Scene setting presentation

Monitoring and Evaluation of Capacity-building UNFCCC 1st Capacity Building Talk

Patricia Rogers, BetterEvaluation 27 November 2020



Simol KNEEBORE

Designing fit-for-purpose monitoring and evaluation

Nature of what is being monitored and evaluated How well understood and predictable – intended results and how to achieve them Multiple actors contributing to results Effect of context on activities and results Timelag before results evident Visibility of activities and results

Primary intended users Primary intended uses – learning, accountability, signalling Timing of monitoring and evaluation compared to implementation (before, during, afterwards)

Types of Key Evaluation Questions being asked

Nature of the monitoring and evaluation

Resources and constraints

Quantity, quality and relevance of existing data Internal team time Funding to engage external support Goodwill and support of key stakeholders IT systems Barriers to travel and engagement

Challenge 1: Getting information about patterns that can inform decisions

Scenario:

After a training program has been completed, the following indicators are reported:

- 60% of participants did not meet the required level of competency by the end of the program
- 60% of participants were from rural areas

How can you use this information to either improve the course or change the targeting of participants to achieve better outcomes?

SCENARIO A: Does not work for rural participants			SCENAR some ru	SCENARIO B: Does not work for urban participants or some rural participants			
	Not competent	Competent	TOTAL		Not competent	Competent	TOTAL
Rural	<mark>60</mark>	0	60	Rural	<mark>20</mark>	<mark>40</mark>	60
Urban	0	40	40	Urban	<mark>40</mark>	0	40
TOTAL	60	40	100	TOTAL	60	40	100

Data rehearsal – mock up data with different scenarios and trial making a decision based on it

Disaggregation – collect data in a way that allows this

Challenge 2: Evaluating performance given multiple dimensions and diverse evidence

Scenario:

A community-based program to reverse land degradation and salinity needs to understand how effective local groups are and track this over time.

Classic indicators:

Number of times group has met in past year

Number of registered members

Number of active members (attend more than half the meetings)

5 Exemplary	Most members of the community are contributing to the group and recognise they play an integral part in achieving holistic, long term and agreed community objectives. The group has its own identity and strives for excellence. They are able to identify and implement innovative solutions to problems with little or no government support. Members are willing to accept leadership, responsibilities and different roles. All members are implementing on-ground works and attending regular meetings. The group is exceeding salinity tree and pasture establishment targets and will be able to halt salinity within 30 years
	[4 and 3 not shown]
2 Not adequate	The group looks to government to set directions and activities. A small group of dedicated members have held leadership roles for long periods and are experiencing 'burn-out'. The group may compete with other organisations for membership, or members may consist of people with specific agendas. There is no long term planning to assist direction setting and goals are strictly short term and self-centred. On-ground works are completed by a small, dedicated core through government funding. Salinity targets are not being met although small areas of salinity may be mediated with time
	[1 not shown]

Global scale or rubric – developed and validated (reliable scoring), can track over time, can add other evidence, communicates about desirable values

Source: Corangamite dryland salinity program. <u>https://www.betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/rubrics</u>

Challenge 3: Understanding Value for Money

Scenario:

A training program reports costs and benefits for two different modes. Which provides better value for money?

Option A: Residential course	Option B: Virtual course and online support
100 participants	100 participants
100% pass rate (100 pass)	60% pass rate (60 pass)

Adapted from King, Hurrell and Hutchings 2018 <u>https://www.opml.co.uk/files/Publications/evaluating-vfm-in-complex-adaptive-development-programmes.pdf?noredirect=1</u>

Challenge 3: Understanding Value for Money

Scenario:

A training program reports costs and benefits for two different modes. Which provides better value for money?

Option A: Residential course	Option B: Virtual course and online support
100 participants	100 participants
100% pass rate (100 pass)	60% pass rate (60 pass)
Cost: \$ 1,000,000	Cost: \$120,000
(\$10,000 per pass)	(\$2,000 per pass)

Adapted from King, Hurrell and Hutchings 2018 <u>https://www.opml.co.uk/files/Publications/evaluating-vfm-in-complex-adaptive-development-programmes.pdf?noredirect=1</u>

Challenge 3: Understanding Value for Money

Scenario:

A training program reports costs and benefits for two different modes. Which provides better value for money?

Option A: Residential course	Option B: Virtual course and online support
100 participants	100 participants
100% pass rate (100 pass)	60% pass rate (60 pass)
Cost: \$ 1,000,000	Cost: \$120,000
(\$10,000 per pass)	(\$2,000 per pass)
Participants: local leaders of remote communities	Participants: urban residents with formal
with little previous technical experience	technical qualifications in a related field

Adapted from King, Hurrell and Hutchings 2018 <u>https://www.opml.co.uk/files/Publications/evaluating-vfm-in-complex-adaptive-development-programmes.pdf?noredirect=1</u>

Challenge 4: Supporting single loop learning and double loop learning *Scenario*:

After a training program, intended changes in practice are not being achieved – is it a problem in implementation or in design?



Target not met

Review recruitment processes

Challenge 4: Supporting single loop learning and double loop learning *Scenario*:

After a training program, intended changes in practice are not being achieved – is it a problem in implementation or in design?



Target met Target not met

Review course processes



Challenge 4: Supporting single loop learning and double loop learning learning Scenario:

After a training program, intended changes in practice are not being achieved – is it a problem in implementation or in design?



Target metTarget not metReview course processes and content

Challenge 4: Supporting single loop learning and double loop learning *Scenario*:

After a training program, intended changes in practice are not being achieved – is it a problem in implementation or in design?



Target met	Target met	Target met	Target not met
0	0		0
			Review theory of change
			Obstacles to implementing new practices –
			opportunities, incentives?



Nature of the monitoring and evaluation

Nature of what is

being monitored

and evaluated

Resources and constraints

BetterEvaluation	Child Clothad	Join us	Login
Overview + Methods and processes + Approaches + Themes + Resource	e library + Blog se	Contribute	P ▼
Home + Themes + Types of intervention + Capacity development results	Rainbow Fr	ameworl	k
Evaluating Capacity Development	Rainbow Framework overview and		

e programs supporting health, livelihoods, and other impact areas capacity development does not have stand-alone outcomes. Instead, capacity development supports a diverse set of goals in different sectors, at different levels through different activities. Capacity development consequently presents multiple monitoring and evaluation opportunities and challenges for practitioners. Some important issues surrounding capacity development and evaluation are: · Differing interpretations of what 'capacity' means - capacity of whom to do what

and whether it is 'adaptive capacity,' which allows local organizations to remain resilient to change. · Defining long-term outco mes of CD rather than just short-term outputs. Fo

example, what kinds of outcomes can we achieve by helping an organization build a strategic plan? · Establishing causal links between particular CD activities, impr

organizational performance, and the target development impact. · Articulating a clear and logical theory of change, accompanied by realisti need-driven targets rather than donor-driven activities and programs. · Choosing appropriate evaluation tools on a case-by-case basis.

In addition to the specific information on evaluating capacity development which is presented below, the following guidance can be useful for evaluators and for those managing an evaluation and overseeing the development of a monitoring and evaluation system or an evaluation plan:

The Manager's Guide to Evaluation - this interactive guide goes through 9 steps in planning and managing an evaluation, including overseeing design and choice of methods and processes. It includes the GeneraTOR - which supports developme of a terms of reference for an evaluation.

The Rainbow Framework - this provides a brief description of more than 300 different methods, processes and approaches that can be used in evaluation organised in terms of the different tasks involved in an evaluation or a monitorine system. Further information about all of these can be found on the website - her

port & Support

a 🖶

https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/themes/capacitydevelopment

