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1. Introduction

The Innovations Stream of the 2013–2018 Initiative emphasized learning, practice, and documentation of state-of-the-art development approaches. It focused on the Coady approach of citizen-led, community-driven, asset-based development. This includes three components:

- Research, testing, and documenting innovative strategies, tools, and practices;
- Launch of the new Coady Fellowship Program; and
- Strengthening Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) across the organization.

The current study focuses on the first component of the Innovations stream: testing and documenting 15 innovations (strategies, tools, practices, and approaches) in citizen-led, community-driven, asset-based development. This represented a small portion of the overall budget for the initiative and was designed to capture aspects of work Coady staff were engaged in on the ground with partners or in the classroom. Innovations could be based on work that others were doing that had come to Coady’s attention and that enabled partners and Coady to expand their knowledge and networks. Ultimately, innovations were intended to strengthen the development approaches used by Coady’s partners and graduates.

This report provides an overview of Coady’s approach, how innovations were selected, and abstracts of the innovations. Innovation partners were also surveyed for satisfaction with the collaboration, the areas in which they have seen change as a result of the innovation, and whether or not the innovation strengthened their development thinking, teaching or practice.

There is no other institution I can think of that could have supported me to mindfully plan, develop, question, adjust and implement my ABCD-based climate change adaptation project that we implement with smallholder farmers in western Kenya as well as the Coady Institute

~ Lisa Fuchs, ICRAF

An innovation strategy was developed in 2014, which outlined definitions, linkages to other programs, selection processes and criteria, as well as some initial innovations ready to be piloted. Over the second year of the initiative, Coady’s Innovations Working Group led a call for proposals from staff and associates. A second and third call were held in the third and fourth years of the Initiative. Over the course of the Initiative, 28 were assessed, 18 were selected, and 17 were completed. Several shifted focus or changed due to internal and external circumstances. Three additional innovations were completed, as co-funding and partnerships allowed Coady to take advantage of opportunities.

Partners included the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF, Kenya), the Centre for Indigenous Knowledge and Organizational Development (CIKOD, Ghana), the Self-Employed Women’s Association (SEWA, India), the Women and Orphan Movement (Ghana), Philakehle Centre and the Raphael Centre (South Africa), Participedia (global), and Slum Dwellers International (SDI, global), among others. Other projects included global graduate networks and country-based graduate networks. Work took place in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Kenya, Ghana, South Africa, the Philippines, and other locations in the global South.
The innovations range in scope from smaller thought pieces to larger development projects (possible through co-funding from private foundations). These were documented internally (trip reports, project reports, reports to co-funders, classroom resources), documented for public consumption (innovations reports, book chapters, case studies, and webinars), and disseminated in a variety of manners (during field research, with partners, through partners, at conferences/learning forums, through webinars, and through sharing documentation). Non-GAC funding supported dissemination activities at international conferences.

I have always received unmatched support from the Coady staff, and the participation project staff dedicated themselves meticulously to ensure that our (my) write up was of excellent quality and understandable by a global audience.

~ Anonymous

As of January 1, 2019, webinars had received over 300 views, documentation had been downloaded over 700 times, and there had been 2 academic citations. Several academic forms of documentation (conference proceedings, book chapters, peer-reviewed articles) are in progress, but due to the ‘lag’ time in academia between conceptualization to publication, these were not complete by December 31, 2018. A conservative assessment of the indirect reach to different individuals is over 15,000. This occurred due to co-funding and through workshops, use in classrooms, and, in some cases, translation into local languages (Gujarati and Creole) and use by local partners (ICRAF, CIKOD, SEWA, etc.).

Of 18 innovation partners 89% agreed or strongly agreed that the collaboration strengthened their development thinking, teaching, and practice; moreover, 95% were satisfied or strongly satisfied with the collaboration. The thematic areas upon which innovations had an impact were resilient communities (93%), local economies (80%), women’s leadership (73%), and accountable democracies (47%).

We as rural women farmers in the villages are now able to farm more and add value to them to meet the extended markets, like trade fairs, local exhibitions and selling in some hotels and stores based on the skills we have acquired (value chain). It has strengthened us as individuals and the organization such that women farmers in the empowered communities and its surrounding communities now stand firm on their own without looking up to men or other people for support to feed or cater for their families.

~ Anonymous
2. Coady’s Approach: Exploring Innovation in citizen-led, community-driven, and asset-based community development

There is a huge body of literature in many disciplines on the subject of innovation. Technical innovation, institutional innovation, innovation in educational practice, innovation in media for communication, and innovation in development practice are all of interest to the Coady Institute’s work. Literature on social innovation is probably the most relevant, because of its emphasis on citizen-led change and also because social innovation is closely linked with other types of innovation.

Exploring what we mean by innovation is often the first step in determining the goal to which the innovation is directed. Any definition of innovation must therefore also be clear about the kind of social change it is aimed at. Alan Fowler1, for example, argues that social innovations are not only closely tied to specific contexts, but also fundamentally about who gains and loses as a result of change:

“Social innovations are context dependent, original or inventive agent-inspired initiatives that are intended to alter the rules of the game - or the game itself - through the institutions that mediate and co-determine a society's aspirations, trajectory, sustainability and its winners and losers.”

In general, social innovations are new strategies, ideas, activities, or services that meet social needs. They are developed and disseminated primarily by civil society organizations that are social in nature, which differentiates them from business innovations and other innovations motivated primarily by profit. Social innovation processes are sometimes understood as coming from the work of individuals, broader social movements, from market dynamics or organizations.

For a leadership development institution, innovation in how knowledge is developed and shared, both in the classroom and with networks of practitioners, is also central to Coady’s mission. In our Knowledge Building Strategy, we specify three types of innovation: Innovation in Thinking, Innovation in Teaching, and Innovation in Practice.

Clarity about what changes we know communities want to see in their context is the first step in developing criteria for what is selected as an innovation to develop and support. The kinds of changes Coady wants to see are those that make it easier for citizens in every society, including the most marginalized populations, to act with others to initiate and sustain efforts to improve the wellbeing of their members and communities.

---

Who leads and who has ownership of the process of developing and ultimately capturing innovation is also important. Ownership in this context refers less to the notion of intellectual property and more to the agency of citizens to create and share their innovations as they see fit.

Respondents to the innovations partner survey consistently noted that the Coady approach of flexibility, community-led, and participatory design and implementation strengthened the methodologies and approaches taken during the innovations.

The kind of tools introduced in the community by COADY as acted as an eye opener to the community as well as to myself. ABCD training was the very new thing the community was first learning from COADY. The use of Leaky bucket has changed the community way of doing things in terms of priority activities when it comes to farming and financial organization in their households. After mapping institutions and associations, group members are moving on their own to partner with other organizations without even any project link.

~ Victoria Atieno Apondi, ICRAF
3. Innovation Selection, Documentation, and Dissemination

An innovation did not have to be entirely new; in fact the innovation could be in the repurposing of previous ideas, products, and purposes, or a recombination of ideas and practices in novel ways. The bottom line is that these novel ideas and ways of doing things would take us further in the direction in which we want to go.

Prospective innovations to be tested, captured, and shared with others were identified and put forward by Coady program staff (including Associates). These innovations could be based on particular aspects of work our staff are engaged in on the ground with partners or in the classroom. Innovations could be based on work that others are doing that has come to our attention, and which allow us to expand our learning and our networks.

Innovations were selected based on the following criteria:

- Alignment with Coady’s citizen-led approach
- Links to one or more of Coady’s broad thematic areas (Promoting Accountable Democracies, Building Resilient Communities, and Strengthening Inclusive Economies) and/or our particular focus on Women’s Leadership, Youth Leadership, and Indigenous Leadership
- Had the potential to influence development practice and policy in favour of citizen-led development
- Had demonstrated or potential interest among Coady alumni for co-learning
- Presented an opportunity to produce one or more knowledge products
- Presented opportunities to adapt these knowledge products for use as Coady curricula
- If relevant, provided an opportunity to engage a Coady Fellow in either the capturing of the innovation, the production of a knowledge product, or the engagement of learning networks around the innovation plan for developing new Coady curriculum

Over the course of the Initiative, 28 proposals were assessed, 18 were selected, and 17 were completed. Several shifted focus or changed due to internal and external circumstances. Three extra innovations were selected and completed, as co-funding and partnerships allowed Coady to take advantage of opportunities.

Many of the projects feed into Coady’s Innovation Series which documents innovative thinking (exploring development trends and citizen strategies for bringing about successful change), innovative practice (tested tools and approaches to support community development practitioners in their work), and innovative teaching (approaches to education and learning that have been tested for classroom, workshop or training use). Many were also documented in other forms such as technical reports, videos/webinars (available on YouTube), academic resources (book chapters, conference proceedings, and peer reviewed articles), and as standalone tools.

Innovations were disseminated in a variety of manners. Many are available on Coady’s website through the Innovation Series page. Other forms of dissemination occurred during field work and testing, sharing with individual and organizational partners, sharing with graduates, at conferences/learning forums, through webinars, and through use as a classroom resource. They continue to be refined, adapted, and shared with and by alumni and partners.
4. Development Results

4a. Capturing Innovations

Innovations were designed to capture aspects of work Coady staff were engaged in on the ground with partners, or in the classroom. A variety of forms of documentation and dissemination were used to move them from tacit knowledge to explicit knowledge. We were not interested just in factual data, but advice that was tailored to questions asked so that experiences could be captured in collaborative processes to build contextual understandings. Ultimately, they were intended to strengthen the development approaches used by Coady’s partners and graduates.

We have applied the innovation in 1) grassroots women’s ownership and decision making in their own development 2) democratic process of participation, allocation and decision making of poor and women in resource planning 3) developing rural economies 3) bringing innovative thinking for development among women.

~ Megha Desai, Self-Employed Women’s Association (India)

Coady began with the recognition that there is a certain risk with innovations. For example, one was not completed due to external circumstances with partners, and others shifted focus. Others were adapted and changed based on realities on the ground, and sometimes scaled down. Some were scaled up as opportunities for co-funding arose. However, even if not completed as planned, they still provided an opportunity to test, document, and learn from partners and graduates.

The range of innovations bridge theoretical or practical gaps, apply or testing tools/approaches, document practices, apply intersectional lenses, or simply provide a space for partners and graduates to reflect and learn. Many have been incorporated into education programs, have been adapted and used by partners, or now form new tools used in the field. Others are innovations in thinking which could later be turned into an innovation in practice or teaching. Indeed, several innovations included multiple phases to recognize these distinct but interrelated outcomes.

We are using peer to peer slum community exchanges to support collective learning by the poor about resilience building in informal settlements. The research innovation sees dialogue between the poor themselves as a building block for more effective research. Academics capture these narratives and support the aggregation of lessons and best practice emerging from these communities.

~ Anonymous

A partner survey was distributed in December 2018 to partners and graduates involved in innovations projects. In it, respondents were asked to identify if and how they have used the innovation or plan to use the innovation; to select and rank up to three thematic areas upon which the innovation has had impact; to rate and explain their overall satisfaction with the collaboration with Coady on the innovation; and to
rate and explain whether or not the collaboration with Coady helped strengthen their contributions to development thinking, teaching, or practice.

The areas of change represent the typical mix of Coady programming: 93% selected resilient communities as an area where the innovation had impact, 80% selected local economies, 73% selected women’s leadership, and 47% selected accountable democracies. The “other” areas of impact were: inclusive communities, citizen-centered development, youth leadership, and public participation.

*Our students benefitted tremendously from their discussions with the COADY fellows, especially from their insights into development practices and participatory innovations in other parts of the world. Our students often feel that they do not receive sufficient teaching on practice-related matters. The COADY workshop filled this important gap in our overall programming.*

~ Bettina von Lieres, Centre for Critical Development Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Local Economies</th>
<th>Resilient Communities</th>
<th>Accountable Democracies</th>
<th>Women’s Leadership</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most relevant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second most relevant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third most relevant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4b. Application, Satisfaction, and Strengthened Thinking, Teaching, and Practice

90% of respondents stated that they had already or were planning to apply the innovation to their practice. One respondent did not answer this question, while the one who stated they had not applied it noted that they are currently a student, therefore did not have the opportunity yet. Those who have applied or plan to apply noted four main areas: rural economic development and enterprise development (6), direct on the ground application with farmers, rural women, or other marginalized populations (5), and incorporating the innovation into their training and teaching (5). Other uses have been improving data collection and action research and organizational strategy development.

Respondents explained why they were satisfied with the Innovation. They shared various reasons, as each innovation project was different. However, there were a few key trends in the responses. About 1/3 (5) noted that the collaboration contributed to their own or their organization thinking about development problems. About a third (6) shared that the tools were of high quality, and readily adaptable to different contexts. Another third noted the direct improvement of economic development in their projects and programs. A minority noted the opportunity to reflect and think as the primary reason for their satisfaction.

*We were already using participatory democracy as a tool in our work, but during the drafting stages, [but] the discussions that took place helped us to review and improve our strategies to facilitate participatory democracy in our work.*

~ Patricia Blankson Akakpo
Overall, the collaboration with Coady was flexible and support was offered as it was needed in the areas of project design, administration, packing, and even marketing.

Respondents were also asked to rate and explain whether or not the collaboration with Coady helped strengthen their contributions to development thinking, teaching, or practice. 89% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the collaboration had strengthened their thinking, teaching or practice. One respondent was neutral, and one did not respond to this question. The majority (10) noted that the collaboration with Coady had improved their approaches, projects and results in the field. The others noted that the collaboration had allowed them to document previously tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge (4), had contributed to building and creating a body of knowledge (3), or their thinking and models used (3).

We used the research/innovation to start a social enterprise that ensures widows are socially included in society, economically employed and the environment is sustained. Under their social enterprise we worked on the baobab value chain, which informed our strategy. Again in 2017, with support from the COMART foundation, funds were accessed to invest into the business now known as Atarrah Ghana Limited.

~ Fati Abigail Abdulai Widows and Orphans Movement (WOM)
5. Conclusion and Reflections

Coady’s innovations stream of activities has enabled the Institute to test and document 17 innovations (strategies, tools, practices, and approaches) in citizen-led, community-driven, asset-based development. It has also provided a framework for understanding three areas by which Coady can influence the development field: thinking (exploring development trends and citizen strategies for bringing about successful change), practice (tested tools and approaches to support community development practitioners in their work), and teaching (approaches to education and learning that have been tested for classroom or workshop use).

Over the last four years, the GAC-Leadership Initiative supported four Innovations in Thinking, three Innovations in Teaching, and nine Innovations in Practice. The innovations range from bridging theoretical or practical gaps, applying or testing tools/approaches, documenting practices, using intersectional lenses, or simply provide a space, heretofore unavailable, for partners and graduates to reflect and learn. More were identified, and will be explored and documented over the coming years. The innovation strategy, which outlined definitions, linkages to other programs, selection processes and criteria will continue to inform Coady’s documentation and testing of innovations identified by staff, associates, graduates, and partners.

A challenge, not unanticipated, is that it can be difficult to select innovations in advance and anticipate their outcomes and how ‘innovative’ they are. An unexpected outcome was that it was often ad-hoc and unanticipated innovations that were the most interesting. Therefore, Coady will continue to approach innovations with flexibility, with a community-led approach, and participatory design and implementation principles. These were found to help the Institute respond to partner and graduate requests and also strengthened the methodologies and approaches taken during the documentation and dissemination of innovations. It can be more empowering for staff and partners, create more ownership and motivation for other Coady graduates to see how their knowledge is contributing to the field visibly and concretely, and also create much more customized and current curriculum and examples. Furthermore, it is much easier, lower-cost, and potentially more “innovative.”
Annex 1: List of Innovations and Abstracts

1) **ABCD Digital Map**

Initially conceived as a full suite of Digital ABCD tools, this innovation was scaled back in light of other activities and instead focuses on a map that documents stories of ABCD practice in 16 countries (thus far). The final assignment of the online ABCD course was used to create this digital map of the world showing aspects of what is happening in Coady’s ABCD network. There is the potential to expand this map through Coady Connects and other graduates to create a full picture of ABCD projects, and identify connections or related projects across countries or regions, so that graduates and practitioners can support one another in situational leadership and their development practice.

2) **Innovation in Practice: Producer-led Value Chain Tools**

What are the ways to effectively engage producers in the community in value chain analysis? The producer-led process described here tries to address this basic question. It introduces simplified tools and an approach that ensures farmer participation in data collection, analysis, and identification of opportunities and constraints, and design of value chain interventions. This participation requires: (a) an environment in which they feel comfortable to share their knowledge and insights, which is often not the case when extractive surveys and questionnaires are administered to collect information; and (b) the use of simple and participatory tools that will enable them to provide inputs into the process of VCA and also help them to understand complex value chain systems and use this understanding for making livelihood decisions. The key steps and tools described are aimed at empowering the women and men farmers to make informed decisions about their own enterprises and how they relate to the value chain, thereby directly contributing to, and influencing, the overall process of value chain development.

The process of VCA involving these steps and tools was developed at Coady Institute and first tested with Oxfam Canada and its local partners in Ethiopia in August 2012. Global Affairs Canada supported the documentation and refinement of the tools as part of the GAC-Leadership Initiative.

3) **Farm and Household Leaky Buckets**

This guide is meant for organizations that see smallholder farmers as actors in their own right, not just subjects or beneficiaries of their projects. It is based on the premise that smallholder farmers who see farming as a way of life are also interested in seeing farming as a business. It is based on the further assumption that smallholder farmers are capable of learning basic business skills that help them separate and track their farm and household revenues and expenses, and that they will use this knowledge to make better business decisions. It is hoped that the tools included in the guide—the On-Farm, Off-Farm and Integrated Household Leaky Buckets—can be adopted or adapted by government and non-government organizations that support smallholder farmers.

This guide is the product of 6 years of action research in Kenya with more than a thousand smallholder farmers. The action research that led to the production of this guide was carried out by the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF). The World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) is a centre of scientific excellence that harnesses the benefits of trees for people and the environment. Leveraging the world’s largest repository...
of agroforestry science and information, ICRAF develops knowledge practices, from farmers’ fields to the global sphere, to ensure food security and environmental sustainability. ICRAF has been looking for methods to help smallholder farmers see the short, medium, and long-term benefits of agroforestry.

The Integrated Household Leaky Bucket is one of the tools that was developed, tested, and adopted to this end. The Coady International Institute and Comart Foundation were partners in this journey to find ways for smallholder farmers to develop the business skills needed to both grow their individual businesses and working collectively for the betterment of their communities.

4) Indigenous Food Systems and Producer-led Value Chain Analysis (Northern Ghana)

The Centre for Organizational Development and Indigenous Knowledge (CIKOD) in Ghana identified indigenous food value chains as a potential entry point for learning more about how to bridge the endogenous and market-led approaches. This was done through working with the Coady International Institute and other partners in a qualitative, participatory action research initiative. Producer-led value chain development and indigenous food revitalization in Ghana were developed to bridge these seemingly discordant approaches in development learning and practice, to build the capacity of local partner organizations, and to support rural women farmers in two districts of Ghana. This action research initiative will contribute to bridging the space between value chain analyses, market linked development, and food sovereignty concerns using a triple-bottom-line approach that considers and monitors economic, environmental, and equity perspectives as the project evolves.

This innovation looks specifically to indigenous food for the local community as well its economic potential for providing additional income to women who are the primary collectors of this non-timber forest resource. It highlights the case of a social enterprise in the Upper East Region (UER) being developed by the Women and Orphans Movement (WOM) based on strengthening a producer-led value chain for baobab products for domestic as well as export markets.

5) Resource Centres promoting Information Access, Activism and Peoples' Knowledge (Phase 1)

This innovation reports on the first phase of a research project examining the evolving role of libraries and resource centres supporting community development and civic participation, focusing on three aspects: information literacy, documenting people’s knowledge, and library space. It incorporates current best practices and insights from Coady graduates. Current literature in critical library studies is explored to survey the changing trends in information access, knowledge management, and documentation with an emphasis on social justice. Resource centres may be independent or linked to a development organisation (NGO) with a focus on their local communities offering services ranging from library collections to documentation and training. Community resource centres and community learning centres in many countries serve as focal points for popular education, community involvement and valuing local knowledge. Earlier discussions of the “digital divide” have evolved to the call for “digital inclusion,” which considers the learning and engagement required for people to use information in their own knowledge creation, the issues run deeper than mere access to the technology. It cannot be forgotten that very real barriers to access remain, particularly in rural areas.
6) **Resource Centres promoting Information Access, Activism and Peoples' Knowledge (Phase II)**

The initial focus group discussions held during Phase I found that those who do not have resource centres often want one and that those who do are seeking ways to revitalize them in the changing information landscape. Priorities expressed by Coady participants include:

- information literacy and access to current research to support development practice;
- information activism, critical analysis of sources, and uses of information in social justice work;
- ways to create and maintain safe and accessible spaces in the community (people's libraries, learning centres) using a transformative / informal learning lens; and
- ways to document their own work and offer platforms for sharing—supporting local level research hubs, online collaboration and support

Phase II focused on identifying ways to support these priorities. This included researching ways of providing an adult education lens in such work of providing space, information and computer literacy, “sanctuary”, diversity and inclusion, overall reframing or revitalizing role of library embedded in the community in which it serves. There is relevance to be drawn out in learning and supporting those working in social movements and democratic participation. This phase explores the relevance of innovations in public and academic libraries to NGO sector library and resource centre contexts.

7) **Community-Driven Health Impact Assessment and Asset-Based Community Development (Phase 1)**

Building the capacity of citizens or community members to assess and address the challenges they face in today’s world requires innovative approaches. One such innovative approach is the combining of three participatory, health promoting, community development processes: the People Assessing Their Health (PATH) process, the Community Health Impact Assessment (CHIA) process, and the Asset Based Community Development (ABCD) approach. The findings of the work to date has shown that combining these approaches has the potential to further prove the link between health, assets, and agency through grounded testing with Coady graduates from the Philakahle Wellbeing Centre and the Raphael Centre in South Africa.

In March 2016, Colleen Cameron and Brianne Peters facilitated a PATH/CDHIA/ABCD training with 15 Coady graduates and their partners at the Philakahle Wellbeing Centre in Bergville, South Africa. This was funded by the Comart Foundation. After being approved for the current innovation, they returned to mentor Coady graduates in the application of these approaches in 10 communities in April 2017. They also conducted a 4.5 day CDHIA program with 14 ABCD graduates at the Raphael Centre in Grahamstown, South Africa. This included a mentoring component where facilitators introduced the PATH process to six community members.

8) **Community-Driven Health Impact Assessment and Asset-Based Community Development (Phase 2 – ON HOLD)**

The second phase of this innovation was to return to Bergville and Grahamstown in November 2018 to research how these approaches impacted work with communities and within the organizations and to
produce a final publication. Unfortunately, due to unforeseen circumstances the second phase was cancelled. A Coady graduate, key to one of the organizations, passed away. She had requested the training and was the one with the vision behind it. Her passing also meant that her staff have simply been too stretched professionally and emotionally to take much more on. The second organizations’ funding came to an end, and they too were unable to continue this work.

As a result, the second phase of the innovation is on hold but a final publication will be produced documenting the integration of ABCD/CDHIA/PATH as a training methodology, including the tools that were developed by each organization, and some of the early results.

9) **Participedia: Deepening the Reflective Practice and Ongoing Learning in Participatory Democracy**

Since 2015, the Coady International Institute has partnered with Participedia, a global initiative aimed at harnessing “the power of collaboration to respond to [this] recent global phenomenon [by engaging] hundreds of researchers and practitioners from across the globe to catalogue and compare the performance of participatory political processes.” Coady graduates are making unique contributions to this knowledge mobilization effort and in doing so, are strengthening a global community of practice on democratic innovation.

As of May 2018, the Coady has mobilized and supported 22 graduates to reflect on and document their experiences in leading democratic innovation and participatory governance processes in their own diverse contexts. The Innovation Report features the first 12 case studies published by Coady graduates on the Participedia platform as part of this ongoing effort. The rationale for this collection is twofold. First, it showcases a body of work that may offer insights into the contributions the Coady is making—through its graduates—in governance systems and structures around the world. Second, it captures the cases studies in their original form. Cases compiled here reflect the impressions and accounts of individuals directly involved in the experiences documented and capture the original voice behind the story.

Graduates developed their contribution using a template that follows Participedia’s standard narrative structure for case studies. Over periods ranging from 5 to 18 months, each graduate developed and revised numerous drafts based on rounds of feedback and comments from Coady staff and editors. What has emerged is a collection of documented practice in democratic innovation and participatory governance which reflects both the diversity of Coady participants and graduates from around the world.

The cases capture and examine pathways for participatory development; participation for meaningful inclusion; participation for advocacy and policy influence; and participation for transparency, accountability, and effective service delivery. Beyond capturing and documenting innovative practice, the Coady’s partnership with Participedia is also designed to strengthen the ongoing learning of graduates once they return to their practice after participating in Coady educational programs.

10) **Rights-based and Assets-based Community Development**

This innovation explores the intersection between Human Rights Based Approaches and Citizen-Led, Asset-Based and Community-Driven Development. It examines:
vertical, horizontal, political, and economic forms of citizenship and agency (and how the approaches fit into these lenses);
accountability and risk in claiming rights and mobilizing assets;
the balance between the rights and responsibilities of citizenship;
how ABCD and HRBA fit into a Sustainable Livelihoods Framework;
critiques of both approaches; and
the emergence of ABCD and HRBA as alternatives to needs-based approaches.

The innovation also developed a community scorecard (CSC)—a tool to elicit public and social accountability through a community-level, dialogue-based process that engages service providers (duty-bearers) and service users (rights-holders) in efforts to jointly improve the quality of public services. This practice grounds key concepts and principles underlying citizen-led accountability and illustrates how both duty-bearers and rights-holders can be engaged in joint efforts to increase accountability—key to ensuring the rights of citizens are realized.

11) Inclusion and disability: Applying an Intersectional Approach to Facilitation and Global Development Practice

To begin to address the gap between global normative aspirations such as the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the lived experiences of people with disabilities, this innovation project aims to better reflect the realities faced by people living with disabilities in course curriculum. This included examining how community-driven approaches to development are currently addressing aspects of inclusion, access, and equity and exploring ways they can be strengthened to meet both the needs of practitioners living with disabilities and practitioners working with people living with disabilities (PWDs). This content is vital in providing key resources and learning for facilitators and practitioners with respect to the realities faced by PWDs, an aspect of teaching that is often ignored or underemphasized in their education and training. It also begins to reinforce the values embedded in the decolonization of pedagogy and the classroom.

The innovation was collaborative in design and implementation; individuals with lived experience and expertise in disability and global development were invited to collaborate on the innovation. Outputs developed jointly by Coady and project participants included a collection of tools and materials as well as teaching and facilitation strategies to aid in creating inclusive educational processes and content. The content focused on accessibility, disabled persons’ movements, progressive policy, disability, global development, as well as other content identified by the teaching staff of the Coady. A major outcome of the innovation project was to create new knowledge products with persons with lived experience that would be both shared internally and externally as open-source material. The intent was to share the content with graduates via webinars disseminated via the Coady’s graduate learning network and other media-rich repositories.

12) Urban citizen-led infrastructure responses to climate change in the Philippines

This project examines innovative examples of citizen-led community infrastructure projects in urban informal settlements and slums in Asia. The infrastructure projects are also demonstrative of taking into
account extreme weather vulnerabilities due to climate change. Slums are dynamic spaces where people work very hard and are forced to innovate due to limited resources and a lack of access to formal institutional support. The premise of the project is to examine the conditions that are required to allow for citizen-led innovation to occur in an urban setting when resources are limited.

The research involves citizens telling their own stories of innovation themselves to ensure their authentic voices are transmitted to a broader audience. Questions asked include: how did the community come together to initiate the project; did these individuals identify assets that already existed in the community to allow for this project to transpire; how did these individuals identify external actors to participate in the infrastructure project; and what was it about the ways in which the external actor responded that was important to the success and sustainability of this initiative? The project also examines barriers and challenges the community overcame to allow for the development to occur.

The Innovation unfolded in several phases. Phase 1 included desk research and meetings with Slum Dwellers International in July 2017 to identify examples of innovation in African and Asian informal settlements and slums. Phase 2 involved going to the identified communities with a partner from Slum Dwellers International to conduct the research in the identified communities (including vulnerabilities associated with climate change) and capture the stories of how individuals came together and implemented a community based sustainable infrastructure project. Phase 3 involves writing case studies and producing podcasts for dissemination (including several forthcoming academic articles).

13) Social Network Analysis

This innovation presents Coady’s test of Social Network Analysis to map alumni networks in South Africa. It provides a brief overview of Coady’s approach and work in South Africa, an introduction to Social Network Analysis as a methodology, and initial findings from the study and recommendations for supporting graduate networks. While similar to the asset-based community development (ABCD) tool of asset-mapping, Social Network Analysis provides a new set of analytical tools and approaches for mapping relationships.

There is potential to expand the use of the tool to convene, understand, and support graduate networks in South Africa as well as in other countries or regions. The study provided initial findings about what motivates graduates to stay connected with one another and initial recommendations for how Coady can contribute to building and sustaining these networks and enhance their development contributions. In particular, graduates wish to support each other’s use of ideas and tools, collaborate on projects, and share community development opportunities.

Coady has played a role in facilitating these connections, but also has the opportunity to enhance the networks that exist and contribute to building them where they do not. Beyond mapping Coady’s graduate network, Social Network Analysis has the potential to be used as an advocacy tool, to build alliances and coalitions for specific development issues, and as a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) tool to map the longer term outcomes and impacts of Coady’s programs. It could also be used by graduates themselves to map the social networks within their own fields of development.
14) Learning from Youth Leaders

Today, more than half of the world’s population is under the age of 30. In community development and social change work, and in society more broadly, there are increasing numbers advocating for the meaningful participation of youth and for young people’s voices to be heard. In many instances, however, this sentiment seems to come either from a place of charity (to incorporate the voices of marginalized populations) and/or from a desire to ‘mentor tomorrow’s leaders’—seeing young people as ‘having future potential’ rather than as being able to offer meaningful, important, and unique contributions in the present. Events around the world throughout history demonstrate that young people are at the heart of social justice and social change, and that young people are disproportionately represented at the leading edge of these movements. They form the core of those addressing today’s great strategic opportunities and challenges, from rebuilding the global economy to combating violent extremism to building a sustainable environment.

There are many individuals and organizations around the world striving to enhance the capacity of young leaders and enable them to optimize their potential to realize their visions for a more equitable future. With so many leadership development programs, trainings, and workshops available for young leaders, this project was developed from the idea that it may be helpful to identify some of the fundamental elements involved in Coady youth leadership programs that, in combination, make these programs somewhat unique. Further, utilizing and building upon these foundational and underpinning philosophies that inform Coady youth leadership learning opportunities, some specific examples of program practices, principles, and methods are offered that have established the conditions for many participants in these programs to experience some form of personal transformation. And along the way, some of the frameworks and models that support or inform this work will be introduced and referred to.

This (continually evolving) website is intended to serve two primary purposes:

- To inform potential Coady youth participants and partners about the work we do, and
- to provide information that may prove helpful to others who are also working to support youth leadership for social change.

The first phase of development will primarily consist of populating the site with the information, methods and practices currently used in Coady youth leadership programming. Subsequent phases will use these details to attempt to create a holistic framework that can be utilized by those supporting youth leadership for change to optimize their work.

15) Exploring Techniques to Simplify Feminist Economics through Gender Sensitive Budgeting Tools

While the market/neoliberal model of development creates processes that support growth and creation of financial wealth, it does not take into account the contributions of the ‘household’ as a primary unit of the economy. This household contribution includes informal labour, including the ‘care’ contribution of women, the elderly, and children. Social and gender roles further limit women’s involvement in the market economy guided by capitalistic ideology. This applies to other marginalized sections of society. However, most of the countries financing for equal opportunity tend to do so without creating strong mechanisms for the inclusion of everyone’s rights from the planning stage, in other words, rethinking the
very economic system to make it more inclusive. This is important that the examples should be placed for inclusiveness that will guide the environment, policy, planning and the process of allocation.

Participatory budgeting is an attempt to address this, however, the ground level capacity to understand and effectively implement it does not exist. For example, in Bangladesh most of the Ministries have been practicing gender budgeting since 2008, yet clarification in the implementing departments and particularly in the local government agencies are not there. It is found from different researchers that the gender budgeting concept is not at all clear to them and that creates lots of hazy and fragile discussions, which underscores the importance of the clarity on the participatory feminization of the planning, budgeting and implementation process to minimize the gaps.

This innovation is trying to fill a gap by creating a practical tool and guidelines for its use in participatory budgeting. The specific components of the innovation project include:

- Researching on the current state of practice of participatory budgeting in Bangladesh;
- Building a participatory tool to capture the various missing pieces of the contributions by the care economy and the like;
- Testing the tool in Bangladesh;
- Building local capacity for its use and strategies for adoption along with Coady graduates; and
- Creating educational materials and tools packages for broader sharing.

16) Bridging the Divide in Community Development: The Importance of Process in Linking Community Demands and Responsive External Support

Since smallholder farmers in the Global South are among the people most vulnerable to the impact of current and future climate change, numerous external actors focus on building their capacity in climate change adaptation and mitigation practices. Previous experience, however, shows that the success, efficiency, and sustainability of these projects depends on appropriate models and tools being implemented in order to take relevant climate-smart practices to scale.

After the successful completion of a four-year asset-based community-development (ABCD) climate change adaptation and mitigation pilot (2010–2014), and more than three years into the four-year (2015–2019) proof of concept phase, this innovation documents and explores sixteen key messages about the importance of process.

These lessons focus on how external actors can meaningfully support community-driven scaling of land-based development activities that are both context-specific and responsive to local identities, interests, and preferences (IIP). These IIPs can be understood as the quintessence of people’s complex life aspirations that are composed of and influenced by their socio-cultural background (identities), their rational calculations (interests), and their personal taste (preferences). Scaling, here, is furthermore understood as more quickly, equitably and sustainably reaching more people over a wider geographical area.
17) Exploring the Accelerating Adoption of Agroforestry Project (Produced by the World Agroforestry Centre, Kenya)

Smallholder farmers in western Kenya are amongst the most vulnerable populations to climate change and variability. Experience from numerous projects indicates that intervention success, efficiency, and sustainability is highly related to appropriate models, processes, and tools taking relevant climate-smart and resilient practices to scale.

The Accelerating Adoption of Agroforestry in Western Kenya Project, also known as the Triple A Project, innovatively scales up the asset-based community-driven development (ABCD) approach in combination with best practices in agroforestry and agriculture. Triple A aims for context-specific adaptation and mitigation options based on local identities, interests, and preferences. It combines general capacity development with tailor-made best practice trainings selected by individual project groups and adapted to their respective concerns.

The project, implemented in parts of Kisumu and Kericho Counties which form the Nyando River Basin, has been running in pilot and proof-of-concept phases since 2011. While Coady has played a large role in the project since the pilot phases, the GAC Leadership Innovation project has supported the documentation of best practices and approaches.

18) Using Action Research to Develop, Adapt and Adopt Context-specific Approaches for External Actors to Implement Sustainable Asset-based Community-driven Development Initiatives

The World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), in collaboration with the Coady Institute, has integrated an asset-based approach to a project entitled ‘Accelerating the Adoption of Agroforestry’ (Triple A). This paper explores how action research during the initial pilot phase of the project (2010–2014) provided the reflection time necessary for project implementers to improve their approach in the proof-of-concept phase (2015–2019), which was scaled to 600 households.

The paper outlines the overall process, precise steps, and important features of the approach, and specifically focuses on how external actors can be fair and useful partners to communities interested in driving their own development, by: (a) contributing to building self-awareness, skills and confidence; (b) proposing to be ‘equal’ partners who adapt their offer in terms of trainings, skills, and knowledge to self-formulated interests; and (c) proposing sustainability-focused modules into the trainings, including community finance mobilization, farmer-to-farmer outreach, and a backstopping office that allow project staff to provide demand-driven support.
Annex 2: Innovations and Documentation

1) ABCD Digital Map
   a. Digital Map Digital Map of ABCD Practitioners

2) Producer-led Value Chain Tools
   a. Innovation in Practice: Producer led value chain analysis: Facilitator’s guide
   b. Innovation in Practice: Producer-led value chain analysis: The missing link in value chain development – a tool for effective engagement of small producers
   c. Conversion into local languages (i.e., Gujarati & Creole) by partner organizations

3) Farm and Household Leaky Buckets
   a. Innovation in Practice: The Integrated Household Leaky Bucket

4) Indigenous Food Systems and Producer-led Value Chain Analysis (Northern Ghana)
   a. Innovation in Thinking: Innovation, investments, incentives and impact: What can rural women in Ghana teach us about social enterprise?
   b. Webinar: Building Community Resilience
   c. Classroom educational video (on trading of ground nuts in local markets in Northern Ghana)
   d. Internal documents and reporting: field reports, value chain analysis, power point

5) Resource Centres Promoting Information Access, Activism and Peoples' Knowledge (Phase 1)
   a. Conference proceedings: Information access and activism: Libraries and resource centres promoting and curating people’s knowledge
   b. Internal literature review

6) Resource Centres Promoting Information Access, Activism and Peoples' Knowledge (Phase II)
   a. Webinar: Resource Centres Promoting Information Access, Activism, and People’s Knowledge
   b. Innovation in Thinking: Resource Centres Promoting Information Access, Activism and People’s Knowledge
   c. Website of tools (under development)

7) Community-Driven Health Impact Assessment and ABCD (Phase 1)
   a. Peer reviewed paper: Community-Driven Health Impact Assessment and Asset-Based Community Development: An Innovate Path to Community Well-Being
   b. Innovation tool: Community Health Impact Assessment Tool and Facilitators Guide (internal to the Raphael Centre)
   c. Classroom resource: A reflection on the practical steps and training tips integrating ABCD/CDHIA/PATH processes, including the tools that were produced by each organization

8) Community-Driven Health Impact Assessment and ABCD (Phase 2)
   a. Innovation on hold due to unforeseen circumstances. Final report and tools planned.
9) Participedia: Deepening the Reflective Practice and Ongoing Learning in Participatory Democracy
   a. Innovation in Practice: Participatory, accountable, and inclusive governance in practice: A collection of Participedia case studies by Coady graduates
   b. Participedia case studies
      a. Enhancing People’s Participation in Local Radio in Nepal, Bhumiraj Chapagain
      b. Persons With Cerebral Palsy Self-Mobilising for Meaningful Participation in Uganda, Peter Ochieng
      c. Omaar: Civic Education to Mobilize Youth in Community Engagement in Zakazik (Sharquia, Egypt), Aliaa Saber Hussein
      d. Citizen Observers: Social Accountability in Nigeria’s Judicial Sector, Barbara Shitna Maigari
      e. The Women’s Advisory Platform: Promoting Gender-inclusive Governance in Juaboso District (Ghana), Patricia Blankson Akakpo
      f. Engaging Youth in Municipal Youth Policy Development (Santa, Northwest Cameroon), Patience Agwenjang
      g. El-kfoor Village Community Committees (El-Minia, Upper Egypt), Hany Ghaly
      h. The Social Accountability for Education Reform Initiative (Ba-Ziyd, Beni Suef, Egypt), Moshira Saad Eldein Mahmoud Zeidan
      i. Youth with disabilities’(YWDS) inclusion in Development in Uganda, Betty Cheptoek
      j. Engaging local CSOs to achieve sustainable development: the Peru 2030 Agenda Ambassadors Program, Rosario Garavito
   c. Webinars
      i. Documenting graduate experiences in Participatory Governance
      ii. Citizen Observers: Social Accountability in the Nigerian Judicial Sector
      iii. Persons with Cerebral Palsy Self-Mobilize for Meaningful Participation
      iv. Enhancing People's Participation in Local Radio in Nepal
      v. Coaching & Mentoring Professionals in the Uses & Research of Public Participation

10) Rights-based AND Assets-based Community Development
   a. Internal Draft Discussion Paper
   b. Innovation in Thinking: Assets on the right(s) track? Reflections at the intersection of human rights-based approaches and asset-based and citizen-led development. (forthcoming)

11) Inclusion and Disability: Applying an Intersectional Approach to Facilitation and Global Development practice
   a. Online compendium in Moodle of teaching/learning tools based on the courses/subject matter covered at the Coady.
c. Innovation in Teaching: Applying an intersectional approach to facilitating and global development practice

d. Webinar: Universal Design for Learning: Connecting Accessibility and Adult Education

12) Urban Citizen-led Infrastructure Responses to Climate Change in the Philippines
   a. Multi-media Case Study
   b. Conference proceedings: Reframing Urban Resilience (forthcoming)
   c. Academic paper currently being written for publication (forthcoming)

13) Social Network Analysis
   a. Innovation in Thinking: Applying social network analysis to Coady networks: The case of South Africa
   b. Webinar: An Introduction to Social Network Analysis

14) OceanPath Fellowship Model / Learning from Youth Leaders
   a. Website of tools and approaches: https://coady.stfx.ca/youthleaders/

15) Exploring Techniques to Simplify Feminist Economics through Gender Sensitive Budgeting Tools

16) Bridging the Divide in Community Development
   a. Innovation in Practice: Bridging the divide in community development

17) Exploring the Accelerating Adoption of Agroforestry project (Produced by the World Agroforestry Centre, Kenya)
   b. Video: Trees on Farms: Transforming lives through sustainable agriculture
   c. Video: Youth empowerment through agroforestry
   d. Video: Women in agroforestry for improved livelihoods
   e. Video: Accelerating Adoption of Agroforestry in Western Kenya

18) Using Action Research to Develop, Adapt and Adopt Context-specific Approaches for External Actors to Implement Sustainable Asset-based Community-driven Development Initiatives