



Participatory evaluation of environmental education: Stakeholder assessment of the Wildlife Clubs of Kenya

McDuff, M. D., & Jacobson, S. K. (2001). Participatory evaluation of environmental education: Stakeholder assessment of the Wildlife Clubs of Kenya. *International Journal of Geographical and Environmental Education*, 10(2): 127-148.

Contact: Mallory McDuff
 Dept. of Environmental Studies
 Warren Wilson College
 WWC CPO 6092
 PO Box 9000
 Asheville, NC 28815-9000
 Ph: 828.771.3787
 Email: mmcduff@warren-wilson.edu

Program Profile	
Program Description:	The Wildlife Clubs of Kenya (WCK) is an environmental organization which educates Kenyan youth about wildlife and conservation. WCK works with schools to involve students and teachers in a variety of activities such as field trips to national parks, conservation education workshops, environmental rallies, art competitions, and community improvement projects (e.g., tree plantings, clean-up projects). In addition, WCK lobbies the Kenyan government to take conservation related action and publishes <i>Komba</i> , a wildlife magazine for youth.
Program Goals:	The WCK has three main goals: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Educate Kenya’s youth about the environment and natural resources; 2. Alert the public to the great cultural, environmental, aesthetic and economic value of natural resources; and 3. Develop a better understanding of the need to conserve wildlife and other natural resources.
Program Funding:	WCK is funded through membership contributions and private donations.
Program Links:	http://www.wildlifeclubsofkenya.org/background.htm
Evaluation Profile	
Evaluation Goals & Questions:	WCK conducted a participatory evaluation, in which teachers and WCK staff worked together to identify the following six key evaluation questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the most effective WCK programs? 2. What are the least effective WCK programs? 3. What are the primary constraints faced by WCK? 4. What are the benefits to students of WCK? 5. What are the primary impacts of WCK? 6. What recommendations are there for improving WCK?

Evaluation Methods:	<p>Because WCK used a participatory evaluation strategy, the first step involved determining which stakeholders should participate.</p> <p>During an evaluation workshop, teachers and WCK staff developed institutional diagrams identifying the importance of WCK stakeholders and how these various stakeholders interact. Analysis of these diagrams revealed four primary stakeholder groups, teachers, students, WCK staff, and external support organizations (e.g. Conservation organizations, donors, and government).</p> <p>A qualitative evaluation approach was used to investigate the six evaluation questions. Semi-structured interviews, consisting of eight open-ended questions, were conducted with students, WCK staff, and external support organizations. Questionnaires, consisting of 13 open-ended questions, were administered to teachers. The interviews and questionnaires address the same issues related to WCK programming.</p>
Instruments:	A partial set of evaluation instruments is available in the report.
How were results used?	The evaluation results suggested that WCK should work to improve communication between WCK offices and local clubs and that different stakeholders had different perceptions about the role of WCK. The results were used to strengthen communication, as well as share perceptions between stakeholder groups. In addition, this evaluation served as a foundation for an assessment of the impacts and future directions of other Wildlife Clubs throughout Africa.
Evaluation Cost:	This evaluation was funded by a foundation doctoral research grant, and cost a few hundred dollars in travel and materials. This total however, does not include cost related to evaluator or program staff time.
Evaluation Insights:	<p>What worked well? Conducting the stakeholder analysis and then involving all stakeholders in the evaluation planning process was extremely valuable.</p> <p>What were important evaluation “lessons learned”? Conducting a participatory evaluation takes extra time, but the benefits of infusing a monitoring/evaluation mindset into a nonformal program were worth the effort. For programs that typically use external evaluation or no evaluation at all, participatory evaluation empowers program staff in concrete evaluation skills.</p> <p>What could have been done differently? Funding for follow-up after the year of evaluation activities would help ensure application of skills gained to future institutional evaluations.</p>
Profile information provided by:	<p>Susan Jacobson Department of Wildlife, Ecology and Conservation, University of Florida & Mallory McDuff Dept. of Environmental Studies Warren Wilson College</p>
Profile prepared by:	<p>Jason Duvall, Ph. D. Candidate, University of Michigan Dr. Beth Covitt, Michigan State University</p>
Posted on:	November 2007