commune councillors too because there were not enough for everyone. People accused us of nepotism and blamed us for giving them to one person and not another. Now there’s nothing to give, neutral, so there is no more accusation of nepotism.”

It is innovative and has achieved considerable progress in terms of sanitation coverage. But the real results might not even be clearly seen at the end of the program. Earl, the developer of the concept of Outcome Mapping, said that “in many cases, the real results may not occur until sometime after the program is completed” (Earl, Carden, & Smutylo, 2001, p. 9). “It is also reasonable to expect that even once the desired outcome has been reached, it may erode due to subsequent influences either within or entirely independent of the program” (ibid: p.10). In potentially expanding project in the future, it will be important for WaterSHED to pay attention to ensuring that the participants have the capacity to respond to ongoing changes.

A key question for Cambodia is how to transition out of the perpetual cycle of dependency in development mentioned above. Civic Champions has taken the first step in this direction as an innovative program to bring local leaders out of their comfort zone. In doing so, there needs to be consideration given to possible adverse responses due to the conservative environment in Cambodia, especially in the rural areas. There is no one-size-fits-all solution to leadership and development problems, but the current situation in Cambodia requires a strong push to reach the threshold of a lower middle income country in the next few years. Therefore, the Civic Champions approach should be integrated in the government’s decentralization policies.

References

Chase, C. (2014). A Study of Drivers for Latrine Take-up in Rural Cambodia: Analysis from Two Sanitation Marketing Programs. Presentation Delivered at the Water and Health Conference at University of North Carolina.

Earl, S., Carden, F., & Smutylo, T. (2001). *Outcome Mapping: Building Learning and Reflection Into Development Program*. Ottawa: International Development Research Center.

MRD. (2012). *National Strategy for Rural Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene 2011-2025*. Phnom Penh: Royal Government of Cambodia.

Smutylo, T. (2005). *Outcome Mapping: A Method for Tracking Behavioral Changes in Development Programs*. Rome, Italy:: The Institutional Learning and Change.

WSP. (2011). *The Economic Returns of Sanitation Interventions in Cambodia*. Phnom Penh: Water and Sanitation Program, the World Bank.

APPENDIX 1: Terms of Reference

The *Civic Champions* Project

Vision

Civic leaders have become confident in taking action to improve the standard of living in their villages. Leaders are proactive, taking initiative and using all resources in their power. Leaders believe they can make a positive change and inspire their villagers to make change together. Leaders actively involve villagers by seeking their input and ideas to make positive changes in their villages. All villagers are healthy and have access to adequate sanitation.

Mission

WaterSHED's *Civic Champions* project supports a **Community of Action** comprised of rural leaders working to identify and implement effective ways of developing **leadership potential** to raise rural standards of living. Over the course of one year, participants join a cyclical 90-day program to discover, develop and deploy their leadership capability. The program is about transforming values, mindsets and behaviors, creating a dynamic leadership community.

These Champions use their leadership to promote and coordinate change in their communities. They inspire and connect the business sector, community members/groups, and government to achieve better outcomes for their communities. As agents of change, they lead collective action towards the attainment of total sanitation and other and other essential development priorities. The project uses participatory methods to monitor progress and actively shares results with the wider community, including media and government.

Proof of Concept

This 12-month proof-of-concept project, in partnership with sub national government is being implemented in two districts in Kampong Speu province, comprising approximately 28 communes and 350 villages. A highly successful project will be characterised by the emergence of a cohort of civic leaders who can influence and motivate those within their sphere of influence to bring about a dramatic improvement in sanitation coverage, including many villages with 100% access. This transformation will be evaluated alongside 'comparison' districts in order to determine the effectiveness of the methodology to catalyze civic champions and

Key integrated innovations:

- 1) **Government leadership:** dramatically improve the enabling environment by identifying and cultivating sub-national officials to be successful civic champions.
- 2) **Social marketing:** messages and images/media that inspire behaviour change and engage local authorities to become civic champions for improved sanitation.
- 3) **Enterprise Development:** engage local producers to offer attractive, low-cost, products through insight into viable business models that maximize outcomes.

enable more rapid and cost-effective total sanitation.

Assignment Title

Cultivating Civic Champions: Evaluating leadership capacity development among elected local-level government representatives in rural Cambodia.

Purpose

To evaluate of the *Civic Champions* Project to verify whether the leadership program concept has further potential.

Objectives

1. To understand the ability of participants to inspire and motivate their peers and constituents to engage in community level change;
2. To assess the role of the pilot project in developing the participants' ability to inspire and motivate their peers and constituents and assess the participants perceived change in self efficacy;
3. To determine whether change in sanitation coverage in treatment districts can be attributed to the leadership of members of the civic leadership cohort;
4. To assess the cost-effectiveness of the program in terms of changes in sanitation coverage;
5. To provide recommendations for future iterations and as appropriate, for scaling up the project.

Key Tasks

1. Prepare an inception report
2. Review background documents, multimedia and website materials provided by WaterSHED.
3. Review and summarise information and data captured through the Civic Champions monitoring mechanism.
4. Conduct a series of interviews and focus group discussions with participants.
5. Conduct key informant interviews including:
 - a. key WaterSHED staff
 - b. project consultants
 - c. selected Advisory Group members

Deliverables

1. Present the inception report to WaterSHED
2. Prepare a power point presentation of the methodology, key findings and recommendations.
3. Present the methodology, key findings and recommendations to WaterSHED.
4. Prepare a 2-page summary of the methodology, key findings and recommendations.

5. Provide photos of activities undertaken during the evaluation.
6. Produce a Final Evaluation Report including the following:
 - a. A summary of project activities, achievements and challenges;
 - b. An assessment of the project's influence on civic leadership capacity and attitudes to leadership, both for participants and their peers and constituents;
 - c. An assessment of the project's impact on the change in sanitation coverage;
 - d. A compilation and analysis of feedback from participants and other key informants; and
 - e. Recommendations for the continuation and, if appropriate, the scale-up of activities.

Schedule

The schedule of work is to be developed by the consultant in the period from late August to early September 2014. The assignment is expected to take 10-12 days.

The assignment will require the consultant to work in both Phnom Penh and Kampong Speu Province.

The final report and other deliverables are required to be submitted by 26 September 2014.

Budget

The consultant is to develop a budget for this scope of work including all interpretation and translation and all in country travel.

For international consultants an additional international travel budget will be negotiated.

Qualifications

The Consultant must have proven experience with local governance in Cambodia and demonstrated experience in the evaluation of development projects. Knowledge of, or experience with, the use of Outcome Mapping or Outcome Harvesting methodologies will be an asset.

Bid Instructions

To submit a bid (firm) or to apply (individual), please submit maximum 1 page explanation of proposed evaluation methodology or approach and listing of previous relevant experience (firm) or CV (individual). Submit electronically to civic@watershedasia.org.

Appendix 2: Interview Guides

Advisory Group Member

- How many AG meetings have you attended? How many discover conferences you attended?
- Why do you think your institution was invited to be involved in the project?
- Describe your overall roles being a member of AG. What do you think are the roles of AG?
- What happened during each AG meeting?
- How do you assess the level of interaction/communication between different members of AG?
- After 12 months of existence, do you think AG has been able to achieve what it was meant to do?
- How much do you think you personally have been able to influence the direction of the project? How much do you think AG as a whole has been able to do so?
- Can you describe some of the strong and weak points of the Civic Champions project?
- How do you assess the impact of this project on the commune councillor's leadership as well as on the overall promotion of water and sanitation in rural Cambodia?
- If WaterSHED were to run the civic champions project all over again, what do you think are the changes they should make?
- Are there any comments, suggestions, complaints, or praise about the project you'd like to share with us?

Project staffs

- Can you describe your roles in the project?
- What does each participant in the project have to do? What do you think motivates them to engage in those tasks?
- Overall assessment of the program: what is good, what is not? Do you think the project has been able to achieve what it set to achieve?
- Assessment on self-teaching: pro and con, what have they been able to achieve?
- Attitude to leadership: from your perspective, what are the changes you observe in the councillor's attitude to leadership? Can you give any specific example?
- Through your interactions with the commune councillors, what do you think are the things they enjoyed the most / the least about the project?

- How do you assess the impact of this project on the commune councillor's leadership as well as on the overall promotion of water and sanitation in rural Cambodia?
- If WaterSHED were to run the Civic Champions project all over again, what do you think are the changes they should make?

Commune Councillor (Civic Champions)

Standard Introduction:

My name is _____. I am part of a team who has been commissioned by WaterSHED to independently assess the Civic Champions Project. Although I have been asked by WaterSHED, my work is independent and my report will not be influenced by WaterSHED. I will not share any specific information about your identity with WaterSHED or any other entities that might potentially lead to your repercussion. Your name or your commune will not be included in our report. You are free to express your opinion to us. The notes I take will not be shared with WaterSHED.

- Can you describe your roles as a participant of Civic Champions project?
- What were the challenges that you were facing in implementing your roles as commune councillor?
- How did you overcome those challenges?
- Have you ever received any leadership training before Civic Champions? What is different about Civic Champions from other leadership training you have received?
- Why did you decide to join Civic Champions? What did you think were the benefits of Civic Champion?
- What have you learned from Civic Champions? Did you get what you expected to get out of the project?
- What do you think of Civic Champions? Can you tell us something you like and did not like about Civic Champions?
- Have you ever shared the knowledge that you have gained from CCP with your peers? How do you do that?
- If there was one thing you would change about Civic Champions, what would that be?
- What will you do to maintain the momentum you have gained after Civic Champions?

Commune Councillors (non-Civic Champion)

Standard Introduction:

My name is _____. I am part of a team who has been commissioned by WaterSHED to independently assess the Civic Champions Project. Although I have been asked by WaterSHED, my work is independent and my report will not be influenced by WaterSHED. I will not share any specific information about your identity with WaterSHED or any other entities that might potentially lead to your repercussion. Your name or your commune will not be included in our report. You are free to express your opinion to us. The notes I take will not be shared with WaterSHED.

- Is there anyone responsible for Water and Sanitation in your commune?
- Latrine coverage in the commune? Any records? Is there any change in recent years? What caused those changes?
- What are your roles in promoting health and sanitation? Can you give specific activities you have done so far?
- What does leadership mean to you? What are the challenges in your work as a leader?
- What are the challenges in achieving ODF in your commune?
- Is there a plan to achieve ODF? How are you going to achieve that?
- How do you motivate people to build latrine?
- Have you received any support in WatSan, materials or non-materials, from NGOs / provincial dept? How have those supports assisted you in your work?
- What have been the priorities in your CDP the last three years? What did your commune spend development fund on in the past three years?
- What do you think would help increase latrine coverage in your commune?

APPENDIX 3: List of Communes Visited

Category	Commune	District	Time scheduled
High	Roka-Koh commune	Kong Pisei	8am 09/08
Mid	Prey Vihear commune	Kong Pisei	8:00, 09/09
High	Moha Reussey commune	Kong Pisei	8:30, 09/09
Low	Veal commune	Kong Pisei	2:00, 09/09
Mid	Prey Nhiet commune	Kong Pisei	2:00, 09/09
High	Pang Lvea commune	Oudong	8:00, 09/10
Mid	Prey Krosang commune	Oudong	8:30, 09/10
Low	Trach Tong commune	Oudong	2:00, 09/10
Mid	Veal Pong commune	Oudong	2:30, 09/10
non	Ni Tian commune	Bor-Seth	8:00, 09/12
non	Po Chamroeun commune	Bor-Seth	10:00, 09/12
non	Svay Rompia	Bor-Seth	2:00, 09/12

APPENDIX 4: Civic Champions Intentional Design Framework

Vision:

Civic leaders in rural areas are confident in taking action to improve the standard of living in their communities. They believe they can make a positive change and inspire villagers to make change together. Leaders are proactive and harness all resources within their sphere of influence by engaging others and recruiting and developing tomorrow's leaders. They actively seek the input and ideas of community members. They achieve significant improvements in the standard of living in rural areas, and leaders continue to seek new opportunities to advance welfare and economic development.

Mission:

WaterSHED's Civic Champions project supports a **Community of Action** comprised of rural leaders working to identify and implement effective ways of developing **leadership potential** to raise rural standards of living. Over the course of 1 year, participants join a cyclical 90-day program to discover, develop and deploy their leadership capability. The program is about transforming values, mindsets and behaviours, creating a dynamic leadership community.

These Champions use their leadership to promote and coordinate change in their communities. They inspire and connect the business sector, community members/groups, and government to achieve better outcomes for their communities. As agents of change, they lead collective action towards the attainment of total sanitation and other and other essential development priorities. The project uses participatory methods to monitor progress and actively shares results with the wider community, including media and government.

Partner: Ministry of Interior (MoI)/Department of Local Administration

Behavior Change Statement:

The Civic Champions project intends to see the MoI/DoLA recognise the value of inspirational leaders who can bring about change using available resources. MoI/DoLA takes action by including leadership as a priority program component of CC induction and development and provides resources for leadership development for all commune councillors.

Progress Indicators:

Level 1:

- Actively supporting the civic leadership project through advisory group membership and participation
- Including in regular meetings, information about the civic leadership project

Level 2:

- Encouraging the reporting of outstanding leadership examples received from Provincial level
- Sharing key achievements with the Minister of Interior
- Seeking to 'map' change enabled through leadership development
- Seeking to share achievements more widely through local media and other government mechanisms

Level 3:

- Actively seeking to develop leadership training at district and commune level. In line with DoLA responsibilities to *coordinate with relevant units to establish appropriate mechanisms for education, training and capacity building that will support Commune/Sangkat Councils and decentralization*
- Implementing an expanded CC leadership development program

WaterSHED Strategies/Actions:

- Conduct workshop/info-session on civic champion project as required by MoI/DoLA.
- Invite MoI/DoLA senior managers to be an active participant on the Civic Champions advisory group
- Keep MoI/DoLA staff up to date on progress and share stories of success.
- Provide opportunities to observe training and other activities
- Provide mapped data showing change over time

Partner: Kampong Speu Provincial Governor's Office

Behavior Change Statement:

This project intends to see the Kampong Speu Provincial Governor's Office adopting better practices and processes to support, share information and be more accessible to local authorities and other relevant stakeholders such as NGOs and the private sector. They work constructively with these groups to help and motivate them to take action to improve their communities.

Progress Indicators:

Level 1:

- Actively supporting the civic leadership project through advisory group membership and participation
- Including leadership on the agenda of meeting with districts
- Discuss local leadership development at monthly meetings with district offices
- Participants in leadership training stay for the full course

Level 2:

- Promoting the collection and sharing of leadership change stories
- Sharing successes in sub-national leadership development with higher levels of government
- Establishing a system to reward/recognize outstanding leadership at all sub-national levels

Level 3:

- The governor himself is active in promoting leadership development through his various networks
- Advocating to higher levels of government for the expansion of leadership development program

WaterSHED Strategies/Actions:

- Conduct workshop/info-session on civic champion project as required by the provincial Governor office
- Invite the provincial governor to be an active participant on the Civic Champions advisory group
- Keep the provincial Governor up to date on progress and share stories of success.
- Provide opportunities to observe training and other activities
- Provide mapped data showing change over time

Partner: Kampong Speu District Offices – Oudong and Kong Pisei

Behavior Change Statement:

The project aims to see District Offices that work with commune councils to set ambitious targets for development priorities, including sanitation. They bring a sense of urgency, exhibit a high level of energy and optimism that inspires the communes to take action. They follow up regularly and proactively with commune officials and other partners, and communicate clearly and responsibly with the Governor's Office, MOI/DoLA, and the communes. They don't only jump to the front of the boat and say "let's go", but they grab an oar and start to paddle at the same time. They are genuinely interested in learning about what works in their communes so that they can share it with other communes, and recognizing the successful leaders at village & commune level. That means they would also actively monitor and track progress against the targets.

Progress Indicators:

Level 1:

- Seeking training to try to develop their leadership skills and capacity
- Staying the full course of the Community of Action Program
- Incorporating the discussion of local leadership and influencing change in the agenda at monthly meetings with Commune Councillors

Level 2:

- Encouraging commune councils to set goals and participate/support the process/discussion
- Seeking mechanisms to 'map' key issues and change in the district
- Promoting the collection of leadership change stories and share successes in sub-national leadership development with higher levels of government
- Establishing a system to reward/recognize outstanding leadership at all sub-national levels

Level 3:

- Seeking leadership training opportunities for all CCs and district level staff through MoI
- Promoting outstanding change in their communities through media and government channel

-Willing to collaborate, share information and open-minded (approachable by other partners)

Strategies/Actions:

- Conducting workshop/info-session on civic champion project as required by the District office
- Keeping the district Governor up to date on progress and share stories of success.
- Providing opportunities to observe training and other activities
- Providing mapped data showing change over time
- Assisting to establish a reward and recognition system for demonstrated leadership leading to outstanding change
- Supporting access to media and other appropriate mechanism for publicly sharing change initiatives and results
- Provide motivational materials, awards and certificates.

Partner: Kampong Speu Commune Councillors – Oudong District and Kong Pisei District

Behavior Change Statement:

This project intends to see the Kg Speu Commune Councillors taking initiative to make positive changes in their communities. They encourage participation from community members and influence village leaders to desire and recognize the importance of WASH products and services. The Commune Councils model and support leadership for the betterment of the lives of their community members.

Progress Indicators

Level 1:

- Actively seeking opportunities to improve their leadership
- Incorporating councillors leadership and influencing positive change into the Councils regular meeting agenda
- Actively engaging with other stakeholders including community, private sector and NGOs to identify realistic opportunities for change

Level 2:

- Requesting support to ‘map’ key issues and change in their communities
- Setting goals for change based on findings from mapping and proactive stakeholder engagement
- Reporting of opportunities and change taking place to higher authorities

Level 3:

- Lobby higher levels to allocate more financial resources to commune level
- Lobby chamber of commerce at province level to invest more to share the benefit with villagers: job creation with good standard, market for crops with good prices
- Continue to share and promote leadership in their commune in a participatory way

WaterSHED Strategies/Actions:

- Provide Leadership development program
- Provide regular coaching session to leaders enrolled in the program
- Provide motivational tools/materials to support motivation of leaders and for them to sue to influence and motivate others
- Provide WASH data at village level
- Support local media interest in the change taking place through the leadership program