

PROMOTING DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION THROUGH PARTNERSHIP WITH A VOLUNTARY NETWORK

**Evaluation of the Development Cooperation between the
Norwegian Association for Persons with Developmental Disabilities (NFU) and the
Caribbean Association for Mobilizing Resources and Opportunities for Persons
with Developmental Disabilities (CAMRODD) (2000 -2006)**

**Max Frampton
Chief Evaluator**

**Lennise Baptiste
Evaluation Consultant**

CONTENTS

Page	
i	FOREWORD
ii	ABBREVIATIONS
iii	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY <ul style="list-style-type: none">Background to the Evaluation<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Norwegian Association for Persons with Developmental Disabilities (NFU)○ Caribbean Association for Mobilizing Resources and Opportunities for Persons with Developmental Disabilities (CAMRODD)
iv	Impact of SCcOPE on the developmentally disabled
v	Final Recommendations
1	INTRODUCTION <ul style="list-style-type: none">Background to the EvaluationNFUCAMRODD Recommendations from the 1999 Evaluation
3	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK <ul style="list-style-type: none">Development Cooperation StrategyPrinciples of Effective PartnershipsOverview of the responsibility of nonprofit boards
5	THE NFU-CAMRODD AGREEMENT 2003-2004 <ul style="list-style-type: none">Overall AimsObligation of NFUObligation of CAMRODD
7	EVALUATION APPROACH <ul style="list-style-type: none">Objectives of the evaluationData CollectionOpportunitiesLimitations
8	FINDINGS <ul style="list-style-type: none">Objective 1 – Review of CAMRODD’s work to assess its impact on persons and families

with developmental disabilities

- 15 Objective 2 – Assess the impact of the SCcOPE programme in the different countries in which it was implemented**
- 17 Objective 3 – Review NFU’s contribution to CAMRODD as a network**
- 21 Objective 4 – Recommendations for CAMRODD’s organizational viability and financial sustainability as an advocacy network for persons with developmental disabilities.**
- 22 CONCLUDING REMARKS**
- 24 REFERENCES**
- 26 APPENDIX A – Partnership Agreement between CAMRODD and NFU, 2003 – 2004**
- 32 APPENDIX B – Planned Activities 2003 – 2004**
- 38 APPENDIX C – List of Interviewees**

FOREWORD

This evaluation was conducted by independent evaluators commissioned by NFU and CAMRODD. After the initial introductions and clarification of the purpose the evaluation, respondents made themselves available for interview, sometimes at short notice. There was candidness during the interview process and evaluators believed that those questioned valued their membership in CAMRODD or their association with the organization.

We interviewed a range of persons and were able to obtain multiple perspectives about the operations of CAMRODD and its partnership with the NFU. We were fortunate to speak to persons who were in the roles of participants, organizers, trainers as well as leaders within CAMRODD. We were also able to obtain a public view of CAMRODD based on interviews with key personnel in the ministries of education and social development in different countries and members of disability organizations not affiliated with CAMRODD. There was evidence of CAMRODD's intervention in the activities organized at the local level in member countries.

We are grateful for the contributions of all of the interviewees as they allowed us to get a broad view of CAMRODD's operations from which we drew conclusions and made recommendations.

DECEMBER 2006

Max Frampton
Chief Evaluator

Lennise Baptiste
Evaluation Consultant

ABBREVIATIONS

CAMRODD	Caribbean Association for Mobilizing Resources and Opportunities for Persons with Developmental Disabilities
NFU	Norwegian Association for Persons with Developmental Disabilities
NORAD	Norwegian Government Agency for Development Abroad
SCcOPE	Service and Communities Creating Opportunities for people with Disabilities through Equality
UN	United Nations

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background to the evaluation

The partnership between the Norwegian Association for Persons with Developmental Disabilities (NFU) and the Caribbean Association for Mobilizing Resources and Opportunities for Persons with Developmental Disabilities (CAMRODD) began in 1993. NFU's support enabled development activities which were supposed to strengthen the advocacy skills within the member countries of CAMRODD. These included training workshops and the Service and Communities creating Opportunities for People with Disabilities through Equality (SCcOPE) programme. NFU also provided some coordination and administrative support to CAMRODD. Since 2003, SCcOPE has been the main focus of NFU's support. The NFU - CAMRODD cooperation was terminated on December 31, 2005, two years earlier than the planned end of December 2007. NFU cited administrative and communication challenges as the catalyst for the decision to conclude the partnership with CAMRODD.

The overall aims of the partnership

- To help secure and safeguard the rights of people with developmental disabilities in the Caribbean in line with UN Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities and the CAMRODD Blueprint.
- To contribute to the development of CAMRODD into a powerful, democratic, membership-based, advocacy organization / network of and for people with developmental disabilities in the Caribbean.

Objectives of the evaluation (Terms Of Reference, September 2006)

1. To review CAMRODD's work as a regional network to assess its impact on persons and families with developmental disabilities.
2. To assess the impact of the SCcOPE program in the different countries in which it has been implemented for organizations of CAMRODD and persons with developmental disabilities.
3. To review NFU's contribution to CAMRODD's development as a network

The impact of SCcOPE training on persons with developmental disabilities

During the period 2001 to 2005 the SCcOPE training was conducted in Antigua, Aruba, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Lucia, Guyana, and St. Vincent.

Content and methods used in the program

The aim of the programme was the strengthening of member organizations and the fostering of leaders who would advocate on behalf of people with developmental disabilities in their respective countries. The training was intended to heighten participants' awareness of the rights of persons with developmental disabilities and also their enthusiasm to work on behalf of such persons.

Main finding

While the programme was intended to create networks among the participants, those interviewed indicated that for various reasons they were unable to keep the momentum and truly engage in advocacy.

Impact in the countries in which training was conducted

- The individual projects were varied in theme and content and encompassed a wide range of activities in which persons with developmental disabilities could be included. For varying reasons the projects were not sustained and only short term results can be described.
- The SCcOPE programme for St. Vincent was modified, shortened, and targeted towards parents. A direct result of this programme was the formation of the St. Vincent and the Grenadines Parents Support and Advocacy Group which was formed by parents who were participants of the programme.

Recommendations for strengthening the impact of SCcOPE on the living conditions for persons with developmental disabilities

- Seek alliances with tertiary institutions such as the University of the West Indies, the University of Guyana, regional Teachers' Colleges and Nursing Schools to have the content of the SCcOPE modules integrated as a compulsory component in health and human service programmes.
- Work with governments to have basic training for public servants using aspects of the SCcOPE curriculum in order to improve their service delivery to the disabled community.
- Engage local mentors/coaches to work closely with the tutors to assist the participants to choose projects that are relevant and can have direct impact on the circumstances of persons with developmental disabilities in that country. These coaches would assist with maintaining the longevity of the projects after the SCcOPE training is completed.
- Introduce a modified SCcOPE programme in technical vocational training to educate those professionals who will actively engage in providing housing for the community which will include persons with developmental disabilities. Training can also be provided to the institutions to promote the creation of an enabling environment for inclusion of trainees with developmental disabilities.
- Involve parents and persons with disabilities as participants in the programme.

Final Recommendations

The following recommendations are designed to respond to the challenges identified by those interviewed and based on the conclusions drawn by the evaluation team.

FOR CAMRODD

- Review the bylaws to reflect the organization's needs in 2007 and beyond by defining the roles and responsibilities of Board Members, setting a term limit in office for elected officers, defining the roles and responsibilities of member country representatives, defining processes for operations (e.g. Communication protocol, decision making, conflict resolution, accountability checks and balances)
- CAMRODD is encouraged to develop a strategic plan (short, medium and long term goals) in pursuit of its dream and in turn develop tactical or annual plans to deploy the strategy.
- Consider the use of technology to improve communications within CAMRODD (teleconferencing and internet chat rooms).
- CAMRODD should consider developing projects that simultaneously include all member countries and these should be coordinated to have the impact of mass, timing, and scale.
- CAMRODD should seek to cultivate champions to promote its cause.
- CAMRODD should seek to partner with other organizations, in the Caribbean, working for the rights of persons with disabilities, to capitalize on the synergy and potential benefits of critical mass and coordinated effort.
- CAMRODD should seek to develop its capacity for report writing, proposal writing and project management.
- Consider seeking funding for individual projects and embark on a sustainability drive by ensuring delivery of the project objectives.
- Consider including persons with developmental disabilities as active members of CAMRODD.
- Pay special attention to terms and conditions when arranging future partnership agreements and uphold CAMRODD's responsibilities contained therein.

FOR NFU

- Adhere to the terms and conditions contained within the partnership agreements and ensure that partners are clear on the objectives of the partnership.
- Leverage NFU's experience and organizational capability to assist with the development of the partner organizations. Consider a more active approach during the formative part of the partnership, starting with a coaching then moving to a consultative role, especially with assisting the partners to develop capacity and systems to deliver on the objectives of the partnership.
- Utilize processes to triangulate, or cross reference, reports from corporation partners.

Final remarks

During the period under review there were many challenges with the NFU-CAMRODD partnership. However, this evaluation team believes that the partnership has contributed to the changing perceptions and attitudes of governments and society within the Caribbean. Through their many programmes the partnership has helped to promote the rights of persons with developmental disabilities and can claim ownership to some of the influencers for the changes in attitudes and future benefits that persons with developmental disabilities receive from regional governments and the society at large.

INTRODUCTION

Background to the evaluation

The partnership between the Norwegian Association for Persons with Developmental Disabilities (NFU) and the Caribbean Association for Mobilizing Resources and Opportunities for Persons with Developmental Disabilities (CAMRODD) began in 1993. During the period 1992 – 2002, NFU's support enabled CAMRODD to facilitate workshops on parent empowerment, parenting skills and networking, leadership training, early stimulation and detection for children with developmental disabilities, organizational development courses and the Service and Communities creating Opportunities for People with Disabilities through Equality (SCcOPE) program. NFU also provided some coordination and administrative support to CAMRODD.

Since 2003, SCcOPE has been the main focus of NFU's support for the work Of CAMRODD. Training for this program was conducted in Trinidad and Tobago, St. Lucia, Guyana and St. Vincent. This was in keeping with NFU's role as an advocacy organization, since as described by the NFU, the SCcOPE program aimed to strengthen advocacy skills of its participants. The training activities were intended to mobilize parents and professionals to advocate for equal opportunities by employing a human rights' approach to disability ⁽¹⁵⁾.

Norwegian Association for Persons with Developmental Disabilities (NFU)

NFU was founded in 1967 and the majority of its members are parents and people with developmental disabilities. It is a part of the Atlas Alliance, which provides support to persons with disabilities in developing countries. The Atlas Alliance is a foundation which engages in fundraising and these funds are in turn allocated to members of the Alliance for use in their different projects. The Norwegian Government Agency for Development Abroad (NORAD) also contributes a significant part of Alliance funds. Members are then obligated to account for the use of the allocated funds. More than ninety percent (90%) of CAMRODD's funding came from NORAD.

NFU is a national advocacy organization in Norway, which promotes inclusion of people with developmental disabilities and emphasizes the responsibility of the society to care for them. This theme extends to its international work and NFU will only form partnerships with organizations, which are primarily concerned with persons with developmental disabilities. NFU provides support to democratic, member-based parents' organizations.

Program Officers, Board Members and resource persons who are parent members, work with organizations in different parts of the world, and make site visits during which they meet with personnel in partnering organizations. They also assist when requested with development interventions by facilitating workshops or locating resource personnel. The organization employs a development cooperation strategy as it responds to organizations requesting funding.

Caribbean Association for Mobilizing Resources and Opportunities for Persons with Developmental Disabilities (CAMRODD)

This organization was launched in Jamaica in 1970 with eight parent groups from different islands under the name Caribbean Association for Mental Retardation ⁽¹⁾. The two initial concerns were the lack of services and the absence of groups advocating for children with developmental disabilities ⁽¹⁵⁾. The organization focused on strengthening and educating parents and the formation of parent groups. In the first 20 years this was done through biennial conferences, the aim of which was to stimulate thought and make participants more aware of the services which should be provided for the disabled population.

In 1992, CAMRODD composed its blueprint, which was revised in 2000 for presentation at their 30th anniversary conference. The document entitled *New directions for the 21st century* outlined its dream that “every individual with a disability takes his/her rightful place in the society of his/her respective country; that every individual with a disability be treated with dignity and equality and be given the opportunity to develop self respect” ⁽⁷⁾. The philosophy of the organization was also outlined in the blueprint and it stated:

All persons with disabilities should be recognized as citizens and accorded all rights extended to citizens. People must have equal opportunity to participate in the social and economic life of the community. They must have access to support and resources to enable them to participate. The goal of this process is to create a warm, loving environment within their homes and communities

In 2006, the CAMRODD network comprises 22 member countries and CAMRODD’s dream is still the main goal of the organization. The present administrative structure includes persons performing the role of:

- President
- Vice President
- Secretary/Treasurer
- Assistant Secretary/Treasurer
- Board members (5)
- Advisors (6)

Within this structure there are nine persons who are eligible to vote during any Board meeting. The advisors do not have voting rights at the Board meetings, but they provide expertise because of their involvement in the disability movement and in some instances also provide historical relevance for decision making. At the General Assembly which is held every two years, each country representative, has voting privileges, which include the appointment of Board Members. The members of the CAMRODD board are all volunteers. There is no salaried position, however, NFU provided some contribution as partial funding for wages for the Secretary and Coordinator within the CAMRODD Secretariat.

CAMRODD’s work continues through the strengthening of the regional and national networks, which includes, reviewing the work done for the help and welfare of persons

with developmental disabilities, cooperating with regional governments, collaboration with organizations of and for persons with developmental disabilities and the establishment of parent associations where they do not exist ⁽¹⁾. However, the overall goal of the organization ⁽¹⁵⁾ remains the improvement of the current situations of persons with developmental disabilities.

Recommendations - 1999 evaluation of the NFU – CAMRODD partnership ⁽³⁾

1. In the future, it is important that CAMRODD obtain funding from other resources as well, particularly in order to get a more independent position.
2. The consultants would recommend prolonged support from NFU until more diversified funding be secured.
3. CAMRODD should work out plans for more diversified funding for its core activities.
4. In some Caribbean countries where service development is relatively advanced, and the thrust for advocacy has started, both partners could possibly profit from exchange of experiences on more equal terms. Here, one of the Caribbean parent organizations could cooperate with NFU not only in the role of sponsor, but also as a parent organization with long experience in advocacy work from another part of the world. From both parts, plans could have been worked out for a more systematic project of institutional learning on both sides.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Development cooperation strategy

One perspective of development describes a process by which institutions within a society can address its challenges to benefit the members of its population. NFU employs a development cooperation strategy in its funding initiatives. The organization assists fundees like CAMRODD to implement development activities, which benefit persons with developmental disabilities in its member countries. One method of measuring the impact of development activities would be the examination of changes in behaviour of participants and communities and the persons with whom they interact.

In the case of the NFU - CAMRODD cooperation, the development activities were supposed to strengthen the advocacy skills within the member countries of CAMRODD. The NFU - CAMRODD cooperation was terminated on December 31, 2005, two years earlier than the planned end of December 2007. NFU cited administrative and communication challenges as the catalysts for the decision to conclude the partnership with CAMRODD.

A common theme among the respondents was inadequate communication between CAMRODD and the NFU as well as within the CAMRODD network. The extents to which these communication barriers existed and impacted upon the NFU – CAMRODD partnership were examined during the evaluation process. The evaluation team was

also guided by a common finding in partnerships in that, “a lack of motivation or the ability to absorb and communicate knowledge as well as the dynamics of power, opportunism, suspicion, and the difference in information sharing strategies can hinder the processes, which allow organizations to learn from each other”⁽⁴⁾.

Principles of effective partnerships

During the conduct of this evaluation, the team sought to discover what persons associated with the two organizations understood about the parameters of the partnership and the roles and responsibilities of each organization.

Some of the accepted principles of effective partnerships^(2, 5, 9) include:

- Establishing clear goals for the partnership
- Regular measurement of progress
- Including key stakeholders from the initial stages
- Recruiting ‘champions’ to make the initiatives from the partnership visible to the public
- Establishing clear governance structures that define roles and responsibilities of each partner
- Establishing ground rules that guide the work of the partnership especially with regard to a communication protocol
- Adapting the goals or initiatives to changing conditions and resources, which include changes in personnel or the location of administrative facilities
- Drawing on the strengths and contributions of each partner for mutual benefit
- Developing strategies to maintain momentum and to sustain the work of the partnership over time

There are two factors⁽⁹⁾ which can also undermine the effectiveness of partnerships. Firstly, when one is a good partner, this can invite exploitation by other partners who may attempt to maximize their individual appropriation of the mutual gains, and undermine and minimize the collective knowledge development within the strategic alliance. Secondly, when the partners are not highly receptive to information sharing and transparency of processes, then the collaboration would be compromised.

As the evaluation team sought to understand this partnership, they were guided by the Terms of Reference⁽¹³⁾, the NFU agreement with CAMRODD 2002 - 2004 and the theoretical framework of partnerships.

Overview of the role of the responsibility of non-profit Boards

In a nonprofit corporation, the Board reports to stakeholders, particularly the clientele which the nonprofit organization serves. It provides continuity for the organization representing, the organization's point of view through interpretation of its products and services, and advocacy for them⁽¹⁶⁾. There are some accepted responsibilities of Boards which are applicable in the context of the NFU-CAMRODD agreement. They include:

- Determining the organization's mission which each individual board member should fully understand and support
- Selecting an executive after reaching consensus about the roles and responsibilities of each member
- Periodically evaluating the performance of the Executive
- Engaging in organizational planning
- Engaging in fundraising and managing the organization's resources effectively with outlined procedures for accountability
- Monitoring the organization's programs and services
- Enhancing the organization's public image
- Outlining procedures for conflict resolution

Some of the factors which can affect the roles and responsibilities of Boards ⁽¹²⁾ include the extent to which the:

- organization depends upon board members for delivery of programs;
- focus of the organization is on fund-raising versus direct service;
- level of risk involved in service, and the degree of vulnerability of the clientele;
- stability of income and the ways it is generated;
- stability of the social, political, and economic environment in which the organization operates;
- extent to which the organization is subject to external oversight;
- skills of the Executive Director and other Board members;
- the diversity of the community from which members are drawn and the clientele served

The evaluation team recognized that a critical factor that would serve to contextualize the findings of this report resided in the respondents' ability to describe the role of the CAMRODD Board and its responsibility in upholding the agreement with NFU.

THE NFU-CAMRODD AGREEMENT 2003-2004

At this point of the report the evaluation team found it important to include some of the critical aspects of the NFU-CAMRODD agreement for the period 2003 – 2004, the full text of which is included as Appendix A.

Overall aims of the partnership

- To help secure and safe-guard the rights of people with developmental disabilities in the Caribbean in line with UN Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities and the CAMRODD Blueprint.
- To contribute to the development of CAMRODD into a powerful, democratic, membership-based, advocacy organization / network of and for people with developmental disabilities in the Caribbean.

Obligation of NFU

- NFU's primary role will be advisory, consultative and supportive.
- Funding -
 - NFU shall provide funding of the activities as described in Annex 1 (Appendix B - Proposed Action Plan of CAMRODD 2002 - 2004) of this agreement as specified in the document "Guidelines for Funding and Financial Management of NFU Partnership Programmes". All funding (from NFU) is subject to annual approval and disbursement by NORAD and the Atlas Alliance.
 - NFU shall transfer funds on a quarterly basis to CAMRODD according to the budget agreed for the contract period
 - Funds shall be transferred in US dollars to a bank account opened by CAMRODD specifically and solely for funds from NFU. A satisfactory quarterly financial report is a pre-requisite for the transfer of the grant for the next quarter.
- Support training and technical assistance
 - NFU shall maintain an active interest in developments within CAMRODD and give feedback on reports and other documents sent to NFU
 - NFU shall make itself available as a sounding board and conversation partner for CAMRODD and offer advice to contribute to CAMRODD's development as an advocacy network.
 - NFU shall aim to visit CAMRODD twice a year to follow up progress, participate in strategic discussions and reviews, provide training, and participate in other relevant activities. Visits shall be planned and organized together with CAMRODD.
 - NFU shall assist CAMRODD with the setting up and maintenance of information and financial management systems and administrative systems.
- Information
 - NFU shall immediately inform CAMRODD of any developments related to NFU or the ATLAS Alliance affecting the cooperation

Obligation of CAMRODD

- CAMRODD shall be responsible for the implementation of the document attached as Annex 1 (Appendix B) and the financial management of the funds.
- CAMRODD should ensure that the financial management is in line with the conditions for financing specified in the document "Guidelines for Funding and Financial Management of NFU Partnership Programmes". These guidelines shall be considered an integral part of this agreement.
- Funding provided by NFU shall be used solely for the purposes outlined in the document attached as Annex 1 (Appendix B).
- Reports
 - CAMRODD shall submit quarterly reports to NFU in April, July and October of each year. Quarterly reports shall contain a narrative and financial section.

- A full annual report covering the whole of the year and audited annual financial statements shall be submitted to NFU by March 01, of the following year. Accounts shall be audited in line with “Guidelines for Funding and Financial Management of NFU Partnership Programmes”.
- NFU shall retain the right to carry out / appoint its own audit of the partner organization’s account if deemed necessary.

EVALUATION APPROACH

Objectives of the evaluation (TOR)

4. To review CAMRODD’s work as a regional network to assess its impact on persons and families with developmental disabilities.
5. To assess the impact of the SCcOPE program in the different countries in which it has been implemented for organizations of CAMRODD and persons with developmental disabilities.
6. To review NFU’s contribution to CAMRODD’s development as a network

Data Collection

The team employed qualitative methodology in this evaluation. Our data collection strategies included site visits, conducting individual interviews as well as focus groups, and the review of documents. The evaluation team conducted face to face interviews in most instances. Respondents from Antigua, Suriname, Jamaica, Barbados, St Lucia, St Vincent, Trinidad and Tobago, and Guyana were included as well as the NFU personnel who were interviewed via telephone. The countries were chosen based on the Terms of Reference of the evaluation as requested by CAMRODD and NFU. The list of interviewees is attached as Appendix C. The validity of our qualitative findings is based on triangulation of the data ⁽⁶⁾.

Opportunities

- Computer technology allowed for easy access, transfer and storage of documents from the NFU.
- NFU programme officer Bettina Thorvik made the necessary contacts, which allowed for the telephone interviews of the NFU personnel.
- The personal relationship between CAMRODD representatives and Ministers of Government allowed the evaluation team to interact directly with government officials who could be policy ‘champions’ for the disability movement in their country and by extension the region.

Limitations

- Because CAMRODD consists of many member countries in which there are several disability organizations, it was difficult to trace whether changes were due to CAMRODD’s efforts or to parallel initiatives emanating from other organizations.
- It was difficult to gain access to the SCcOPE participants, because some had moved out of the region and or had changes in addresses or contact information.

The absence of local coordinators or coaches to interact with and support the participants after their training also contributed to this challenge. Record keeping at the country level also left much to be desired.

- Because CAMRODD's work is voluntary in nature, it was, in some instances, difficult to gain access to individuals via email or the telephone. This also affected the team's ability to gather adequate data to understand the capacity for advocacy of the member organizations of CAMRODD.
- Access to CAMRODD'S records was a challenge as those records that still exist are stored in the VPSI's office building in Suriname. At the time of the evaluator's visit in September 2006, the former Administrative Assistant within the CAMRODD Secretariat indicated a willingness to work part time to secure and arrange CAMRODD's files for transfer to the new location in Barbados. This information was passed on to the new CAMRODD President because of the importance of preserving historical data.
- During the course of the evaluation a request was made of the President and past Board members for a copy of the SCcOPE curriculum or training material. The past President and Secretary Treasurer / CAMRODD coordinator had indicated that the material was housed on a compact disc in Suriname. We were unable to obtain the training material, but we were given a copy of the participants' manual by the NFU Programme Officer, Bettina Thorvik.
- Country reports to CAMRODD were not acquired so it was difficult for the team to triangulate the data gathered from interviews. On the whole, documented evidence at the national level was not readily available.
- There were some challenges with the travel arrangements with regard to the itinerary of the persons who needed to be interviewed. This resulted in the evaluator having to visit some countries more than once and in some instances still conduct follow-up telephone interviews. This increased the operating costs and impacted on the projected timeline.

Findings

For each of the evaluation objectives, specific issues were identified in the Terms of Reference for examination by the team. Though the team had many pieces of information, our findings as stated were the result of triangulation from at least three sources.

Objective 1 – Review of CAMRODD's work as a regional network to assess its impact on persons and families with developmental disabilities

Political, legal and institutional issues in the Caribbean (selected islands) to which people with developmental disabilities have had to respond since 1998.

- The main challenge for persons with developmental disabilities in the region, as for persons with other disabilities, has been inclusion. A comprehensive inclusion strategy as suggested by Disabled Persons Organizations of the Caribbean (DPOC) would comprise at the very least the inclusion of children with disabilities into regular schools, widespread accessibility of public and other buildings to

persons with physical disabilities, voice activated computer programmes in libraries to accommodate those who are blind or visually impaired, sign language training for public service personnel like the police and health workers.

- The individual Caribbean countries in this sample are at different stages of development within the context of the definition of developing countries and their governments have had to manage their limited resources to meet the needs of all of their citizens. There is the recognition that persons with developmental disabilities are entitled to the rights, which extend to every other citizen, and there is a movement by governments in the selected countries to begin catering to their specific needs as part of their social development program. “Through their inclusion of Article XIV *Rights of Disabled Persons* in the CARICOM Charter of Civil Society, Caribbean States have already affirmed their commitment for equity for persons with disabilities in their societies” (DPOC, 38).
- The CAMRODD blueprint was always referred to by respondents involved in the disability movement and the policies coming out of the countries in the sample indicated that they were in alignment with CAMRODD’s vision.
 - In Trinidad and Tobago, members of the Consortium for the Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities of which there is at least one CAMRODD member, have collaborated with government officials to develop a White Paper to inform the inclusion process of children with developmental disabilities into regular classrooms.
 - The government’s policy in St. Vincent is inclusion for every group. In 2005, the government made provisions for a student confined to a wheelchair who had been successful in the secondary entrance examination to attend secondary school by making the accessibility adjustments to the school compound. The supporting Bill, for inclusion for every group, was enacted on November 20, 2006.
 - In Guyana, The National Commission on Disability has been appointed by and is accountable to the President of Guyana. The main function of the group is to act as a directing and coordinating body on national disability issues to ensure that persons with disabilities enjoy quality of life.
 - In St. Lucia, there is no definite policy for the wellbeing of people with developmental disabilities. However, in the document *The St. Lucia Human Rights Practices 1993*, there was the indication that awareness of the circumstances of the disabled had risen, though there was no specific legislation protecting the rights of persons with disabilities. At that time in 1993, the National Council for the Disabled in St. Lucia (a member of DPOC) was advocating for the development of a Bill, which would increase the educational opportunities and access to public facilities for disabled people. However, no update about the Bill was available. The St. Lucia National Council of and for Persons with Disabilities, Inc., is also completing a policy document on behalf of persons with disabilities. The organization of which the CAMRODD Board member from St Lucia is a member, is part of this Council. In 2005, a conference on inclusive education was conducted by the World Bank for representatives of government and non-governmental organizations in St. Lucia. Following

the Inclusive Education Conference, World Bank representatives conducted a workshop called “Alliances for Inclusive Developmental” which also covered international and local funding possibilities.

- In 2005, Jamaica, St Kitts, St. Lucia and Suriname were selected as countries for inclusive education case studies by the World Bank in conjunction with CAMRODD.

Impact of the recommendations given in the 1999 evaluation

- With regard to the first recommendation about funding, the past CAMRODD President and Coordinator both indicated that they had made a few unsuccessful attempts to source additional funding with requests to UNICEF and UNDP. Their perception was that it was difficult to get funding for an umbrella organization as funders were more interested in funding country organizations. Other Board members claimed a lack of knowledge, or vague recollection, of any of the recommendations of the 1999 evaluation. The records indicated that NFU remains the only source of external funding for CAMRODD.
- The second recommendation of the consultants was for prolonged support from NFU until more diversified funding could be secured by CAMRODD. There was an agreement for a continuation of the partnership until December 2007 ⁽¹³⁾. However, CAMRODD did not fulfill their reporting obligations, as stated in the agreement so as to facilitate NFU’s reporting to the Atlas Alliance and NORAD. In 2003, NFU in good faith still sent the allocations while awaiting reports, however in 2005, funds were withheld until reports were received. Money was borrowed from the VPSI (Association of Private and Social Organizations), CAMRODD’s member organization in Suriname to conduct CAMRODD’s business. CAMRODD’s lack of adherence to the reporting requirements of the agreement eventually led to NFU’s termination of the partnership.
- In reference, to the third recommendation about an exchange of experiences between the two partners
 - NFU expressed interest in using the SCcOPE programme in Norway and with some of its international partners but evidence indicated that this remained at the level of a philosophical discussion
 - During their follow-up visits to the Caribbean, NFU’s Programme Officers made presentations on advocacy and related topics, however respondents, from both NFU and CAMRODD, confirmed that no serious effort was made to benefit “from the exchange of experiences on more equal terms”⁽³⁾.

The coexistence of service providers and advocacy organizations/parent organizations in the workplace and in the same network

- What the team found were service providers who were encouraging parents in an informal way to include their children in public activities. The advocacy groups which were formed were of a voluntary nature and comprised mainly parents and interested persons but these groups focused on sharing experiences and supporting members, not influencing policy. All of the advocacy groups were external to the service providers.

- In two of the selected countries, parents of children with developmental disabilities described the great difficulty they experienced accessing the grants offered by their governments. They were challenged by the government personnel staffing the delivery units to prove their worthiness or eligibility. Respondents spoke of encouraging parents to take their children with them as they applied for the different grants. This highlighted the need to educate personnel, within the public service, who are performing bureaucratic tasks intended to service the disabled population.

The capacity of CAMRODD's member organizations to perform the role of advocates for persons with developmental disabilities in their respective countries

This was very challenging to assess. The members of CAMRODD who were interviewed spoke of encouraging parents to organize themselves but there was little evidence of concrete steps taken to form parent groups. Respondents also spoke of the activities in which their organizations were involved as they engaged in systems (legislation, policy) advocacy. However these discussions took place without documented evidence and the time limitation impacted on the team's ability to gather adequate data about the advocacy capacity of the member organizations of CAMRODD. For each of the member organizations it would have been helpful if we could have acquired information about:

- the mission of the organizations
- the 'champions' locally, regionally and internationally, who have helped to project and promote the work of the organization
- the organization's history with advocacy activities
- projected plans for advocacy by the organization
- Respondents spoke about their attempts to promote parent advocacy.
 - In St. Vincent a new parent group has been formed and training has been conducted for them by the Vice President of CAMRODD.
 - In St. Lucia, participants responded with zeal to the SCcOPE training and completed their community service projects. There was no networking after the training. However, the participants were affiliated with service providers either as teachers or parents.
- With regard to citizen or community advocacy, in most countries different groups of the disabled population are represented by as many organizations. This was evidence of the increasing number of persons who are aware of the importance of responding to the needs of persons with developmental disabilities. Though there are many different groups there was little evidence of combined initiatives. Many groups were not member organizations of CAMRODD.

Changes in the quality of life of persons with developmental disabilities and their families because of the different programs being carried out by CAMRODD.

- It was difficult to assess the impact of the work of any one organization on the quality of life of people with developmental disabilities. This evaluation team recognized that CAMRODD has directly and indirectly impacted on the lives of people with developmental disabilities through its training programmes. The leadership and coping skills training has stimulated action among the participants and parents and this training has in turn been passed on by the participants. The basic result is a changing attitude towards persons with developmental disabilities and subsequent improvement in relationships with them even within the family. However, it was difficult to make direct links to CAMRODD.

The organizational structure of the network:

- Roles and responsibilities within the organization
 - CAMRODD's by-laws list the duty of the President and the Secretary-Treasurer as "In the absence of the President the first Vice- President will carry out the duties of the president and in the absence of the first two the second Vice-President will carry out the duties of the President". There is no description of the duties or responsibilities of other elected Board members. In the absence of such information we asked past and present Board members to explain the role of the Board and each of the elected officers and members. The respondents viewed the CAMRODD Board meetings as an opportunity to discuss the issues being faced by the disabled population within the region, however they could not define the role of any other member but the President. There was no evidence of the procedure by which responsibilities were allocated among the Board members.
- Communication within the network: secretariat and members, network and board, and communication among members
 - This was a major challenge for the CAMRODD organization. Respondents discussed how they were affected by the lack of, or inadequate communication within the network for the period under review. This resulted in Board members feeling slighted and marginalized, and discontent was evident though for differing reasons. On the one hand, the past CAMRODD President and Secretariat, believed that communication was a two-way process and that they waited in vain for feedback on proposed plans, reports and acknowledgments of the receipt of communication. On the other hand members of the Board believed that information was not transmitted in a timely fashion and relevant information pertaining to the operations of CAMRODD was not shared.
 - Board members also claimed to have no knowledge of the NFU - CAMRODD communication challenges with respect to lateness of reports and its threat to the continuance of the partnership, even though NFU recommended that this topic be discussed at the Board meeting in St.

- Lucia, in October 2004. Some members even claimed to have no knowledge of the terms of the NFU – CAMRODD agreement.
- The past President and Secretary / Treasurer Coordinator, indicated to this evaluation team that they did not place a high priority on submitting reports to NFU as they were more interested in directing their focus on other activities of CAMRODD.
 - Board members believed that the past Coordinator was an NFU employee and referred to him as the NFU Coordinator. They claimed not to have been involved in the selection process or decision to recruit the past Coordinator.
 - The past President and Coordinator had not shared CAMRODD's reports to NFU, reports from NFU's visits and the budget with CAMRODD's board. There was also no documented evidence of Board members requesting this information.
 - There were communication challenges because some members did not have access to email and documents had to be transmitted via fax in these instances. This method would have been inefficient when there were documents with many pages.
 - There was very little evidence that Board members requested updates when there were lapses in communication from the Secretariat. There was evidence that documents and requests for further information and feedback on plans by the Secretariat were sent to Board members. However subsequent to NFU's announcement of the withdrawal from the partnership, the new President of CAMRODD, requested financial information from the Secretariat.
 - There was also evidence that the member countries did not submit their country reports on time and in most instances no written reports were submitted for the period under review.

Use of different human resources in CAMRODD member organizations for the different programs

- While some board members and advisors were involved in creating the broad three year objectives there was no evidence that the general membership was involved in providing input or feedback on the plans. There was also no evidence to suggest that the Board members participated in the budgeting activities of CAMRODD for the period under review.
- The viewpoint of some Board members was that the work and representation of CAMRODD revolved around the past President and the Secretary – Treasurer/ Coordinator and in the absence of communication they trusted these officers to conduct the business of CAMRODD.
- There was evidence to show that the Vice President
 - attended the First American Forum on Poverty and Disability in Managua in 2004 with the past President and Secretary – Treasurer / Coordinator
 - Made a presentation at the Inclusive Education Conference in St. Lucia
- At the CAMRODD board meeting in Barbados in 2002 there was documented evidence of an attempt to allocate tasks for the upcoming General Assembly and

Board meeting, but there were no follow-up reports on the success of that approach.

- All of SCcOPE training was conducted by the past President, Secretary Treasurer/Coordinator and Dennis Rust who came out of Suriname. There was evidence that there were other trained SCcOPE tutors within CAMRODD. In the case of Guyana, the evaluation team learned that there were trained SCcOPE tutors who had indicated to the Secretariat their interest and availability to participate as tutors in the Guyana programme. They were used instead to coordinate the logistics such as venue, lodging and meals, and sourcing participants for the programme.
- In 2005, the first Caribbean Conference on inclusive Education was held in St. Lucia where the CAMRODD country representative coordinated the activities such as arranging accommodation, venues for the different sessions and meals for participants.
- Also in 2005, CAMRODD representatives participated in a workshop conducted by the World Bank called “Alliances for Inclusive Development”, which also included the topics of international and local funding possibilities. There was no evidence to indicate that any of the participants engaged in writing proposals seeking funding on behalf of CAMRODD after that training.

Strengthening the network and communication between the different member countries through CAMRODD's programmes

- The biennial conference in 2002, provided information, and training on disability issues, made participants more aware of the rights of persons with disabilities and provided opportunities for networking among member countries. The extent to which the networking continues could not be measured as this was affected by the communication challenges within the organization.
- The leadership programmes, which were conducted prior to 2003 were designed to provide participants with knowledge and skills to become more assertive and have an informed perspective of persons with developmental disabilities.
- The job placement programme in Trinidad and Tobago from June 5-9th, 2000 was designed to assist participants with tasks such as resume writing and presenting oneself for integration into the world of work
- A course on the empowerment for self advocates was held in Aruba Sept 21-24th, 2000. It aimed to teach participants how to communicate more effectively.
- Courses for parents were conducted in Trinidad and Tobago, Dominica and Suriname and were designed to teach parents coping skills in order to care for their children with developmental disabilities.
- A workshop for fathers was held in Curacao and Suriname to encourage fathers to be more involved in caring for their children and advocating for their rights.
- In 2002, a workshop on organizational development was conducted in Barbados to strengthen, build capacity, and develop member organizations in CAMRODD.
- The Inclusion conference in Curacao in May 2003 and the Inclusive Education conference in St. Lucia in 2005 have also contributed to strengthening the national and Caribbean networks.

Objective 2 - Assess the impact of the SCcOPE program in the different countries in which it was implemented for member organizations of CAMRODD and persons with developmental disabilities.

The SCcOPE training was conducted at different sites. These included:

- Antigua – June 17-24th, 2000 and January 5-9th, 2001
- Aruba – August 14-18th, 2000
- Trinidad and Tobago - March and November 2003
- St Lucia – April 2004 and October 2004
- Guyana – November 2004 and June 2005

Content and methods used in the program

- In the absence of the teaching manual and curriculum documents, the team used the participants' manual and interviews with participants to gather information about the SCcOPE programme. The aim of the programme was to strengthen member organizations and foster leaders who would advocate on behalf of persons with developmental disabilities in their respective countries. The curriculum included three modules:
 - Human rights approach to disability
 - Shifting models of practice
 - Community development projects
- The training was intended to heighten participants' awareness of the rights of persons with developmental disabilities and also their enthusiasm to work on behalf of people with developmental disabilities. The course provided a setting for parents and professionals to meet and discuss openly their own situations and perspectives. The projects were individual projects, which in most cases were successfully completed and assisted in the development of leadership skills of participants.
- While the programme was also intended to create networks among the participants, those interviewed indicated that for various reasons such as, lack of follow-up and support from CAMRODD, lack of support from their individual institutions, personal training needs, and lack of financial resources they were unable to keep the momentum and truly engage in advocacy.
- The University of Guyana had indicated its interest in endorsing the SCcOPE programme and had discussions with President and Secretary/Coordinator of CAMRODD in this regard.

The impact of SCcOPE for persons with developmental disabilities in the countries in which it was conducted

- The individual projects were varied in theme and content and encompassed a wide range of activities in which persons with developmental disabilities could be included. Participants worked enthusiastically to obtain favourable results in the implementation of their projects, which focused on inclusion and integration into

the wider society. For varying reasons the projects were not sustained and only short term results could be described. However, the projects in which persons with disabilities interacted with persons from the wider society had the impact of positively changing those persons' perspectives and attitudes towards persons with disabilities.

- Another indirect benefit from the programme was that the participants, on returning to their workplace, were able to share information on the rights of persons with developmental disabilities. Respondents indicated that their perspectives on and attitudes towards persons with disabilities were positively altered and they continue to share those perspectives with the persons they encounter.
- Due to a number of circumstances, the SCcOPE programme for St. Vincent was modified, shortened, and targeted towards parents. A direct result of this programme was the formation of the St. Vincent and the Grenadines Parents Support and Advocacy Group, which was formed by parents who were participants of the programme. This group has grown in membership and in November 2006, with the assistance of CAMRODD, conducted a training programme on coping skills for parents, guardians and caregivers. This programme was attended by thirty-six participants.

The value/impact of transferring SCcOPE to other organizations within the network of CAMRODD and NFU

- There was agreement among those interviewed that the SCcOPE programme was highly valued by them. It helped to provide more perspective to their work and increased their desire to work on behalf of persons with developmental disabilities in order to improve their lives. They believed that the programme was worth the time and effort spent in the development and implementation of their individual projects. However, most of the participants interviewed expressed the desire for more support especially from their tutors during the project stage of the programme and after the final SCcOPE session, when they reported on their projects. That kind of support would have assisted greatly in facilitating the continuity and sustainability of the projects. For those interviewed CAMRODD's involvement in the SCcOPE programme ended with the project reports and presentations.
- The evaluation team was unable to link the SCcOPE participants with member organizations in CAMRODD. They were either involved in service delivery or related to persons with developmental disabilities. Active membership in one or more of the organizations in CAMRODD's network would have helped to strengthen its capacity and broaden the sphere of influence of the SCcOPE programme.

Recommendations for strengthening the impact of SCcOPE on the living conditions for persons with developmental disabilities

- CAMRODD can seek alliances with tertiary institutions such as the University of the West Indies, the University of Guyana, Teachers' Colleges and Nursing Schools to have the content of the SCcOPE modules integrated as a compulsory component in health and human service programmes.
- In order to truly include persons with developmental disabilities and increase their access to public services, CAMRODD can work with governments to have basic training for public servants, using aspects of the SCcOPE curriculum, to improve their service delivery to the disabled community.
- If CAMRODD chooses to continue the SCcOPE programme, local mentors/coaches should be engaged to work closely with the tutors to assist the participants to choose projects that are relevant and can have direct impact on the circumstances of persons with developmental disabilities in that country. These coaches would assist with maintaining the longevity of the projects after the SCcOPE training is completed.
- A modified SCcOPE programme can be introduced in technical vocational training to educate those professionals who will actively engage in providing housing for the community, which will include the developmentally disabled. Training can also be provided to the institutions to promote the creation of an enabling environment for inclusion of trainees with developmental disabilities.
- There should be greater involvement of parents and persons with disabilities as participants in the programme. With the move toward inclusion among regional governments, CAMRODD's work should focus on getting parents and persons with disabilities to understand their rights and exercise those rights.

Objective 3 - Review NFU's contribution to CAMRODD's development as a network.

Activities in CAMRODD since the establishment of the partnership with NFU in 2000

The leadership of CAMRODD changed in 2000 from Aminta Sprockel of Curacao to Marja Themen-Sliggers of Suriname. Aminta Sprockel then assumed the role of Coordinator operating out of Curacao, while the President operated out of Suriname.

From 2000 to 2003, CAMRODD provided various training programmes for its members with the assistance of NFU's funding. These included the SCcOPE programme, training in leadership, early detection and early stimulation among others. These training programmes helped increase awareness as well as provide some practical tools and skills to participants. Countries were assisted by CAMRODD with an allotment of \$1000.00 US dollars and tutors to assist with the training programs. NFU was the sole

funder for CAMRODD and during this period NFU received all their reports and budget proposals from CAMRODD in a timely manner. Financial reports were accompanied by an auditor's report.

In 2003, the CAMRODD Secretariat relocated to Suriname and within the NFU a new Programme Officer was assigned to CAMRODD. A new Coordinator was also appointed and operated out of the new Secretariat in Suriname. It is at this point that the administrative and communication challenges with NFU began. The new partnership agreement between CAMRODD and NFU 2003-2004 also stipulated that NFU would only fund the SCcOPE programme and coordination activities related to SCcOPE, so this changed the main focus of CAMRODD's work. SCcOPE was expected to strengthen the capacity of member country organizations and in turn CAMRODD's network. As a result the beneficiary training group of CAMRODD's programmes diminished.

General Assemblies were still held in 2003 and 2005. At the general assembly of 2005 the membership of CAMRODD learned of NFU's decision to withdraw from the partnership. Members of CAMRODD's Board expressed how surprised they were by the announcement while NFU's representatives were very also surprised to learn that CAMRODD's Board members were unaware of the administrative and communication challenges between the two organizations. Even more disturbing was the intense reaction from new attendees to the assembly who were openly accusatory to different degrees of CAMRODD's leadership and NFU's agenda, it was described as a baptism of fire by more than one respondent. In interviews with members of the Board, total blame for the dissolution of the partnership was laid at the feet of the past President and Secretary – Treasurer / Coordinator. The evaluation team remained unclear about the member countries that were present at the 2005 general assembly and the reconvened meeting of 2006.

Evaluation of the Partnership

In order to objectively examine the operating context of the NFU-CAMRODD agreement the team chose to employ the principles identified in theories about effective partnerships.

1. Establish clear goals for the partnership
 - Appendix A outlined the agreement between the two parties with the expected obligatory deliverables for both CAMRODD and NFU. This was signed by the past President of CAMRODD and President of NFU. The responses of CAMRODD Board members indicated their ignorance of the conditions of the agreement. However as the group charged with overseeing the work of CAMRODD, there was no indication that they made an effort to have these elected officers provide any clarification in the absence of timely communication.
2. Regular measurement of progress

- The timely submission of reports to NFU changed with the change in venue of the Secretariat and Coordinator. Board members also spoke of late or no circulation of agendas and accompanying documents for meetings. The past President and Secretary – Treasurer Coordinator spoke of no receipt of feedback and reports from member countries. CAMRODD received regular reminders from NFU about their submission deadlines and in turn NFU's own reporting deadlines to NORAD and the Atlas Alliance. The admission by the past President and Secretary-Treasurer / Coordinator indicated disregard for and non-adherence to the reporting obligations of the partnership agreement.
3. Inclusion of key stake holders from the beginning of the partnership
 - Based on the responses from interviewees, failure to inform the member organizations of CAMRODD about the terms and conditions contained in the partnership agreement impacted negatively on the discharging of their responsibilities.
 4. The involvement of champions to make the partnership initiatives visible to the public
 - During the SCcOPE training there was media coverage which included interviews with the participants.
 - The evaluation team saw no evidence of champions who were engaged in making the partnership visible
 5. Establishing clear governance structures which define the roles and responsibilities of each partner
 - The roles and responsibilities of each partner with regard to the agreement were outlined (see Appendix A).
 - NFU provided Terms of References that outlined the objectives and obligations of its Programme Officers for each follow-up visit to CAMRODD.
 - CAMRODD's bye-laws defined the structure of CAMRODD's Executive Committee and outlined the role of the President and the Secretary-Treasurer. The role of the 1st Vice President is defined as carrying out the responsibilities of the President in his/her absence. The role of the 2nd Vice-President is to do the same in the absence of the former two individuals. There is no defined role for the ordinary elected members of the Executive Committee. However, Article IV Section 1 of the bylaws stated "there shall be only one voting delegate for each country". Examination of the present Executive Committee of CAMRODD shows that, out of a committee with nine votes, there are two persons from Barbados (President and Secretary/Treasurer) and three persons from Trinidad and Tobago (Vice President and two Board Members).
 6. Establishing ground rules that guide the work of the partnership especially with regard to a communication protocol.

- An examination of ground rules would address issues such as the convening and conducting of meetings, communication, information sharing and decision making. These ground rules should be available at all meetings so that new members are initiated correctly. These rules are also important so as not to stifle useful debate or prevent full participation by all present. The decisions taken should be clearly documented as well as the process for resolving contentious issues that may be impeding the progress of the partnership. The evaluation team encountered a major challenge in finding out and understanding CAMRODD's ground rules from past and present Board members.
 - In 2003 the past President and the NFU Programme Officer established that CAMRODD's Secretariat through the Coordinator should be the point of contact for NFU.
 - The partnership agreement called for a bank account to be opened by CAMRODD specifically and solely for funds from NFU. From 2003 there is evidence that both parties within the partnership did not adhere to this stipulation. NFU transferred the funds into an account of VPSI, CAMRODD's member organization in Suriname.
 - The prerequisite of satisfactory quarterly financial reports for the transfer of the grant for the next quarter of each year was not closely adhered to in 2003 and 2004. However, in 2005 NFU withheld transfer of funds until quarterly reports were submitted.
7. Drawing on the strengths and contributions of each partner for mutual benefit.
- During their follow-up meetings the NFU Programme Officers made presentations at SCcOPE Training and during workshops and meetings. These presentations included topics such as advocacy, lobbying, organizational development, the formation of parents groups, and information about the NFU organization and its work in advocacy. There was some discussion on extending the SCcOPE programme to NFU and some of its partners.
8. Developing strategies to maintain momentum and to sustain the work of the partnership over time.
- The NFU Programme Officer, as well as a NFU Board member, met with CAMRODD's Board in St. Lucia in 2004 to develop an outline of the objectives for the period 2005-2007.
 - CAMRODD participated in the Inter Americana Conference on Inclusive Development and the Panamanian Conference on Inclusive Development in September 2004 in preparation for the world meeting in Mexico in 2006.
 - CAMRODD participated in Social Forum on Poverty in Quito, Ecuador in 2004.
 - CAMRODD became a full member of Inclusive Inter Americana in 2004.
 - CAMRODD participated in the Inter Americana Forum on Poverty and Disability in Nicaragua in 2004.

- In 2005 CAMRODD members attended training on seeking funding locally and internationally.

Assess the impact of NFU's added value to the development of CAMRODD

- NFU made training presentations during their visits to CAMRODD's member countries.
- NFU invited CAMRODD's President and Coordinator, and Board Member from Jamaica to attend their General Assembly in Norway as observers.
- NFU recommended CAMRODD for membership in Inclusion International

Objective 4 - Assess CAMRODD's organizational viability and financial sustainability as an advocacy network for persons with developmental disabilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are designed to respond to the challenges identified by those interviewed and based on the conclusions drawn by the evaluation team.

FOR CAMRODD

- Review the bylaws to respond to the needs of its member organizations in 2007 and beyond by
 - Defining the roles and responsibilities of Board Members
 - Having a term limit in office for elected officers
 - Defining the roles and responsibilities of country member representatives
 - Defining processes for operations (e.g. Communication protocol, decision making, conflict resolution, accountability checks and balances)
- While the CAMRODD Blueprint is an excellent dream, the evaluation team found it to be too broad and general in nature. CAMRODD should develop a strategic plan (short, medium and long term goals) in pursuit of this dream and in turn develop tactical plans which may be bi-annual to deploy the strategy.
- Consider the use of technology to improve communications within CAMRODD like teleconferencing and internet chat rooms.
- Because of the potential of associating with CARICOM and the goals of the Caribbean Single Market and Economy (CSME), CAMRODD should consider developing projects that include all country members and these should be coordinated to have the impact of mass, timing, and scale within the different countries.
- CAMRODD should seek to recruit champions to promote its cause.
- CAMRODD should seek to partner with the many other organizations, in the Caribbean, working for the rights of persons with disabilities, for instance the Caribbean Chapter of Disabled International, to capitalize on the synergy and potential benefits of critical mass and coordinated effort.

- CAMRODD should seek to develop its capacity for report writing, proposal writing and project management.
- Consider seeking funding for individual projects and embark on a sustainability drive by ensuring delivery of the project objectives.
- Consider including persons with developmental disabilities as active members of CAMRODD.
- Pay special attention to the terms and conditions when arranging future partnership agreements and uphold CAMRODD's responsibilities contained therein.

FOR NFU

- Adhere to the terms and conditions contained within the partnership agreements and ensure that partners are clear on the objectives of the partnership.
- Leverage NFU's experience and organizational capability to assist with the development of the partner organizations. Consider a more active approach during the formative part of the partnership, starting with coaching then moving to a consultative role, especially when assisting partners to develop capacity and systems to deliver on the objectives of the partnership.
- Utilize processes to triangulate, or cross reference, reports from corporation partners.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

There was great potential for the growth of the CAMRODD network through its partnership with NFU and through its programmes, which were designed to empower participants and improve the circumstances of people with developmental disabilities. However, there were challenges mainly because of the voluntary nature of service given by Board members, a factor which was identified in the 1999 evaluation.

Two keys to successful boards are first getting the best people as members and then making sure that there is clarity about the purpose of the Board and the responsibilities of officers in the organization. The challenge of achieving a balance between income generating work and voluntary service can encourage members to "rubber stamp" the activities of the leaders. Board members must be actively involved in the work of the network and be accountable for their deliverables each time the Board meets. CAMRODD has a history of success and can use the findings from this evaluation to refocus the organization in terms of its mission, vision, values, roles and responsibilities, as it forms new partnerships and continues its work on behalf of persons with developmental disabilities.

NFU also has a history of success in working for the rights of persons with developmental disabilities. When forming future partnerships NFU should consider leveraging its experience and expertise to assist its partners with their organizational development especially in the formative stages of new associations. While the terms and conditions in the written agreement may be explicit, ensuring that both partners

clearly understand their obligations and monitoring for compliance with the terms of the agreement can pave the way for more successful cooperation.

The 'partnership' paradigm is affected when changes in project management formats and guidelines are decided by the funding agency and not monitored sufficiently at the locality. This monitoring would give program officers a better idea of the challenges of terrain and technology especially as communication is a key factor in a partnership arrangement. Time to monitor administrative tasks must be built into partnership agreements so that both sides are aware of the importance of accountability and transparency of transactions.

During the period under review there were many challenges with the NFU-CAMRODD partnership. However, this evaluation team believes that the partnership has contributed to the changing perceptions and attitudes of governments and society within the Caribbean. Through their many programmes the partnership has helped to promote the rights of persons with developmental disabilities and can claim ownership to some of the influencers for the changes in attitudes and future benefits that persons with developmental disabilities receive from regional governments and the society at large.

REFERENCES

1. CAMRODD a look in the past for a better future. *Eye on CAMRODD*, 1(1), 2004. CAMRODD Secretariat: Suriname
2. Guiding principles for partnerships for sustainable development ('type 2 outcomes') to be elaborated by interested parties in the context of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (2002). Available online: http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/partnerships/guiding_principles7june2002.pdf
3. Hertzberg, A. & Stadwijk-Kappel, N. (1999). A network for advocacy? Evaluation of CAMRODD and the NFU co-operation.
4. Larsson, R., Bengtsson, L., Henriksson K. & Sparks, J. (1998). The interorganizational learning dilemma: Collective knowledge development in strategic alliances. *Organization Science*, Vol. 9, No. 3, Special Issue: Managing Partnerships and Strategic Alliances (May - Jun., 1998), pp. 285-305.
5. Levy Epstein, J., Sanders, M., Simon, B., Salinas, K., Rodriguez Janson, N. & Van Voorhis, F. (2002). School, family and community partnerships: Your handbook for action, 2nd edition. Corwin Press, Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, California, USA.
6. Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Applied Social Research Methods Series: Vol. 41. Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
7. *New directions for the 21st century*, 2nd edition. CAMRODD's Blueprint, April 2000.
8. NFU – We are here for you, a publication of the Norwegian Association for Persons with Developmental Disabilities
9. Reegle, G., Blue-Banny, M., Frankland, H., Lord Nelson, L. & Summers, J.A.(2004). Dimensions of family and professional partnerships: Constructive guidelines for collaboration. *Exceptional Children*, 70.
10. St. Lucia human rights practices, 1993, January 31, 1994. U.S. Department of State. Available online: http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/erc/democracy/1993_hrp_report/93hrp_report_ara/Stlucia.html
11. Strategy for NFU's work for international solidarity: 2006 and beyond. Available online at <http://www.nfunorge.org/files/1048/Fil/10291/NFU113-06engstrategiforinternasjonal.doc>
12. Ten Basic Responsibilities of Nonprofit Boards (1988). National Center for Nonprofit Boards: Washington, DC, USA.
13. Terms of reference for an external evaluation of the development cooperation

between CAMRODD and NFU, September 2006

14. *The Caribbean Disability Scene*, 1(1), June 2002, a publication of the Disabled Organizations of the Caribbean. The Herald Ltd: Kingston, Jamaica.
15. Thorburn, M. J. (2003). Towards a shared responsibility approach: Reshaping roles and responsibilities. Prepared for discussion at a conference on disabilities a copy was given to the evaluation team.
16. What exactly is the Board's job? Nathan Garber, Editor-in-Chief, Nonprofit Boards and Governance Review. Available online at <http://garberconsulting.com>