Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit

for Junior Farmer Field and Life Schools

Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit

Ms Terri Ballard, Ms Tanith K.Bello, Ms Francesca Dalla Valle

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION

The JFFLS programme was piloted in Mozambique and Kenya in 2004 and JFFLS schools have been implemented since then in Burundi, Cameroon, DRC, Gaza & West Bank, Ghana, Malawi, Namibia, Nepal, Rwanda, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Programme evaluations have been undertaken in five countries up to now: Mozambique, Kenya, Uganda, Sudan and Gaza & West Bank.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is an important aspect to undertake in a project or programme and supports the management work to ensure compliance of its strategies, objectives and approach. It is the mechanism for which the process aspects of a programme can be tracked and accounted for, as well as its impact assessed. M&E improves programme management and implementation and builds a case for advocacy.

1.1 Workshop on JFFLS M&E

FAO staff working in JFFLS programmes in five countries (Kenya, Uganda, West Bank & Gaza Strip, Sudan and Mozambique) attended an M&E workshop on August 11-12, 2009 in Nairobi to reach consensus on core M&E tools, based on the piloting that was taken place in the five countries, and to finalize the JFFLS M&E Toolkit. The specific objectives of the workshop were to:

1. Understand experiences from the field with M&E and use of existing JFFLS M&E tools;
2. Define realistic expectations of the JFFLS (its desired impact and outcomes based on realistic appraisal of the project);
3. Identify a few simple core indicators of outcome and impact;
4. Critically review all existing M&E tools for JFFLS and modify as indicated;
5. Decide on (revised) tools to include in the final JFFLS M&E Toolkit.

Workshop participants acknowledged that programme managers as well as donors are aware of the difficulty in measuring the overall GOAL or desired IMPACT of JFFLS programmes. JFFLS are intended to improve livelihood possibilities for participants in the future in order to improve food security and (in certain areas) reduce the impact of HIV and AIDS on households. Given the short term nature of many of the JFFLS programmes, and the wide age range of participants, from 12 to 18 in most cases, a more realistic approach would be to measure changes in medium term outcomes as an indication of programme effectiveness and success.

During the workshop, the group defined the core focus areas of JFFLS in general, generated a list of the main outcomes expected under each focus area, including examples of activities that lead the JFFLS towards accomplishing the outcomes, and arrived at a list of core indicators to be measured at beginning and end to evaluate whether the outcomes were reached. It was acknowledged that further work needs to be done to refine and finalize definition of the indicators and to ensure that the evaluation tools are appropriate to capture the necessary information. However, the group was satisfied that the outputs of the workshop reflected consensus and provided a strong experiential basis for defining indicators that can be utilized across a broad range of JFFLS contexts.

1.2 Development of a core JFFLS Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit

As a result of Nairobi 2009 M&E workshop, this core JFFLS Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit has been written to be included in the forthcoming JFFLS Facilitator Guide. Since the Getting Started! Manual was written, specific M&E tools have been revised and tested using a mix of methods, and a realistic appraisal has been made about to what extent "impact" of this type of programme can be assessed. This Toolkit is not intended to be a definitive manual on how to set up a programme Monitoring and Evaluation system. It will provide a summary of M&E principles relevant to JFFLS and describe a minimum set of core tools for on-going monitoring and programme evaluation. A considerable amount of this document will be dedicated to evaluation of outcomes and impact, as this is the area that can cause most concern among programme managers and M&E officers. There are a number of issues to consider when deciding how to evaluate a programme, some of which will be touched on here. During the Nairobi workshop, a core set of programme outcomes and associated evaluation indicators were identified which will be presented in this toolkit. We will suggest targets for change for the core indicators, ways to collect the information, and examples of how indicators can be created from survey data. Additionally, interview guides for focus group discussions and key informant interviews have been refined, based on the experience of several countries. These techniques are useful in the final phase of the JFFLS course to hear directly from the JFFLS participants, their caretakers and principal local stakeholders how and why the programme worked or not, what were some of the difficulties they encountered and the successes they experienced, what were any unintended outcomes, and what would be their suggestions for the next phase of the programme

The concept of providing a **"core"** set of M&E tools for JFFLS is important in order to generate standard information on performance across different programmes. Monitoring and evaluation systems should not represent an undue burden on Programme staff but at the same time should provide key information for monitoring the progress of the programme and evaluating whether the programme was successful. It is assumed that programmes will have information needs beyond what the core tools provide, and thus will feel free to collect other M&E data as defined for their specific programmes.

2. GETTING STARTED ON M&E – KEY DEFINITIONS AND CONCEPTS[1]

Monitoring and evaluation is a process that helps programme implementers make informed decisions regarding programme operations, service delivery and programme effectiveness, using objective evidence. It is a process in that it involves on-going and routine collection of information used to assess if the programme has made efficient use of resources and is on track (monitoring), and to assess to what extent the programme has reached its objectives in terms of outputs (programme activities) and outcomes and impact (whether the expected benefits to the target population were reached). Monitoring and evaluation is often required by sponsors and other stakeholders in order to provide evidence that the investments into the project were worthwhile or whether alternative approaches should be considered to improve effectiveness.

2.1 Monitoring

Monitoring is the routine tracking of the key elements of programme/project performance, usually inputs and outputs, through record-keeping, regular reporting and surveillance systems. It is used to track changes in programme performance over time and is an ongoing, continuous process. It requires the collection of data at multiple points throughout the programme cycle, including at the beginning to provide a baseline; and can be used to determine if activities need adjustment during the intervention to improve desired outcomes.

Monitoring is sometimes referred to as process evaluation because it focuses on the implementation process and asks key questions: How well has the programme been implemented? What has been accomplished?

Performance Monitoring and Evaluation can*:*
- assess achievements and shortfalls in program/project implementation while it is ongoing
- Reliably record changes over time in inputs, outputs, effects and outcomes
- indicate problems that may be resolved while the project is ongoing

Monitoring should be conducted at every stage of the program, with data collected, analyzed and used on a continuous basis. Evaluations are usually conducted at the end of programs. However, they should be planned for at the start because they rely on data collected throughout the programme, with **baseline data** being especially important.

2.2 Evaluation

Evaluation measures how well the programme activities have met expected objectives and the extent to which changes in outcomes can be attributed to the programme or intervention. Performance evaluation also consists of analyzing inputs and activities to determine their contribution to results.

Evaluation also refers to the process of determining the worth or significance of an activity, policy or program. The difference in the outcome of interest between participating or not in the programme is known as its "impact," and measuring this difference and is commonly referred to as "**impact evaluation**." A scientifically sound evaluation study design helps evaluators to measure the difference between what happened and what WOULD have happened if there had been no programme.

1 Most of the material presented in this section comes from a self-guided mini-course on the Fundamentals of M&E, prepared by Measure Evaluation. A full reference for the internet link to this document is presented in the Resources section. It is highly recommended that JFFLS staff responsible for programme management and M&E take this mini-course.

Evaluation study designs are described later in the document.

In addition to a tool to measure a programme's worth, evaluation is also a managerial tool to generate information that will inform future decisions on strategies and interventions. Overall, evaluation should inform on five major criteria, drawn from the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development, Criteria for Evaluation Assistance (OECD, 1991), namely:

- Relevance - the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, participant and donor;
- Effectiveness – the extent to which an activity attains its objectives;
- Efficiency - the extent to which resources (human, physical, etc.) has been used cost-effectively;
- Impact - the positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly; or indirectly, intended or unintended; and
- Sustainability - the extent to which the environment created by the programme can continue once the programme has ended.

2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation plans

Monitoring and evaluation plans should be part of every JFFLS programme. This plan details 1) the program's objectives, 2) the interventions developed to achieve these objectives, and 3) the procedures that will be implemented to measure whether or not the objectives are met.

M&E plans usually include a programme description, the logical framework (see below), a detailed list of process and evaluation indicators that will be used for monitoring and evaluation, and the means of verification (i.e. how the information for creating indicators will be produced). A data collection plan will detail the recommended timing and methods to be used, how the data will be handled and analyzed, and what reports will be produced.

2.4 Logical framework

A *logical framework* is dynamic planning and management tool that logically relates the main elements in programme and project design and helps ensure that an intervention is likely to achieve measurable results. It helps to identify strategic elements of a program, their causal relationships, and the external factors that may influence success or failure. It can provide the basis for monitoring progress achieved and evaluating programme results. A results chain, part of the logical framework, is a tool that outlines how the programme expects to achieve results. The Monitoring and Evaluation Chapter (7) of the Getting Started! Manual provides examples of results chains (page 111) and a JFFLS logframe (p. 115-7). A word of caution is needed at this point. No matter how "logical" your programme framework is, life is not likely to be so logical. Programmes always encounter unexpected turns in events or changes in the environment that threaten the logical progression of the programme. It is therefore necessary to build flexibility into logical frameworks and results chains, and try to anticipate what might come up in the future to deviate the way your programme is progressing. Better to be prepared! Good planning can assist in this.

Below we list the components of a Results Chain as they might pertain to a JFFLS programme. Programme **monitoring** deals mainly *with Inputs, Processes and Activities and Outputs* to keep track of for example, if the programme is on schedule, how the planned activities are being planned and prepared for, and whether the expected outputs have taken place. **Evaluation** deals with outcomes and impact to measure how well the programme has accomplished what it set out to do.

BOX 1. Components of a Results Chain

Inputs – the resources invested in a program, for example, technical assistance, computers, food, agricultural inputs or training.

Processes or Activities – The multiple activities, both planning and implementation, carried out to achieve the program's objectives, for example training in building a multi-story kitchen garden (MSKG), demonstration of improved agricultural practices, teaching songs about HIV and AIDS awareness.

Outputs – the immediate results achieved at the programme level through the implementation of activities, measured through routine monitoring, for example number of trainings, productive MSKGs at the school, community drama shows carried out.

Outcomes – The changes measured at the population level in the program's target population, some or all of which may be the result of a given programme or intervention. Outcomes refer to specific knowledge, behaviours, or practices on the part of the intended audience that are clearly related to the program, can reasonably be expected to change over the short-to-intermediate term, and that contribute to a program's desired long-term goals. Examples may include putting into practice improved agricultural techniques, obtaining knowledge to be able to start an enterprise, changing values to reflect greater gender sensitivity, handling problems in a responsible manner.

Impacts – The anticipated end results or long-term changes, positive and negative, intended or unintended long-term produced by the programme. The Getting Started! Manual describes impact of JFFLS as "Improved food security and sustainable livelihoods of participants and their households as a mitigation strategy against HIV and AIDS".

3. MONITORING - PROCESS EVALUATION

Routine monitoring systems of inputs, activities and immediate outputs (often called "process evaluation") is carried out to understand what is happening in the programme and uses the information to improve planning and performance while the programme is still active. It involves learning from experience and facilitates changes within the project, local institutions and government agencies. Problems identified early through monitoring can be resolved more quickly and appropriately, thus improving the probability of success.

A process monitoring system should be developed by individual projects or programmes to meet their particular needs. JFFLS have a centralized coordinator working for FAO, WFP or other sponsoring organization, but activities may be implemented by different agencies, governmental or non governmental, who are accountable to their donors or Ministries and have their own internal monitoring practices. This may be particularly the case for keeping track of finances and other inputs received for carrying out activities. For this reason, the Toolkit does not elaborate on monitoring system elements or how to set up a JFFLS monitoring system. However, we provide a brief description of monitoring indicators, as these are the building blocks of a logical framework and are used both for measuring programme processes and performance as well as impact.

3.1 Monitoring indicators

Monitoring systems use ***indicators,*** which are quantitative or qualitative measures of programme performance that detail the extent to which programme results are being or have been achieved. Indicators can be measured at each level: input, process, output, outcome, and impact. One of the most critical steps in designing an M&E system is selecting appropriate indicators. The M&E plan should include descriptions of the indicators that will be used to monitor programme implementation and achievement of the goals and objectives.

Indicators of programme inputs measure the specific resources that go into carrying out a project or programme (examples: "timeliness of delivery of agricultural inputs to use for demonstration in past month"; "Regularity of facilitator planning meetings in past 3 months").

Indicators of outputs measure the immediate results obtained by the programme (examples: "number of students involved in theatre presentations during the annual programme", "percent of participants who attend JFFLS lessons", "number of agricultural demonstrations in the first 6 months", etc).

Logical frameworks, as part of the M&E plan, include targets to be reached for every level indicator. Achievement of the programme in terms of delivery and immediate outputs is measured by comparing the target set ex-ante with its level of achievement at regular intervals and at the end of the programme. The programme staff may decide that 50% of students should take part in theatre programmes, or that the attendance rate to JFFLS classes does not decline by more than 5% at mid-term.

4. EVALUATION OF OUTCOMES AND IMPACT

4.1 What should JFFLS programmes be evaluating?

There has been concern among JFFLS programme staff that it may not be possible to measure true impact of the programmes for several reasons. JFFLS are intended to improve future livelihood possibilities for participants in order to improve food security and (in certain areas) and reduce the impact of HIV and AIDS on households, which are long term goals. JFFLS programmes are often of a short term nature and they have wide age range of participants, from 12 to 18 in most cases. It would therefore be difficult to assess the livelihood successes of the participants when they reach adult age; it would be unrealistic to assess improvement of food security of households and community at the completion of a JFFLS cycle, given the focus of the JFFLS on the youth and the relatively short duration of the programme, and it would be even more difficult to measure whether participants have successfully stayed healthy and free of HIV in their lives. A more feasible approach to JFFLS evaluation would be to measure changes in medium term outcomes as an indication of programme effectiveness and success. The Nairobi workshop helped to clarify the concerns and was able to reach a consensus that the JFFLS programmes can only realistically carry out outcome evaluations, or identify "elements of impact" that are measurable within the time frame of expected results. It was decided that evaluation of major outcomes of JFFLS programmes would cover the immediate or direct effects of the programme on participants, such as increased knowledge about prevention of HIV and AIDS and other diseases, attitude changes about gender roles, and improved practices and adoption of new agriculture or business skills.

4.2 Who should carry out the evaluation?

While routine monitoring and process evaluation are usually carried out by the programme staff, it is generally recommended that programme evaluations be conducted by independent, external evaluation experts. However, depending on why the evaluation is being done, it could be carried out by the programme itself if the purpose is for internal learning rather than accountability (in which case, independent external evaluations are more come). It will be important to involve principal local stakeholders for the JFFLS programme in the decision on the type of evaluation to carry out, its purposes and the ultimate use of the information, which will guide the decision on who is to carry it out. As part of programme design planning, the stakeholder analysis that is carried out should also cover the aspect of monitoring and evaluation. It is important to know what stakeholders are expecting and what type of evaluation will meet their expectations. A stakeholder analysis should help you answer the following questions:

- How much are stakeholders willing to devote resources (money, time) for programme evaluation and at which stages will they be involved (preparation, implementation, analysis, and dissemination)?
- What are the expectations of the users of the evaluation regarding the quality and quantity of data, in terms of accuracy, reliability and generalizability of the results?
- What level of detail is required?

Taking into consideration the purpose of the evaluation, the estimated costs, the amount of time required, and the expectations of the stakeholders and donors will help lead to a decision on what type of evaluation is to be planned and who is best to carry it out.

Having an external agency carry out the baseline as well as the final evaluation adds to the cost of evaluation, admittedly; however external evaluations have the great advantage of being impartial

and guaranteeing a high quality of the collected information, given the experience and skills of professional evaluators. External evaluators will often plan the evaluation and develop the evaluation tools together with programme staff to ensure that everyone fully understands the purpose and context of the programme to be evaluated.

One determining factor in choosing whether programme staff or external evaluators are best to carry out an evaluation should be the quality of the information to be generated. The methods and techniques we describe in this toolkit require a certain level of expertise and skill in order to ensure accurate and valid results. Questionnaires should be constructed in a way to capture the information desired, and should be pre-tested and adapted before use. Survey enumerators should be closely supervised and questionnaires checked for gaps or obvious mistakes. Qualitative techniques require facilitators with experience in guiding discussions and encouraging contributions. Analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data should be done by persons experienced in the specific analytic techniques in order to appropriately report findings and draw conclusions. Other considerations include knowledge and understanding of the JFFLS and what it is attempting to accomplish. JFFLS programmes may decide that outsiders would not be the best choice for conducting focus group discussions and key informant interviews, as they might miss the subtleties of the responses or not be able to lead the discussion in the right direction. Additionally, persons involved in the evaluation planning and implementation may have particular knowledge and experience with these types of techniques, such as teachers and facilitators. Working with local staff who has extensive experience in collecting data similar to that needed for the evaluation can greatly facilitate fieldwork.

These are all considerations that should be discussed among the programme staff and local stakeholders when planning the evaluation.

4.3 Use of indicators to evaluate outcome and impact

As we mentioned before, ***indicators*** are quantitative or qualitative measures of programme performance used to demonstrate change and to detail the extent to which programme results are being or have been achieved. Indicators can be measured at each level: input, process, output, outcome, and impact. One of the most critical steps in designing an M&E system is selecting appropriate indicators. The M&E plan should include descriptions of the indicators that will be used to monitor programme implementation and achievement of the goals and objectives.

Indicators of <u>outcomes and impact</u> measure whether the changes that were expected as a result of the programme were observed and whether this change signifies programme "success". Examples of outcome and impact indicators that can be measured at different times to detect change include : percent of youth that have introduced two crops to grow at home in the past year", "percent of youths that demonstrate knowledge and interest in market opportunities", "level of perception of youths on what are gender equitable roles".

Indicators should satisfy the following requirements:

- **Significant:** The indicator records a central, meaningful aspect of the intended change
- **Plausible:** The change measured by the indicator is connected to the project activities
- **Independent:** The change is measured independently of the means deployed, i.e., the indicator does not describe what was done to have produced the change (in our case, participation in a JFFLS).
- **Assessable:** The facts required for assessment/measurement can be gathered (Vahlhaus, 2001)

Box 2: Additional guidelines for the selection of indicators

- Select at least one indicator for each log frame component (input, output, outcome, impact).
- Select no more than 2-3 outcome / impact indicators per area of significant programme focus.
- Use a mix of data collection sources whenever possible (survey, focus group, key informant interviews, observation, and participatory techniques).

Some problems to avoid

- Choosing too many indicators with little consideration of the time, human resources and cost required to collect the indicator data.
- Identification of indicators that seem unrealistic due to lack of data to construct the specified indicator and/or because the indicator is very difficult to measure.
- Defining indicators that express the reason for desired change as participation in the programme (in this case, the JFFLS). For example, it would be incorrect to define an indicator as "increase in knowledge of HIV prevention <u>due to attendance in a JFFLS</u>". The more correct definition of the indicator is "Increase of persons correctly identifying three methods to prevent HIV". Other methods are used to attribute the observed increase in knowledge directly to the programme. This will be described more when we discuss evaluation study designs.
- Setting results targets when there is no reference to a baseline.

4.4 Setting targets for results

Once outcome and impact indicators are identified in the logical framework, it is necessary to set targets for the level of result or change that must be met to achieve success. It is important that targets be <u>realistic</u> so that you are not setting yourself up for defeat before you start! Target setting should take into consideration the resources of the programme and the probability of actually achieving the desired level of change given surrounding circumstances, such as interest level or time availability of participants, limited project funds, community support and encouragement, unexpected shocks or events etc.

There are at least 2 different ways of setting targets. One way is to set the *relative change* (compared to baseline) in the indicator that you would expect to observe at the time of evaluation. The other is to set an *absolute level* of the indicator you expect to observe at the time of evaluation. The following table provides simple examples of these two kinds of targets. While indicators do not include reference to participation in the JFFLS, and can thus be used to measure change in either participants or comparisons, targets make an explicit reference to the result <u>among programme participants.</u>

BOX 3: Setting Targets for Indicators		
Indicator	**Target : relative change (compared to baseline)**	**Target : absolute level**
% of youths who have introduced at least two crops to grow at home in the past year	50% increase over baseline of JFFLS participants who have introduced two or more crops at home.	At least 50% of JFFLS youths have introduced two or more crops at home
Comments	*It is necessary to know the baseline value of the indicator in order to assess if there has been an increase. Such a high target (<u>50% increase from baseline</u>) would be appropriate only where the baseline level was considerably less than 50% before the programme started. If the baseline value is already near 50%, then a lower target would be chosen.*	*This type of indicator may be used in the absence of baseline information, in which case a relative change cannot be calculated. This type of indicator can still be used to measure whether the target was reached or not.*

Achievement of the outcome and impact is measured by comparing the target set ex-ante with its level of achievement at the time of evaluation (end-of-project and possibly mid-term as well). However, knowing that you reached your target still does not tell if the positive result you observed was due to your programme. This is called **Programme Attribution**; we will get into that topic shortly.

4.5 Useful information for establishing targets

In a later section of this toolkit, we recommend a core set of indicators that address the main focus areas of the JFFLS programme and provide EXAMPLE targets for each of the recommended core indicators. It is not possible to provide standard targets that all JFFLS programmes should strive to me, as the level of change you might want to observe at the end of the programme depends on the observed level of the indicator at baseline (before the programme started. This may vary greatly across countries. The following are several sources you can use to determine targets that are realistic and achievable.

- Stakeholders' expectations of progress. Exploring the achievement expectations of national counterparts such as programme implementers and managers may be useful to provide a realistic idea of what can be achieved.
- Expert judgements and research findings. Experts knowledgeable about the programme sector and local conditions as well as research findings are other useful sources of information for target setting.
- Accomplishments of similar programmes. Information on what is being done in the programme sector under similar conditions by other agencies and organizations that have a reputation for high performance is an excellent input to the target setting process.

(UNFPA)

4.6 Attribution

How can you be sure that positive results found by the evaluation are due to the JFFLS and not due to other factors, such a new school curriculum that included the same material as JFFLS or an agricultural project carried out by an NGO in many of the same households as JFFLS participants? In order to answer that question, we want to know how the situation would have been if the project had not been implemented. For example, if the JFFLS had not taken place this year, would the children still have learned that they could be at risk of HIV, or would they still have increased the types of crops grown in the household plot? Trying to isolate the programme effect and say with assurance that the results we saw are due to the programme is called the "attribution gap", and in order to fill this gap, we need to use credible evaluation methods.

There are two key ways to fill the attribution gap: 1) measure change in the predetermined indicators at start of the programme (before the activities have begun) as well as at the end among participants, and 2) at the same time measure change in the predetermined indicators in a control group. The control group represents people who are similar to programme participants in all senses except they did not benefit from the programme.

How do we use these two elements to isolate the programme effect? Without a control group it may appear, based on a simple comparison of change between two time periods, that use of (for example) improved agricultural techniques promoted by JFFLS had either increased (success) or decreased (failure) since the programme began. One might mistakenly conclude that the project was very effective or ineffective unless other information is available to determine what would have been the change in use of improved techniques in the absence of JFFLS. It may be that other agricultural development programmes in the area were teaching community members about improved techniques, or that poor climate conditions limited the interest of farmers in experimenting with new practices. We presume that these factors would affect both our programme participants and the control person the same way, so by calculating the change in expected outcome among the participant group in comparison to that experienced among the control group, we are then able to isolate the program effect.

In summary, a programme evaluation should collect information in two points in time (before and after) and on two different groups (participants and controls). However, for a number of different reasons it may not always possible for JFFLS programmes to carry out the baseline before the programme starts or to use a control group. In a later section, some alternatives to this classic study design are offered that still allow us to attempt filling the attribution gap and to make judgments on the success of our programme.

4.7 Importance of the baseline

Initial planning of a JFFLS will involve carrying out a community diagnosis and stakeholder analysis (see Getting Started! Step 1: Planning) 2. This is crucial for understanding the local context, enhancing community involvement, ensuring that the proposed JFFLS will meet the needs of the community, and that potential JFFLS participants are appropriately selected. All of the information gathered from document reviews, from talking with local stakeholders and from other methods, such as focus groups with community members, should be documented carefully and retained for reference for evaluators. The Getting Started! Manual provides guidance on selecting JFFLS participants, intended to be youth who are orphaned and vulnerable or vulnerable for other reasons. Communities themselves are called upon to identify potential participants. Criteria used for selection to participate in the JFFLS as well as profiles of the selected students and their households will constitute a valuable resource for understanding the starting point and can be used to interpret results of programme evaluation at the end.

Community diagnosis, stakeholder analysis and participant selection profiles constitute one type of baseline information which is descriptive in nature. Another type of baseline information comes from collecting data on the pre-determined outcome and impact indicators in order to better set targets for desired change and to be able to compare indicators at different time periods to measure that change (as already discussed under Attribution). Optimally, this will be carried out *before* activities are begun, and among both participants and non participants (as a control group). Persons constituting the control group should be similar to the selected youth, which means that they too should come from vulnerable situations and in theory have similar levels of knowledge, attitudes and practices as the selected participants before the JFFLS begins. If the controls differ from the participants in important ways, this will bias the results and invalidate the study.

The question of using a control group in a JFFLS evaluation may bring up ethical issues of identifying and interviewing youth who in the end will not benefit from the JFFLS. One strategy to overcome this is to take advantage of a planned expansion. Such a strategy chooses eligible youth for a control group from an area where the programme is planning to expand to in the future, ensuring that the controls are similar in many respects to youth already selected and baseline data from the control area can be collected prior to the introduction of the intervention in the active area. Alternatively, it might be possible to compare current JFFLS participants with youth who have also been indicated as potential participants but who are not yet enrolled. In other words, those who go first are the group of participants, and those who go later make up the control group.

---

[2] The type of information to gather from a community diagnosis might include the following:
   a. What have been the major issues, trends, challenges and constraints for children and youth in building/developing their livelihoods?
   b. What kind of support is provided to children/youth to develop and enhance their knowledge and skills base (agricultural and life skills, livelihoods, nutrition/food security)?
   c. What has been local institutional response to youth problems?

4.8 Quantitative outcome and impact evaluation methods

Surveys constitute the main **quantitative method** of collecting evaluation data. A survey uses a fixed data collection instrument (questionnaire) with standardized set of questions that get asked to everyone (participants as well as controls) in the same way. Quantitative methods make use of statistically valid and objective ways for gathering and analysing evidence in the form of hard numeric data or nonnumeric data that can easily be coded into a numeric form. Quantitative indicators have statistical qualities (scores, means, percents etc) that allow comparisons to measure change or difference, for example between the beginning and the end of the programme, or between programme participants and non-participants living under similar conditions but without the intervention. Quantitative methods are most appropriate for answering "*who*", "*what*", "*how many*, "*when*", and "*how much change*". One big advantage of surveys is that by selecting a survey sample that is statistically representative of the target population, it is possible to generalize the sample results to larger population[3]. The other advantage is the use of statistical hypothesis testing to produce valid estimates of the magnitude of observed changes (between start and end, among participants and non-participants).

We have established that in order to draw proper conclusions on whether expected and observed change in the participants is due to the programme or to other factors, the evaluation survey should be carried out before implementation and at the end (and sometimes also mid-term), and a control group should be used. *Is it possible to carry out a proper evaluation if these conditions cannot be met in full?*

---

[3]   Advice on calculation of sample size and choice of a sample selection design has been widely covered in the literature. While it is not in the scope of this Toolkit to cover these topics, we can recommend a very useful document produced by the FANTA Project (Magnani 1997, see the resources section).

The following table provides information on alternative study designs, whether they can or cannot allow assessment of changes in the participants that are attributable to the programme, and suggestions for overcoming some of the limitations.

Box 4: Non-experimental study designs to evaluate impact of programmes and projects[4]			
Design description	*Information provided by this design*	*Limitations*	*Suggestions for Overcoming Limitations*
Pre and Post Comparison group	Allows for an assessment of change and for the attribution of impact.	Without randomization to the intervention group, the comparison group may be biased in ways that aren't readily observable or that aren't easily taken into account.	Collect information in the survey on those variables that are likely to differ between intervention and comparison groups that would affect the impact measure. 'Control' for these potential differences statistically in the analysis. In the case of JFFLS, some characteristics that may differ are household composition (orphans, single-headed or child-headed households, livelihoods of the households.
Pre and Post No comparison group	Allows for an assessment of change.	This design does not allow for the attribution of observed change to the project.	Use other sources of information to examine whether there are alternative explanations for the changes detected. Use monitoring data from the project to assess whether it was implemented as expected. If it was, then the monitoring data supports the possibility that the impacts were due to the project.
Post-only Comparison group	Provides a picture of the characteristics of the intervention population relative to a comparison group at a single time point.	This design does not allow for the assessment of change, and it would be very difficult to attribute anything to the project If the intervention group is better off than the control group when the survey is performed, it is not very feasible to conclude that this is because they benefited from the program. The reason is that they may have been better off before the programme began and did not improve at all, or not from the programme itself.	Use another source of data to give an indication of the levels of key impact variables within each group before the project began. If these other data suggest that the intervention group was worse off than the comparison group before the project, and if the intervention group is same or better off than the comparison group after the project, this might indicate that a change occurred that was due to the project intervention.
Post-only No control group	Provides a picture of the characteristics of the beneficiary population at a single time point.	This design does not allow for the calculation of change or attribution of impact.	Include questions in the questionnaire that ask participants to recall how things were before the programme and after. Ask questions about how things changed for them due to the program. Report these responses.

At this point, we raise two issues that programmes will need to consider when planning the quantitative part of their evaluation. The first point is whether to carry out a survey of households of youth JFFLS participants (and control households). Traditionally, JFFLS programmes have carried out surveys among the youth participants of JFFLS programmes, and in some cases, of control youths as well. Additionally, household surveys have been used in at least two country programmes (Uganda and Mozambique) to characterize household socio-economic characteristics and to try to understand the prevailing attitudes and practices of households with respect to the JFFLS curriculum (agricultural techniques, health and safety, nutrition, gender roles). Carrying out both a baseline and end-of project household survey would help determine whether these characteristics, attitudes and practices have changed in the household as a result of the JFFLS participation by a household

---

[4] Taken from a concept note on Household Surveys of Programme Beneficiaries, prepared by Jennifer Coates, Tufts University, for use in a FAO e-learning course entitled "Assessing Impact of Large-Scale Food Security Programmes" - due for release in early 2010.

member, and adding a control group of households at both points would enable assessing the isolating the contribution of the programme towards the observed changes. However, here are several limitations to the use of household surveys in JFFLS evaluation. They are expensive and complex to carry out. One reason is the distances that need to be covered to reach the households of JFFLS participants and their controls, if selected using representative methods to ensure generalizability (see Magnani, 1997 for sampling designs). Another reason is the complexity of the questionnaires in order to gather valid and accurate information on socio-economic and food security status. Often household surveys collect far too much information that ends up not being used in the analysis because it is difficult to analyze (as in the case of income or crop histories). It may also be difficult to capture adequately through household survey questionnaires the type of information that is pertinent to JFFLS evaluation (adoption of new techniques, change in gender roles, knowledge on HIV and AIDS, improved food security). The pros and cons of household surveys need to be carefully discussed by the JFFLS team, including if there might be other, less complicated ways of obtaining the needed information from households, for example using qualitative techniques among caretakers of JFFLS participants. Because of their complexity and expense, this Toolkit does not consider household surveys to be a **core** tool for JFFLS evaluation.

The second issue to consider is related to youth surveys, which *are* considered to be a core tool for JFFLS evaluation. We have developed an example of a youth questionnaire (YQ), described in a later section and provided in the annex, that enables creation and measurement of quantitative outcome indicators. Conducting youth surveys is a very valid and direct way to gather information on outcome variables and can be used as the one of the principal means to assess how the JFFLS has contributed to a positive change in the youths' lives. Because most JFFLS programmes have a limited number of participants per class (recommended at 30 in the Getting Started! Manual), you might consider administering the survey questionnaire to all JFFLS participants, and not to only a sample. If a control group of youth is selected for interviews as well, in this case sample selection will need to be made among the total population of suitable controls.

4.9 Qualitative outcome and impact evaluation methods

While quantitative methods (surveys) make use of statistically valid and objective ways for gathering and analysing evidence in the form of hard numeric data or nonnumeric data, qualitative methods provide much more information on processes through which the programme outcomes and its impact were achieved. The methods are more explorative in nature and are sensitive for gathering culturally specific information about the values, opinions, behaviours, and socio-cultural context of particular groups from their own perspective. This kind of information is subjective and cannot easily be expressed in numbers or obtained through predetermined standardised indicators, but produces valuable data for local programme officials and beneficiaries. This type of evaluation approach is appropriate for answering questions of "*why*" and "*how*" the programme did or did not make a difference in the lives of its participants. There are several techniques that have been used by JFFLS, such as focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews with local stakeholders, facilitators and community members.

In a focus group discussion people in general from similar backgrounds or experiences (e.g., boys, girls, mothers, fathers, facilitators) are brought together to discuss a specific topic of interest to the investigator(s). Homogeneous samples are preferred because mixing age/ gender groups may inhibit some people from expressing their views. Participants are asked to reflect on the questions asked by the interviewers, provide their own comments, listen to what the rest of the group have to say and react to their observations. The main purpose is to elicit ideas, insights and experiences in a social context where people stimulate each other and consider their own views along with the views of others. The interviewer acts as facilitator introducing the subject, guiding the discussion, cross-checking each other comments and encouraging all members to express their opinions. Focus group discussions should be led by a skillful facilitator to ensure an even participation from all members.

Semi-structured interviews are guided conversations with key persons where broad and open questions are asked, and new questions are allowed to arise as a result of the discussion. This is different from questionnaires and surveys where there are very structured, close-ended questions that are not deviated from. A semi-structured interview is therefore a relatively informal, relaxed discussion based around a predetermined topic. However, it is important to prepare an interview guide that lists a pre-determined set of questions or issues that are to be explored during an interview. This guide serves as a checklist during the interview and ensures that basically the same information is obtained from a number of people or groups. The order and the actual wording of the questions are not determined in advance. Moreover, within the list of topic or subject areas, the interviewer is free to pursue certain questions in greater depth. The advantage of the interview guide approach is that it makes interviewing of a number of different persons more systematic and comprehensive by delimiting the issues to be taken up in the interview. One important weakness is that the interviewer's flexibility in changing wording and sequencing questions may result in substantially different responses from different persons, thus reducing comparability.

A more participatory approach may be used with the qualitative methodology to understand what has been learned by JFFLS participants and where lapses of understanding can be found. This approach may draw on Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) methods as well as specific JFFLS teaching techniques. This approach for evaluation is a very powerful way to understand what effects the JFFLS has had on lives of the participants, but also to empower them to be able to gain the insights that the JFFLS programmes promote. This type of approach differs from surveys and even from focus groups or in-depth interviews because its purpose is not to extract information but to facilitate a dialogue that helps the participants learn about themselves and thereby gain new insights that lead to change or empowerment. In PRA exercises, a skilled facilitator helps people generate a shared understanding – often through tangible visual diagrams - of the factors that shape their lives and of the changes that have been made to improve their lives and future livelihoods, their safety and health. The PRA methods could be successfully adapted to use in JFFLS and integrated into the mix of evaluation methods available. There are a number of documents that describe these techniques, listed in the Reference Section.

By the same token, the JFFLS learning techniques are very appropriate for evaluating what has been learned or changed concerning topics that are more difficult to reduce to a single quantitative indicator. Box 5 lists the topics for which qualitative indicators have been described (see Table 1 later in the document) and the range of techniques that could be used to measure the indicators.

Box 5. Participatory tools that can be used as part of the JFFLS curriculum	
Qualitative outcome and evaluation indicators	**Available techniques for assessing the indicators**
• Increase in agricultural knowledge and practices • Better understanding of the links between agriculture and life cycle steps • Level of HIV and AIDS and awareness of risky behaviour • Level of knowledge on prevention of diseases and healthy life styles • Expanded gender-equal attitudes • Strengthened decision making and problem solving	Folk tales, quizzes, painting, drama, songs, role play, poems, dance, riddles, puppetry, video, photos, individual children's projects.

4.10 Proposing a mix of methods

It is often suggest that in carrying out evaluations, a mixture of quantitative and qualitative methods be employed, using the strengths of one to overcome the weaknesses of the other. JFFLS evaluations have already been carried out in a number of programmes 5 and have demonstrated interesting result using a mix of methods. Using several different techniques and/or sources of information to answer a question, such as whether and how the JFFLS is making a difference in the lives of participants, is called triangulation – a way to cross-check findings. The assumption is that there is a higher level of confidence with a given result if different techniques lead to the same result.

Box 6: Comparison of quantitative and qualitative approaches		
General Framework	Quantitative	Qualitative
	Seek to confirm hypotheses about phenomena	Seek to explore phenomena
	Instruments use more rigid style of eliciting and categorizing responses to questions	Use semi-structured methods such as in-depth interviews, focus groups, and participant observation
Analytic objectives	To quantify variation To predict causal relationships To describe characteristics of a population	To describe variation To descript and explain relationships To describe individual experiences To describe group norms
Question Format	Closed-ended	Open-ended
Data Format	Study design is stable from beginning to end Participant responses do not influence or determine how and which questions researchers ask next. Study design is subject to statistical assumptions and conditions	Some aspects of the study are flexible, for example, the addition, exclusion or wording of a particular interview questionnaire Participant responses affect how and which questions researchers ask next Study design is iterative, that is, data collection and research questions are adjusted according to what is learned

Box 6 compares the two different approaches we have been discussing - quantitative and qualitative – and lists the comparative advantage of each. It can be seen how combining the two approaches will lead to a more comprehensive evaluation and to richer results.

From Family Health International at:
http://www.fhi.org/NR/rdonlyres/etl7vogszehu5s4stpzb3tyqlpp7rojv4waq37elpbyei3tgmc4ty6dun-bccfzxtaj2rvbaubzmz4f/overview1.pdf

---

[5] See the Nairobi workshop report in the annexes, which summarizes evaluations carried out in Sudan, Uganda, Kenya, Gaza Strip and Mozambique.

5. RECOMMENDED CORE M&E TOOLKIT FOR JFFLS

The purpose of this Toolkit is to provide guidance on several **core** tools for monitoring and evaluation, which if applied by all programmes, will generate key information on programme performance to be used nationally and also at international level. Evaluation is a common good and for this reason, providing access to interested organizations and potential donors via global networks of evaluation reports and lessons learned will only improve the delivery and effectiveness of JFFLS programmes in the future. This toolkit does not include all possible approaches, methods and techniques for monitoring and evaluation. Indeed, we do not mean to imply that approaches, methods and techniques not covered should not to be used. Instead, the toolkit highlights a few recommended **core** tools that have been developed with the benefit of trial and error by several JFFLS national programmes, in the belief that they can be applied universally in the different contexts where JFFLS programmes operate. In order to propose harmonized core M&E tools, however, we must first have a vision of what the JFFLS approach is supposed to accomplish and how we go about measuring it. One major outcome of the Nairobi workshop is what was considered to be a universal definition of the core focus areas of JFFLS in general, a list of the main outcomes expected under each focus area, and a definitive list of core quantitative and qualitative indicators to be measured at baseline, (possibly mid-term) and at the end. Based on this document, we have defined the core tools to include in this Toolkit, which are described in the next section and presented in full in the annex.

We start this section by presenting the matrix of the key focus areas for JFFLS and expected outcomes under each area, a list of core outcome qualitative and quantitative indicators, targets for achieving the outcomes as measured by the indicators, and means of verification (the recommended way to measure the indicators). In the case of quantitative indicators measured via the youth survey, the specific questionnaire item in the Youth Questionnaire (see Tool annexes) is included under means of verification.

TABLE 1: JFFLS key focus areas and desired outcomes, core outcome indicators, targets for measurement of outcome achievement for the indicators and means of verification				
Key focus areas	**Outcome**	**(Measurable) outcome indicators**	**EXAMPLE Target for JFFLS participants to reach by end of the JFFLS programme (See tips for selecting targets in the document)**	**Means of verification (how the indicators are to be measured)**
I. Agricultural knowledge, skills and practice; Development of agricultural skills, knowledge and practice to provide future livelihood opportunities for youth				
	Production of crops outside of school compounds (Replication of good agricultural practices).	% of youth that have introduced two or more crops to grow at home in the past year	At least 50% of JFFLS youth have introduced two or more crops at home in the past year as a result of participating in JFFLS	YQ baseline, (midterm), final. Measured precisely with statistics **Created from YQ 3.3**
		% of youth adopting at home at least two (JFFLS-taught) improved agricultural skills in past year	33 to 50% increase from baseline of JFFLS participants who adopted at least two (JFFLS-taught) improved agricultural skills in past year. (Rate of change expected depends on baseline value).	YQ baseline, (midterm), final. Measured precisely with statistics **Created from YQ 3.4**
	Increase in availability and access to food in the household. *Transmission of agricultural knowledge JFFLS participants to the rest of the community.*	Number of MSKG in the households of the communities (in appropriate settings)	75% Increase from baseline of JFFLS participant households with MSKG (assuming the baseline value is near 0)	IYQ baseline, (midterm), final. Measured precisely with statistics **Created from YQ 3.6**
			30% increase from baseline of non participant households with MSKG (assuming the baseline value is near 0).	Rough estimate arising from direct observation and key informant interview at baseline and at end. -or- obtained from YQ administered to non JFFLS youth
	Increase in agricultural production knowledge and practice	% youths able to correctly identify 2 ways to protect crops and animals from hazards and pests	40% increase from baseline of JFFLS participants able to correctly identify 2 ways to protect crops and animals from hazards and pests	YQ baseline, (midterm), final. Measured precisely with statistics **Created from YQ 3.5**
		Extent that youth are able to list names of 3 common pests in their areas	50% increase from baseline of JFFLS participants who are able to list names of 3 common pests in their areas	Rough estimate arising from discussion among the youth in focus group discussions (FGD) or in-class exercises using visual props, done at baseline, (midterm) and end
II. Life Skills (knowledge, attitude and practice)	*Develop life skills and understanding risk and prevention of HIV and AIDS and other common diseases*	Extent to which youths able to able to dispel 3 common myths about HIV/AIDS	50% increase from baseline of JFFLS youths able to able to dispel 3 common myths about HIV/AIDS	Rough estimate arising from discussion among the youth in FGD or in-class exercises using visual props, done at baseline, (midterm) and end
		% youth with answering at least 3 out of 4 HIV/AIDS questions correctly	40% increase from baseline of JFFLS participants answering at least 3 out of 4 HIV/AIDS questions correctly	YQ baseline, (midterm), final. Measured precisely with statistics **Created from YQ 4.1 – 4.4**

Key focus areas	Outcome	(Measurable) outcome indicators	EXAMPLE Target for JFFLS participants to reach by end of the JFFLS programme (See tips for selecting targets in the document)	Means of verification (how the indicators are to be measured)
	Awareness of hygiene and sanitation to prevent illness (safe food storage, hand washing with soap, safe disposal of feces, clean water, use of mosquito nets in malarial areas)	% youth who can describe 2 hygienic practices to prevent disease	At least 75% of JFFLS youths can describe 2 hygienic practices to prevent disease	Rough estimate arising from discussion among the youth in FGD or in-class exercises using visual props, done at baseline, (midterm) and end
	General awareness importance of good nutrition for healthy life	% youth who consumed fruit or vegetable 4 times in the past 7 days	At least 75% of JFFLS participants have consumed a fruit or vegetable at least 4 times in the past 7 days	YQ baseline, (midterm), final. Measured precisely with statistics **Created from YQ 4.6**
		% other household members who consumed a fruit or vegetable the previous day	At least 60% of other members of household of JFFLS participants have consumed a fruit or vegetable the previous day	YQ baseline, (midterm), final. Measured precisely with statistics
		Extent to which youth can correctly match 3 agricultural and life cycle steps	at least 75% of JFFLS participants can correctly match 3 agricultural and life cycle steps at the end of the JFFLS programme	Rough estimate arising from in-class exercises using visual props, done at baseline, (midterm) and end
	Strengthen ties of JFFLS with school attendance and activities	% youth attending school regularly (in settings where attendance is known to be irregular and JFFLS has objective of increasing it)	25% increase from baseline of JFFLS participants attending school regularly	YQ baseline, (midterm), final. Measured precisely with statistics **Created from YQ 2.5**
		% youth with good grades	25% increase from baseline of JFFLS participants with good grades	YQ baseline, (midterm), final. Measured precisely with statistics **Created from YQ 2.7**
	Increase awareness, attitudes and skills to increase self actualization and to handle situations in an appropriate manner	Level of perception of youths on gender equitable and inequitable roles (boys and girls have = opportunities, male and female roles have equal value)	50% of JFFLS participants changed attitude about role of males and females in the society	Rough estimate arising from discussion among the youth in FGD or in-class exercises using visual props, done at baseline, (midterm) and end
		Level of knowledge of steps to take when witness or experience violence or abuse and right not to experience violence	40% Increase from baseline of JFFLS participants with an adequate level of knowledge of steps to take when witness or experience violence or abuse and right not to experience violence.	Rough estimate arising from discussion among the youth in FGDs at baseline, (midterm) and end.
		Level of confidence of ability to make decisions and to handle problems	At least 60% of JFFLS participants are confident about their ability to make decisions and to handle problems	Rough estimate arising from discussion among the youth. Parents and local stakeholders in FGD done at baseline, (midterm) and end
III. Enhancement of potential for economic empowerment only pertinent to programmes with business modules	Development of business and marketing skills	% of youths that demonstrate knowledge and interest in market opportunities	At least 60% of JFFLS youth have knowledge and interest in starting an enterprise	YQ baseline, (midterm), final. Measured precisely with statistics **Created from YQ 5.1, 5.2a and 5.3a.**
	Enhancement of education and vocational training	% of youths who recognize the need to get further education or training in order to improve their chances in the labor market	At least of 70% of JFFLS youth can identify advantages to getting further training/ education	Rough estimate arising from discussion among the youth in FGD or in-class exercises using visual props, done at baseline, (midterm) and end.

5.1 Core on-going monitoring tools

Several standard monitoring tools were developed and tested in Kenya to assist facilitators in planning, implementing and evaluation JFFLS processes and activities. The Nairobi workshop participants put considerable time into reviewing these piloted tools, using the following criteria:

1. *Is the reporting frequency correct?*
2. *Is too much/too little being asked?*
3. *Are there other ways of getting the desired information?*
4. *Are they universally applicable (can they be contextualized)?*
5. *Is the information being used/ by whom?*
6. *Is the design of the tool appropriate?*

Out of the discussions during the workshop, very good suggestions were made on what should be the main monitoring information needed to assist facilitators in planning their work, assessing how the programme is going and learning from mistakes to improve the programme. The results of the workshop constitute a **core** set of tools for JFFLS facilitators to monitor their work within the programme and to measure progress towards programme targets. The forms are described here and included in full in the annex 6. The immediate purpose these core on-going monitoring tools is to facilitate the collection of useful information for the local as well as national programme staff to keep track of programme processes and activities, for learning and for accountability. However, they also allow a flow of harmonized information to be sent to sponsoring organizations, such as FAO, to enhance a greater understanding of how the concept of JFFLS is being realized. The four tools are summarized in the following box.

---

6 After the Nairobi workshop, the monitoring tools were revised by Ms Tanith Bello of FAO-Kenya according to the recommendations of the group.

> **BOX 7: JFFLS Monitoring tools for process evaluation**
>
> **JFFLS Monitoring Tool #1. Facilitators' Monthly Activity Planning Form.**
>
> This form is filled out together by the facilitators. It will help facilitators plan their JFFLS sessions for the following month (e.g. learning field activities, agricultural topics, life skills topics, cultural activities). It is to be filled out at the BEGINNING of each month and shared with the local and JFFLS Programme Coordinator. The form should also be filled out every time a new module of the JFFLS curriculum is initiated.
>
> **JFFLS Monitoring Tool #2. Facilitators' Monthly Monitoring Form.**
>
> This form is filled out by each facilitator on a monthly basis to provide information (disaggregated by sex of participants) on attendance and on the total number of sessions held. At the end of each month, the reports from each site will be sent to the local & national JFFLS Programme Coordinators.
>
> **JFFLS Monitoring Tool #3. Facilitators' Quarterly Monitoring Report.**
>
> This form is to be filled out by each facilitator at the end of each three month period. It is used to report on progress being made with the JFLS curriculum activities (ie. planned, on-going, completed, or upcoming). It will assist in keeping track of progress being made with JFFLS curriculum activities. A separate form will be filled out by the facilitators for different topics (agriculture, life skills).
>
> **JFFLS Monitoring Tool #4. Mid-Term M&E Questionnaire**
>
> This is a mid-term evaluation tool whose use will help facilitators and coordinators to better understand whether the programme is progressing as planned, if attendance and interest of participants is as hoped, and if expected outputs have been reached. It also gives information on whether the guiding principles of the JFFLS are being put into practice, such as helping participants make the links between crops, animals and human health, providing equal opportunities for boys and girls, and providing access to information and resources to reduce risks and improve lives of the youths.
>
> The M&E monitoring tools is to be filled out every six months by the local JFFLS coordinator. This questionnaire is administered with JFFLS facilitators, in each JFFLS school, and allows process monitoring, trouble shouting while the project is on-going and collect qualitative information to feed into the final project evaluation.

5.2 Core evaluation tools

Before describing the core evaluation tools that have been recommended by the Nairobi Workshop, it is important to summarize the steps and sequence for carrying out a JFFLS evaluation.

I. <u>Planning the evaluation</u> is an integral part of initial planning for the JFFLS programme itself. This involves programme staff, donors and principal stakeholders of the programme. Realistic estimates of the costs and time to commit to both monitoring and evaluation should be made and integrated into the programme design and the M&E plan.

II. <u>Implementing the baseline assessment before the programme starts</u> will assure that knowledge of the context in which the programme takes place at the start, as well as the status, knowledge and practices at baseline that are expected to change as a result of the programme. The baseline assessment includes community diagnosis, stakeholder analysis, selection profiles of participants, and data collection on the pre-determined outcome and impact indicators, using both quantitative and qualitative methods.

III. <u>Carrying out the evaluation</u> should be done both at midterm (depending on the duration of the course) and at end-of-programme. Mid-term evaluations supplement information from the on-going monitoring system and can be valuable for identifying and correcting problems in achieving the objectives before the programme ends. The final evaluation will gather the same quantitative information as the baseline assessment in order to measure changes in the pre-determined indicators. It is also desirable to understand directly from the JFFLS participants, their caretakers and principal local stakeholders at the end of the programme how and why the programme worked or not, what were some of the difficulties they encountered and the successes they experienced, what were any unintended outcomes, and what would be their suggestions for the next phase of the programme. This is best carried out using qualitative and participatory techniques.

We discussed before the importance of gathering baseline information and of using control groups in order to measure change and to isolate the contribution of the programme to the observed change (attribution). These principles apply no matter what methods and techniques are used for evaluation.

The following table lists the core recommended tools for JFFLS; the intended respondents, and the timing for their use (baseline, mid-term and end of project). Each tool and analysis support document will be described below and provided in full in the annexes. [7]

TABLE 2: Core Evaluation Tools: targeted respondents and timing of use			
Core Evaluation Tool	**Respondents**	**Baseline**	**(Mid-term) End of Project**
Core Youth Questionnaire	JFFLS participants and controls	X	X
Focus Group Discussion Guide with JFFLS Participants	JFFLS participants		X
Focus Group Discussion Guide with **caretakers** of JFFLS Participants	Caretakers of JFFLS participants		X
Semi-structured Interview Guide for Key informants	District officials, local development officers and other local stakeholders		X

A. Core Youth Questionnaire.

The questionnaire contains items for collecting the data necessary to create the recommended quantitative evaluation indicators. It contains 5 core sections and one optional section, as outlined below.

<u>Section 1:</u> Youth Details

<u>Section 2:</u> Education

<u>Section 3:</u> Agricultural Knowledge

<u>Section 4:</u> Health and Nutrition

<u>Section 5:</u> Business and Enterprise

<u>Optional:</u> Labour (if JFFLS includes a module on Labour).

Individual programmes will in many cases need to collect further information from JFFLS participants and can expand the Core Youth Questionnaire accordingly.

---

7 We have not provided structured tools for measuring change using the qualitative indicators listed in table 1, as the range of possible techniques will vary from programme to programme. It is however important to note that this part of the evaluation should also be carried out both at baseline and at end of project.

An accompanying document has been included to provide numeric examples of how to create the pre-determined indicators using data collected with the Core Youth Questionnaire.

B. Focus Group Discussion Guide for Youth <u>Participants</u>

This is a participatory tool to help evaluate the EFFECTIVENESS and IMMEDIATE IMPACT of the JFFLS programme and participants' satisfaction. The guide contains a set of core discussion points or issues to explore during the focus groups with youth participants to evaluate their satisfaction with the programme and to solicit problems encountered as well as suggestions for improvement. The guide serves as a checklist during the focus group and ensures that basically the same information is obtained from different groups. Each programme should decide what information is necessary to have and add additional questions to the interview guide, as necessary. The same guide can be used for groups with different characteristics, such as boys, girls, younger children, those about to finish school etc.

C. Focus Group Discussion Guide for JFFLS Participant <u>Caretakers</u>

This guide contains a set of core discussion points that can be used in focus group settings with caretakers of the youth participants to evaluate their satisfaction with the programme and to solicit problems encountered as well as suggestions for improvement. The groups will be composed of caretakers of JFFLS participants and may vary by characteristics, such as caretakers of boys, girls, younger children, those about to finish school etc.

There are two accompanying forms that will assist facilitators of focus group discussions in analysis of the information obtained from the discussions - a Focus Group Sample Note-taker Form, and a Focus Group Debriefing form.

D. Semi-structured Interview Guide for Key informant interviews with District officials / local development officers / other local stakeholders.

This is a participatory tool to help evaluate the RELEVANCE, EFFECTIVENESS and IMMEDIATE IMPACT of the JFFLS programme. Key informants are persons who provide information that can assist in understanding the context of a programme or project, or clarifying particular issues or problems. They are not chosen randomly, but intentionally to give voice to the different groups that have stake in the JFFLS.

The accompanying form, the Semi-structured Interview Debriefing Form, will assist interviewers in organizing the information obtained from the interviews for analysis of content.

6. DOCUMENTING AND REPORTING M&E RESULTS

All the information collected from the on-going monitoring system, baseline survey assessment, evaluation studies, JFFLS sessions, monitoring visits, and facilitators' meetings provides valuable documentation of the JFFLS programme. It is important that programmes carefully document what has been done and that all materials generated or gathered by the JFFLS be made available to project managers, sponsoring organizations, and donors as well (or most importantly) to the participants and their caretakers, the community and the local implementers of the programme.

In order to facilitate the flow of communication and strengthen the existing JFFLS network, it may be necessary to create a database for all the M&E data collected and analysed. Training of facilitators should include a capacity building component on how they, together with local stakeholders and participants, can use the data generated by JFFLS to continually monitor and improve the community-level management of JFFLS schools and to provide examples for those who wish to implement JFFLS programmes in other locations.

7. RESOURCES

Carletto C and Morris S. 1999. Designing Methods for the Monitoring and Evaluation of Household Food Security Rural Development Projects. Washington, D.C.: IFPRI. Available at: http://www.ifpri.org/themes/mp18/techguid/tg10.pdf.

Catley A, Burns J, Abebe D, Suji O. 2008. Participatory Impact Assessment. A Guide for Practitioners'. Feinstein International Centre, Tufts University. Available at: http://wikis.uit.tufts.edu/confluence/display/FIC/Participatory+Impact+Assessment .

Frankel N. And Gage A. M&E Fundamentals: A Self-Guided Minicourse. MEASURE Evaluation. Available at: http://www.ledna.org/links/monitoring-and-evaluation-fundamentals-a-self-guided-minicourse.

IFAD. Managing for Impact in Rural Development. A Guide for M&E. Available at: http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/guide/.

Informal Working Group on Participatory Approaches and Methods to Support Sustainable Livelihoods and Food Security (IWG-PA). Available at: http://www.fao.org/participation/.

Mack A, Woodsong C, MacQuen KM, Guest G, Namey E. 2005. Qualitative Research Methods: A Data Collector's Field Guide. Family Health International. Available at: http://www.fhi.org/en/rh/pubs/booksreports/qrm_datacoll.htm.

Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development. Criteria for Evaluation Assistance. Paris, 1991. Available at: http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/31/12/2755284.pdf.

Magnani R. 1997. Sampling Guide. Washington DC: Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance Project. Available at: http://www.fantaproject.org/downloads/pdfs/sampling.pdf.

MEASURE Evaluation. 2002. A Trainer's Guide to the Fundamentals of Monitoring and Evaluation for Population, Health, and Nutrition Programs. MEASURE Evaluation Manual Series No. 5. Chapel Hill, NC: MEASURE Evaluation project, Carolina Population Center. Available at: http://www.cpc.unc.edu/measure/publications/html/ms-02-05.html.

Rao V, Woolcock M. 2003. Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches in Programme Evaluation, in The Impact of Economic Policies on Poverty and Income Distribution - Evaluation Techniques and Tools, edited by François Bourguignon F and Pereira da Silva LA. World Bank and Oxford University Press. Available at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALANALYSIS/1104890-1120158274352/20566665/Integratingqualitativeandquantapproachesraoandwoolcock.pdf.

Rossi, P. and Freeman, H. 2004. Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (7th edition). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

UNFPA. Programme Manager's Planning Monitoring and evaluation Toolkit. Tool Number 6: Programme Indicators
Part I: Identifying Output Indicators - The Basic Concepts. Available at: www.unfpa.org/monitoring/toolkit/tool6_1.doc

Vahlhaus M.2001. Guidelines for Impact Monitoring in Economic and Employment Promotion
Projects with Special Reference to Poverty Reduction Impacts- Part II: How to Introduce and Carry Out Impact Monitoring – Tips, Methods and Instruments.

ANNEX I

JFFLS Monitoring Tool # 1

Facilitators' Monthly Activity Planning Form[1]

JFFLS Name and Location:				DATE: dd/mm/yyyy	
JFFLS MODULE: ☐ Agricultural Topics ☐ Life Skills topics					
FACILITATOR NAME: _____ Signature_____					
Brief description of Activities to be presented and discussed	**Tick under which module**	**PRACTICAL Y/N**	**THEORICAL Y/N**	**What kind of social animation is used?**	**Date of session DD/MM/YY**
1)	☐ AGRICULTURE ☐ LIFE SKILLS				
2)	☐ AGRICULTURE ☐ LIFE SKILLS				
3)	☐ AGRICULTURE ☐ LIFE SKILLS				
4)	☐ AGRICULTURE ☐ LIFE SKILLS				
Note to the Coordinator (if any):					

[1] WHO: The facilitators in consultation plan & fill together this form
WHY: 1) To help you planning your JFFLS sessions for the following month (e.g. learning field activities, agricultural opics, life skills topics, cultural activities)
2) to receive advice from the JFFLS Programme Coordinator or other facilitators, especially if you have questions while you are planning the JFFLS session for the following month.
WHEN: at the BEGINNING of each month, please submit this form to your local JFFLS Programme Coordinator – every time you are about to start a new module of the JFFLS curriculum.
Note for Programme Coordinators: Please link the information received to the information you gather with the JFFLS Quarterly Monitoring Tool #3.

JFFLS Monitoring Tool # 2

JFFLS FACILITATOR'S MONTHLY MONITORING FORM²

A. GENERAL INFORMATION		
JFFLS name:_____ Location:_____		DATE: _____
Type of JFFLS: ☐1=Inside School ☐2=out of school (Community)		Total number of JFFLS participants: _____

B. PARTICIPANTS' ATTENDANCE for each JFFLS session												
Weeks	Week 1			Week 2			Week3			Week 4		
Sessions	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12
Nr. of Girls												
Nr. of Boys												
Total												

Note: This format allows collection of disaggregated information on attendance on a monthly basis (please extract from your class register)

C. Facilitators' attendance of JFFLS sessions in the month	
JFFLS Facilitator: Agricultural Topics Life Skills topics Social Animation	Total Nr. of sessions in ONE month _____
Facilitator Name:_____	

---

2 WHO: Each Facilitator
   WHY: Filling out this form will assist you in keeping records on attendance
   WHEN: At the END of EVERY MONTH, for each JFFLS site, please send the form to the local & national JFFLS Programme
   Coordinator.

JFFLS Monitoring Tool # 3

JFFLS FACILITATOR QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT [3]

1. Facilitator's Observations – Agricultural Topics

A. IMPLEMENTATION STATUS of JFFLS Activities (according to JFFLS curriculum/programme)													
JFFLS Module: Agricultural	**Time-bound indicators**												
	P= Planned			**O**=On-going			**C**=Completed			**E**=Expected			
	3 Months (12 WEEKS)												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
1.1													
1.2													
1.3													
1.4													
1.5													
1.6													

JFFLS NAME:_____ **DATE:** _____

Facilitator's Name_____ **Signature:**_____

---

3 WHO: The facilitators in consultation discuss & fill together this form.
   WHY: 1)To assist you in keeping track of progress being made with JFFLS curriculum activities
        2) To understand what improvements theJFFLS in the speicifc location is making over time
    WHEN: AT THE END of EVERY THREE (3) months

JFFLS Monitoring Tool # 3

JFFLS FACILITATOR QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT [4]

2. Facilitator's Observations – **Life skills Topics**

A. IMPLEMENTATION STATUS of JFFLS Activities (according to JFFLS curriculum)												
Module: Life Skills	**Time-bound indicators**											
	P= Planned				**O**=On-going			**C**=Completed		**E**=Expected		
	3 Months (12 WEEKS)											
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**
JFFLS Activities												
1.1												
1.2												
1.3												
1.4												
1.5												
1.6												
B. If you could not complete all the activities as planned, please explain why												
C. Other observations/recommendations:												

JFFLS NAME:_____ **DATE:** _____

Facilitator's Name_____ **Signature:**_____

[4] WHO: The facilitators in consultation discuss & fill together this form
    WHY: 1)To assist you in keeping track of progress being made with JFFLS curriculum activities
        2) To understand what improvements theJFFLS in the speicifc location is making over time
      WHEN: AT THE END of EVERY THREE (3) months

JFFLS M&E Tool # 4

MID-TERM M&E QUESTIONNAIRE[5]

A. COMMENTS ON JFFLS FOR THE LAST SIX MONTHS					

Please answer each of the following questions by ticking the most appropriate value (from 1 to 5).
Each value has a different meaning as follows:

(1)=Very poor;   **(2)**= Poor;   **(3)**=Average;   **(4)**= Good;   **(5)**= Very good

QUESTIONS	PERCEPTION LEVEL				
1. Participants' attendance (girls and boys)					
1.a. How was boys' attendance at JFFLS sessions in average?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5
1.b. How was girls' attendance at JFFLS sessions in average?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5
2. JFFLS administration and community support					
2.a In case you need advice on JFFLS management, how do you judge your contacts with the JFFLS coordinator?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5
2.b. How is the delivery of tools & equipment to local JFFLS schools?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5
2.c How is support from the community?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5
2.d How is support from the hosting school?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5
3. JFFLS facilitation materials					
3.a How do facilitators find the JFFLS facilitation materials?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5
3.b How comfortable do facilitators feel with the materials?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5
4. JFFLS learning process					
4.a How is JFFLS participants learning process?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5
4.b How is enthusiasm among JFFLS participants?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐5
Other comments:					

---

5 TO BE DISTRIBUTED BY LOCAL JFFLS COORDINATOR TO FACILITATORS FOR M&E FEEDBACK after the first SIX (6) months of JFFLS activities implementation

JFFLS M&E Tool # 4

MID-TERM M&E QUESTIONNAIRE[6]

JFFLS Facilitator Name: _____ **Signature:**_____

(PLEASE WRITE name in CAPITAL letters and sign)

B. ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS:
1) What topics motivated the participants <u>most</u>? Was there a difference between the girls and boys?
2) What topics motivated the participants <u>least</u>? Was there a difference between the girls and boys?
3a) Did you present the link between agricultural and life in each session**?** ☐ **1. Yes**   ☐ **2.No** **3b)** Were the participants able to present the link and explain it?   ☐ **1. Yes**   ☐ **2.No**
4) Are the participants able to represent the agricultural and/or life topics they have learnt through songs, poems, energizers, plays etc.? ☐ **1. Yes** ☐ **2.No**   *If yes, please give examples*
5a) Are you making the links between crops, animal and human health in each session? ☐ **1. Yes**   ☐ **2.No** **5b)** How, for example?
6) Are the participants able to understand the importance and value of growing healthy crops, raising healthy animals and making the link to human health? ☐ **1. Yes** ☐ **2.No**
7) In your opinion, which facilitation skills/activities help the participants understand the risk of HIV infection and all of the preventive and protective measures? *Please list*
8) What facilitations skills do you think work best in helping the participants understand the risks of exploitation (child abuse, child labour etc.), how to prevent them and how to be protected against them? *Please list*
9) What facilitations skills do you think work best in helping the participants understand the resources that are available to them in their community to counteract the risks they face (e.g. diseases or exploitation)?

---

6 (TO BE DISTRIBUTED BY LOCAL JFFLS COORDINATOR TO FACILITATORS FOR M&E FEEDBACK) after the first SIX (6) months of JFFLS activities implementation

10) Did you encounter any specific challenges in adopting the JFFLS teaching materials? ☐ **1. Yes** ☐ **2.No**
IF YES, Please explain

11) Did you coordinate with and/or invite other facilitators to your field days, sessions etc.? ☐ **1. Yes** ☐ **2.No**

12) Are you making sure that the girls and boys have the same opportunities to do things? ☐ **1. Yes** ☐ **2.No**

13) Do the girls and boys understand the value of working together and sharing the same knowledge on agriculture and livelihoods skills? ☐ **1. Yes** ☐ **2.No**

C. Other observations/recommendations:

JFFLS NAME:_____ **DATE:** _____

Facilitator's Name_____ **Signature:**_____

ANNEX II

Junior Farmer Field and Life Schools (JFFLS) Core Youth Questionnaire

COUNTRY_____
NAME OF THE SCHOOL_____
JFFLS NAME_____
YOUTH'S NAME _____
ENUMERATOR NAME_____

SECTION 1: YOUTH DETAILS

1.1 Age: _ _ yrs.

1.2 Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

1.3 Which adults do you live with?
Father and mother?   ☐
Father only   ☐
Mother only   ☐
Other adult   ☐
No adult   ☐

1.4 How many living siblings do you have? Brothers ☐ Sisters ☐

SECTION 2: EDUCATION

2.1 BASELINE ONLY Can you read?   ☐ Yes ☐ No

2.2 BASELINE ONLY Can you write?   ☐ Yes ☐ No

2.3 Are you currently enrolled in School? ☐ Yes ☐ No (**If no, go directly to question 2.10**)

2.4 At what level are you enrolled?
<u>Primary</u> School Level/Class _____ or
<u>Secondary</u> School level/Class _____

ALL THE REMAINING QUESTIONS ARE TO BE ASKED BOTH AT BASELINE AND AT END OF PROJECT

2.5 How often do you attend school?
Every day or almost   ☐
Not very regularly   ☐
Almost never   ☐

2.6 If you miss school days some times or very often, why is that?
Because of domestic duties   ☐
Because I'm sick   ☐
Other reason (specify_____)

2.7 How are your grades/class records?

Good	☐
Just satisfactory	☐
Poor	☐

2.8 Do you learn about agriculture in the school?   ☐ Yes ☐ No

2.9 Do you learn about nutrition in the school?   ☐Yes ☐ No

2.10 If you are NOT currently enrolled in school, why is that?
Comment to evaluator: Here put in a list possible reasons for not being enrolled in school...)

Financial problems?	☐
I'm not interested	☐
No encouragement from family	☐
I need to work	☐
Other reason (specify_____)	

2.11 and 2.12 administered only to JFFLS participants

2.11 When did you join JFFLS? _ _ months ago

2.12 Why do you participate in JFFLS?
Comment to evaluator: Here put in a list possible reasons for JFFLS participation. Need to contextualize. The following are examples only.

To get agricultural knowledge & skills	☐
Because it's new programme and I'm curious	☐
to get information on HIV/Aids	☐
Other reason (specify_____)	

SECTION 3: AGRICULTURAL KNOWLEDGE

3.1 Do you work on your family's field or garden?

Yes	☐
No	☐
We don't have a field or garden	☐

If no, or don't have a field or garden, go to No. 3.5

3.2 Have you introduced new crops to grow at home?

Yes	☐
No	☐

If yes, which ones?

Comment to evaluator: Here put in a list possible "new" crops that might have been introduced. The following are examples only.

Tomatoes	☐
Squash	☐
Improved maize hybrids	☐
Orange flesh sweet potato	☐
Salad	☐
Millet	☐
ETC	☐
Other crops	☐ (specify_____)

If no crops have been introduced, skip to question 3.4.

3.3 If yes, Where or from whom did you learn about these crops?

Parents/relatives/guardians	☐
School	☐
Programmes	☐ (specify_____)
Others persons in the community	☐
Other source	☐ (specify_____)

3.4 Have you used any of the following agricultural techniques at home in the past year?
Comment to evaluator: Contextualize the list to your setting. The following are examples only.

Use of improved seeds/varieties	☐ Yes	☐ No
Zero/minimum tillage	☐ Yes	☐ No
Proper spacing	☐ Yes	☐ No
Row-planting	☐ Yes	☐ No
IPM	☐ Yes	☐ No
Crop Rotation	☐ Yes	☐ No
Manure (compost or green)	☐ Yes	☐ No

3.5 Which of the following are methods for protecting crops and animals from hazards and pests
Comment to evaluator: Here put in local techniques that they should know about. The following are examples only.

Pesticides	☐ Yes ☐ No
Intercropping with pest-resistant plants	☐ Yes ☐ No
Use of beneficial insects	☐ Yes ☐ No
Mix and rotate crops	☐ Yes ☐ No

3.6. Does your household have a Multi-Story Kitchen Garden?   ☐ Yes ☐No

SECTION 4. HEALTH AND NUTRITION

Please say if the following statements are true or false:

4.1 You can get AIDS by being bitten by a mosquito that has bitten someone with AIDS.
☐True ☐ False

4.2 Condoms reduce the risk of getting the AIDS virus (or HIV infection).   .
☐True ☐ False

4.3 Only people who look sick can spread the AIDS virus.   .
☐True ☐ False

4.4 A person can get AIDS by touching, kissing or hugging someone with AIDS.
☐True ☐ False

4.5 How many times do you normally eat every day?

Three or more?	☐
Twice?	☐
Once?	☐

4.6 How many days in the past week (7 days) did you eat any fruits or vegetables?   ☐

4.7 Yesterday, did you eat any fruits or vegetables?
☐ Yes   ☐ No

4.8 Yesterday did <u>any</u> of the other persons in your household eat fruits or vegetables?
☐ Yes   ☐ No

SECTION 5. BUSINESS AND ENTERPRISE
(For JFFLS implementing the business and entrepreneurship module)

5.1 Do you know where your closest market is?

☐Yes ☐No *if no, go to 5.3a*

5.2a Have you identified in your local market a particular product that you think is needed but is not sold?

☐ Yes ☐No, *if no, go to 5.4*

5.2b (If yes) what was that product? Please specify_____

5.3a Would you like to have your own enterprise? ☐ Yes ☐No, *(if no, end of questionnaire)*

5.3b (If yes) which type of enterprise would you like to have (indicate most important)?
Comment to evaluator: Here put in a list of possible enterprises. Need to contextualize. The following are examples only.

agriculture products	☐
livestock	☐
Mechanics	☐
Handicraft	☐
catering/restaurant	☐
computer/electronic	☐
equipment	☐
other	☐ please specify_____

OPTIONAL SECTION ON LABOUR IF JFFLS INCLUDES MODULE ON LABOUR.

3.1 Are you currently working? Yes ☐ No ☐ **(if no, go to 4.1)**

3.2 Are you paid for your work? Yes ☐ No ☐ **(if no, go to 3.6)**

3.3 If yes, what type of work do you do? *(Select CODE from list to the right)* |___|

3.4 Do you work every day? Yes ☐ No ☐

3.5 How many hours do you work a day? |___| hours

3.6 Do you carry heavy loads? Yes ☐ No ☐

3.7 Do you use agricultural chemicals (pesticides, fertilizers)? Yes ☐ No ☐

Work Codes:
1=Farm labour
2=Fishing/Mending nets
3=Hawking
4=Bicycle transport
5=Hunting gathering
6=Domestic duties
7 =Handicrafts
8 =Off-farm labour
9 = Fetching water
10= Fetching wood
11 =Sexual favours
12 =Others
(specify)…………
13 = No Income

ANNEX III

Several Examples of Quantitative Indicator Calculation Using Youth Questionnaire Items

a. Simple indicator on school attendance

(measurable) outcome indicators	Target for JFFLS participants	Means of verification NOTE: Youth Questionnaire (YQ) used as general survey questionnaire administered to youth, whether JFFLS participants or not.
% youth attending school regularly (in settings where attendance is known to be irregular and JFFLS has objective of increasing it)	Increase from baseline of 25% (depending on baseline value) among JFFLS participants	YQ baseline, (midterm), final. Measured precisely with statistics **Created from YQ 2.5**
Questionnaire items related to school attendance **YQ 2.5**: How often do you attend school	Response Codes: 1 – every day or almost every day 2 - not very regularly 3 – almost never	In analysis, a new variable, schREGULAR, created to indicate if the respondent responded that s/he has regular attendance. schREGULAR, = **1** if **Schq1** response is " every day or almost every day"(coded as 1 in original variable) schREGULAR, = **0** if **Schq1** is " not very regularly" (coded as 2 in the original variable), or" almost never" (coded as 3 in the original variable).

Creation of Regular School Attendance Indicator [% youth attending school regularly**]**

[NUMERATOR] number of youth attending school regularly

—————————————————————————————————————   X 100

[DENOMINATOR] number of youth responding to questionnaire

Steps in the analysis

Create a new variable schREGULAR corresponding to school attendance (last column of table above)	0 code means youth does not attend regularly 1 code means youth does attend regularly	Used to calculate frequency of youth who attend school regularly
Run a frequency of schREGULAR	Code N percent 0 50 50% 1 50 50% total 100 100%	The Number of youth with a value of 1 for the variable schREGULAR is put into the numerator of the formula for creating the indicator

EXAMPLE: Measuring percent of change from baseline to end of project using the school attendance indicator

BASELINE Prevalence of youth attending school regularly   = 60%
End-of-Project prevalence of youth attending school regularly   = 80%

Percent of change is calculated as (prevalence at end – prevalence at baseline) / prevalence at baseline.
In this case, the percent change observed is (80% – 60%) / 60% = 33%

THEREFORE, THE PERCENT OF CHANGE OBSERVED (33% increase in regular school attendance) EXCEEDED THE TARGET OF 25% INCREASE DESIRED.

b. Composite indicator on HIV and AIDS knowledge

(measurable) outcome indicators	Target for JFFLS participants	Means of verification NOTE: Youth Questionnaire (YQ) used as general survey questionnaire administered to youth, whether JFFLS participants or not.
% youth with answering 3 out of 4 HIV/AIDS questions correctly	Increase from baseline of 40% among JFFLS participants	YQ baseline, (midterm), final. Measured precisely with statistics **Created from YQ 4.1 – 4.4**

Questionnaire number	Questions related to HIV and AIDS	Response Coded T/F CORRECT RESPONSE:	In analysis, a new variable is created corresponding to each HIV and AIDS questionnaire item to indicate if the respondent replied correctly or not. The variable is coded as 1 for a correct response and 0 for an incorrect response. ***This is easily done using statistical software or can be done manually if dataset is small.***
YQ 4.1	You can get AIDS by being bitten by a mosquito that has bitten someone with AIDS.	false	*Correct4.1* $= \boldsymbol{0}$ if YQ4.1 response is **true** *Correct4.1* $= \boldsymbol{1}$ if YQ4.1 response is **false**
YQ 4.2	Condoms reduce the risk of getting the AIDS virus (or HIV infection).	true	*Correct4.2* $= \boldsymbol{1}$ if YQ4.2 response is **false** *Correct4.2* $= \boldsymbol{0}$ if YQ4.2 response is **true**
YQ 4.3	Only people who look sick can spread the AIDS virus.	false	*Correct4.3* $= \boldsymbol{0}$ if YQ4.3 response is **true** *Correct4.3* $= \boldsymbol{1}$ if YQ4.3 response is **false**
YQ 4.4	A person can get AIDS by touching, kissing or hugging someone with AIDS.	false	*Correct4.4* $= \boldsymbol{0}$ if YQ4.4 response is **true** *Correct4.4* $= \boldsymbol{1}$ if YQ4.4 response is **false**

Creation of HIV and AIDS knowledge Indicator [% youth answering at least 3 out of 4 HIV/AIDS questions correctly]

[NUMERATOR] number of youth answering at least 3 out of 4 HIV and AIDS questions correctly

――― X 100

[DENOMINATOR] number of youth responding to questionnaire

Steps in the analysis

Create a new variable corresponding to each HIV and AIDS questionnaire items (last column of table above)	0 code means item answered INcorrectly 1 code means item answered correctly	used to indicate if the individual HIV and AIDS item was answered correctly or not. Do for each of the 4 HIV and AIDS items in the questionnaire.
Sum the values of the 4 created variables into a new variable called HIVsum	HIVsum = correct4.1 + correct4.2 + correct4.3 + correct4.4 note that incorrect replies are codes as 0 so do not contribute to the sum.	Gives the total number of correct answers out of the 4 HIV and AIDS questionnaire items.
Run a frequency of HIVsum	*Example Frequency for HIVsum:* 	Code	N	%
0	5	5%
1	20	20%
2	25	25%
3	**35**	35%
4	**15**	15%
TOTAL	100	100%		Number of respondents answering 3 or more questions correctly is the numerator of the formula for calculating the indicator. (Using the sample frequency in the previous cell, numerator would be 50 and the denominator would be 100)

EXAMPLE: Measuring percent of change from baseline to end of project using the HIV and AIDS knowledge indicator

BASELINE Prevalence of youth answering at least 3 out of 4 questions correctly   =   30% [30 out of 100]
End-of-Project prevalence of youth answering at least 3 out of 4 questions correctly   =   50% [50 out of 100]

Percent of change is calculated as (prevalence at end – prevalence at baseline) / prevalence at baseline.

In this case, the percent change observed is (55% – 30%) / 30% = 67%

THEREFORE, THE PERCENT OF CHANGE OBSERVED (67% INCREASE IN HIV AND AIDS KNOWLEDGE) EXCEEDED THE TARGET OF 40% INCREASE DESIRED.

Suggested full set of questions from which to select four relevant to the JFFLS curriculum

		True or False (correct answer)
1	You can get AIDS by being bitten by a mosquito that has bitten someone with AIDS.	false
2	Condoms reduce the risk of getting the AIDS virus (or HIV infection).	true
3	Only people who look sick can spread the AIDS virus	false
4	A person can get AIDS by touching, kissing or hugging someone with AIDS.	false
5	Abstinence is one method to avoid getting HIV infection	true
6	You can tell if a person is infected by HIV by looking a him or her	false
7	You can get AIDS by having sexual intercourse with someone who has shared drug needles.	true
8	There is no good reason to get tested for AIDS since there is no cure	false

c. Composite indicator on Business knowledge and skills

(measurable) outcome indicators	Target for JFFLS participants	Means of verification NOTE: Youth Questionnaire (YQ) used as general survey questionnaire administered to youth, whether JFFLS participants or not.
% of youths that demonstrate knowledge and interest in market opportunities	At least 60% of JFFLS youth have knowledge and interest in starting an enterprise	YQ baseline, (midterm), final. Measured precisely with statistics **Created from YQ 5.1, 5.2a and 5.3a.**

Questionnaire number	Questionnaire items related to business skills		In analysis, a new variable is created corresponding to business skill questionnaire item to indicate if the respondent replied positively or not. The new variable is coded as 1 for a correct response and 0 for an incorrect response. ***This is easily done using statistical software or can be done manually if dataset is small.***
YQ5.1	Do you know where your closest market is?	Yes is a positive response	*Pos5.1 = **0** if YQ5.1 response is **no** *Pos5.1 = **1** if YQ5.1 response is **yes**
YQ5.2a	Have you identified in your local market a particular product that you think is needed but is not sold?	Yes is a positive response	*Pos5.2a.= **1** if YQ5.2a response is **no** *Pos5.2a = **0** if YQ5.2a response is **yes**
YQ5.3a	Would you like to have your own enterprise?	Yes is a positive response	*Pos5.3a = **0** if YQ5.3a response is **no** *Pos5.3a = **1** if YQ5.3a response is **yes**

Creation of Business knowledge and interest Indicator [% youth answering at yes to 3 Business questions]

[NUMERATOR] number of youth answering yes to YQ5.a+YQ5.2a+YQ5.3a

_____   X 100

[DENOMINATOR] number of youth responding to questionnaire

Steps in the analysis

Sum the values of the 3 questions into a new variable called BUSsum	BUSsum = (Pos5.1 + Pos5.2a + Pos5.3a) note that "no" replies are codes as 0 so do not contribute to the sum.	Gives the total number of yes answers out of the 3 BUSINESS questionnaire items.
Run a frequency of BUSsum	*Example Frequency for BUSsum:* Code N % 0 5 5% 1 20 20% 2 25 25% 3 55 55% TOTAL 100 100%	Number of respondents answering yes to all three business questions becomes the numerator of the formula for calculating the indicator. (Using the sample frequency in the previous cell, numerator would be 55 and the denominator would be 100)

EXAMPLE: Measuring percent of change from baseline to end of project using the Business knowledge and interest indicator

BASELINE Prevalence of youth answering yes to all 3 questions   =   30%
End-of-Project Prevalence of youth answering yes to all 3 questions   =   55%

HOWEVER, the target of at least 60% of youth having knowledge of and interest in starting an enterprise was not reached.

ANNEX IV

Focus Group Discussion

Guide JFFLS Participants

This is a participatory tool to help evaluate the EFFECTIVENESS and IMMEDIATE IMPACT of the JFFLS programme and participants' satisfaction. A focus group is an interview with small groups of relatively homogeneous people with similar background and experience. Participants are asked to reflect on the questions asked by the interviewers, provide their own comments, listen to what the rest of the group have to say and react to their observations. The information obtained is not the opinion of a single individual but rather a consensus of opinions.

The following is a set of **core** discussion points or issues to explore during the focus groups with youth participants to evaluate their satisfaction with the programme and to solicit problems encountered as well as suggestions for improvement. The guide serves as a checklist during the focus group and ensures that basically the same information is obtained from different groups. Each programme should decide what information is necessary to have and add additional questions to the interview guide, as necessary. The same guide can be used for groups with different characteristics, such as boys, girls, younger children, those about to finish school etc.

Do you think that what you have learned in JFFLS is useful? How and why?

What did you like most about JFFLS?

What did you like least about JFFLS?

What are the most significant changes that happened in your life because you participated in JFFLS?

If you are asked to talk to your friends and fellow students about JFFLS, what would you say?

In what ways do you contribute differently at home because you attended JFFLS?

What skills and attitudes have you learned or changed because you attended JFFLS?

How much of what you learned in JFFLS did you already know? Where did you learn those things before?

Did attending JFFLS cause in any difficulties in your life such as family relationships, social activities, school performance? If so, what kinds of problems?

What improvements or new topics would you like to see in the JFFLS for the next cycle?

Focus Group Discussion

Guide Caretakers of JFFLS Participants

This is a participatory tool to help evaluate the EFFECTIVENESS and IMMEDIATE IMPACT of the JFFLS programme and participants' satisfaction. A focus group is an interview with small groups of relatively homogeneous people with similar background and experience. Participants are asked to reflect on the questions asked by the interviewers, provide their own comments, listen to what the rest of the group have to say and react to their observations. The information obtained is not the opinion of a single individual but rather a consensus of opinions.

The following is a set of core discussion points that can be used in focus group settings with caretakers of the youth participants to evaluate their satisfaction with the programme and to solicit problems encountered as well as suggestions for improvement. The groups will be composed of caretakers of JFFLS participants and may vary by characteristics, such as caretakers of boys, girls, younger children, those about to finish school etc.

What skills and ideas have the youths learned or changed because they attended JFFLS?

Do you think that what the youths have learned in JFFLS is useful? How and why?

What are the main positive changes you have noticed for the youths attending the JFFLS?

In what ways do the youths contribute differently to at home because they attended JFFLS?

If you are asked to talk to your friends and acquantainces about JFFLS, what would you say?

Were there any negative aspects of the JFFLS on family life, community relations, school performance or other? If so, what were they?

What improvements or new topics would you like to see in the JFFLS for the next cycle?

Focus Group Sample Note-Taker Form

Group composition _____
Note Taker Name: _____
Number of Particants: ____
Venue: _____
Date___/___/_____
Staring time: _____ Ending time: _____

Seating chart (indicate the participants and their number/identifier)

Discussion points	Responses	Observations

Focus Group Debriefing Form

1) What are the main themes that merged in this focus group?
2) Did any information contradict what you learned in previous focus groups?
3) What did participants say that was unclear or contradictory to you?
4) What did you observe that would not be evident from reading a transcript of the discussion (e.g. group dynamics, individual behaviors, etc.?)
5) What problems did you encounter? (Logistical, behavior of individuals, questions that were confusing, etc.?)
6) What issues will you follow up? (E.g. what other questions can be asked to clarify, or add?)
7) Does the note taker have any suggestions for the moderator and vice versa?

Semi-structured Interview Guide

Key informant interviews with District officials, local development officers and other local stakeholders

This is a participatory tool to help evaluate the RELEVANCE, EFFECTIVENESS and IMMEDIATE IMPACT of the JFFLS programme. Key informants are persons who provide information that can assist in understanding the context of a program or project, or clarifying particular issues or problems. They are not chosen randomly, but intentionally to give voice to the different groups that have stake in the JFFLS.

This guide contained a set of **core** questions or issues to explore during the interview. It serves as a checklist during the interview and ensures that basically the same information is obtained from a number of people. Each programme should decide what information is necessary to have from key informants and add additional questions to the interview guide, as necessary. The interview should not last more than around 30-45 minutes.

What do you know about the JFFLS in your community (district)?

In your opinion, how well is the JFFLS addressing vulnerability of children?

What has changed in the community and for the participants, in your opinion, as a result of the JFFLS?

To what extent do you think the JFFLS activities are meeting participants' and stakeholders' needs?

To what extent are JFFLS programmes aligned with the strategic objectives of local development partners?

Do you think the JFFLS has implemented its planned activities in an effective and timely manner?

Are there any problems or difficulties you have noticed that affect how well the JFFLS functions?

What are your suggestions for improvements in the JFFLS programme for future cycles?

Semi-structured Interview Debriefing Form

1) What are the main themes that merged from these interviews?

2) What did respondents say that was unclear or contradictory?

3) What did you observe that would not be evident from reading a transcript of the interviews (gestures, body language).

4) What problems did you encounter? (Logistical, questions that were confusing, etc.?)

5) What issues will you follow up? (E.g. what other questions can be asked to clarify, or add?)