

ELMT Monitoring and Evaluation Framework: Overview

We have divided monitoring and evaluation into three broad levels:

1. Impact assessment (mainly goal and IR level):

Sustainable improvement in the environment or the lives of the client group (largely through PIAs and evaluations and sectoral reviews).



2. Evidence of change monitoring (below IR level):

Changes in the behavior, relationships, activities or actions of the individuals/groups and organizations the program works with directly (through quarterly reflection and focusing on changes within monitoring tools).



3. Activity monitoring (activity level):

Whether activities are implemented as planned (activity reporting, DIP review, and country level consortium meetings).

1. Impact evaluation

This will be carried out by PIA to be overseen by Tufts University. The suggested topics of these PIAs are:

- i) Fodder production – desirability, methods; VSF, CARE Som, (CIFA), SCUS. (This could be related to the pastoral food security framework and mobility issues)
- ii) Community based animal health services; the 3 country approaches and current policy constraints; VSF, SCUS, CARE Ethiopia, (KCA)
- iii) Strengthening of rangeland management – drought reserves/prosopis control/prescribed fire; SCUS, CARE Eth, CARE S May (this relates to livestock mobility)
- iv) Livestock marketing/livelihood diversification - all; May Appropriate areas for interventions (linked to livestock trade)
- v) Enhancing local level EW/ER;
- vi) Peace building approaches: peace committees, customary institutions, other approaches (Oxfam GB, SCUS, CARE Ethiopia, CARE Somalia).

An overall review of the program including the lessons learnt from the consortium functioning will also be carried out at the end of the program.

2. Evidence of change monitoring

The evidence of change approach has been adapted from a tool used by CONCERN Worldwide in Mozambique in 1996 for monitoring of changes in knowledge, attitudes and practice. It has been refined over the years and some elements of outcome mapping have now been incorporated.

What is it?

The evidence of change approach is about defining, as a team, the specific changes the program hopes to influence within the implementation period and jointly reflecting on a regular basis on whether those changes are taking place in order to enhance program implementation. It is a learning approach to monitoring and evaluation that requires front line staff to cite concrete examples of where change is occurring both positive and negative so that the team can reflect on how much this change is due to the program compared to other influences and in order that they can agree on how their own actions can be strengthened to promote positive change or limit negative change.

The evidence of change framework can be used on it's own as a tool for team review and reflection or it can be used as a basis to develop a more comprehensive monitoring system, the information from which can enrich the evidence of change review.

Evidence of change framework

| Change indicator (expected change) | Evidence of positive change | Evidence of negative or no change | Action point to build on positive change or address negative or no change or explore the example further |
|---|------------------------------------|--|---|
| IR1 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| IR2 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Cross cutting issues | | | |
| Social and gender equity promoted | | | |
| Conflict sensitive service delivery | | | |
| Strengthened customary institutions | | | |
| Collaboration with other stakeholders | | | |
| Other changes observed | | | |

How to use the evidence of change framework?

Step 1: Defining change indicators

As a team, for each activity take each of the key stakeholders you are working with e.g. a particular group within the community, CBO, local government or other actor and identify the key changes that you hope your program will influence within the program period. It is useful to identify changes that could happen at different stages of the program and different intensities of change e.g. changes in knowledge, attitudes and practices/behaviors. Be as specific as possible and try and limit the number indicators that will be reviewed at any one session to around 10, otherwise the review can be too extended or too superficial.

Step 2: The evidence of change review

Every quarter with your project team including front line staff and decisions makers:

- a) Set the scene for open, honest reflection;
- b) Review your indicators to make sure they are still relevant and adjust them if they are not;
- c) Identify specific examples of change for each of the indicators: these should include: where, what, what evidence you have. Remember: ‘evidence’ needs to be concrete and specific and give solid grounds for belief. It needs to recognize where other factors may have also influenced the change and if only limited changes are identified then how the change will contribute to the overall objective or theory of change should be articulated – i.e. not leave the reader constantly asking ‘so what?’;
- d) Agree as a team whether this change is actually happening and the influence you feel the program has had vis a vis other influences;
- e) Note down the change and define action points: how to build on positive change or minimize negative change or explore the example further.

Often the evidence of change cited needs further exploration to understand the complexity of the change processes underway. This is best done through in depth interviews with the individuals or groups concerned. It is suggested that for learning purposes these interviews are documented as case studies of change (see separate guideline). As part of the review it is also good to reflect on how your strategies and organizational practices are supporting the change and how they can be strengthened in the future.

Some of these examples of change and case studies could be used for reporting, however, it is important that this is only done where the team feels comfortable sharing the information so not to inhibit the openness of future reviews and the documentation of the case studies.

There are a number of principles to ensuring an effective the evidence of change review. Firstly it is important to remember that with other tools, it depends on how it is used. The review needs to be done analytically, in a spirit of openness and self criticism and should be done as a team with field staff (who can see the change happening in communities) **and** program managers (who can ensure recommendations are taken on). The examples cited need to be specific and verifiable – not general subjective assertions. Indicators should be reviewed and adjusted regularly to incorporate improved understanding and changing context and focus. Finally the evidence of change review is very much enriched if it draws on information from other monitoring tools, particularly participatory techniques to gather stakeholders’ perceptions of change and unintended consequences.

Developing a monitoring plan with the evidence of change approach:

The following schema can be used to develop a more comprehensive monitoring plan and tools developed that explicitly collect information on the change the program has influenced. This need care to ensure the collection of information is focused on these changes rather than collecting loads of information on aspects of people’s lives that the program has had no influence over.

| Change indicator (expected change) | Monitoring tool to be used | How often | By whom | How will the information be analyzed |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------------|----------------|---|
| IR1 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| IR2 | | | | |
| | | | | |

Step 1: For each change indicator define monitoring tools that collect information about the change

These could include: monthly/quarterly monitoring formats; in depth case studies; periodic stakeholder questionnaires; broad community questions e.g. Most Significant Change Technique; personal journals etc.

In order to be practical and to maintain focus, limit the number of monitoring tools, however make sure that there is some triangulation i.e. mechanisms to verify changes are in place through, for example, reviews or evaluations.

Step 2: Design the tools

The tools should explicitly collect information on the change indicators that have been identified. However, other information e.g. for reporting purposes and on cross cutting issues, and for enhancing understanding could also be included as long as everyone is clear on why information is being collected and how it will be used.

Make sure that tools are:

- a) Simple, focused and easy to use/understand;
- b) Should record information in the order that you collect it;
- c) Collect information on cross cutting issues: e.g. social and gender equity: how many women and socially marginalized people are included, whether the activity enhances access and control of resources; and conflict sensitivity.
- d) Provide space for unanticipated changes and recommendations and follow up;

If possible design the tools with those people that are going to use them and make use the people that will use the information are also consulted. Some example tools are given below.

Step 3: Pilot tools with the staff which are using them and adapt them together;

Make sure that information is collected in time to feed into evidence of change review and that it is synthesized beforehand.

Case studies (see guideline)

Main aim: Exploring the positive or negative changes that are happening as a result of the program, mainly for your teams learning but also for reporting (if sent with reports)

Main issues to explore:

1. In what ways did this individual, their family, their community, group and the environment change;
2. How did the program influence this change;
3. What other external influences have there been;
4. Try and explore changes in relation to the cross cutting issues of the program:
 - Social and gender equity;
 - Conflict sensitivity;
 - Strengthening of pastoral voice;
 - Cross border nature of livelihoods;

4. Activity monitoring

The main tool for monitoring whether activities have been carried out as planned in the quarterly narrative report and quantitative activity reporting format. This is complimented by the DIP review carried out by the DCoP every quarter and country level consortium meetings facilitated by the CoP and DCoP. At the country level co-ordination meetings an activity update is provided by the consortium members which is consolidated into a program update for ELMT. LVIA also manages a web based map of completed activities by ELMT which it will update on a quarterly basis.

The quantitative activity report also provides information for the USAID indicators as follows:

| USAID Indicator | ELMT interpretation | Target for two years | | Achievement so far | |
|--|---|----------------------|---|--------------------|---|
| | | M | F | M | F |
| Number of vulnerable individuals benefiting directly from USG assistance (pink) | Number of households where at least one member is engaged in the project other than NGOs and government. Beneficiaries include people who receive training but not those that attend meetings or gatherings. Includes all direct beneficiaries plus people served by CAHWs, water points etc. | | | | |
| Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance (pink) | Number of households where at least one member is engaged in the project other than NGOs and government. Beneficiaries include people who receive training but not those that attend meetings or gatherings. Includes direct beneficiaries plus people served by CAHWs, water points etc. | | | | |
| Number of producers' organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) assisted as a result of USG interventions (blue) | Number of associations (groups of two or more individuals) supported through the project | | | | |
| Number of people receiving USG supported training in natural resource management and/or biodiversity conservation (green) | Number of people trained in NRM | | | | |
| Number of people with increased adaptive capacity to cope with impacts of climate variability and change as a result of USG assistance (yellow) | Number of people with increased capacity to cope with climate change due to improved early response capacity, improved NRM and increased livelihood options that are resilient to or improve resiliency to the effects of climate change e.g. camels, fodder, cereal banks, business skills development | | | | |
| Number of additional surveillance and/or control systems in place for agricultural threats (biological and environmental) as a result of USG assistance (red) | Number of organizations with strengthened early warning or early response capacity (including livestock disease) | | | | |

USAID does not request gender specific information on the first indicator, however we will provide this anyway.