2021

SCIAF STRATEGIC AIMS 2016–2020

EVALUATION REPORT

DR LIZ STONES

Executive summary

This report evaluates and documents SCIAF's performance against the principal aims and key indicators of the 2016 - 2020 Strategic plan, identifying and discussing significant successes and failures to achieve objectives. It further builds recommendations to support improved performance and performance monitoring in the future.

The findings and analysis presented in this report are supported by two aligned and interrelated reports: the Innovation Report and the Partnerships Report. The Innovation Report identifies and summarises key innovations in projects and ways of working, and particularly those with relevance for the new strategic period. The Partnerships Report comprises an assessment of the quality and outcomes of partnerships with overseas partners across the 2016 - 2020 strategic cycle.

The methods of this evaluation comprised a thorough review of relevant documents and data combined with in-depth interviews with staff, a partner survey and interviews, and participant observation of SCIAF strategic reflection sessions. The matrix below summarises the methods used to interrogate each of the four aims, elaborated in the following sub-sections. Note that Aims 3 and 4 are addressed in depth in the separate Partnership and Innovation Reports.

During the 2016 - 2020 strategic cycle, SCIAF has made great progress enhancing the quality of work through strengthened and focused partnerships, internal structuring and enhanced accountability and learning processes. During this period, SCIAF has supported over 1.5 million direct beneficiaries and over 6 million indirect beneficiaries across the 14 intervention countries, engaged with schools and parishes across Scotland, advocated for climate justice and fair and just economic models, and supported partners to build their capacities and processes.

Internally, SCIAF has undergone massive transformations across the strategic period; restructuring departments and roles, welcoming new staff members into new and existing roles, responding to massive external changes and challenges across the sector, moving to new premises and shifting to new ways of working in response to the global pandemic.

The 2016 - 2020 strategic cycle has achieved improvement in the quality of interventions and actions overseas and in Scotland, supported by enhanced MEL tools and processes. Although the planned *standard indicator* measuring participant satisfaction was implemented inconsistently, SCIAF has achieved significant progress in improving the quality of systems and processes, and supported partners to do the same. SCIAF has strengthened inward and outward accountability and enhanced programme quality, achieving impressive outcomes across the projects and intervention countries despite the global Covid-19 pandemic. External evaluations of IF grants were excellent throughout the strategic period, donors, sister agencies and partners consistently report excellent feedback on the quality of SCIAF's work, and IF targets were significantly exceeded.

SCIAF's approach to partnership has proven successful and sustainable, supporting national capacity building and spill-over effects in target counties and providing meaningful and appropriate accompaniment to partners. Internal procedures have been strengthened within SCIAF, and strategically cascaded to partner organisations; supporting them to better serve their communities and also to cascade these benefits onwards to other national organisations.

Furthermore, the SCIAF team have achieved these outcomes in the context of the biggest global emergency of the century, and under unprecedented conditions of physical and emotional hardship under nationwide lockdowns.

Overall, the strategic MEL Framework reflects SCIAF's sincere commitment to monitor, assess and learn over the past strategic period, and to support organisational progress towards the strategic aims. Furthermore, the framework contributed to the enhanced alignment of strategic priorities and vision across the organisation. SCIAF has largely succeeded in capturing relevant outcome and impact level data aligned with the strategic aims, despite some challenges in indicator definitions and inconsistent monitoring. Furthermore, SCIAF has achieved many excellent additional strategic outcomes which are not reflected in the framework, particularly for partners. Significantly, these include the extensive and robust professionalization of partner strategies, processes and practices and the amplification of partner voices through the development of the partner advocacy strategy.

Although strategic indicators were articulated against the strategic aims, in some cases the indicator definitions were poorly formulated and targets lacked specificity. For example, the scale indicators and targets were conceptually disconnected from the programme selection and design criteria: SCIAF does not prioritise programmes which target the highest number of beneficiaries, but rather on the quality of outcomes. Furthermore, although the satisfaction indicator was not consistently utilised, other tools facilitated the collection and analysis of data demonstrating the quality of outcomes.

Challenges are identified with indicators, some of which lack clarity in their formulation and definition. Others were over-ambitious, in some cases unachievable, and some were not supported by strategic actions or planning. In other cases, indicators were not aligned with the existing systems and metrics; creating measurement deficits. This report also identified an imbalance between departments' representation across the Framework; PED   was under-represented and IHDD was over-represented, while CS' indicators were largely operational rather than strategic.

The 2016 - 2020 framework reflected the learning of the previous iteration, and internal assessments illuminated valuable insights and lessons contributing to improvements which were then integrated into the 2021-2025 framework. Specifically, the new framework embraces improved organisational balance, representation and voice, is more closely linked to quarterly and annual indicators and MEL systems and reflects SCIAF's learning with a focus on objectives and the flexibility to achieve them. SCIAF has also enhanced the organisational focus looking to the future, both thematically and geographically, targeting resource deployment to maximise the value and scale of impact.

This strategic evaluation process has illuminated both operational and strategic recommendations to support SCIAF to better capture and reflect on organisational outcomes and achievements and to continue to build on these into the future. These include refining MEL and reporting systems and enhancing their adaptability and distribution across the organisation, maximising staff and volunteer resources, building in periods of strategic reflection, disseminating knowledge and lessons across horizontal networks, and frequent horizon-scanning to identify and respond to emerging challenges and opportunities.

Acknowledgements

Heartfelt thanks to the SCIAF staff, board and overseas partners for their dedicated support and timely engagement throughout this strategic evaluation process, and for living their commitment to a just and peaceful world. Special thanks to Mark Adams and the Working Group – Rhiannon Campbell, Anne Karlin and Michelle Nixon –for their support, preparation of documents and data, and efficient and proactive coordination throughout this evaluation. Thanks also to the Reference Group for providing meaningful and thought-provoking strategic oversight and direction.

This evaluation would not have been possible without the support of interviewees from CS, PED and IHDD who gave their time and insights. Last but by no means least, thanks to SCIAF's dedicated and committed overseas partners for their enthusiastic and active participation in this process.

The opinions expressed in this report are the author's own.

Acronyms

BHR	Business and Human Rights
CAFOD	Catholic Agency for Overseas Development
CHS	Core Humanitarian Standards
CI	Caritas Internationalis
CIDSE	Coopération Internationale pour le Développement et la Solidarité
CIMS	Caritas Internationalis Management Standards
CLPL	Career-long Professional Learning
COMED	Communications Outreach Media and Education Department
CS	Central Services
CSP	Country Strategy Paper
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
FCHM	Feedback and Complaints Handling Mechanisms
FE	Final Evaluation
HEF	Humanitarian Emergency Fund
HR	Human Resources
ICO	Information Commissioners Office
IF	Institutional Funding
IHD	Integral Human Development
IHDD	Integral Human Development Department
IT	Information Technology
KII	Key Informant Interview
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LFM	Logical Framework Matrix
MEAL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
MoV	Means of Verification
MSC	Most Significant Change
MSP	Member of Scottish Parliament
MTR	Mid Term Review
NIDOS	Network of International Development Organisations in Scotland
OSCR	Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator
PED	Public Engagement Department
PIMS	Programme Information and Management System
PCM	Project Cycle Management
SCCS	Stop Climate Chaos Scotland
SGBV	Sexual and Gender-Based Violence
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Timely
SMT	Senior Management Team
SNP	Scottish National Party
VfM	Value for Money

Table of Contents

Tables and Figures

1. Background and Context

Inspired by the gospel call to build a just world, SCIAF challenges injustice by strengthening poor and oppressed people and by stimulating the Scottish public to share in our common struggle for human dignity. The objectives set out in SCIAF's Memorandum of Association enable SCIAF to undertake a wide range of charitable activities which contribute to the relief of poverty; advancement of education; the relief and prevention of sickness, disease, and physical and mental disability; and the relief and assistance of people who are victims of war or natural disaster anywhere in the world.

SCIAF developed five strategic aims to guide their work during the 2016 - 2020 period. These are:

Strategic Aim 1: Peaceful and just communities - People live with dignity in strong, vibrant communities which are safe, peaceful and just, and are able to influence the decisions that affect them.

Strategic Aim 2: Sustainable livelihoods and a resilient environment for all - Men and women of all backgrounds can provide for their families and communities, now and in the future, through the sustainable use of the resources available to them.

Strategic Aim 3: Education - People have the skills and knowledge to live life to the full.

Strategic Aim 4: Emergencies - Men and women from poor and vulnerable communities survive and recover from humanitarian catastrophes and are protected throughout.

In addition, SCIAF has set out Underpinning Actions (**Strategic Aim 5**) to ensure the organisation: has a learning culture; promotes respect, equality and mutuality; delivers transparency, openness, honesty, accountability and trust; and is professional.

The aims of the 2016 - 2020 Strategic Plan align with the core values of SCIAF: Dignity and respect, empowerment, hope, solidarity, and integrity. During the 2016 - 2020 period, SCIAF also documented its aim to develop further specialism and capacity in four thematic areas; disability, sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV), sustainable agriculture, and climate change adaptation and to focus on cross-cutting themes, specifically advocacy, gender, disability, good governance and DRR and climate change across relevant programmes and projects. As well as providing practical support to overseas partners, SCIAF aims to challenge the underlying causes of poverty through education and advocacy, and aim to influence policy on issues like business ethics, human rights and climate change, and raise awareness of the need for change through work in schools and parishes in Scotland.

1.1 The strategic evaluation cycle

A preliminary audit was first conducted over the summer of 2016 to assess the strategic aims and associated monitoring systems and comprised a document review augmented by 15 individual and group interviews with the SCIAF staff. The audit revealed two core underpinning challenges, with recommendations to address these to facilitate the operationalization of the strategic plan. The audit identified a disconnection between the Strategic Plan structured by Aims, and management systems which continued to work on a departmental basis. This resulted in misunderstandings regarding department operational plans and monitoring systems and, in some cases, the emergence of parallel or informal reporting systems which impeded organisational information flows. The report also noted that the organisational MEL framework had not been consistently adopted across departments and was not consistently used to develop team and departmental goals or plans. The audit recommended the alignment of these systems to enhance clarity and alignment of strategic and operational direction within the organisation.

The Mid Term Review (MTR) was conducted in 2018 to assess progress towards the strategic aims, to reflect on reasons for the observed achievements and effectiveness, and to identify recommendations for the final period of the Strategic Plan. It also sought to identify and assess emerging trends, issues and opportunities of relevance to the new strategic plan. The methodology of the MTR comprised document review, survey, Most Significant Change (MSC) activity and interviews with staff, partners, funders, supporters, and networks. While the MTR found strong evidence that SCIAF was broadly on track towards the achievement of the strategic plan, opportunities were identified to enhance the reporting of achievements. The report also highlighted the importance of ensuring that the organisation moves forward together, acknowledging and respecting internal debates while maintaining unity of purpose.

This Final Evaluation (FE) conducted in 2021 comprises a participatory and utilisation-focused process to enhance accountability against the strategic plan for the SCIAF Board, staff members, supporters and networks. The FE was supported by a SCIAF Working Group to increase cross-organisational relationships and working, widen and deepen knowledge and ownership of the evaluation within SCIAF, increase the likelihood of learning influencing policy and practice and improve the implementation of the new Strategic Plan. The FE was also supported by the Reference Group who provided strategic oversight. SCIAF partners were active participants in the evaluation, sharing their views on the quality and the outcomes of partnerships with SCIAF.

2. Aims of the evaluation

The Final Strategic Evaluation was initially structured around four core aims, within which specific guiding questions were developed to inform the process and structure of the evaluation. In recognition of the complexity of these questions, separate but related reports were developed to address Aims 3 and 4, and accordingly this report focuses only on Aims 1 and 2.

AIM 1: **Evaluate and document SCIAF's performance against the principle aims and key indicators of the 2016 - 20 Strategic Plan.**

- To what extent has SCIAF achieved its strategic aims and objectives in 2016 - 2020?
- To what extent has the achievement of the strategic aims contributed to the broader organisational Vision?

AIM 2: Identify and document significant successes and failures to achieve objectives, identifying ways to improve performance *and performance monitoring[1]* in future.

- Where these aims and objectives were not fully achieved, what were the causes of the discrepancy?
- Were the targets and indicators appropriate and sufficient to capture the organisational achievements in this area?
- What lessons can be learned from these reflections and insights?
- What best practices should be showcased, institutionalised and embedded in policies and practices, and implemented going forwards?

AIM 3: Evaluate the quality and outcomes of our partnerships with overseas partners.

- To what extent has SCIAF empowered partners to better serve their target communities and groups?
- How has SCIAF supported the professionalization and capacity building of partners, both operationally and strategically?
- In what ways has SCIAF's approach to partnership amplified and empowered the experience and expertise of partner organisations?
- How agile, adaptable and responsive has SCIAF been to partner priorities and changing circumstances in their target communities and contexts?
- What have been the most significant outcomes and achievements of SCIAF partnerships over the period of the strategic plan?

AIM 4: Identify key innovations in projects and ways of working, and particularly those with relevance for the new strategic period.

- To what extent has SCIAF embraced innovation in projects, outreach and advocacy?
- How does SCIAF's culture embrace learning and innovation in ways of working and internal processes?

---

[1] Content in italics added to initial aim.

3. Methods

The methods of the FE comprised a thorough documentary review combined with in-depth interviews with staff, a partner survey and interviews, and participant observation of SCIAF strategic reflection sessions. The matrix below summarises the methods used to interrogate each of the four aims, elaborated in the following sub-sections. Note that Aims 3 and 4 are addressed in depth in the separate Partnerships and Innovation Reports.

Table 1: FE aims and data collection matrix

No	Aim	Methods
1	Evaluate and document SCIAF's performance against the principle aims and key indicators of the 2016 - 20 Strategic Plan	• Document and data review. • Participatory reflection session. • Key informant interviews. • Triangulation of data compiled by the working group.
2	Identify and document significant successes and failures to achieve objectives, identifying ways to improve performance in future;	• Document and data review and case studies. • Assessment of MSC data presented in quarterly reports and impact reports. • Participatory reflection session. • Key informant interviews with staff.
3	Evaluate the quality and outcomes of our partnerships with overseas partners;	• Review of available partner survey data and reports. • Document review. • Key informant interviews with staff and partners. • Partner survey data.
4	Identify key innovations in projects and ways of working, and particularly those with relevance for the new strategic period.	• Document and data review and case studies. • Key informant interviews with staff. • Assessment of MSC data presented in quarterly reports and impact reports. • Partner survey data.

3.1 Document review

A thorough review of relevant documents, reports, strategies, procedures and data was undertaken at the start of the evaluation period, with additional resources reviewed on a rolling basis throughout the evaluation.

The SCIAF Evaluation Working Group also provided a detailed report of achievements against each of these targets. These data were augmented, triangulated, interrogated and validated throughout this evaluation through the analysis of relevant documents, interview data and team reflection sessions. The findings are presented for each of the aims and the supporting strategies sequentially in a table format, with broader observations, best practices and lessons learned discussed in the next section of this report.

3.2 Key informant interviews

Key informant interviews were facilitated with selected members of SCIAF staff and partner organisations. The interviews were semi-structured using individual interview guides prepared in

advance, and structured around the guiding aims of the evaluation and informed by the document review.

As it was not possible to interview all relevant stakeholders given the parameters of this assignment, the interview data was augmented by interviews conducted during the MTR in 2018 with supporters, donors and networks.

3.3   Participatory reflection sessions

The participatory reflection sessions were facilitated to ensure that the SCIAF teams were empowered to engage in the strategic evaluation process, and to reflect on how their team performed against the strategy. Participants share their experiences, achievements, challenges and insights. The key questions guiding these reflection sessions are:

1. What are we proud of across the last strategic cycle?
2. What areas of improvement can we identify for the next strategic cycle?
3. Are there any gaps in our performance reporting; missing data, unclear processes, revised plans or targets?

These sessions aimed to give opportunities to discuss and reflect on the last strategic cycle both within departments as across the organisation; share achievements and identify lessons for the future. This augments the consolidated data provided by the Working Group and the individual contributions of interviewed staff members; amplified the voices of the SCIAF team and providing new, shared insights. This process also contributed the added value of enhancing ownership of the strategic review and the new strategy going forwards. Finally, this provided the opportunity to assess the degree to which the various teams shared the vision and goals outlined in the strategy, and the extent to which their achievements and outcomes aligned with the existing indicators and targets, or indeed surpassed them.

3.4   Partner survey

A structured partner survey was developed to capture key elements of partner relationships, with a focus on quality and outcomes. All ongoing SCIAF partners were invited to share their experiences and insights by email, with the opportunity to follow up with a one-to-one interview on request. The survey guide was designed to interrogate aim 3: "Evaluate the quality and outcomes of our partnerships with overseas partners", and also to reflect on innovations to shed light on aim 4: "Identify key innovations in projects and ways of working, and particularly those with relevance for the new strategic period". Key topics included capacity building and support with strategy, procedures, professionalization; mutuality, empowerment and decolonisation; outcomes and achievements; innovation, agility and adaptability.

The survey was designed to be light-touch and minimise the burden on respondents while also gathering meaningful and relevant insights to inform this evaluation. It was shared in a simple email format to increase engagement and minimise survey fatigue and potential conflict with internal partner surveys, and responses are reported anonymously.

Twenty-four partners responded to the survey and one partner requested a remote interview via Zoom, providing detailed responses of between two and ten pages.

4. Findings

4.1 Overview

The 2016 - 2020 Strategic Aims were accompanied by a detailed MEL Framework, connecting strategic and operational measures and targets across the organisation. This was the second strategic MEL framework ever developed or implemented by SCIAF and was a significant strategic achievement despite some challenges and limitations. The first aim of this evaluation, and its foundation, is the assessment of, and reflections on, SCIAF's performance against the principle aims and key indicators of the 2016 - 2020 Strategic Plan:

Table 2: SCIAF Strategic Aims 2016 - 2020

Strategic Aim 1	Peaceful and just communities	People live with dignity in strong, vibrant communities which are safe, peaceful and just, and are able to influence the decisions that affect them.
Strategic Aim 2	Sustainable livelihoods and a resilient environment for all	Men and women of all backgrounds can provide for their families and communities, now and in the future, through the sustainable use of the resources available to them.
Strategic Aim 3	Education	People have the skills and knowledge to live life to the full.
Strategic Aim 4	Emergencies	Men and women from poor and vulnerable communities survive and recover from humanitarian catastrophes and are protected throughout.
Strategic Aim 5	Supporting Strategies	Learning Culture; Respect, Equality and Mutuality; Transparency, Openness, Honesty, Accountability and Trust; Professionalism.

During the 2016 - 2020 strategic cycle, SCIAF has supported over 1.5 million direct beneficiaries and over 6 million indirect beneficiaries across the 14 intervention countries. Targets were established across strategic aims, but their definitions were poorly formulated and the strategic indicators did not always capture a truly representative split of participants. Significantly, the scale indicators and targets were conceptually disconnected from the programme selection and design criteria: SCIAF does not prioritise programmes that target the highest number of beneficiaries.

The table below presents the breakdown of beneficiaries by gender across the strategic aims.

Table 3: Total number of projects and beneficiaries (m/f), by strategic aim

		Direct beneficiaries			Indirect beneficiaries		
	Projects	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
Aim 1: Peaceful and Just Communities	88	65,581	56,707	**122,288**	1,351,083	1,478,142	**2,829,225**
Aim 2 Sustainable Livelihoods	145	394,391	377,747	**772,138**	1,140,879	957,904	**2,099,507**
Aim 3 Education	39	51,795	53,786	**105,581**	54,524	52,643	**107,167**
Aim 4 Emergencies	133	252,629	267,687	**520,316**	544,369	453,882	**998,249**
Total	**405**	764,396	755,927	**1,520,323**	3,090,855	2,942,571	**6,034,148**

SCIAF established the *standard indicator* to monitor the quality of interventions. This was designed to measure participant satisfaction across all interventions and establish participants' voice at the heart of SCIAF's MEL framework, supported by data gathered using standardised satisfaction surveys. The standard indicator was piloted in 2017 but was inconsistently monitored across the last

strategic cycle. Accordingly, these data do not provide a comprehensive overview of project and programme quality across the strategic aims.

Despite this, strong and credible evidence, both from internal assessments and from external reviews, indicates that SCIAF has implemented high-quality projects and programmes, achieved significant progress in improving the quality of systems and processes, and supported partners to enhance their accountability and compliance. It is noteworthy that these scores are somewhat taken for granted within the organisation. For example, they were not highlighted as a significant achievement by the IHDD team during the reflection session, although CS expressed pride at these *"very high scores from external experts on the quality of project and programme delivery"*.

SCIAF continued to implement robust project monitoring and developed the Scorecard tool (discussed subsequently, and in the Innovation Report) which captured excellent outcomes across the projects, which met their objectives even during the global Covid-19.

External evaluations of IF grants were also awarded A and A+ throughout the strategic period. The Project Cycle Management (PCM) manual was also developed to enhance and ensure effective quality control. Donors, sister agencies and partners consistently report excellent feedback on the quality of SCIAF's work, which is further evidenced by the over-achievement of the IF targets during the strategic period. For Humanitarian Emergency Fund (HEF) projects, SCIAF are consistently awarded the highest or second-highest project ratings through competitive peer review processes. The quality of SCIAF's projects and programmes is excellent. Looking to the future, there is potential for using the findings of these evaluations to assess thematic or programmatic lessons and best practices.

Some SCIAF staff suggest that overarching global indicators under each thematic area may not reflect the complexity and diversity of SCIAF's work, and may even be fundamentally incompatible with the organisational commitment to the partnership principles, localisation and partner-led projects. For others, the constraints were largely technical; some indicators were insufficiently detailed and clear in their formulation and definition, over-ambitions, and not aligned with the existing systems and metrics. There is no doubt that these issues introduced challenges in monitoring, measurement and reporting. In some cases, indicators were operational rather than strategic, and there was an imbalance between departments' representation across the Framework. Specifically, Public Engagement (PED - COMED at the time of formulation) was under-represented and IHDD was over-represented, while CS' indicators were largely operational.

Overall, the strategic MEL Framework was a powerful tool to monitor, assess and learn about organisational progress towards the strategic aims which contributed to the enhanced alignment of strategic priorities and vision across the organisation. SCIAF has succeeded in capturing relevant outcome and impact level data aligned with the strategic aims, although many excellent achievements are not reflected in the framework. The framework was a considerable improvement on the previous iteration and design and illuminated valuable insights and lessons contributing to improvements in the 2021-2025 framework. Specifically, the new framework embraces improved organisational balance, representation and voice, and is more closely linked to quarterly and annual indicators and MEL systems.

4.2 Strategic Aim 1: Peaceful and just communities

To contribute to the achievement of Strategic Aim 1, SCIAF supported projects focused on the three principal elements of Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV), peace-building and conflict resolution and land rights and governance. Table 4 provides a summary of achievements against the targets of Aim 1.

Table 4: Summary of progress against Strategic Aim 1

People live with dignity in strong, vibrant communities which are safe, peaceful and just, and are able to influence the decisions that affect them.			
1.1 People affected by SGBV are protected, have their immediate needs met and are able to rebuild their lives and exercise their rights fully in society.	11,000 survivors assisted with holistic approach.	**Target significantly exceeded*** 67,825 (56% female) survivors directly assisted. 591,048 (36% female) participants indirectly assisted. 34 projects supported Aim 1. *Data refers to all participants of SGBV interventions.	
	At least 75% survivors report satisfaction with quality of services provided.	**Target exceeded but inconsistently monitored.** 93% report satisfaction* *Based on data from one SGBV project.	
	Survivors assisted by projects and key informants report policy makers and state officials increasingly prevent and punish SGBV and provide greater assistance to survivors.	**No data.** Multi-part indicator, no measurement plan in place.	
1.2 People in communities live peacefully with one another and are able to reconcile their differences between themselves and others.	36,000 women and men are assisted to resolve conflicts and build conflict resolution mechanisms.	**Target significantly exceeded.** 50,310 participants (50% female) directly assisted. 867,573 participants (50% female) indirectly assisted.	
	At least 75% beneficiaries report satisfaction with quality of services provided.	**No data.**	
1.3 People living in poverty and marginalisation actively participate in public life and influence the decisions that affect their lives.	66,000 men and women have secured usage of their land and territories.	**Target not met** (and over-ambitious). 9,017 participants (57% female) directly assisted. 1,380,345 participants (52% female) indirectly assisted.	
	At least 75% beneficiaries report satisfaction with quality of services provided.	**No data.**	

4.2.1 Sexual and Gender-Based Violence

The SGBV workstream included three targets. These focus on 1) scale and 2) quality of interventions, and 3) the outcomes for wider legal and policy mechanisms preventing and punishing SGBV and supporting survivors.

SCIAF supported high numbers of participants under the SGBV objective of Aim 1, significantly exceeding the target numbers and indirectly supporting over half a million people across a range of projects, partners and intervention countries.

However, there are some measurement issues within these data. For example, for the target "*11,000 survivors assisted with holistic approach*", the reported data includes all individuals who participated in programmes and projects classified under this aim; including SGBV survivors but also wider communities in which SGBV remains prevalent. This doesn't undermine the achievement, but it suggests that either a) the phrasing of the target would benefit from refinement or, b) the MEL participant data would benefit from further disaggregation to differentiate this target group.

To assess the quality of outcomes, strategic indicators refer to the beneficiary satisfaction scores, with global targets of 75% self-reported satisfaction with the quality of services. Unfortunately, these were inconsistently monitored, both under Aim 1 and across the other strategic aims.

For SGBV, only three projects (less than 1% of the projects classified under this Aim) used the standard indicator. The available data (based on only one project) reveals 93% participant satisfaction. Although the satisfaction score data are inconsistent, other sources of data provide strong and credible evidence of high project and programme quality. These include excellent external evaluations, which consistently SCIAF rank projects in the top two categories (A and A+).

The third SGBV objective under Aim 1 was also challenging; "*participants report that duty bearers a) prevent and b) punish SGBV, and c) assist survivors*". This is a complex, ambitious and three-part target with inherent measurement issues. It also seems that no measurement plan was in place to comprehensively monitor these outcomes. While case studies are available to support these outcomes under specific projects, these are distributed across projects and intervention countries and are not systematically used as evidence in support of the strategic organisational achievements against this objective.

4.2.2 Communities live peacefully

The scale targets for conflict-resolution were also exceeded under the first Strategic Aim, but similar measurement issues remain. The recorded numbers reflect all individuals supported by projects and programme categories under this aim, and do not align with the specific formulation of the indicator. Under this objective, the standard indicator (satisfaction levels) was not used.

4.2.3 Active participation in public life

The third scale-related target, "*66,000 men and women have secured usage of their land and territories*" was highly ambitious given the layers of dependencies in securing land rights across different legal and political landscapes, and the long-term nature of these outcomes. However, considerable advocacy work has been completed with excellent outcomes achieved on land rights and governance issues. Furthermore, extensive support has been provided to partners to build and

develop national advocacy strategies (discussed under Supporting Strategies and in the associated Innovation Report). While advocacy outcomes were not clearly reflected across the Strategic Aims, nor monitored effectively against these indicators, the evidence base strongly supports positive outcomes for supporting partners to assist their communities in securing use of their land.

It is noteworthy that these strategic objectives e.g. securing usage of their land and territories focused on direct and indirect beneficiary outcomes, and this necessarily excludes/limits monitoring of broader shifts in the legal and political frameworks and processes that support the achievement of these rights. Looking to the future, monitoring community- or systems-level change would better reflect the breadth of achievements of the organisation in supporting peaceful and just communities, securing rights and supporting participation in public life. In practice, the evidence collated in quarterly reporting and other internal documents suggests that these kinds of broader outcomes are likely to have been achieved, or at least that SCIAF has made valuable and significant contributions to their achievement.

4.3 Strategic Aim 2: Sustainable livelihoods and a resilient environment for all

Under the second strategic aim, the indicators and targets focused on sustainable agriculture, climate justice and fair and just economic models; lives and livelihoods outcomes. Table 5 provides a summary of achievements against the targets of Aim 2. As with Strategic Aim 1, some of the targets were ambitious, aligned MEL tools were missing and reporting was inconsistent.

Table 5: Summary of progress against Strategic Aim 2

Men and women of all backgrounds can provide for their families and communities, now and in the future, through the sustainable use of the resources available to them.			
2.1 People living in poverty develop environmentally sustainable and climate resilient livelihoods.	1,150,000 men, women and children have significantly and sustainably increased their incomes, food security and assets.	**Target not met.** 772,138 participants (51% female) directly assisted. 2,099,507 Participants (54% female) indirectly assisted. 145 Projects supported Aim 2.	
	1,000,000 women and men using more environmentally sustainable livelihoods strategies.	**Target not met.** 763,196 participants (51% female) directly assisted. 2,076,607 participants (54% female) indirectly assisted.	
	At least 75% beneficiaries who report satisfaction with quality of services provided.	**Target exceeded but inconsistently monitored.** 70-100% report satisfaction* *11 projects used the standard indicator.	
2.2 People champion action for climate justice and make lifestyle and purchasing choices that strengthen the livelihoods of the people we work with.	A visible commitment by international leaders to achieve climate justice.	**Target achieved** (see detail below).	
	A visible commitment by individuals in the Catholic community in Scotland to lifestyles that support living simply.	**No data.** Not measured but campaign actions indicate high levels of support.	
	Evidence of SCIAF or partners making a demonstrable contribution to positive change in targeted policy areas.	**Target achieved.**	
	SCIAF reduces carbon footprint over lifetime of strategic plan.	**Target achieved.**	
2.3 People champion fair and just economic models that enable everyone to pursue sustainable livelihoods of their choosing.	Catholic community in Scotland more aware of CST on fair and just economic models.	**No data.** No measurement plan in place.	
	Evidence of action by the Catholic community in support of fair and just economic models.	**No data.** No measurement plan in place.	
	Evidence of SCIAF or partners making a demonstrable contribution to positive change in targeted policy areas.	**No data.** No measurement plan in place.	

4.3.1 Environmentally sustainable and climate resilient livelihoods

The first target under Aim 1, "*1,150,000 men, women and children have significantly and sustainably increased their incomes, food security and assets,"* was used to measure the number of participants supported by projects categorised under this aim. It combines both scale and quality components, is highly complex, and includes an undefined value assessment (what constitutes *significant and sustainable* increase?) as well as combining three distinct outcomes (increase in *income, food security* and *assets*). The second target also focused on scale; "*1,000,000 women and men using more environmentally sustainable livelihoods strategies*". The target numbers were ambitious and were not met over the strategic cycle. In part, this is due to strategic decision-making to focus on the quality and depth of engagement to support relevant, effective interventions contributing to meaningful and sustainable outcomes; rather than prioritising high participant numbers. Nevertheless, the internal evidence base in combination with the evaluation assessment provides strong evidence for positive and sustainable outcomes for this target group overall, with further evidence of the diffusion of these outcomes across intervention countries (e.g. the Agro-Ecology Toolkit developed in Nicaragua was later translated into Khmer by a SCIAF partner organisation, and is now used to support farmers in Cambodia). These spill-over and cascade effects were not effectively captured or monitored, and therefore it is likely that the secondary beneficiaries are not comprehensively recorded.

As with Aim 1, the satisfaction targets (75% self-report satisfaction with the quality of services) were significantly exceeded but inconsistently monitored. The data collected against these indicators reveal high levels of participant satisfaction and is supplemented by excellent programme feedback and external evaluations which consistently rank projects in the top two categories (A and A+).

4.3.2 Action for climate justice and lifestyle choices

Under the climate justice targets, the definitions are problematic (e.g. what constitutes, "*a visible commitment*"?), the measurement of outcomes is unclear, some targets lack specificity and the data does not feed into the strategic monitoring tools efficiently. Despite this, significant achievements have been made towards climate justice; within Scotland, internationally, and through partner-led advocacy actions.

The target of *visible commitments by international leaders to achieve climate justice* is problematic as SCIAF's northern advocacy work is focused primarily on decision-makers in Scotland. In Scotland, SCIAF's achievements have been impressive across the last strategic cycle. Reflecting chronologically, in 2017, SCIAF achieved four 'asks' of the Climate Campaign: 1) Scottish Government set the ambitious target to phase out new fossil fuel cars by 2032 (8 years earlier than the UK Government's target); 2) Scottish Government committed to establish a Just Transition Commission to move towards a more resource-efficient and sustainable economic model; 3) Scottish Government committed to doubling annual investment in active travel, and; 4) Fracking was effectively banned in Scotland. In 2018, following campaigns, lobbying and events at Scottish Parliament, MSPs actively adopt SCIAF's language in internal debates and motions. The Labour Party also adopted SCIAF's calls for targets in the Climate Bill. In 2019, SCIAF played a significant role in influencing the content of the Climate Bill, including; 1) Net zero emissions reduction target for 2045 and 75% by 2030 (SCIAF also advocated for this target to be increased from 70-75%) and 2) amendments requiring

consideration of the impact on developing countries during future climate target review. In 2020, SCIAF increased engagement with Westminster following the FCDO/DFID merger and responded dynamically to shifts across the sector. SCIAF also brought partner voices directly into the Scottish Government's International Development Review through online networking and engagement. Overall, SCIAF has played a critical role in shaping the debates around Climate Justice in Scotland and England, and MSPs and MPs use SCIAF's language in written and verbal inputs, express support for SCIAF's positions in parliamentary debates and Committees in Holyrood and Westminster, and commended SCIAF's work.

These achievements continue through to the next strategic cycle. In 2021, the Scottish National Party (SNP) met three of the asks in SCIAF's election manifesto, agreeing to; 1) increase the International Development Fund from £10-£15 million; 2) double the Climate Justice Fund to £24 million over four years, and; 3) bring forward a Wellbeing and Sustainable Development (Scotland) Bill during the next Parliament.

Over the strategic period, SCIAF was also active in ongoing discussions about the effective use of development aid, at theUK level and in Scotland. During a meeting with Scottish Parliament's Committee on External Relations, one stakeholder commented:

> *"SCIAF's work shows the very best practice in how funding can be used because the outcomes are not just for one country, but can be repeated in others. With those outcomes, gaining future funding becomes a much more likely prospect."*

SCIAF's advocacy outcomes have been impressive over the past strategic period. It is advisable to ensure that these outcomes are celebrated and showcased internally and externally, including through partner networks and on SCIAF's online platforms. These achievements should also be strategically communicated to supporters, particularly young people, as direct evidence of the effectiveness and value of their time and effort in supporting SCIAF's Scotland-facing work, as well as the work of overseas partners.

The aim "*visible commitment by individuals in the Catholic community in Scotland to lifestyles that support living simply*" was not supported by a monitoring strategy or aligned tools. Accordingly, no data are available to support the achievement of this outcome.

The third target under this objective, "*evidence of SCIAF or partners making a demonstrable contribution to positive change in targeted policy areas*," is sufficiently vague to constitute almost anything done by SCIAF or any partner, across any targeted policy area. Evidence of SCIAF's contributions have been summarised under the previous points, but the organisation has also made significant and sustainable achievements in supporting partners to enhance their advocacy actions, which provides strong evidence of SCIAF supporting partners to make a demonstrable contribution to positive change in their priority policy areas.

Following a comprehensive mapping and workshop in 2017, SCIAF developed a partner advocacy manual and training strategy which was piloted in 2018. SCIAF delivered training in 2018 and piloted the manual in 2019 in Uganda and Zambia, revising it in 2019 and 2020 in response to emerging insights to enhance the empowerment of partners. These achievements laid robust foundations for further positive outcomes into 2021; e.g. SCIAF partner Caritas Lugazi secured an agreement from local government officials to hold regular meetings with farmers to discuss and agree on the provision of agricultural extension services. In 2020, partners developed a video to help cascade the learning around their advocacy strategy development to national organisations around the world.

Further amplifying partner voices in the global north, SCIAF has facilitated meetings between representatives of partner organisations and the Cabinet Secretary for the Environment, and MSPs at the Scottish Parliament (in person and via video link) to discuss Scotland's Climate Bill. SCIAF also set into motion opportunities for partners to share their first-hand experiences of the impact of climate change in Zambia and Malawi at COP24 in Poland. In 2019, Colombian partners were supported to meet with Scottish Minister for Equalities, who later drew on their experiences disseminating these more widely to colleagues in Parliament. The outcomes of the River Guardians are also an outstanding achievement of the past strategic cycle, discussed in depth in the Innovation Report.

Internally, the target of reducing SCIAF's carbon footprint over the strategic cycle has been met, and the Environment Group had achieved impressive outcomes, although specific targets and metrics are absent. The positive outcomes have resulted from a series of intentional decisions and actions by SCIAF. SCIAF's move from the Park Circus premises to new, energy-efficient offices in central Glasgow has resulted in increased environmental efficiency; with 100% renewable electricity (and no natural gas) consumption and increased access by public transport. According to a previous internal assessment, these previously accounted for 6% of SCIAFs carbon footprint. These outcomes have also been supported by the travel restrictions associated with the Covid-19 pandemic. The vast majority of SCIAF's carbon footprint results from flights (according to a previous assessment, around 92%), and these have been significant curtailed since 2020. Remote partner support, project monitoring, and engagement in overseas conferences and network events have proven efficient, cost-effective and environmentally responsible. The shift to home-based working has also resulted in dramatic reductions in printed materials, and staff reflect that this has demonstrated inefficiencies in the previous approaches to printed materials. Lessons learned during this period should inform future planning, as travel restrictions ease and staff return to the office. It is worth noting that SCIAF has the potential to cascade and champion these good environmental practices to sister agencies and wider networks, to showcases these examples of living the values of Catholic Social Teaching (CST) and commitments to environmental protection, with Value for Money (VfM) implications also. For example, the biggest budget item of the CI Finance Committee (pre-pandemic) was travel to attend committee meetings.

4.3.3 People champion fair and just economic models

SCIAF's work on Business and Human Rights (BHR) and an International Treaty on BHR was reflected under these objectives, although these intentionally strategically deprioritised to ensure the Climate Justice and Southern-Based Advocacy elements were comprehensively resourced throughout the last strategic cycle. There is also been considerable churn in key staff working towards these outcomes and the targets under this objective lacked ownership, measurement tools and strategies and accordingly, data are limited. However, in 2019 SCIAF joined the UK Binding Treaty Group for civil society, signed CORE's statement on UK mandatory human rights due diligence, and the global statement on the protection of human rights defenders. SCIAF also co-organised a training event on the Binding Treaty held in Glasgow in June 2019, attended by representatives of the Scottish Government, and ensured that Scottish voices were included in the UK debate on the UN Binding Treaty. In 2020, SCIAF co-organised a meeting of the Scottish Parliament's Cross-Party Groups (CPG) on International Development with the topic of Business and Human Rights; presenting the work of the organisation and amplifying SCIAF's voice through the input of Fr. Chiti. As a result, Lewis Macdonald MSP (the Chair of the CPG) agreed to table a motion in the Scottish Parliament supporting the UN Binding Treaty on Business and Human Rights.

4.4 Strategic Aim 3: Education

Under the third strategic aim, the indicators and targets focused on education projects, education outreach, and commitment to values; with a dual focus on outcomes overseas and within Scotland. Table 6 provides a summary of achievements against the targets of Aim 3.

Table 6: Summary of progress against Strategic Aim 3

People have the skills and knowledge to live life to the full.		
3.1 People overseas who are excluded from mainstream education participate and benefit from informal, formal and vocational education	87,000 individuals successfully complete the educational course studied (enrol, attend and pass the school year or vocational / informal course);	**Target not met.** 25,382 participants (50% female) directly assisted. 48,622 participants (54% female) indirectly assisted. 38 Projects supported Aim 3
	Increase % in target group (marginalised groups e.g. refugees, orphaned and vulnerable children, disabled people) enrolled and successfully pass course.	**Target achieved.** Internal review suggests target achieved, but MEL tools were absent.
	More than 75% beneficiaries, parents, teachers and community leaders who report satisfaction with quality of services provided;	**No data.**
3.2 People have an increased awareness of the global issues affecting poverty and are inspired to take action.	Catholic community in Scotland more aware of the causes of global poverty.	**Not monitored.** SCIAF's work has expanded significantly through increased online engagement and downloadable materials, but data not captured to measure scale.
	Increased engagement in Scotland's parishes and schools.	**No data.** Anecdotally increased through online engagement.
3.3 The Catholic community demonstrates stronger recognition and support for SCIAF and our work.	90% parishes and 60% secondary schools actively support SCIAF's work	**Target not met and not realistic.** 62% parishes active. 42% schools active.

4.4.1 Overseas education outcomes

The first overseas education target focuses on scale and was not met over the past strategic cycle, although over 25,000 people were directly assisted through the 38 SCIAF projects supporting Aim 3. Moreover, many of SCIAF's education projects supported outcomes beyond 'enrolment, attendance and graduation' of educational courses, and wider achievements should also be showcased. For example, many were oriented to wider livelihoods outcomes including income generation, employment and self-employment outcomes identified through partner-led needs assessment processes. It is therefore likely that SCIAF effectively supported projects classified under the Education strategic aim which achieved significant successes in livelihoods outcomes that were not captured under this strategic aim. Other significant and sustainable educational outcomes were achieved during the strategic cycle, such as supporting local educational institutions to align their curriculum with national educational priorities, but were not comprehensively monitored.

The engagement of marginalised targets groups cannot be measured robustly as these data were not systematically captured within the MEL system and datasets. Anecdotally, staff report increased enrolment and completion of marginalised groups including refugees, orphaned and vulnerable children, and disabled people. While precise numbers are unavailable during the 2016 - 2020 strategic period, this has been addressed going forward with the PIMs database system capturing more fine-grained data about project participants. Furthermore, in recognition of the dearth of disability data, SCIAF has also created an integration tool to capture more comprehensive demographic data going forward. Recognising this progress, during the reflection sessions the IHDD team expressed commitment to doing more to support disability inclusion and monitoring. It is also noteworthy that SCIAF has recently secured £1.7million to implement a forthcoming project supporting children with disabilities in South Sudan, and effective disability MEL tools developed under this programme could be effectively utilised more broadly across SCIAF projects and programmes.

As before, limited data are available on participant satisfaction or overseas projects. However, the excellent programme feedback and external evaluations are indicative of high-quality programming across SCIAF's education projects. It is also important to acknowledge that this Aim was downgraded in 2019 and internal report from 2020 onwards is merged with *Strategic Aim 2: Sustainable livelihoods and a resilient environment for all*. This shift is formalised in the new strategy.

4.4.2 Development education in Scotland

Examining the second objective of Aim 3, the PED have broadly achieved increased engagement in schools and parishes and increased awareness among the Catholic community of Scotland. While data are available on the score and scale of engagements, data on the 'awareness of the causes of global poverty' has not been captured. However, SCIAF has made excellent use of communications channels to raise awareness of the principles of the IHD model, projects, and partners, areas of intervention, outcomes and impacts; despite high churn in the PED management and team.

In 2018, SCIAF conducted a participatory internal impact evaluation (supported by Schools Focus Group made up of current/retired Head and Deputy Head Teachers and Religious Education Advisors), visiting 11 schools (7 primary and 4 secondary) across 7 diocese conducting interviews and FGDs with teachers and pupils. The evaluation aimed to help to improve visits, resources and the visibility of SCIAF in schools. Perceptions of SCIAF were positive; teachers were quoted as saying that SCIAF, "*makes real the Gospel values*", "*gives Christian witness*", "*helps to lift people in developing countries out of poverty*" and "*encourages sustainability and promotes skills… no 'quick fix' … a 'hand up', not a 'hand-out'*". Students also viewed SCIAF as helping them to put faith in action, for example, "*scripture says we should look out for one another and 'do stuff'*". While the findings fed into advocacy strategy, these sorts of impact assessment (and supporter surveys, parish interviews, etc.) are not explicitly included in the MEL strategy and do not align closely with existing MEL frameworks or indicators.

In 2019, the DevEd team were created to support the achievement of these objectives and support engage with Catholics (and others) in Scotland by amplifying the voice of the vulnerable of the world, and inspire them to support the work of SCIAF over the long term through Reflection, Action and Giving (time and money), summarized as REFLECT – ACT – GIVE. To achieve this overarching objective, the DevEd team continue to develop awareness raising materials to enhance understanding and support of SCIAF's mission, campaigns and activities, volunteering, and

opportunities to support fundraising campaigns and respond to emergencies supporting the PED vision and strategy.

Inevitably, since the outset of the pandemic and the associated restrictions on movement and assembly in the last year of the 2016 - 20 strategy, engagement with supporters, schools and parishes have been transformed. Face to face school and parish visits have necessarily been curtailed, but opportunities for digital engagement have increased and been seized across the organisation. SCIAF has increased their presence in the digital domain and developed innovative new online resources (hosted on the website, Kahoot quizzes and online Career-long Professional Learning (CLPL) zoom modules), which have been downloaded and used directly by educators in Scotland and beyond.

Critically for monitoring the scope and scale of the outcomes of these achievements, there has been limited success in capturing outcomes (including rates of use, sharing, student attendance, etc.) after the resources have been downloaded. For online events, teacher participation rates have vastly increased as virtual spaces are more accessible to busy educators than physical venues. For example, one online workshop before Lent saw attendance of over 150 teachers; an unprecedented turnout. However, it is unclear how the learning was disseminated and cascaded down to students across Scotland. Online joint assemblies were very effective at reaching large numbers of attendees; as lots of schools were able to join simultaneously. Tracking the outcomes of these online events is inherently challenging; how these teachers use the information, cascade it down to their students and communities, etc.

For schools, the indicator definitions have been challenging from the outset, and these challenges are not limited to online engagement. School visits include activities ranging from short presentations to hundreds of students during school assemblies, to full-day classroom workshops. There is a lack of clarity around these targets and which data should feed into the MEL; number of volunteer visits, or hours spent engaging? Number of schools, or number of students in attendance? Since 2018, the schools' team have been monitoring the number of teachers reached, and in principle, SCIAF's in-person educational activities have reached 200 schools. These include activities from full-day engagement to a short assembly. However, it is highly likely that outcomes are not captured comprehensively in existing MEL tools, and PED would benefit from a dedicated and embedded MEL officer.

4.4.3 Support for SCIAF in Scotland

The active engagement of schools and parishes across Scotland has fallen year on year across the strategic period. For parishes, support has fallen from 87% active parishes in 2016 to 62% in 2020. For schools, this has fallen from 78% active in 2016 to 42% in 2020.

Throughout the strategic cycle, there have been frequent and significant shifts in the PED leadership (five over the five-year period), team composition and distribution of responsibilities, which are reported to have introduced directional shifts and delays, sometimes at critical times. Changing roles and responsibilities combined with staff turnover have resulted in capacity gaps across the department. Schools and Parishes Officers were previously responsible for preparing the Development Education materials, these tasks have now been allocated to dedicated officers, putting Development Education at the heart of the Engagement Strategy. Some staff have observed a lack of clarity over roles and responsibilities for some team members. Some staff perceive a capacity gap (and strategy deficit) in managing and supporting parish and schools volunteers, which is reported to affect volunteer retention.

Further to these internal shifts, there have been significant changes in the way that SCIAF engages with schools and parishes in response to Covid-19 lockdowns and restrictions, which have introduced challenges for fundraising through these channels. Inevitably, the nationwide lockdowns have affected SCIAF's face-to-face engagement in parishes and schools since the start of the pandemic. The pandemic caused churches to close entirely, and subsequently to operate with restricted attendance numbers. These restrictions on supporter numbers were coupled with reduced opportunities to give (e.g. no longer passing the plate), and as a result, parish income has fallen. However, these numbers have seen a constant decline since the start of the strategic period. Promisingly, individual givers have increased, indicative of ongoing engagement and commitment to supporting SCIAF despite the challenges affecting supporter donations in parishes and schools. This is despite the GDPR legislation when SCIAF opted for Consent to mailings rather than using Legitimate Interest to engage with supporters. This inevitably reduced the number of registered supporters on email and telephone contact lists. The decision was reversed in 2020, and SCIAF now relies on legitimate interest for mailed contact.

Staff interviews suggest that further research is urgently needed to assess supporters' needs and priorities, particularly in parishes. This engagement should also be supported by a knowledgeable team (staff and volunteers) of practising Catholics, with relevant, up-to-date, practical experience of how Scottish Catholics practice their faith and how these practices are changing, looking to the future.

4.5 Strategic Aim 4: Emergencies

Aim 4 has one work stream, which is further broken down to facilitate meaningful tracking and scoring. Targets were not set for participant numbers, which is reasonable given the unpredictable nature of emerging crises and the difficulty in predicting the scale of emergencies over the strategic plan. Table 7 provides a summary of achievements against the targets of Aim 4.

Table 7: Summary of progress against Strategic Aim 4

Men and women from poor and vulnerable communities survive and recover from humanitarian catastrophes and are protected throughout.			
People living in poverty and vulnerability have the resources to minimise, survive and recover from the impact of emergencies.	Number of men and women assisted to survive humanitarian crises in line with international standards.	**Significant outcomes achieved.** 520,316 participants (49% female) directly assisted. 998,249 participants (55% female) indirectly assisted. 133 Projects supported Aim 4.	
	Number of women and men assisted to recover from humanitarian crises in line with international standards.	**Significant outcomes achieved.** 123,468 participants (54% female) directly assisted. 342,713 participants (43% female) indirectly assisted.	
	Number of men and women with increased preparedness and resilience to disasters.	**Significant outcomes achieved.** 396,848 Participants (48% female) directly assisted. 655,536 Participants (61% female) indirectly assisted.	
	% large scale[2] emergencies responded to.	**No target.** 73% of the projects responded to large-scale crises.	
	% small scale emergencies in programme countries responded to.	**No target.** 27% of the projects responded to large-scale crises.	
	% emergency projects meeting internal quality standards set out in the SCIAF emergency approach guidelines.	**No data.**	

During the 2016 – 2020 period, SCIAF successfully supported 133 projects across 32 countries under Aim 4. This total includes longer-term projects which started before 2016 and continued through into the strategic period. Of these projects, 73% responded to major crises, while 27% responded to minor crises. The satisfaction indicator was only used one emergency project (no data available), with all CI EAs using the CI satisfaction indicator to avoid duplication.

No data was available at the time of this evaluation to assess the percentage of emergency projects which met the SCIAF Internal Quality Standards identified in the Emergency Guidelines. The standards are aligned with international best practices with reference to Sphere, CHS and Caritas Internationalis (CI) Emergency Procedures and Toolkit, linking response and recovery with involvement in influencing and advocacy work, and it is advisable to enhance monitoring to ensure and showcase compliance with quality standards going forward.

---

[2] Emergency Appeal issued by CI, part of the Syria programme, or assisting more than 1,000 people directly. Where information was not immediately available for the number of project participants it was assumed to be less than 1,000 if it did not meet these other criteria.

4.6 Achievement of the Supporting Strategies

The supporting strategies underpin the Strategic Aims and are at the heart of their achievement. Interestingly, staff responsible for meeting targets and reporting against indicators within the supporting strategies tended to downplay or qualify their achievements, regarding them as, "*serving SCIAF's core work of supporting overseas partners or advocating for the poor*", and *"the servant of the other aims*". In reality, the supporting strategies are the solid foundation of SCIAF's achievements against the Strategic Aims, without which the others would not be possible. The 2021-2025 Strategy recognises this, and furthermore takes into account that many of these supporting strategies are inseparable from the other aims. For example, the partnership principles, embedding the learning culture, the IHD framework, and so on.

4.6.1 Learning Culture

SCIAF has embraced a learning culture internally, through partnerships and national and international networks. Throughout the 2016 - 2020 period, SCIAF committed to working together with partners and others to learn and improve the quality and impact of overseas work, and to contribute to knowledge sharing around international development and the strategic aims. SCIAF has maintained high levels of engagement with Caritas (CI, CIDSE, Caritas Europa) and other networks (e.g. NIDOS, SCCS and Bond). Table 8 provides a summary of achievements against the targets of the learning culture component of the supporting strategies.

Table 8: Summary of progress against Supporting Strategies: Learning culture

Learning Culture			
We will work together with our partners and others to learn and improve the quality and impact of our work, and to contribute to learning more widely.	Consultations for strategic plan and review show a high level of recognition and regard for SCIAF learning amongst staff, partners, and key stakeholders.	Strategic review processes (initial Audit, MTR, and FE) have been inclusive and participatory.	
	SCIAF has improved ways of gathering evidence of our impact.	MEL systems are continuously reviewed and strengthened.	
	Staff make use of development and training opportunities to develop competencies, knowledge and skills.	Staff development opportunities are generous, flexible, and widely utilised.	
	SCIAF partners are supported to meet key minimum standards required for successful project completion.	SCIAF partners have been extensively supported to meet and exceed key minimum standards.	

The commitment to learning is strongly embedded within SCIAF and its organisational culture. The strategic planning and review processes have welcomed and encouraged the participation of staff, partners, supporters, donors and networks. However, internal decision-making is not always transparent (a pertinent example is the targets within the Strategic Aim framework), and institutional memory is not consistently captured leading to poor ownership of some targets and indicators. For example, some key strategy documents are not labelled with contributors, nor are iterations dated.

There has been significant internal restructuring in PED and IHDD during the past strategic period, and these processes of change have followed a trajectory of learning and improvement as adaptive change management strategies have been implemented to enhance participation, voice and ownership during each iteration of these restructuring processes.

SCIAF has embraced improved ways of gathering impact throughout the 2016 - 2020 strategic period, and committed to innovation (see associated Innovation Report) and a culture of learning. Internally, SCIAF has also trialled, refined and implemented new and improved methods and processes of knowledge sharing and building. These include, but are not limited to, adapting staff 1:1s as a time for learning and reflection in the Covid context, 360s reviews, the Project Information Management System (PIMS), Project Reviews, standardising summary sheets and scoring for External Evaluations, trialling the Standard Indicator and Quality Framework, supporter surveys and the NFP Synergy reports. SCIAF has also committed to increasing MEL capacity, creating the new position of MEAL Manager and MEAL Assistant during the IHDD restructuring process.

In addition to improving internal learning and reflection processes, SCIAF also supports wider knowledge sharing and dissemination among networks and across the sector. While this is not included in the strategic aims, significant achievements have been made across the strategic cycle. SCIAF's Director is on the boards of CIDSE, *Caritas Europa* and SCCS, and has chaired SCCS' CoP Steering Group and the Glasgow Climate Dialogues. The Director, Board, senior management and management staff have attended regular high-level and high-profile events; from meetings on emergencies in Syria and Iraq to the CIDSE HOP and HOA meetings and global events both in-person pre-Covid, and remotely during the pandemic period. SCIAF has played a growing role in the CI Accountability Working Group, for example leading the CI real-time evaluation of the Indonesia Emergency Appeal in December 2018. SCIAF has also led the sector in Scotland in raising awareness of and preparing and planning for, COP 2026.

Addressing next the objective of internal learning, staff have been supported to effectively "*make use of development and training opportunities to develop their competencies, knowledge and skills*" throughout the strategic period. Staff interviews unanimously confirmed high levels of support for personal and professional development; commitment to learning, reflection and improvement; and robust and enduring underpinning shared values and mission. SCIAF staff report generous and supportive training budgets and development opportunities with flexible interpretation to allow for a range of professional development training and activities; from formal, certified, high-level training and skills courses, to shadowing peers in other organisations. Management staff have maintained these budgets despite cuts in other areas; further demonstrating SCIAF's commitment to living these values as a learning culture.

SCIAF support for partners is also extensive and is addressed in depth in the associated Partnership Report. There has been a significant commitment to supporting partners to professionalise, coupled with increased due diligence, regular organisational capacity assessments, and frequent monitoring of partner compliance over the strategic plan. Assessment frameworks have been reviewed and revised, and organisational minimum standards have been introduced and implemented. Partners' compliance has been regularly monitored and assessed, with support from updated Organisational Profile and Partner Finance Questionnaire forms and a Minimum Standards checklist introduced in 2019. This has been further supported by the replacement of the PCM database with PIMS (the Programme Information and Management System) in 2020. The new system supports improved tracking and reporting on key indicators across the partner portfolio. A Minimum Standards component was custom built for SCIAF and integrated into this. Safeguarding has a core aspect of this professionalization and learning process, both within SCIAF and across the partner portfolio. SCIAF and partners have established and implemented child protection policies in addition to safeguarding policies to protect the most vulnerable; including women, persons with disabilities, refugees, and more. This is also discussed in the associated Innovations and Partnerships Reports.

Within a week of the UK entering the first Covid-19 pandemic lockdown in 2020, SCIAF's Board released £1million from the reserves (one third of the total available reserves) to support partners to cope with, and respond to, the pandemic. All overseas grants were also to assess the emerging needs, and cost-extensions were approved to support partners to pay staff salaries throughout local lockdowns.

4.6.2 Respect, Equality and Mutuality

Table 9 provides a summary of achievements against the targets of the respect, equality and mutuality components of the supporting strategies.

Table 9: Summary of progress against Supporting Strategies: Respect, Equality and Mutuality

Respect, Equality and Mutuality			
A commitment to men and women's equality and empowerment is evident in all SCIAF's work.	SCIAF Board has significant female representation by end Strategic Plan.	**Target achieved.** SCIAF is now represented by 5 female committee members and 2 (22%) female board members.	🟩
	Women represent 50% of all beneficiaries;	**Target achieved.** Of 1,520,323 total participants, 764,396 (50%) are female.	🟩
	13,000 women in leadership positions as a result of SCIAF-supported projects overseas.	**No data.**	
	100% development projects rated gender sensitive or gender transformative by end of Strategic plan.	**Target not (quite) achieved, and not realistic.** 97% in 2019. 92% in 2020.	🟧
A commitment to integral human development is evident in all SCIAF's projects and programmes.	All new overseas development projects and programmes from 2017 based on IHD framework.	**Target not realistic.** IHD Guide launched in 2019.	
Caritas Partnership Principles underpin our work.	Annual survey of partners reports high level of compliance with Partnership Principles	**Annual survey not completed.**	
	SCIAF and partners have child protection policies in place.	61% of partners are child protection policy compliant. Compliance requirements are considerably more stringent compared to 2016.	🟩

SCIAF has made considerable progress in high-level women's representation, from an all-male board in 2016 to two (22%) female board members and five female committee members in 2021; one of whom is also a member of a partner organisation. Interestingly, staff perception of the representativeness of the governance is mixed. During interviews, one staff member highlighted the presence of women on the board as a "*major achievement which should be celebrated*", while another explained, "*the board does not have significant female representation. They have one. It's still mostly older white men.*" While the latter is true, the fact remains that five of the nine Board members are Catholic Bishops. Of the remaining four, half are women.

SCIAF has also achieved the strategic target in equal representation of women are among beneficiaries, with the 50% female representation target achieved across the projects and

programmes. SCIAF has continued to promote women's leadership across many projects, but standard indicators and MEL systems have not been developed to monitor these outcomes. The target of, *"13,000 women in leadership positions as a result of SCIAF-supported projects overseas"* was therefore not monitored, and no data are available. A significant percentage of development projects are now rated gender-sensitive or gender-transformative, although the target of 100% was not realistic and has not been achieved.

During the last strategic period, it is also noteworthy that SCIAF has led a gender organisational policy from a theological perspective, ensuring that the organisation supports women's equality while maintaining alignment with the underpinning values of CST. This has been an ambitious and challenging project over the last five years resulting in a gender framework and integration tool for programming. The piloting of the gender manual has been postponed due to the pandemic.

Further internal awareness-raising is needed to ensure that all staff recognise the progress made by the organisation in enhancing women's voice and representation. It's also important to identify targets that are both aspirational and realistic; both in terms of Board representation and the gender sensitivity of projects.

The IHD framework was developed and refined throughout the previous strategic cycle, with the IHD Guide ultimately launched in 2019. Accordingly, the target, "*all new overseas development projects and programmes from 2017 based on IHD framework*" was not feasible. However, the IHD framework is acknowledged and valued organisation-wide and among partner organisations, and this target is being incorporated into the Country Strategy planning process to be carried out in 2021. Furthermore, from 2019 onwards Development Education (teaching the IHD framework) was made a central feature of SCIAF's Engagement programme.

The annual partner survey has been replaced by more targeted and strategic data gathering mechanisms, for example, the Feedback and Complaints Handling Mechanisms (FCHM) survey in 2021. During the 2018 partner survey, 97% of partners rated working with SCIAF as either 'very good' or 'good', but levels of compliance with the Caritas Partnership Principles were not specifically monitored. Partner outcomes are discussed in depth in the associated Partnership Report. Consultations with partners are built into the planned Country Strategy development process due to start in Q3 2021.

Throughout the strategic cycle, SCIAF has tracked and reported against partners' Child Protection and safeguarding policies, and compliance has increased overall. However, internal standards, requirements to update and revise policies, and measurement frameworks have changed throughout the strategic period. In 2017, SCIAF shifted to a risk-based approach, with projects identified as high/medium/low risk. Between Jan and June 2018 the focus remained on high-risk partners with no policy. This successfully supported the majority of partners to meet SCIAF's minimum standard level. After July 2018, a more stringent approach was adopted requiring partners to update policies regularly (every 3 years). Any partner with policies older than three years was marked as non-compliant. As a result, the proportion of partners meeting standards dropped significantly in July 2018 and rose slowly over the remainder of the year and during 2019. Efforts were made to work with partners to review their policies. During 2020, technical issues associated with the shift to PIMS and home-based working introduced challenges, but these have been successfully resolved. At the end of the strategic period, levels of reported compliance are slightly lower than in 2016, (61% compared with 64%) but compliance requirements have increased significantly. Bringing all partners into compliance with minimum standards is a key priority for 2021,

and significant resources are allocated to supporting the programme team and partners to assess and improve their safeguarding systems.

4.6.3 Transparency, Openness, Honesty, Accountability and Trust

Several core indicators are included under this sub-category, including scale outcomes such as "increased participation in public life, and influence in decisions that affect their lives", income, perceptions of SCIAF in Scotland, volunteers, and staff satisfaction. These are complex and diverse and are addressed under subheadings for clarity.

4.6.4 Accountability

Table 10 provides a summary of achievements against the targets of the accountability component of the supporting strategies.

Table 10: Summary of progress against Supporting Strategies: Accountability

Accountability			
A commitment to accountability to all stakeholders, and most particularly men and women living in poverty and marginalisation, is evident in all SCIAF's work	Annual accountability report shows accountability system functioning; annual accountability report shows high level of satisfaction with SCIAF's work.	**Indicator no longer relevant.** Accountability system integrated and augmented by extensive investment in FCHM, enhancing downwards accountability.	
	SCIAF meets all legal requirements for charitable reporting.	**Target achieved.**	
	67,000 men and women report increased participation in public life, and influence in decisions that affect their lives.	**No data.** See Aim 1, Objective 1.3 Land Rights and Governance. 17,565 participants directly assisted.	
	Positive perception of SCIAF among Mass-going Catholics grows from 75% (2014) to 85%.	**No data.**	

While the accountability working group was disbanded and no report was produced, SCIAF developed in-depth action plan detailing all accountability actions and achievements. The majority of these accountability actions were completed and the remainder were integrated into the normal operational plans. It is therefore not possible to monitor accountability outcomes using this indicator, but the evidence suggests high levels of organisational and partner compliance and the accountability action planning has been well-integrated into existing workstreams. Staff and partners reported high levels of satisfaction with SCIAF's work; as did networks and supporters interviewed during the MTR. It is therefore important to signpost humility and willingness to share insights and evidence, 'warts and all', throughout this evaluation process and more generally with networks, partnerships, and supporters. Furthermore, SCIAF has provided high levels of support to partner organisations to enhance their accountability processes and practices through extensive and significant investment in developing Feedback and Complaints Handling Mechanisms (FCHM) throughout this strategic period.

SCIAF meets all legal requirements for charitable reporting. Furthermore, over the past strategic period, SCIAF has supported partners (across diverse contexts, with mixed levels of capacity) to professionalise and meet these same requirements. This has enabled partners to enhance

accountability to communities and to access a wide range of funding opportunities, discussed further in the Partnership Report.

No data are available on the last two targets under the accountability workstream, although scale data around participation in public life is captured under Aim 1.

4.6.5 Volunteers

Table 11 provides a summary of achievements against the targets of the volunteer component of the supporting strategies.

Table 11: Summary of progress against Supporting Strategies: Volunteers

Volunteers			
Increase the contribution of volunteers to SCIAF's work, and provide mutually useful and rewarding volunteering opportunities	100% more volunteers contribute significantly to SCIAF's work.	**Target not achieved.** Volunteer strategy needed.	█
	Both staff and volunteers report high levels of satisfaction in the annual survey.	**Target achieved.** Staff satisfaction has increased significantly. Volunteer satisfaction not monitored.	█
	Volunteers involved at all levels from governance to daily tasks.	**Target achieved.** Governance: 968 hours in 2019, 864 hours in 2020. Daily tasks: 2099.5 hours in 2019, 819.5 hours in 2020.	█

The volunteering strategy was a key target at the time of the initial assessment in 2016, again in 2018 during the MTR, and it remains incomplete in 2021. However, action has been taken by CS to address the issue by developing a policy and set of processes for recruiting and managing volunteers. Centralised guidance is essential to support volunteers' health and wellbeing across the organisation. Recognising the challenges of the pandemic and lockdowns for volunteer wellbeing, individual members of staff have maintained informal but regular check-ins throughout the strategic period. SCIAF has always used tokens of appreciation and gratitude to acknowledge and thank volunteers for their support and commitment. However, communication with volunteers is inconsistent across the departments, and an organisational volunteer policy is overdue. Another significant factor affecting the volunteers, particularly the parish representatives, was the GDPR legislation and the loss of contact details for supporters and volunteers.

It is also important to support the focus on the quality of the relationship between SCIAF and volunteers, avoiding the temptation to use simplified scale targets. For example, the target of 100% increase in volunteers was not achievable nor desirable for the SCIAF team. Volunteer recruitment, training and management requires considerable resource investment, and increasing volunteer numbers must be supported by strategic decision-making rather than a simple target. Specifically, skilled specialist volunteers could be selected to provide further valuable technical support with proofreading, translation, delivering schools visits, and as community and parish representatives. This could be augmented with other technical skillsets, for example, retired media professionals could support SCIAF and partners in their advocacy.

At present, volunteers engage in both governance and daily tasks but are unevenly distributed across the organisation, and further opportunities remain for their fruitful engagement. Although it is the simplest approach, it is inadequate to monitor the total number of volunteers, their working

hours or days, or full-time equivalent (FTE) posts. As one staff member noted about office and schools representatives,

> *We don't have many and they are very skilled and dedicated and do a lot of work. We need to keep that focus on quality not numbers, as our volunteers are very engaged and very skilled.*

It is also important to engage volunteers strategically, ensure they are included in processes and activities relating to strategic direction and organisation vision (including the IHD Framework), and providing spaces for them to engage directly with partners, where appropriate. One staff member commented,

> *Someone is needed to manage volunteers, even temporarily… Some have left because they don't like the way SCIAF is changing, others are staying because of our personal relationship, rather than for the organisation. We need to formalise these relationships.*

Following up on the concerns raised around SCIAF's evolution and maintaining volunteer support going forwards, this issue was also raised during the MTR. For example, one staff member noted,

> *Volunteers don't like that SCIAF getting more corporate and spending money on flashy things, new offices and website, external consultants and a big Comms team.* Some of these *volunteers have been with us for 30 years, and they don't see the value of these investments.*

Staff also mentioned the importance of preventing survey fatigue, referring to the inclusion of volunteers in frequent surveys and interviews.

For volunteers, as for diocese and parishes, targeted approaches are needed to ensure that the engagement is effective, rewarding and tailored to their needs and priorities. Practising Catholic volunteers are significantly involved in strategic issues through the Board and Committees. They should be actively encouraged to 'keep an ear to the ground' and enhance understanding of the changing practices of the Catholic faith across Scotland in the ongoing context of the pandemic. These Catholic volunteers could also provide a valuable sounding board to fact-check or validate Communications materials, particularly given the increasingly secular balance of the team.

4.6.6 Staff satisfaction

Staff satisfaction is included in the strategic framework as a sub-component of an objective under the category of 'Volunteers': "*Both staff and volunteers report high levels of satisfaction in the annual survey.*" However, it is an important outcome and therefore included as a separate sub-section of this report.

SCIAF has succeeded in achieving significant improvements in staff satisfaction since the beginning of the last strategic cycle. The momentous shift in staff satisfaction from the challenges identified in 2017 to the present day is a testament to the organisation-wide commitment and determination to implement proactive, targeted strategies to support staff; and to the effectiveness of those measures in practice. These have been augmented by increased clarity in the roles and responsibilities of staff and improved inter- and intra-departmental communication mechanisms and practices. These processes have supported a wider shift from the departmental silos identified in the initial audit, through a period of transition, to the current situation of effective shared operational

practices and high levels of staff satisfaction, despite challenging workloads and circumstances over the past year in particular due to the pandemic.

SCIAF conducts and responds to regular staff satisfaction surveys to monitor and enhance staff motivation, reduce staff turnover, and increase innovation. During the MTR in 2018, the Union Group expressed commitment to supporting and cultivating an enabling, caring and empowering working environment, and the SMT response to the 2020 staff survey report acknowledges their help in this process. Overall, SCIAF has achieved a 25% improvement in staff satisfaction levels across the organisation since the last survey in 2017. The target of 'high levels of staff satisfaction' has been well achieved, although volunteer satisfaction has not been comprehensively measured.

It is noteworthy that the satisfaction survey report identifies a range of areas for improvement, but does not comprehensively showcase areas where improvements have been achieved and best practices could be learned. For example, responses to questions around the SMT and director providing strong strategic direction, communication with staff, and leading by example, have improved significantly across the organisation. In 2017 only 9% believed SMT and director led by example; in 2020, this has increased dramatically to 87%.

Based on the relatively cursory review and analysis of the volumes of raw quantitative and qualitative data presented in the body of the report, it appears that the staff satisfaction survey data analysis and reporting processes would benefit from refinement and increased resources. The format and structure of the survey report commences with pages of cleaned quantitative and raw qualitative data (which is likely individually identifiable by the writing style and content of respondents). The satisfaction survey questions are long and detailed, and the majority of the data are not analysed in the body of the report. This is indicative of insufficient time allocated to comprehensive analysis and effective presentation of the survey data. For example, within the duties and responsibilities section of the report, only one question ("I never have to neglect some tasks because I have so much to do") is analysed in the report, despite interesting outcomes in other areas. The report also relies on averages which obscure significant differences between departments and staff levels. For example, while 64% of staff now believe that policies and practices are consistently implemented, this percentage falls to 46% in IHDD. This still represents an impressive improvement from only 7% in 2017. Internal staff satisfaction reporting would also benefit from analysing and celebrating changing trends and patterns over time, rather than treating each satisfaction survey as a snapshot.

Finally, the latest satisfaction report details a list of 23 action points that are not grouped by theme or responsible staff member. The SMT has proposed a strong response; monitoring workload at staff 1:1s and team meetings, providing training to help staff prioritise, offering adjusted work patterns and adding wellbeing to the Health and Safety policy and the annual health and safety action plan and committing to the development of a stress policy and HSE Stress risk assessor to be repeated in 2021. However, these action points are primarily process-oriented; including discussions, team meetings, team reviews, the establishment of groups and development of policies and action plans, further surveys and reviews; without sufficient focus on the intended outcomes of these processes.

It is advisable to reorient the framing of targets and action points emerging from satisfaction reviews: focusing on the outcomes. It is also worth noting that the main areas for improvement identified in the 2020 report were not clearly aligned with the data in all cases. For example, "SMT and director leading by example" has already seen significant improvements. The target to reduce "interpersonal friction" is problematic, as strategies to enhance communication and conflict

management would be more appropriate. "Consistent implementation of policies" has already improved dramatically since the last satisfaction survey.

The main challenge which stands out in the staff satisfaction data, and also emerged consistently during the interviews, concerns workload. Workload remains the main ongoing challenge for staff identified in the 2017 and 2020 staff satisfaction reports and IHDD review. Almost half of respondents in PE and IHDD indicated that workload was an issue resulting in neglected tasks, and 23% of staff in IHDD and 1 in PED reported suffering 'intolerable' levels of stress (although the question formulation is somewhat problematic).

Workload was mentioned frequently during the staff interviews for this FE, generally as an explanation for a target not met or a task not completed; "*we are just so stretched*", "*sometimes the workload is intense and it can be hard to fit it all in*"; and usually followed by a qualified; "*but it's well worth it*". While the majority of staff acknowledged the underlying passion and commitment which drives them to strive, it must also be acknowledged that there will always be more to do; the sands will continue to shift.

> *We are an enthusiastic, dynamic team all pushing for it (to respond intentionally to external shifts) - but we always have too much work and are pushed to the limit. So, what gives if we prioritise this? Something else has to give to keep on top of it.*

On the topic of workload, it is also important to acknowledge the seasonal calendar of SCIAF's national engagement, which is oriented around Christmas, Lent and summer appeals and punctuated by emergencies and other events. The consistency of this calendar lends itself to strategic planning, presenting time-bound annual opportunities to test new innovations and structure external and internal reviews and research studies that should be intentionally operationalized.

During the interviews, many SCIAF staff reflected on the momentum of the organisation, "*never taking our foot off the pedal*". While these processes of continuous improvement reflect both the individuals and organisational drive and commitment, in some cases interviewees noted that *actions* can be prioritised over *outcomes*. One interviewee explained,

> *"We have a huge willingness to drive everything forward. But are we spending our time doing the most impactful things to reach our goals?" For another, "if someone comes to us with an idea we don't question it or fight it, we act on it. Particularly if it's an external voice. Actually, we need to be more careful before adding new activities, especially at times of year when we already have such a lot on…"*

Several interviewees acknowledged that the momentum and support for adding new tasks and priorities often emerges from the team rather than the management staff. However, calculating operational investments (time, human resources, expenditure), careful timetabling, and integrating more strategic prioritisation, is likely to pay dividends in enhancing outcomes.

For management in particular and staff in general, there would be added value in providing or encouraging regular opportunities to stop 'doing' and reflect; on what has been done and achieved, and how to translate these achievements into actionable learning going forwards. While each appeal is subsequently reviewed, for some staff more is needed. The continual striving is a powerful testament to staff commitment, but it may be introducing inefficiencies if not balanced with

intentional periods of reflection; higher-level thinking and learning from best practices to keep the focus on goals rather than activities.

4.6.7 Income

Table 12 provides a summary of achievements against the targets of the income component of the supporting strategies.

Table 12: Summary of progress against Supporting Strategies: Income

Income			
Increase our income in order to increase our impact.	Increase income across all voluntary income channels by 45%.	Target not met. 7% increase in voluntary income achieved.	
	Increase IF income by 18%.	**Target exceeded by 15%.**	✳

SCIAF started the strategic cycle with high reserves and implemented a managed programme across the past five years to reduce these. This process was managed efficiently, retaining adequate but not excessive reserves and swiftly and effectively deploying the reserves to support partners in response to the Covid-19 pandemic. While the full £3million reserve budget was initially released to support the pandemic response, facilitate the maintenance of all planned work and respond to the emerging crisis, ultimately only £600,000 of the reserve budget was absorbed to meet partner needs during this period.

Income across all voluntary channels remained constant across the strategic cycle. The expectation of increased income across all channels was aspirational, and there have been iterative rounds of strategic planning to achieve the intended outcomes for voluntary income. However, high levels of turnover in the departmental leadership has contributed to shifting targets and strategies, which have now been consolidated into the Big 50 goal and associated strategy.

While voluntary income remained constant, the target of 45% increase was not achieved and this is experienced as "*damaging to morale*" for some staff. One staff member reflected,

> *"This target was so controversial and we didn't get close to meeting it. Was it an issue with the target, or did we do something wrong? We aren't even sure why it was set so high, or how we were expected to meet it. We need to reflect properly on this because there is another ambitious one in the strategic cycle."*

For IF income, targets were significantly and substantially exceeded every year of the strategy, and over the 5-year period the target was exceeded by 15% (see table 13). This is a source of pride and excitement for the team, who identified this outcome as a significant achievement of the strategic period.

Table 13: IF Income Received 2016 – 2020 (figures from audited accounts)

Year	Total SCIAF income	Income from institutional funding	Institutional income as % of total	Income against target
2016	£7,411,738	£2,030,629	27%	£130,629 above target
2017	£7,897,814	£2,386,372	30%	£286,372 above target

2018	£8,764,393	£2,696,613	31%	£396,613 above target
2019	£8,456,445	£2,943,033	35%	£543,033 above target
2020	£7,977,838	£2,775,529	35%	£295,529 above target
Total IF income 2016 - 2020	£12,832,176	32%		£1,652,176 (15%) above target

Looking to the future, the new goal of PE to achieve £50million over 5 years is extremely ambitious while also grounded in a robust strategic plan, supported by iterative, evidence-based approaches, with associated investment across the organisation.

4.6.8 Professionalism

Table 14 provides a summary of achievements against the targets of the professionalism component of the supporting strategies.

Table 14: Summary of progress against Supporting Strategies: Professionalism

Professionalism			
SCIAF's work is of a consistently high quality, reflecting good practice and national and international standards.	% new projects in line with strategies.	**No data.**	
	% projects reflecting good governance, DRR and climate justice approaches.	**No data.**	
	External evaluations find projects reflect good practice.	**Target achieved.** External evaluations consistently graded A and A+.	
	SCIAF plays an active part in CST programme, which continues to deliver quality programming.	**Target achieved.** SCIAF plays an active part in CST programme, with CAFOD, and Trocaire.	
	Fundraising Codes of Practice met at all times.	**Target achieved.** SCIAF adheres to Fundraising Codes of Practice.	
	Advertising standards and lobbying regulation met at all times.	**Target achieved.** Lobbying register maintained, standards and regulation met.	
	Annual audit completed successfully with no significant issues.	**Target achieved.** Annual audit completed, no significant issues.	
	OSCR returns completed annually.	**Target achieved.** OSCR returns completed annually.	
	Risk framework regularly monitored.	**Target achieved.** Risk framework regularly monitored.	
	Safety and security policies and procedures regularly monitored.	**Target achieved.** Security policy rewritten, updated annually and overseen by CAFOD security advisor.	
	IT review completed and recommendations implemented.	**Not relevant.** Original IT review is now obsolete, largely about wiring in previous offices.	
	Administration and management costs remain below 10%.	**Target achieved.** NB: No longer required in accounts.	
	Gift Aid income maximised.	**Unclear target.**	
	ICO compliant.	**Target achieved.**	

Integrate Caritas Internationalis Management Standards across all work	Self-audit (Y2 and Y5) shows high level of compliance across the organisation.	**Target achieved.**	
Strengthen capacity of SCIAF to deliver.	PCM manual and database supports consistent, effective and efficient project management and reporting.	**Not relevant.** Replaced by PIMS for increased efficiency.	
	Institutional donor relationships managed effectively as partnerships.	**Target achieved.** Donor relationships are reported to be excellent.	
	Implementation of HR/Admin review.	**Target achieved.** Two redundancies.	
	Assessment of our building to meet our future needs.	**Target achieved.** SCIAF has relocated to new offices.	
	Strengthening governance, including Board and advisory group composition and governance/management relationship.	**Target achieved.** Strengthened membership quality and diversity.	
	All key internal policies are developed and reviewed at least on an annual basis.	**Unachievable target.** All policies have a review date between 1-5yrs.	

The quality of SCIAF's work across the 2016 - 2020 strategic period has been outstanding, with high levels of compliance to increasingly rigorous standards. While they have been achieved and are a testament to organisational professionalism and good conduct, the majority are misplaced in the strategic framework. The majority of targets under this objective, however, are operational and process-oriented.

SCIAF has enhanced and strengthened professional processes over the strategic cycle, and has supported partners to do the same. This is particularly impressive given the diversity of SCIAF's overseas partner cultures, organisations and practices. As one staff member noted,

> *"The Minimum Standards and Safeguarding strategies have gone from somewhat ad hoc to really tight systems with a focus on the quality of our partnerships and downward accountability to the communities we serve."*

Furthermore, this learning has been disseminated widely through partner networks, cascading positive outcomes across both governmental and non-governmental organisations in target countries and leading to wider professionalization of the sector. These wider outcomes have emerged through partner survey data but were not anticipated in the MEL framework, nor captured comprehensively with existing MEL tools.

During the reflection sessions, the CS team expressed pride in the quality of SCIAF's excellent track record of adherence to statutory requirements, timely reporting and consistently clean audits; *"it works so well that the outcome is no outcome, it's easy to overlook"*. It is also noteworthy that SCIAF has had no ineligible costs in the past decade; management of systems and process and compliance are exemplary and subject to continual review and improvement.

During the reflection sessions, the CS team highlighted the ability of the organisation to respond to due diligence requirements as a key achievement. During the interviews and group sessions, staff appreciated SCIAF's proactive and public response to the Oxfam safeguarding scandals and the

robust underpinning organisational strategies, and staff commitment to safeguarding training. The safeguarding group meets quarterly, and benefits from expert leadership and strong support from the Director (a proactive group member) and Board. Across the organisation, all staff attend annual safeguarding training and duty of care responsibilities are taken very seriously across SCIAF, providing further evidence of the professionalism of the team.

4.7 Contribution to the Organisational Vision

The achievement of each of these Strategic Aims and Supporting Strategies presented in the preceding sections broadly contribute to the broader organisational vision:

A just world in which no one is poor or oppressed, and everyone can live life to the full.

The Strategic Aims also support, and are informed by, SCIAF's underpinning values of dignity, justice, common good, solidarity, compassion, and sustainability and the organisational commitment to serving the poorest and most marginalised people. In particular, the IHD Framework is signposted as a core component of this broader organisational commitment to supporting people in living life to the full; recognising and contributing to individuals in all their complexity.

The staff interviews, partner survey and staff satisfaction survey data all indicate that the SCIAF family feel a strong affinity for, and high levels of ownership for the organisation vision and underpinning values, and that this has increased over the past 5-year period. As one interviewee explained, *"SCIAF stands apart in living its values",* a view shared by many.

During the last staff satisfaction survey, staff responded with high levels of support for the statement, *"I am clear about how my work fits into the overall aims of the organisation"* with 100% agreement in CS and IHDD, and 80% support in PE. As one interviewed member of staff explained,

The core values and mission of SCIAF are stable. Rooted in the Catholic Church and its' values, and Catholic Social Teaching. We have come full circle, and we have pride in the SCIAF identity and brand, in the underpinning values of CST, and the CI global federation network. We haven't forgotten our roots.

SCIAF has achieved significant and impressive progress across the 2016 - 2020 strategic period, with outcomes extending far beyond the initial targets and indicators formulated in the strategic MEL framework.

5. Conclusions

During the 2016 - 2020 strategic cycle, SCIAF has made great progress enhancing the quality of work through strengthened and focused partnerships, internal structuring and enhanced accountability and learning processes.

During this period, SCIAF has supported over 1.5million direct beneficiaries and over 6 million indirect beneficiaries across the 14 intervention countries, engaged with schools and parishes across Scotland, advocated for climate justice and fair and just economic models and supported partners to build their capacities and processes.

Internally, SCIAF has undergone massive transformations across the strategic period; restructuring departments and roles, welcoming new staff members into new and existing roles, responding to massive external changes and challenges across the sector, moving to new premises and shifting to new ways of working in response to the global pandemic.

The 2016 - 2020 strategic cycle has achieved improvement in the quality of interventions and actions overseas and in Scotland, supported by enhanced MEL tools and processes. The planned '*standard indicator'* measuring participant satisfaction has been implemented inconsistently and does not provide the intended evidence for the quality of SCIAF's overseas actions. However, the available evidence overwhelmingly demonstrates that SCIAF has achieved significant progress in improving the quality of systems and processes, and supported partners to do the same. SCIAF has strengthened inward and outward accountability and enhanced programme quality, achieving impressive outcomes across the projects and intervention countries despite the global Covid-19 pandemic. External evaluations of IF grants were excellent throughout the strategic period, donors, sister agencies and partners consistently report excellent feedback on the quality of SCIAF's work, and IF targets were significantly exceeded.

SCIAF's approach to partnership has proven successful and sustainable, supporting national capacity building and spill-over effects in target counties and providing meaningful and appropriate accompaniment to partners. Internal procedures have been strengthened within SCIAF, and strategically cascaded to partner organisations; supporting them to better serve their communities and also to cascade these benefits onwards to other national organisations.

Furthermore, the SCIAF team have achieved these outcomes in the context of the biggest global emergency of the century, and under unprecedented conditions of physical and emotional hardship under nationwide lockdowns.

Overall, the strategic MEL Framework reflects SCIAF's sincere commitment to monitor, assess and learn over the past strategic period, and to support organisational progress towards the strategic aims. Furthermore, the framework contributed to the enhanced alignment of strategic priorities and vision across the organisation.

SCIAF has largely succeeded in capturing relevant outcome and impact level data aligned with the strategic aims, despite some challenges in indicator definitions and inconsistent monitoring. Furthermore, SCIAF has achieved many excellent additional strategic outcomes which are not reflected in the framework, particularly for partners. Significantly, these include the extensive and robust professionalization of partner strategies, processes and practices and the amplification of partner voices through the development of the partner advocacy strategy.

Although strategic indicators were articulated against the strategic aims, in some cases the indicator definitions were poorly formulated and targets lacked specificity. For example, the scale indicators and targets were conceptually disconnected from the programme selection and design criteria: SCIAF does not prioritise programmes that target the highest number of beneficiaries. Furthermore, although the satisfaction indicator was not consistently utilised, other tools facilitated the collection and analysis of data demonstrating the quality of outcomes.

Challenges are identified with indicators, some of which lack clarity in their formulation and definition. Others were over-ambitious, in some cases unachievable, and some were not supported by strategic actions or planning. In other cases, indicators were not aligned with the existing systems and metrics; creating measurement deficits. This report also identified an imbalance between departments' representation across the Framework; PED was under-represented and IHDD was over-represented, while CS' indicators were largely operational rather than strategic.

The 2016 - 2020 framework reflected the learning of the previous iteration, and internal assessments illuminated valuable insights and lessons contributing to improvements which were then integrated into the 2021 - 2025 framework. Specifically, the new framework embraces improved organisational balance, representation and voice, and is more closely linked to quarterly and annual indicators and MEL systems. SCIAF has also enhanced the organisational focus looking to the future, both thematically and geographically, targeting resource deployment to maximise the value and scale of impact.

6. Recommendations

This strategic evaluation process has illuminated both operational and strategic recommendations to support SCIAF to better capture and reflect on organisational outcomes and achievements and to continue to build on these into the future.

6.1 Operational recommendations

6.1.1 Focus on clear, SMART indicators and targets

Indicators at all levels should be clear, simple, and SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound). They should also be aligned with existing metrics and departmental strategies, and closely aligned with a relevant Means of Verification (MoV) and 'owned' by a responsible staff member. It was noted throughout this assessment that a lack of clarity around the definitions of some indicators introduced challenges in operationalizing, capturing and reporting on achievements, and constrained the assessment of progress against the targets under the strategic aims. In the last strategic period, many of the indicators under the Supporting Strategies were process-oriented, activity-oriented, or operational rather than results- or outcome-oriented. Similarly, much of the data compiled in support of this evaluation described activities and processes rather than outcomes and achievements.

Many staff members noted the dissonance between the goal-setting approaches across different departments, teams, managers and staff. Some of the targets were (and remain) controversial, and these issues were frequently mentioned as a source of dissatisfaction during the 2017 staff satisfaction survey. Some staff feel strongly that targets should be ambitious and aspirational targets which challenge them to continually, iterate and improve; even if they are unlikely to be achieved. For other staff and teams, unachievable goals are problematic and discomforting, and obscure real achievements with the expectation of ultimate failure to meet the set targets. For these individuals, realistic and achievable targets are motivating, and the potential for exceeding these is inspirational. The PE team are firmly in the 'inspirational targets' camp; with the 2021 2025 strategic target of increasing fundraising from 5million to 50million in five years. The past strategic cycle included realistic targets (some even relating to essential operational processes, such as financial compliance and reporting), aspirational (e.g. 45% increase in voluntary income) targets, and others that lack clear underpinning logic are perceived by staff as somewhat arbitrary (e.g. 100% more volunteers). Going forward, it is important to capture the assumptions, logic and risks underpinning the strategic targets. It's important also to respect these very real differences in staff perceptions to ensure that targets continue to inspire, and not discourage, the diverse SCIAF team. In particular, it's advisable to articulate the decision-making logic, goal-setting processes, and ownership of strategic targets to provide clarity and future-proof against staff turnover.

6.1.2 MEL systems should adapt to capture outcomes in changing contexts

Over the last strategic period, SCIAF has undergone extensive transformations, and some aspects of the MEL Framework are no longer relevant to capturing organisational achievements effectively. The need for dynamic and adaptive MEL is exemplified by the rapidly changing conditions associated with the Covid 19 pandemic and response measures. Even at the strategic level, it is important to revisit and reformulate indicators and targets regularly, to ensure their ongoing relevance and to capture outcomes and impacts effectively.

This point was raised frequently during staff interviews, highlighting examples of fixed strategic targets that did not respond to internal departmental changes (e.g. the massive shifts in PED) nor the changing realities facing staff, supporters particularly volunteers, schools and parishes, and also overseas partner organisations. As one interviewee commented, "*our targets need to be responsive to the world which is changing so fast*".

Participant numbers, demographics, and outcomes are increasingly nebulous and distributed as engagements shift into the virtual domain, particularly where online data are anonymised. It's also essential to effectively monitor not just direct online engagement, but also spill-over and cascade effects which may include outcomes in physical and virtual spaces. New definitions, tools and targets are needed to effectively monitor engagements in this new terrain to ensure reflection and learning continues to support adaptive programming. For example, counting the number of schools visits is inadequate when schools are closed by national lockdowns, and engagement and delivery methods have shifted online. While MEL data on download numbers are compiled, these shifts speak to the deeper need to ensure the system remains agile and continues to capture wider outcomes as external conditions and modalities shift.

More broadly, targets should be adjusted when they are either met or proven to be unfeasible. Indicators that are no longer relevant should be removed. MoVs should be amended to keep pace with the development and improvement of new and existing MEL tools. Appropriate MEL tools must be utilised consistently to facilitate comparative assessment. If the tools or processes are too onerous, invasive or inappropriate, both the tools and aligned indicators should be adjusted or replaced. To achieve this, high levels of buy-in are needed from SCIAF staff, and tools should be simple, intuitive and relevant across contents. For example, the global satisfaction indicator was used inconsistently during the last strategic cycle, and accordingly, the related outcomes could not be demonstrated nor assessed. SCIAF should reflect on the relevance and appropriateness of these systems going forward; was this simply a consequence of high workload and an overlooked task, or is this indicator unsupported by the team or unsuitable for cross-cultural contexts? Frequent, light-touch assessments could illuminate disconnects between the frameworks and systems and should be implemented throughout the next strategic cycle.

6.1.3 Distribute MEL responsibilities and skills organisation-wide

While SCIAF has made a strong start in distributing MEL through the alignment of quarterly reporting with the strategic aims, technical MEL capacity remains largely concentrated in the IHDD team, which inevitably results in an unconscious bias affecting the underpinning assumptions, strategies and tools of the MEL system. During the last strategic cycle, many staff members noted that the imbalance between indicators relating to the work of IHDD, and those aligned with other departments. This was in part a consequence of low levels of engagement in the initial planning and design of the strategic framework and indicators by COMED and CS, but this also reflects a broader imbalance in MEL skills and capacities across the organisation.

Attitudes to MEL are also distinctly, fundamentally different across departments; with IHDD applying the tools, methods and system favoured by donors and applicable to projects and other departments approaching every aspect of the MEL from alternative perspectives. Even the views on what constitutes 'data' are diverse, with many outside of the IHDD team regarding data as primarily numerical and perceiving qualitative data, case studies, image, video and audio data to be a fundamentally distinct category of information;

People increasingly want to see what's happening, they want stories and audio and video testimony. It's important for our supporters in Scotland, as well as programme partners. But I don't think of that as data…

This is reflected in the indicators which were almost universally quantitative, measurable targets and don't fully encompass the 'softer' outcomes; of which there have been many in practice. Qualitative data can be powerful and inspirational, but it can also be a robust and meaningful component of strategic MEL. The Most Significant Change (MSC) approach is showing promise, and could fruitfully be aligned with some other innovative MEL tools and approaches to facilitate some alternative and adaptive MEL strategies to bring on board the teams and departments who have struggled with reporting against the MEL plan over the previous strategic period. Consider processes such as outcome mapping, harvesting, process tracing, and other MEL tools which embed a grounded theory approach to determine SCIAF's contribution to significant changes identified.

Data and performance monitoring tools should be aligned with both the indicators and targets and the departmental priorities and strengths. For some, a spreadsheet of quantitative data is valued and supports adaptive management. For others, stories of change inspire and celebrate achievements, enabling lessons learned and best practices to be operationalized. There is no one-size-fits-all method, and building on departmental strengths, needs and priorities is likely to illuminate SCIAF's achievements more holistically.

Improving the distribution of technical MEL skills and responsibilities is likely to result in increased levels of buy-in and ownership, enhanced relevance of systems and tools, and more comprehensive recording and reporting of achievements and outcomes across the organisation.

6.1.4 Support partner MEL to capture spill-over and cascade effects, and diffusion of benefits

SCIAF's overseas programmes are complex and diverse and respect the different priorities and areas of engagement of SCIAF's partner organisations. Further targeted support to partner MEL capacity could enhance SCIAF's knowledgebase around outcomes and impacts, and capture cascade or spill-over effects, diffusion of benefits, and the potential sustainability of these outcomes.

In some contexts, outcomes cannot be foreseen with accuracy and process tracing from achieved outcomes (intended and unintended, positive and negative) may be a more relevant mechanism to capture these lessons. In other cases, particularly where benefits have cascaded or been organically diffused through communities and actors, outcomes may be unknown by partners and must be actively sought, identified, captured and communicated, perhaps through an approach such as outcome harvesting.

One approach would be to develop a toolkit of simple, outcome-oriented MEL instruments aligned with SMART, standardised indicators, light-touch MEL tools and clear, step-by-step guidance notes across the thematic areas. These could include outcomes closely aligned with the strategic aims, as well as outcomes specific to particular projects or contexts. Tools designed to 'harvest' unintended or unexpected outcomes would be particularly powerful for capturing spill-over effects. Partners could be supported to select the most appropriate tools for their project, adapt them as needed, and implement them with SCIAF support where necessary. The partner survey data reveals that partners are willing and enthusiastic to learn and develop their in-house capacities to demonstrate and report on outcomes; both in terms of projects and programmes and advocacy work.

6.1.5 Celebrate success

It's important to recognise that the strategic planning process is ongoing, without a clear start and finish point. It is important to set achievable targets and celebrate the successes along the way. Set sub-targets if necessary, and when you achieve them - *enjoy it!* Share successes with your colleagues, with the Board, with supporters and partners. Whether it's a simple email expressing gratitude for a hard-working team or an organisation-wide dance party, celebrating successes builds morale and it also reinforces the message that the execution of the plan genuinely matters.

6.1.6 Invest more resources in analysing the staff satisfaction survey data

Staff satisfaction is key to productivity, retention, and a healthy, happy working environment for the organisation. While it is not possible to please *"all of the people, all of the time"*, it is essential to utilise staff feedback from the satisfaction survey in an intentional and strategic way. Sufficient resources should be allocated to the analysis of these data, and a team should be responsible for reviewing, cleaning, analysing, and triangulating the data to ensure this process is unbiased.

Staff (including management, who should lead by example) should all be encouraged to participate in the survey and share their views and experiences. The survey should include clear, appropriate questions; all of which should be analysed to inform the analysis. Satisfaction survey analysis should also reflect on the patterns over time to identify longitudinal trends as well as a snapshot of current affairs.

Recommendations and action points should be outcome-oriented, not process-oriented. The staff satisfaction report should be made available to all staff, and reflections and feedback on the recommendations should be welcomed.

6.1.7 Prioritise key tasks and actions

With complex and challenging workloads and targets, prioritisation needs to be a key skill across the SCIAF team. The staff are determined to accept ambitious tasks, challenging targets, and consistently expressed commitment to, "*continually raising our game*". The ability to prioritise effectively and appropriately, and to clearly and professionally express concerns when a workload is too heavy, is likely to determine whether outcomes are positive or negative.

There is scope to address this in several ways, including 1) build staff resilience to prioritise effectively and manage their workload without resulting in negative wellbeing outcomes including stress, burnout, and high staff turnover, and 2) build in regular reflection periods to review tasks and goals and remove or update those which are no longer relevant or have been overtaken by events.

6.1.8 Maximise value of volunteers

Throughout the past strategic cycle, the volunteer strategy target has been shifted from quarter to quarter, year to year. Volunteers and active supporters should be at the heart of SCIAF and supported by procedures and policies which provide an organisation-wide structure to recruit, monitor, appreciate and celebrate volunteers. Volunteers are a significant investment of resources and could be more strategically deployed and utilised to support SCIAF to achieve strategic targets and objectives.

Like staff members, volunteers will benefit from enhanced clarity of communications, tasks and responsibilities, specified outputs, deliverables and timelines. Volunteers can be motivated by inspirational leadership, a sense of connection to the communities SCIAF serves, and feedback on the outcomes and impacts of their work. This applies to volunteers at all levels, from day-to-day engagement to members of the Board.

SCIAF staff have consistently noted that highly skilled, professional volunteers add significant value to the organisation. Professionals can be recruited from the UK and intervention countries, and also benefit from professional networks which could be leveraged to further add value to their support.

6.3 Strategic recommendations

6.3.1 Reflect and learn from processes of change

The Covid-19 pandemic and associated lockdowns contributed to seismic shifts in ways of working for the SCIAF family. Working from home, reduced environmental impacts, increased online engagement and participation, and the amplification of partner voice are all positive outcomes emerging from this period. SCIAF should take time to reflect on, and selectively mainstream, the positive outcomes of this unprecedented period of change. It is also a timely opportunity to share this learning and reflection widely across the sector, both through networks and partner organisations.

6.3.2 Keep values at heart

SCIAF's strength lies in the authenticity of its mission and the passion of its supporters. While increasing income is important, it is equally critical to demonstrate the organisation's ongoing commitment to service, authentic partnerships, the CST. Supporters must remain connected to SCIAF's overseas work and advocacy, remain loyal to these shared goals and vision and continue to support SCIAF's work throughout their supporter journeys.

6.3.3 Cross-pollinate learning

The quality of SCIAF's projects and programmes has been outstanding across the last strategic cycle. This is a valuable opportunity to reflect and learn from these achievements and ensure they serve to guide and support staff and partners going forwards. Draw out these learnings through meta-evaluation, support partners to peer review and evaluate each other's work, highlight best practices, share learning and cross-pollinate ideas horizontally, as well as among networks.

6.3.4 Horizon scan frequently and strategically

Covid19 has amplified inequalities, particularly for the most vulnerable groups. Gender and disability disparities are increasing, and a massive shift to online engagement has widened the digital divide, highlighting the critical importance of digital inclusion for socio-economic development opportunities. Meanwhile, digital threats are also increasingly concerning. International Aid commitments are declining in the UK and beyond, and the importance of individual donors and mutual aid networks are increasing. The new strategic plan maintains a focus on the core organisational strengths (Aim 1 and 2) and the underpinning processes, but it's also important to keep an eye firmly lifted to the horizon and respond proactively to emerging challenges and opportunities.

7. Annexes

7.1 External sources

- BOND. 2016. Briefing 'An Introduction to Social Innovation for NGOs'
- BOND. 2016. Innovation Audit and Benchmarking Report: UK-based INGOs.
- Elrha. ND. Humanitarian Innovation Fund (HIF).
- SCIAF. 201 Integral Human Development Framework.
- SCIAF. 2018. Manual for Global Advocacy Practitioners.
- SCIAF. 2018. Agro-Ecological Toolkit.
- SCIAF. 2017. SCIAF Innovation Policy.
- Stones, E. 2021. SCIAF Overseas Partnerships Report.
- Stones, E. 2021. SCIAF Strategic Aims Report.

7.2 SCIAF Partner Survey Respondents and Interviewees

With thanks to all SCIAF partner organisations who participated in the survey or interviews in support of this research, including:

- CADECOM Malawi
- CADECOM Mangochi
- Caritas Colombiana
- Caritas Livingstone
- Caritas Mongu
- Caritas South Sudan
- Caritas Zambia
- CDJP Bukavu
- CDJP Cyangugu
- CDJP Kabgayi
- CDJP Kigali
- CDJP Malawi
- CDJP Uvira
- Centre Olame Bukavu
- CDJP Rwanda
- Development & Partnership in Action Cambodia
- Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection
- Kasisi Agricultural Training Centre
- Lisungwi Catholic Parish
- Mundri Relief & Development Association (MRDA)
- Pastoral Social Diocesis de Quibdó
- Popoli Fratelli
- Secretariado Diocesano de Pastoral Social, Diócesis de Apartadó
- Sudan Evangelical Mission
- Zomba Diocese Research and Development Department

7.3 SCIAF staff interviews

With thanks to all SCIAF staff who participated in interviews in support of this research, including:

- Alistair Dutton
- Lorraine Currie
- Robert Swinfen
- Penelope Blackwell
- Geraldine Hill
- Eleanor McKenzie
- Mark Adams
- Rob Angove
- Mari Everett
- Margaret Law
- Mark Booker
- Anne Karlin
- Sarah Swaroop
- Blessings Kachale
- Mark Camburn
- Claudia Alloza
- Siobhan Wright

7.4 Documents Reviewed

- Achieving More – Innovation in SCIAF Policy Statement and Guidelines.
- Innovation in SCIAF Policy Presentation.
- Evaluation of SCIAF Strategic Plan: 2011 - 2015. 2017.
- SCIAF Strategic Plan 2016-2020.
- Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEaL) Framework and plan: Strategic Plan 2016 – 2020.
- Strategic Plan 2016 - 2020 Evaluation Data Collection Plan and Reporting Template.
- SCIAF Strategic Plan 2021-2025: Responding to the Cry of the Poor and the Cry of the Earth: Building a Just and Green World.
- SCIAF Communications Policy 2021.
- SCIAF Advocacy Manual.
- SCIAF Advocacy Manual Pilot: 12-Month Review.
- SCIAF Advocacy mapping report.
- SCIAF Advocacy Strategy 2017-2020.
- SCIAF Advocacy Strategy Review Discussion Paper 2020.
- SCIAF Partner Advocacy IHD Workshops 2019, 2020 and 2021.
- SCIAF Updated Brand Narrative 2021.
- SCIAF PEC Learning from Outreach and Campaigns Review 2020.
- SCIAF Marketing & Communications Strategy 2021 – 2025. Building a Just and Green World: Engaging and inspiring Catholics in Scotland
- SCIAF Annual Companies House Reports 2016-2019.
- SCIAF Partner Survey Report on Feedback and Complaints Handling Mechanisms.
- Caritas Internationalis Management Standards and Scoring Guidelines.
- COMED Restructuring Summary.
- SCIAF IHDD Departmental Meeting Template.
- SCIAF Review of IHDD business case, structure and interview guide.
- SCIAF Evaluation Summary and Scoring.
- SCIAF Guidance Notes: Drafting Organisational KPIs.
- SCIAF Evaluation Management Response Template.
- Caritas Internationalis Accountability Working Group: Real Time Evaluation Report Response to the Sulawesi Tsunami, Earthquake and Liquefaction Disaster, 2018 (EA27-2018).
- SCIAF project evaluations 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020.
- SCIAF Integral Human Development Guide.
- SCIAF IHD Wheel Report.
- SCIAF Impact Magazine 2019.
- SCIAF Impact Evaluation in Schools Report 2018.
- SCIAF Operational Plan 2020.
- SCIAF Minimum Standards Checklist CI.
- SCIAF Partner Child Protection and Safeguarding Policies and Procedures.
- SCIAF Partner Organisational Profiles.
- SCIAF Partner Finance Questionnaire.
- SCIAF Partner Survey Report 2018.
- CAFOD & SCIAF Joint Programme partnership survey report 2021.
- SCIAF Public Engagement: Vision and Strategy.

- SCIAF PED Strategic Planning: Strategic Objectives 2021-25.
- SCIAF Public Engagement Committee Reports.
- SCIAF Quarterly Report Summaries 2016-2020.
- SCIAF Scorecard Reports 2016-2019.
- SCIAF Strategic Audit Report 2016 and Management Response.
- SCIAF Strategic Mid Term Report 2018 and Management Response.
- SCIAF Staff Satisfaction Survey Report 2017 and 2020.
- Caritas Internationalis Partnership Principles: Handbook for Reflection and Action.
- SCIAF Complaints Handling Mechanisms and Inclusion Report.