



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

CAPITALIZING KNOWLEDGE, CONNECTING COMMUNITIES:

UPDATED PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN



OCTOBER 2010

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by DAI.

CAPITALIZING KNOWLEDGE, CONNECTING COMMUNITIES:

UPDATED PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN

Program Title:	Capitalizing Knowledge, Connecting Communities Program (CK2C)
Sponsoring USAID Office:	USAID/Office of Acquisition and Assistance
Contract Number:	EPP-I-00-06-00021-00/01
Contractor:	DAI
Date of Publication:	October 2010
Author:	CK2C Team

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

Cover photo: USAID Staff field visit during the Environment and Natural Resources Management Overview Course held in Cebu, Philippines, 2010.

CONTENTS

- BACKGROUND 5**
- PERFORMANCE MONITORING..... 5**
- PROJECT-SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT MONITORING 6**
- MONITORING CUSTOMER SATISFACTION 7**
- ANALYZING DATA AND REPORTING RESULTS..... 7**
- TASK 1 INDICATORS AND TARGETS..... 8**
- TASK 2 INDICATORS AND TARGETS..... 10**
- TASK 3 INDICATORS AND TARGETS..... 13**
- TASK 4 INDICATORS AND TARGETS..... 16**
- CUSTOMER SATISFACTION INDICATORS AND TARGETS 19**

- ANNEX A: TASK 3 LEARNING MODULE INDEX 23**
- ONE-DAY SHORT COURSE MODULE STRUCTURE 23**
- 5-DAY ENRM OVERVIEW COURSE MODULE STRUCTURE 24**
- E-LEARNING – ENRM OVERVIEW FOUNDATIONS COURSE STRUCTURE 25**
- ENRM APPLICATIONS COURSE STRUCTURE..... 26**

- ANNEX B: ENRM LEARNING INITIATIVE - MONITORING AND
EVALUATION REPORT 2010 29**
- INTRODUCTION 29**
- SECTION I: ENRM OVERVIEW COURSE 31**
- SECTION II: ENVIRONMENT IN DEVELOPMENT – SHORT COURSE..... 40**
- SECTION III: FOUNDATIONS COURSE – ONLINE STANDALONE..... 45**
- SECTION IV: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 48**

- ANNEX I: COURSE EVALUATION FORMS FOR ENRM OVERVIEW,
SHORT, AND FOUNDATIONS COURSES 51**
- ENVIRONMENT IN DEVELOPMENT COURSE 56**
- EVALUATION 56**
- OCTOBER 12TH, 2010 56**
- ENRM DISTANCE LEARNING FOUNDATIONS COURSE EVALUATION 60**

- ANNEX II: FACE-TO-FACE “TEST YOUR KNOWLEDGE”
ASSESSMENT QUIZ RESULTS..... 63**

ANNEX III: ENRM OVERVIEW COURSE BEHAVIOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	67
ENRM LEARNING INITIATIVE.....	67
EVALUATING BEHAVIOR – LEARNING APPLICATION.....	67
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	67

TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLE

1 Task 1 Indicators..... 8

2 Task 1 Targets 9

3 Task 2 Indicators..... 10

4 Task 2 Targets 11

5 Task 3 Indicators..... 13

6 Task 3 Targets 14

7 Task 4 Indicators..... 16

8 Task 4 Targets 18

9 Monitoring Customer Satisfaction—Indicators 19

10 Monitoring Customer Satisfaction—Targets 20

BACKGROUND

USAID's Capitalizing Knowledge, Connecting Communities (CK2C) Program will be implemented over the period October 1st 2007 to September 30th 2012. CK2C builds on best practices and impacts generated by natural resource management (NRM) initiatives. FRAME, CK2C's predecessor project, included stocktaking and community of practice (CoP) components designed to help the development community work smarter and more strategically by capitalizing on lessons learned in the field and strengthening the roles played by NRM champions in critical decision making. CK2C will continue to pursue these objectives by managing and developing the FRAME website (www.frameweb.org), conducting stocktaking activities to research and share NRM best practices, designing a competency-linked NRM training program for USAID, and managing reporting and communications efforts for USAID. The CK2C team is comprised of Development Alternatives Inc. (DAI), Academy for Educational Development (AED), and Training Resources Group (TRG).

DAI will use its web-based management information system (TAMIS) to integrate work plan management, impact and performance monitoring, and project administration into a single, easy-to-use information system. Project staff will be able to house tools that they develop, such as workshop and training planning and documents; drafts of reports, to be shared among staff, USAID, and collaborating local partners before being published on FRAME; and project deliverables, such as annual progress reports and financial reports. This Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) was updated in 2009 due to a contract modification that extended CK2C by three years and added a fourth task to the project: reporting and communication of knowledge gained from a suite of USAID programs managed by the Forestry and Biodiversity (FAB) team of EGAT's NRM Office. The current report covers the period from October 2009 through September 2010. Additional monitoring and evaluation information related to Task 3 can be found in Annexes A & B.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING

The Performance Monitoring Plan, housed in the project TAMIS described above, will compile and track performance monitoring information, including Foreign Assistance Framework common indicators as well as custom indicators. The system can also capture qualitative information, such as anecdotal experiences submitted by local partners, which can be published as success stories on FRAMEweb and in FRAMEgrams to complement the more rigorous impact assessments.

A performance-based approach to CK2C is essential to the success of the initiative. To measure and evaluate the performance of CK2C and its partners we will rely on a rigorous monitoring system. This system will allow the CK2C team to build on winning initiatives and take corrective action when results are less successful than anticipated. An adaptive management strategy will facilitate replication of successes and, thereby, expedite achieving the desired results of CK2C.

An efficient monitoring system must be built around good indicators, cost-effective data collection, rigorous analysis, and efficient reporting procedures. The criteria for selection of good indicators include that they are pertinent and unequivocal; that they are objective and assist in decision making; and that they are readily understandable. Moreover, they should be based on parameters that are quantifiable, and readily measured at a reasonable cost. In most instances, the careful selection of a few pertinent indicators

that are easily measured is preferable to having numerous indicators that require complex procedures for data acquisition. Such an approach also fulfills the requirements of USAID/Washington.

We are committed to providing monitoring information to USAID and to CK2C partners that meets the requirements and guidelines outlined in USAID's ADS 200 - particularly ADS 203. In attempting to gauge the impact of CK2C, attribution becomes a complex issue. Numerous organizations including the national and regional governments, NGOs and donors are active in many of the same regions, districts and even the same communities where CK2C and its partners will undertake stocktaking analyses. Wherever possible we have identified indicators that will address this issue by focusing on impact that is specific to CK2C activities.

The performance and impact monitoring reports will strive to be both candid and transparent. Wherever appropriate, issues of data quality will be discussed and any instances of under-performance relative to our established targets will be accounted for and explained.¹

The following tables (1 to 10) provide two categories of information that are integral to a rigorous Performance Monitoring Plan:

- Impact indicators that measure progress on achieving the targets identified for the four tasks of the CK2C contract and performance indicators to gauge progress relative to specific targets (Tables 1 to 8); and
- Indicators of customer and stakeholder satisfaction with CK2C and partner services and their impact (Tables 9 and 10).

Our Performance Monitoring Plan is founded on the principle that we cannot simply assume that achieving our performance targets will automatically result in meeting our objectives with regard to the impact we anticipate and also that our customers and partners will be happy with the results. In effect we have identified three types of indicators:

- performance indicators that are essential for gauging progress in completing proposed project activities;
- impact indicators that are essential for measuring success in meeting conservation objectives and building capacity for community-based conservation efforts; and
- indicators that gauge the level of customer or stakeholder satisfaction with the improved services that CK2C and our partners will provide.

PROJECT-SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT MONITORING

For each of the four CK2C component objectives and their respective activities, we have identified indicators and targets (Tables 1 to 8). This monitoring plan will allow periodic assessments of performance toward achieving project goals and objectives.

¹ ADS 203.3.2.2 (c) states: Candor and transparency in reporting involves three interrelated actions: (1) assessing the quality of data we use to report progress and stating known limitations; (2) conveying clearly and accurately the problems that impede progress and our efforts to address them; and (3) avoiding the appearance of claiming those results achieved with or by others as our own.

MONITORING CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

Indicators that gauge the level of customer or stakeholder satisfaction with the training and knowledge management services that CK2C and our partners will provide are presented in Tables 9 and 10. Data requiring customer surveys in the field will be collected on an annual basis.

ANALYZING DATA AND REPORTING RESULTS

The CK2C Performance Plan will be managed using TAMIS. The TAMIS will enable CK2C team members – whether they are in Washington or in other locations – to enter data and review overall progress. The added capacity to link the TAMIS databases to a Geographical Information System will enable us to report progress against our targets by region or specific site. Most importantly, we will be readily able to provide maps and other graphics that help our partners visualize performance and impact of CK2C and our partners. CK2C will prepare annual reports on progress toward meeting performance and impact targets.

TASK 1 INDICATORS AND TARGETS

TABLE 1: TASK 1 INDICATORS

Task 1: Assessing and Analyzing Natural Resource Management Successes				
	Overall Impact	Performance 1.1	Performance 1.2	Performance 1.3
Performance Indicator	Number of baseline or feasibility studies prepared	Number of themes for internet-based discussions identified	Number of stocktaking exercises completed	Number of new communities of practice (CoP) established and supported
Indicator Definition	These studies will be undertaken through stocktaking exercises. This is a USAID F indicator.	Internet-based discussion groups will be built around key natural resource management and biodiversity conservation themes. If participants believe it is warranted, these discussions will be elevated to FRAME-based CoPs – see Indicator 1.3.	Stocktaking exercises will involve detailed analyses of the reasons for successful natural resource management and biodiversity conservation initiatives. These initiatives have not necessarily been supported by USAID or other donor organizations.	A CoP is defined as a virtual space for NRM practitioners to share knowledge and resources based on areas of interest, new challenges, geography, or approaches in development.
Unit of Measurement	Number	Number	Number	Number
Data Source	CK2C reports and surveys of partner organizations	CK2C reports	CK2C reports	CK2C reports
Method/Approach of Data Collection	Survey	Review	Review	Review
Schedule/Frequency	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual
Reporting	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual
End Users	USAID, Partners	USAID, Partners	USAID, Partners	USAID, Partners

TABLE 2: TASK 1 TARGETS

Task 1	Overall Impact	Performance 1.1	Performance 1.2	Performance 1.3
Assessing and Analyzing Natural Resource Management Successes	Number of baseline or feasibility studies prepared	Number of themes for internet-based discussions identified	Number of stocktaking exercises completed	Number of new communities of practice (CoP) established and supported
Life of Project Target	8	28	9	21
Baseline Data	zero	zero	zero	Zero
2008 Target	zero	4	1	2
2008 Actual	zero	5	1 underway	3
2009 Target	2	6	2	4
2009 Actual ²	1	5	2 underway	4
2010 Target	2	6	2	5
2010 Actual	33	464	35	6
2011 Target	2	6	2	5
2011 Actual				
2012 Target	2	6	2	5
2012 Actual				

² Data for October – December 2009 was removed from the 2009 Actual to eliminate double counting with FY2011 data. The CK2C Workplan and Annual Reporting period changed from a calendar to a fiscal year cycle at the request of USAID in 2010.

³ This assumes that the southern Africa CBNRM stocktaking exercises in each country can be counted as stand alone studies. The number corresponds to a completed study for Zimbabwe as well as draft studies for Zambia and Malawi.

⁴ This number represents the number of internet-based discussions not only identified but also initiated through CK2C facilitation and organically by FRAMEweb users. This data is collected from website software metrics.

⁵ Again, this assumes that the southern Africa CBNRM stocktaking exercises in each country can be counted as stand alone exercises; the number corresponds to completed exercises for Zimbabwe, Zambia and Malawi.

TASK 2 INDICATORS AND TARGETS

TABLE 3: TASK 2 INDICATORS

Task 2: Web-based Tools for Building Capacity and Communities				
	Overall Impact	Performance 2.1	Performance 2.2	Performance 2.3
Performance Indicator	Number of practitioners initiating and managing web-based discussion groups (disaggregated by gender, region)	FRAME website activity: 1 – number of FRAMEweb site visits; 2 – number of new website accounts	Number of new FRAME web-based user contributions	Number of active Partner Pages supported by FRAME website
Indicator Definition	CK2C will train partners as online facilitators as part of the discussion site training. Online discussions will be based on any number of possible topics surrounding NRM, climate change adaptation, linkages to economic growth and governance, and more.	1 –number of FRAMEweb site visits – total visits are visits by separate users; one visit can result in multiple “hits.” 2 – A new website account is defined as a new individual registered with username and password.	Contributions include a number of website features, such as information resources, questions, answers, comments, blogs, and geospatial viewing/data. This indicator will only count new forums added as part of CK2C. Disaggregated by type of contribution.	Partner Pages will focus on supporting locally based community groups, such as the Venezuelan NGO APIE, to develop or improve their websites, forming linkages with other groups online and utilizing web 2.0 interactive tools such as blogs and discussion areas. Disaggregated by region, type of partner.
Unit of Measurement	Number	1 – Number 2 – Number	Numbers	Numbers
Data Source	CK2C/FRAMEweb reports	CK2C/FRAMEweb	CK2C/FRAMEweb	CK2C/FRAMEweb
Method/Approach of Data Collection	Review of reports	Analysis of records – metric reports available	Review of reports – metric reports available	Review of reports
Schedule/Frequency	Annual	Monthly	Annual	Annual
Reporting	Annual	Monthly ⁶	Annual	Annual
End Users	USAID, Partners	USAID, Partners	USAID, Partners	USAID, Partners

⁶ Monthly updates can be found in TAMIS, section 4.6 (FRAME metrics).

TABLE 4: TASK 2 TARGETS

Task 2	Overall Impact	Performance 2.1	Performance 2.2	Performance 2.3
Web-based Tools for Building Capacity and Communities	Number of trained practitioners initiating and managing web-based discussion groups (disaggregated by gender, region)	FRAME website activity: 1 – number of FRAME site unique visits ⁷ 2 – number of new website accounts	Number of new FRAME web-based user contributions	Number of active Partner Pages supported by FRAME website ⁸
Life of Project Target	71	1 – n/a 2 – 1,800	3,050	15
Baseline Data	Zero	1 – zero 2 – zero	Zero	7
2008 Target	3	1 - 50,000 2 – 200	200	9
2008 Actual	3	1 - 62,788 2 –252	382	10
2009 Target	10	1 – 100,000 2 – 400	600	11
2009 Actual ⁹	17 Total Women – 9 Men – 8 Africa – 5 LAC – 4 US – 8	1 – 2,539,540 2 – 371	538	12
2010 Target	15	1 – 1,500 2 – 400	700	13
2010 Actual	26 Women – 12 Men – 14 US – 19	1 – 2,115 2 – 480	609 Total Blogs – 4 Comments – 4 Resources – 333	14 Total Africa – 3 LAC – 3 US – 8

⁷ This indicator was updated in 2010 to specify “unique visits” versus simple “visits.” The updated metric better defines the number of visits as the number of users that log in to FRAMEweb, counted uniquely in a 24-hour period. This means that it counts only one logged in visit per day, per user versus a simple count of any user (logged in or not) that browsed at least three clicks deep. Data from 2008-2009 records the number of FRAMEweb simple “visits.”

⁸ Both actual and target figures for this indicator are cumulative.

⁹ Data for October – December 2009 was removed from the 2009 Actual to eliminate double counting with FY2011 data. The CK2C Workplan and Annual Reporting period changed from a calendar to a fiscal year cycle at the request of USAID in 2010.

Task 2	Overall Impact	Performance 2.1	Performance 2.2	Performance 2.3
	Asia – 1 Africa – 2 LAC – 4		Questions – 46 Answers – 94 Topics – 17 Favored Items – 54 GeoExplorer Activities – 57	NGO – 5 US Gov – 5 USAID program – 3 University – 1
2011 Target	20	1 – 1,600 2 – 400	750	15
2011 Actual				
2012 Target	23	1 – 1,700 2 – 400	800	15
2012 Actual				

TASK 3 INDICATORS AND TARGETS

TABLE 5: TASK 3 INDICATORS

Task 3: NRM Competency-linked Training				
	Overall Impact 1	Overall Impact 2	Performance 3.1	Performance 3.2
Performance Indicator	Number of people receiving U.S. government-supported training in NRM and/or biodiversity conservation	Number of people receiving USG-supported training in global climate change including the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, greenhouse gas inventories, mitigation, and adaptation analysis	Number of training courses and modules offered 1 – courses 2 - modules	Number of e-learning courses offered and delivered 1 – courses designed 2 – courses delivered
Indicator Definition	The number of individuals participating in activities intended to teach or impart knowledge and information about NRM and biodiversity conservation to the participants with designated instructors or lead persons, learning objectives, and outcomes, conducted full-time or intermittently. Includes USAID competency-linked training, technical training for national NRM staff, and e-learning. Disaggregated by type of trainee (USAID, NRM practitioner, etc.); type of training (e-learning, workshops, etc.); topic; region; gender. This is a USAID F indicator.	The number of individuals participating in activities intended to teach or impart knowledge and information about Climate Change to the participants with designated instructors or lead persons, learning objectives, and outcomes, conducted full-time or intermittently. Includes USAID competency-linked training, technical training for national NRM staff, and e-learning. Disaggregated by type of trainee (USAID, NRM practitioner, etc.); type of training (e-learning, workshops, etc.); topic; region; gender. This is a USAID F indicator.	Number of formal training courses offered and delivered.	Number of e-learning courses offered and delivered
Unit of Measurement	Number	Number	1 – number 2 – number	1 – number 2 – number
Data Source	CK2C reports	CK2C reports	CK2C reports	CK2C reports
Method/Approach of Data Collection	Review of reports	Review of reports	Review of reports	Review of reports
Schedule/Frequency	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual

Task 3: NRM Competency-linked Training				
	Overall Impact 1	Overall Impact 2	Performance 3.1	Performance 3.2
Reporting	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual
End Users	USAID, Partners	USAID, Partners	USAID, Partners	USAID, Partners

TABLE 6: TASK 3 TARGETS

Task 3	Overall Impact 1	Overall Impact 2	Performance 3.1	Performance 3.2
NRM Competency-linked Training	Number of people receiving U.S. government-supported training in NRM and/or biodiversity conservation	Number of people receiving USG supported training in global climate change including UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, greenhouse gas inventories, mitigation, and adaptation analysis	Number of training courses and modules ¹⁰ offered 1 – courses 2 – modules	Number of e-learning courses offered and delivered 1 – courses designed 2 – courses delivered
Life of Project Target	935	910	1 – 31 2 – 128	1 – 9 2 – 45
Baseline Data	Zero	Zero	Zero	Zero
2008 Target	50	25	1 – 1 course 2 – 6 modules	1 – zero 2 – zero
2008 Actual	17	17	1 – 1 course 2 – zero modules	1 – zero 2 – zero
2009 Target	160	160	1 – 3 courses 2 – 12 modules	1 – 2 2 – 5
2009 Actual ¹¹	133 Total USAID Staff - 133 Face-to-face training – 133 E-Learning – 60 Region – data not collected	133 Total USAID Staff – 133 Face-to-Face training – 133 E-Learning - 60 Region – data not collected	1- 7 courses 2 – 16 modules ¹²	1 – 2 2 – 3

¹⁰ Modules are defined as in-depth training sessions on specific topics and with specific learning objectives (mainly technical) that will be offered in conjunction with the ENRM face-to-face courses. These modules are not necessarily developed and delivered by CK2C but their form and content will be developed in coordination with the overarching ENRM curriculum. Several modules will comprise a course. E-learning course modules are included in this number.

¹¹ Data for October – December 2009 was removed from the 2009 Actual to eliminate double counting with FY2011 data. The CK2C Workplan and Annual Reporting period changed from a calendar to a fiscal year cycle at the request of USAID in 2010.

¹² See Annex A for full list of modules.

Task 3	Overall Impact 1	Overall Impact 2	Performance 3.1	Performance 3.2
	Gender – data not collected	Gender – data not collected		
2010 Target	200	200	1- 9 courses 2 – 30 modules	1 – 4 2 – 11
2010 Actual	127 Total USAID Staff - 127 Face-to-face training – 127 E-Learning – 127 Region: AFR – 9 ASIA – 20 E&E – 4 LAC – 8 ME – 1 Washington – 85 Gender – 58 F/ 69 M	127 Total USAID Staff - 127 Face-to-face training – 127 E-Learning – 127 Region: AFR – 9 ASIA – 20 E&E – 4 LAC – 8 ME – 1 Washington – 85 Gender – 58 F/ 69 M	1 – 9 courses 2 – 20 modules ¹³	1 – 4 2 – 7 ¹⁴
2011 Target	250	250	1 – 9 courses 2 – 40 modules	1 – 2 2 – 14
2011 Actual				
2012 Target	275	275	1 – 9 courses 2 – 40 modules	1 – 1 2- 15
2012 Actual				

¹³ See Annex for full list of modules. The indicator target was not met due to delays in the delivery of the ENRM Applications (201) and Earmarks Courses.

¹⁴ The ENRM Foundations 'E-learning' course is now offered as a standalone course, open for participation throughout the year and is not counted towards discrete deliveries as in previous PMP reports.

TASK 4 INDICATORS AND TARGETS

TABLE 7: TASK 4 INDICATORS

Task 4: Reporting and Communications				
	Overall Impact	Performance 4.1	Performance 4.2	Performance 4.3
Performance Indicator	Overall rating (expressed as a percentage of respondents) of biodiversity and forestry communications products is good to excellent	Number of people accessing communications materials	Number of biodiversity reports/publication materials produced	Number of new events and meetings organized
Indicator Definition	CK2C will conduct an annual survey of individuals who access USAID Biodiversity and Forestry communications products and services to measure three elements of communications outreach: accessibility, quality and utility of technical materials, and services. ¹⁵	USAID's Biodiversity and Forestry Team produces a number of print and online communications materials. CK2C will work to measure the number of individuals who are able to access the materials, both electronically and in hard copy. Site visits to the USAID external site will be measured as will attendance to seminar series and other print materials.	CK2C helps draft, edit and produce biodiversity reports, including the annual 118/119 report (#1) and fact sheets (#2).	CK2C helps organize and facilitate biodiversity and forestry seminars for a wide audience. The project will organize four ¹⁶ seminars per year.
Unit of Measurement	Percentage	Number	Number	Number
Data Source	CK2C reports and survey of users	CK2C reports, online metrics such as Constant Contact and USAID external website	CK2C reports, TAMIS	CK2C reports, TAMIS
Method/Approach of Data Collection	Survey	Review	Review	Review
Schedule/Frequency	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual

¹⁵ The target audience for this survey is a subset of the seminar series listserv. This constitutes a proxy for overall impact since the activity is regular and discrete, and the audience(s) is a communications target.

¹⁶ The number of seminars has been reduced to four as noted in the FY 2011 workplan. It is now envisioned that CK2C would organize four seminars and the TransLinks program would organize other seminars.

Task 4: Reporting and Communications

	Overall Impact	Performance 4.1	Performance 4.2	Performance 4.3
Reporting	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual
End Users	USAID, Partners, Public	USAID, Partners, Public	USAID, Partners, Congress, Public	USAID, Partners, Public

TABLE 8: TASK 4 TARGETS

Task 4	Overall Impact	Performance 4.1	Performance 4.2	Performance 4.3
Reporting and Communications	Overall rating of biodiversity and forestry communications products is good to excellent	Number of people accessing communications materials	Number of biodiversity reports/publication materials produced	Number of new events and meetings organized
Life of Project Target	75% of respondents rate products good-excellent	30,000	1– 4 annual 118/119 2– 9-13 other publications 3– 1 Biodiversity Guide	14
Baseline Data	Zero	22,980 ¹⁷	1– 1 annual 118/119 2– 1-2 other publications	6
2010 Target	70% of respondents rate products good-excellent	25,000	1– 1 annual 118/119 2– 3 other publications	6
2010 Actual	82% overall ¹⁸ Quality: 100% Utility: 66% Accessibility: 80%	25,693 ¹⁹	1– 1 annual 118/119 ²⁰ 2– 3 other publications ²¹	7
2011 Target	75% of respondents rate products good-excellent	28,000	2– 1 annual 118/119 2– 3-4 other publications 3– 1 Biodiversity Guide	4 ²²
2011 Actual				
2012 Target	80% of respondents rate products good-excellent	30,000	1– 1 annual 118/119 2– 3-6 fact sheets	4
2012 Actual				

¹⁷ This figure captures unique Forestry page views on USAID external site: 10,167; and Unique Biodiversity page views on USAID external site: 12,813.

¹⁸ The survey was sent to 65 individuals and had an 11% response rate at the time of writing.

¹⁹ This figure captures a variety of sources: unique visitors to the FRAMEweb Seminar Series page: 572; Total number of Seminar Series attendees: 313 (averages were used for months without data); Unique page views of Seminar Series related page views on RMportal: 208; Unique Forestry page views on USAID external site: 9979; Unique Biodiversity page views on USAID external site: 13,821; access to hard copy of Biodiversity/Forestry (118/119) report: 800.

²⁰ The annual 118/119 report was in final draft form and through various stages of clearance by the end of FY 2010. It will be printed on/about October 18, 2010.

²¹ This figure includes three publications: postcard, GCP evaluation printing and FY 2010 Biodiversity and Forestry Report Executive Summary brochure.

²² The targets for FY 2011 and FY 2012 have been reduced to reflect the reduction in CK2C support for the seminar series per USAID request.

CUSTOMER SATISFACTION INDICATORS AND TARGETS

TABLE 9: MONITORING CUSTOMER SATISFACTION—INDICATORS

Customer Satisfaction and Awareness					
	Overall Impact	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4
Performance Indicator	Percentage of trainees that understand the importance of sound environmental management, good conservation and integrated programming ²³	Percentage of discussion group members that rate FRAME-based discussions useful	Percentage of FRAME users that rate information exchange and liaison as good to excellent	Percentage of trainees that rate CK2C trainings as good to excellent	Overall rating (expressed as a percentage of respondents) of biodiversity and forestry communications products is good to excellent
Indicator Definition	Percentage of trainees that understand the importance of sound environmental management, good conservation and integrated programming based on responses to five tailored survey questions.	FRAME-based discussions can be rated by participants and other readers using a simple tool on the web-site.	A simple survey will be conducted to assess FRAME users' satisfaction with the tools and services offered by the site.	A simple evaluation will be conducted at the end of each training session to assess trainees' satisfaction with the course and its delivery.	CK2C will conduct an annual survey of individuals who access USAID Biodiversity and Forestry communications products and services to measure three elements of communications outreach: accessibility, quality and utility of technical materials, and services.
Unit of Measurement	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage
Data Source	Trainee evaluation forms	FRAMEweb survey	FRAMEweb survey	Trainee evaluation forms	CK2C reports and survey of users
Method/ Approach of Data Collection	Survey	Survey	Survey	Survey	Survey
Schedule/ Frequency	Periodic (at each course)	Annual	Annual	Periodic (at each course)	Annual
Reporting	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual
End Users	CK2C, USAID, Partners	CK2C, USAID, Partners	CK2C, USAID, Partners	CK2C, USAID, Partners	USAID, Partners, Public

²³ The language of this indicator was changed to better reflect the objectives of CK2C's training initiative.

TABLE 10: MONITORING CUSTOMER SATISFACTION—TARGETS

	Overall Impact	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4
	Percentage of trainees that understand the importance of sound environmental management, good conservation, and integrated programming based on responses to five tailored survey questions	Percentage of discussion group members that rate FRAME-based discussions useful	Percentage of FRAME users that rate information exchange and liaison as good to excellent	Percentage of trainees that rate CK2C trainings as good to excellent	Overall rating of biodiversity and forestry communications products is good to excellent
Life of Project Target	78%	78%	78%	78%	75% of respondents rate products good-excellent
Baseline Data	TBD	zero	Zero	zero	Zero
2008 Target	70%	70%	70%	70%	N/A
2008 Actual	TBD	71%	71%	100%	N/A
2009 Target	80%	80%	80%	80%	N/A
2009 Actual ²⁴	TBD	80%	78.2% average Tools and Resources 85% Technical Assistance 60% ²⁵ Facilitation 81% Information Updates 87%	91.5% average ENRM Overview & Foundation Course 89% ²⁶ ENRM Short Course 94% ²⁷	N/A
2010 Target	80%	80%	80%	80%	70% of respondents rate products good-excellent
2010 Actual	ENRM Overview – 86.7% ²⁸	76% ²⁹	76.5% average Tools and Resources 82% Technical Assistance 69%	96.7% average ENRM 101 - 93.35% ENRM One Day –	82% overall ³⁰ Quality: 100% Utility: 66% Accessibility: 80%

²⁴ These percentages were not changed due to the revised reporting period as they are based on an annual survey and represent a snapshot of user opinion.

²⁵ 40% of people surveyed stated that they had no opinion.

²⁶ This number is based on participant evaluation of meeting ENRM Overview and Foundation course objectives.

²⁷ This number is based on participant evaluation of meeting the overall goal of the ENRM Short Course objective.

²⁸ This data is derived from the Level Three Evaluation – see page 34 in Annex B.

²⁹ Survey response and data collected increased by 7%.

³⁰ The survey was sent to 65 individuals and had an 11% response rate at the time of writing.

	Overall Impact	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4
			Facilitation 70% Information Updates 85%	100%	
2011 Target	80%	80%	80%	80%	75% of respondents rate products good-excellent
2011 Actual					
2012 Target	80%	80%	80%	80%	80% of respondents rate products good-excellent
2012 Actual					

ANNEX A: TASK 3 LEARNING MODULE INDEX

ONE-DAY SHORT COURSE MODULE STRUCTURE

Module	Specific Learning Objectives
I. Environment Trends	At the end of the session participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognize and articulate the importance of the environment to the overall development agenda. • Identify and understand some of the major environmental trends. • Discuss the ways in which development activities contribute to or are affected by these trends.
II. Institutional and legislative Frameworks Impacting USAID Programming in the Environment Sector: FAF; 117, 118 and 119 and Earmarks.	At the end of the session participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the legislative and institutional context and requirements impacting USAID programming in the environment sector including: Agency earmarks, the Foreign Assistance Framework (FAF) including Agency indicators and Section 118/119.
III. Systems Thinking and Integrated Approaches	At the end of this session participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify how integrated approaches have been used to apply systems thinking in ENRM programming and, • Describe four types of integrated approaches.

5-DAY ENRM OVERVIEW COURSE MODULE STRUCTURE

Module	Specific Learning Objectives
I. Environment Trends	At the end of the session participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognize and articulate the importance of the environment to the overall development agenda. • Identify and understand some of the major environmental trends. • Discuss the ways in which development activities contribute to or are affected by these trends.
II. Systems Thinking and Development	At the end of the session participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand what a systems thinking approach is and how it is relevant to development. • Understand how stakeholders provide information about leverage points within systems.
III. Integrated ENRM Approaches: Strategies and Tools	At the end of this session participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand integrated approaches to apply systems thinking in ENRM programming. • Make informed decisions regarding which approaches might be most relevant to different contexts.
IV. Institutional and legislative Frameworks Impacting USAID Programming in the Environment Sector: FAF; 117, 118 and 119 and Earmarks.	At the end of the session participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the legislative and institutional context and requirements impacting USAID programming in the environment sector including: Agency earmarks, the Foreign Assistance Framework (FAF) including Agency indicators and Section 118/119, and environmental compliance including Regulation 216. • Apply the Agency's legislative and institutional frameworks effectively to achieve broad development goals.
V. Sustainability	At the end of this session, participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulate a sustainability definition. • Identify the various elements of sustainability and some methodologies for applying them to ENRM activities.
VI. Tools for an Integrated Approach	At the end of this session, participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and understand six tools and their application in ENRM programming (SCALE, GCC [climate change adaptation guidance manual], PMP, Land tenure, Value chain, Conflict mitigation).
VII. Bringing it all together	At the end of this session, participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address common challenges faced in carrying out integrated and sustainable ENRM programming in a USAID Mission context.

E-LEARNING – ENRM OVERVIEW FOUNDATIONS COURSE STRUCTURE

Module	Specific Learning Objectives
I. Ecosystems	<p>At the end of the session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe what an ecosystem is, how ecosystems are classified, and how ecosystems function. • Identify different types of ecosystem services and how they connect to development. • Explain the impact of human activities on ecosystems and renewable and non renewable resources.
II. Biodiversity	<p>At the end of the session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define biodiversity. • Explain the value/importance of biodiversity through the lenses of ecosystem services, biological resources, and social benefits. • Identify the drivers that cause the loss of biodiversity. • List the principles that guide USAID's biodiversity conservation programs.
III. Environmental Trends	<p>At the end of this session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and understand some of the major environmental trends. • Discuss the ways in which development activities contribute to or are affected by these trends.
IV. Natural Resource Management (NRM)	<p>At the end of the session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define what NRM is and why it is important. • Describe USAID's approach to NRM. • Identify examples of NRM activities. • Describe the linkages between NRM and livelihoods that inform USAID's approach.
V. Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM)	<p>At the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define integrated water resources management and explain the rationale behind this approach to NRM. • Describe the basic elements of a hydrologic basin. • Identify key IWRM principles.
VI. Global Climate Change (GCC)	<p>At the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define global climate change. • Identify the causes and impacts of global climate change and opportunities to mitigate, as well as to adapt to, climate change. • Describe the linkages between global climate change and development, as well as the USAID approach to global climate change programming.

ENRM APPLICATIONS COURSE STRUCTURE

Module	Specific Learning Objectives
I. Setting the context	<p>At the end of the session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulate how USAID strategic planning and ENRM programming fit together. • Understand the key phases of the USAID program cycle. • Identify other key variables (technical, bureaucratic and interpersonal) that impact internal ENRM programming processes.
II. GCC technical module	<p>At the end of the session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better understand state of the art information on global climate change and be able to apply and integrate these issues into environmental programming.
III. Food Security and Sustainable Agriculture technical module	<p>At the end of this session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better understand state of the art information on food security and sustainable agriculture and be able to apply and integrate these issues into environmental programming.
IV. Biodiversity and Forestry technical module	<p>At the end of the session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better understand state of the art information on biodiversity and forestry and be able to apply and integrate these issues into environmental programming.
V. Freshwater and marine and coastal technical module	<p>At the end of the session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better understand state of the art information on freshwater and marine and coastal sectors and be able to apply and integrate these issues into environmental programming.
VI. Assessment	<p>At the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulate the role of the assessment process in USAID programming (Strategic Planning process and program design). • Identify ways to incorporate scientific and technical analysis and information throughout the programming cycle and sources for this information. • Identify ways to be strategic and efficient about data collection and the use of existing analyses.
VII. Design	<p>At the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply sustainable design principles to ENRM programs. • Analyze the data collected in the assessment phase and apply it to developing a causal model. • Identify cross-sectoral activities that will achieve desired results.
VIII. Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>At the end of the session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify relevant ENRM indicators. • Understand the role of M&E in the program cycle and adaptive management. • Understand a PMP at program and project levels.
IX. Adaptive Management and Implementation	<p>At the end of this session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply principles of adaptive management to ENRM program implementation.

Module	Specific Learning Objectives
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="678 243 1214 273">• Apply best practices to program sustainability.

ANNEX B: ENRM LEARNING INITIATIVE - MONITORING AND EVALUATION REPORT 2010

INTRODUCTION

This is the first Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) report of the Environment and Natural Resource Management Learning Initiative (ENRM LI). The main objective of this M&E system is to determine the effectiveness of the training program offered under the ENRM LI. This report includes the results of the different training courses delivered during FY 2010 and also shows cumulative results when available.

The primary objective of the ENRM Learning Initiative is to update and improve the technical skills, awareness and capacity of USAID staff in the core competencies needed for state-of-the art Environment and NRM programming. The ENRM LI will help USAID staff acquire and master competencies by:

- Offering a learning path which includes a mix of face-to-face courses, online modules, and experiential-based opportunities to keep knowledge and skills current.
- Creating virtual spaces to offer different self-directed learning resources and stimulate networking and knowledge sharing.
- Improving the strategic coordination of course offerings and learning efforts in the ENRM sector.

The course effectiveness measured in this report refers to the face-to-face and distance learning courses offered during 2010 as part of the Learning Path. Each training course's effectiveness is measured by the general satisfaction of the participants in the course (level 1); by their learning (level 2) – the knowledge acquired and skills developed or improved; and by changes in behavior (level 3) – the percentage of participants able to apply one concept or skill learned or acquired during the ENRM Overview course in their work. This M&E system follows Dr. Jim Kirkpatrick's training evaluation system. This report will highlight how the results are contributing to achievement (or not) of PMP and other indicators, will specify the different methods utilized to collect data, and will offer recommendations to maintain a satisfactory level of effectiveness or to improve it.

The report is structured by courses delivered during FY 2010 as follows:

Section I: ENRM Overview Course

Section II: Environment in Development (Short) Course

Section III: ENRM Foundations Course (Standalone)

Section IV: Conclusions and Recommendations

Annex I: Course Evaluation Forms for ENRM Overview, Short, and Foundations Courses

Annex II: Face-to-Face "Test Your Knowledge" Assessment Quiz Results

Annex III: ENRM Overview Course Behavior Interview Protocol

SECTION I: ENRM OVERVIEW COURSE

1. INTRODUCTION

The ENRM Overview course was delivered twice in 2010; the following sections describe data results regarding general reactions to the training, learning from the training, and behavior/application of course content after the training. This report presents cumulative data from the five deliveries of the training since the course launch in June 2008.

2. LEVEL ONE – REACTION

Definition: Level one evaluation is our measure of customer satisfaction. It provides information that can be used to improve the course or training program including immediate feedback about the content, trainers and the logistics of the course.

Data gathering method(s): For this section there is one indicator defined to measure “reaction.” To gather data for this level of evaluation, participants were asked to complete a written evaluation at the end of the face-to-face course that included both quantitative and qualitative questions. In addition, information about the demographics of the course participants was gathered through the USAID University LMS course registration system.

After the initial four deliveries of the course, the evaluation form was modified to offer quantitative data about course design, trainers, facilities and materials. Data on those items in the initial evaluations was quantified by counting the number of positive responses to the questions:

1. Do you think the course had an appropriate balance between practical application and skill building vs. technical content? If not, what suggestions would you make to improve the balance?
2. Would you recommend this blended course to others?
3. Feedback about course design and content (including flow of course, presentations, case studies & journaling).
4. Feedback about trainers and facilitator.
5. Feedback about materials.
6. Feedback about facilities and logistics.

Indicator: Percentage of trainees that rate ENRM Overview training as good to excellent.

93.35% of trainees rated the ENRM Overview Course as good to excellent in FY 2010.

90.2% of trainees rated the ENRM Overview Course as good to excellent since its launch in FY 2008.

	Jan 2008 - Panama	May 2009 - Pretoria	July 2009 - DC	Jan 2010 - Cebu	June 2010 - DC	FY 2010 Cumulative Results	Cumulative Results since 2008
Demographics (participants): No. of participants by gender	16 Women – 7 Men – 9	18 Women – 6 Men – 12	25 Women – 14 Men – 11	18 Women – 8 Men – 10	23 Women – 10 Men – 13	41 Women – 18 Men – 23	100 Women – 45 Men – 55
Overall how will you rate the course ³¹	88.70%	88.6%	87%	94%	92.7%	93.35%	90.2%
Questions about course content and DL - rated agree to strongly agree:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was an appropriate balance between practical application and skill building vs. technical content. If not, what suggestions would you make to improve the balance? 	N/A	84.21%	85%	73.3%	86.4%	78.35%	82.2%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DL foundations course added value to these 5 days. 	N/A	84.2%	100%	87.5%	81.8%	84.65%	88.3%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would recommend this blended course (DL Foundations course and 5-day ENRM Overview) to others. 	93% ³²	94.7%	100%	100%	92.7%	96.35%	96.1%
Course Delivery: Course design and content (Rated excellent and very good)	70% ³³	100%	85.7%	93.8%	92.8%	93.3%	88.5%
Course material	86.7% ³⁴	100%	95%	100%	100%	100%	96.3%
Trainers and facilitator	100% ³⁵	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97.3%
Logistic support and facilities	86.7% ³⁶	100%	100%	68.8%	100%	84.4%	91.1%

Note: Percentage corresponds to responses 4 and 5 on a scale of 1 to 5.

³¹ This percentage is the media per course of meeting the learning objectives presented in Indicator 2 table below. Results of responses to the question about rating the course from good to excellent are only presented for the July 2010 course.

³² Results calculated by counting good, excellent, and very good responses and dividing by the total number of responses. Qualitative data is also available.

³³ Results calculated by counting good, excellent, and very good responses and dividing by the total number of responses. Qualitative data is also available.

³⁴ Results calculated by counting good, excellent, and very good responses and dividing by the total number of responses. Qualitative data is also available.

³⁵ Results calculated by counting good, excellent, and very good responses and dividing by the total number of responses. Qualitative data is also available.

³⁶ Results calculated by counting good, excellent, and very good responses and dividing by the total number of responses. Qualitative data is also available.

3. LEVEL TWO – EVALUATING LEARNING

Definition: Level Two evaluation measures the extent to which participants have changed attitudes, improved knowledge and/or increased skills as a result of attending the course.

In this section you will find results with respect to two indicators defined to measure “learning.”

Data gathering method(s): To gather data for this level of evaluation, participants were asked to complete a written evaluation at the end of the face-to-face course that included both quantitative and qualitative questions on the course objectives.

Indicator: The percentage of participants that at the end of the course believe the training event helped them meet the learning objectives, allowing them to apply or understand the approaches or models presented in the course.

97.05% of participants believed the course helped them meet objective 1, 92% objective 2, 96.35% objective 3, 84.6% objective 4, 93.18% objective 5 and 96.35% objective 6 in FY 2010.

91.52% of participants believed the course helped them meet objective 1, 89.1% objective 2, 91.2% objective 3, 81.4% objective 4, 91.1% objective 5 and 96.4% objective 6 since course launch in 2008.

Objective	2008 - Panama	Jan 2009 - Pretoria	July 2009 - DC	Jan 2010 - Cebu	June 2010 - DC	FY 2010 Cumulative Results	Cumulative Results since 2008
1. ENRM Role: Make a compelling case for ENRM's role in international development as a platform for accomplishing multiple development objectives.	88%	84.2%	91.3%	94.1%	100%	97.05%	91.52%
2. Applying ENRM: Apply integrated ENRM models, approaches and techniques to Agency programming.	86%	84.2%	91.3%	93.1%	90.9%	92%	89.1%
3. Cross-sectoral: Apply cross-sectoral thinking, program design and tools.	88%	84.2%	91.3%	100%	92.7%	96.35%	91.2%
4. Sustainability: Apply principles of sustainability.	84%	84.2%	69.6%	76.5%	92.7%	84.6%	81.4%
5. FAF and Earmarks: Understand the work with USAID's Foreign Assistance Framework, Congressional earmarks, and other USAID Policies and Regulations related to ENRM.	92%	94.7%	82.6%	100%	86.36%	93.18%	91.1%
6. Resources: Identify access and use information resources relevant to ENRM activities.	94%	100%	95.6%	100%	92.7%	96.35%	96.4%

Notes:

- For all courses, rating is calculated from results of scales 4 and 5 (successfully met).

- In the case of Pretoria, 3 participants consistently rated objectives 1, 2, 3, and 4 on scale 3 making 100% of objective met if we were considering responses to 3, 4, and 5.

Illustrative quotes:

- “I have attended a lot of trainings over the past couple of months and this was by far the best. Although the days were very long and my capacity to absorb new information at the end of the day was diminished, the facilitators really tried to make the activity participatory and active.” (Pretoria, January 2009)
- About balance of theory vs. application: “Yes, this is always the challenge with USAID trainings: depth vs. breadth (that and balancing trying to teach to different learning styles). Well-balanced.” (Panama, June 2008)
- “The distance education coupled with the face-to-face training opens eyes to look at ENRM afresh given the world trends.” (Cebu, January 2010)
- “The field trip and real world applications were great! For the first time I have an understanding of what an earmark is and how it applies to my job.” (DC, July 2009)
- “I understand and completely agree with the [ENRM integrated approaches and tools] as a concept. In practice, the application is still unclear. Lots of constraints in agency structure and not clear how to put into practice after program design stage (incorporate into existing contracts).” (Panama, June 2008)
- “Normal inertia surrounding integration is difficult to overcome at times. I am fortunate to have a receptive Mission Director - others are not so fortunate. Is there any way to add this as a module to MD training? Training for other backstops? Useful exercises.” (Pretoria, January 2009)
- “Sometimes we focus too much on our own area, this training helps us think across sector and apply integrated approach for program design.” (Cebu, January 2010)
- “The exercises were excellent! I was able to understand how to deal with complex/ difficult real situations and way to solve it.” (Panama, June 2008)
- “I think it is GREAT that we are doing more ENRM training. This should be just one of a number of courses for people of different levels. We should also have SOTA trainings/conferences every year or two years to help build the ENRM community. Overall: GREAT JOB!!!” (Cebu, January 2009)
- About trainers: “Wonderful mix of expertise. Appreciated their willingness to participate and offer advice beyond course sessions.” (DC, July 2009)
- “Appreciate specific examples from various projects, interactive structure, and involvement of different stakeholders on panel during field trip to exemplify what we discussed.” (DC, July 2010)
- “Please encourage other Mission sectors to attend, especially EG and Program that way, they will understand the environment sector.” (DC, July 2010)

Data Gathering Method(s): To gather data for this level of evaluation in the Overview course delivered in July 2010, participants were asked to participate in a face-to-face course quiz. Data was captured anonymously through the electronic polling system, TurningPoint. The July course was the pilot testing of the quiz.

Indicator: Percentage of participants that scored 80% or higher in the “test your knowledge” assessments applied at the end of the training event. (Note: These indicators are only applicable to ENRM Overview and Foundation courses.)

62.52% of participants scored 80% or higher in the “test your knowledge” assessments applied at the end of the course.

Question	Percentage with correct answers
<p>Which of the following statements best represents the approach(es) to development that is (are) gaining momentum at USAID based on lessons learned in the environment sector: Using a cross sectoral systems approach that takes a holistic view of the world and allows for interactions between sectors Fostering early participation by all stakeholders, empowering them through involvement at all levels, including in decision-making processes Taking an ecosystem approach to ensure quick wins a and b (correct response) a. b and c</p>	81.82%
<p>In planning for the project you are seeing that building the social network between agricultural producers and consumers within the country’s market chain will be critical for success. Based on this information, what type of integrated approach are you most likely to select as a basis for your programming? Spatial Stakeholder and actor-based (correct response) Conceptual Economic a. All of the above</p>	30.43%
<p>A spatial integrated approach (landscape or seascape) focuses on geographic units that often have some inherent ecological basis (e.g. watersheds, wildlife ranges, vegetation system types, etc.). The main strength of this approach is that its scale captures major ecological features and wide-ranging fauna. Which of the following is an example of a Spatial Approach? Nature, Wealth and Power (NWP) System-Wide Collaborative Action for Livelihoods and Environment (SCALE) Value Chain Strategy a. Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) (correct response)</p>	77.27%
<p>Which statement(s) below best capture(s) why systems thinking is so important for ENRM programming: Systems thinking helps us to manage for the short term Systems thinking identifies the tradeoffs between development and environment so costs can be shared equitably Systems thinking hones in on one leverage point for intervention Systems thinking identifies platforms for joint action by stakeholders and partners A and B C and D a. B and D (correct response)</p>	47.83%
<p>True or False: When looking at the Foreign Assistance Framework (FAF), standard Agency reporting indicators are defined primarily at the sub-element level (False)</p>	78.26%
<p>What are the four dimensions of sustainability? Economic, Information, Social and Governance Social, Environment, Governance and Participation Cultural, Economic, Integration and Environment</p>	90.91%

Question	Percentage with correct answers
Environment, Social, Governance and Information a. Governance, Social, Economic and Environment (correct response)	
According to the GCC Adaptation Manual, which of the following steps does NOT correspond to the process for evaluation of climate change? Screen for vulnerability to climate risks Identify mitigation and energy options (correct response) Analyze the options using the different criteria Select a course of action Implement the project a. Evaluate the effectiveness of the adaptation	72.73%
Supporting strategy and activity design, identifying environmental compliance issues, targeting opportunities for earmarked funds and increasing the sustainability of Mission projects and approaches are some of the benefits of: 118/119 Analysis (correct response) FAF Reg 216 Earmarks a. None of the above	54.55%
2. True or False: Standard indicators measure what is being accomplished with USG foreign assistance funds and the collective impact of foreign and host-government efforts to advance country development (True)	47.83%
Which of the following is not a critical element of sustainability? Ownership and collaboration at all levels Diversity of environment, society and culture Creation new goals for existing institutional frameworks (correct response) Action at the appropriate scale a. Committed government with supportive, enabling policy	60.87%
What do program managers need to take into account to practice good adaptive management? Changes in local context New discoveries about drivers and development challenges Incorrect hypotheses and assumptions Lessons learned through implementation successes and failures Areas of underperformance A, C and D B, D and E All of the above (correct response) a. None of the above	78.26%
Overall Media	65.52%

Recommendations:

- Announce the quiz to participants in advance and suggest the review of materials.
- Ensure that all trainers know the questions related to their content areas and can emphasize key concepts.
- Review clarity and relevance of some questions that were not clear to participants.

4. LEVEL THREE: EVALUATING BEHAVIOR

Level three evaluation measures the change in job behavior or the application of course knowledge or skills that are attributable to a person's attendance in an ENRM training program.

Data Gathering Method(s): This indicator was measured by interviewing a sample of 14 participants from the ENRM Overview courses delivered in Panama, Washington DC, Pretoria and Cebu between June 2008 and January 2010. The Washington DC course delivered in July 2010 was not included because this data will be collected, at minimum, six months after the course delivery.

Indicator: Percentage of participants that start implementing at least one of the environment and natural resources management approaches, principles or tools taught during the training event.

86.7% of interviewees reported they have been able to start implementing at least one of the environment and natural resources management approaches, principles or tools taught during the course.

RESULTS

Key concepts applied after the course:

- **Integrated Programming:** For all participants, the most common and compelling takeaway from the Overview Course was the importance of integrated programming. Generally, newer hires felt the course's emphasis on integration helped to broaden (if not completely shift) their perspectives on how to approach their work. On the other hand, more seasoned practitioners noted that while the course did not expose them to significantly new concepts, they left the training with a renewed sense of enthusiasm and value for applying integration to their work.

The level of application of this concept varied among participants: a handful of interviewees were able to directly incorporate it into program design immediately following the course, others were able to actively contribute to team planning discussions, and some, while acknowledging the importance of integration, were hindered in their ability to do so. Participants' ability to fully apply integration depended largely on the work of their mission, as well as their own portfolios, and the amount of influence they could exert in the decision making process. Additional and related factors included timing (some participants engaged in program design shortly after the training, whereas others went into projects already being implemented), funding (difficulty in meeting criteria tied to money or requirements for indicators; shifting of money to other programs), mission hierarchy (and lack of influence on decision makers), and career level (not having autonomy; not having environmental programs in portfolio).

While many participants have been able to integrate "cross-sectorally" within ENRM (e.g., between systems, or between water and biodiversity programs), with the exception of two interviewees, it seems that true cross-sectoral integration has yet to be implemented in ENRM programming.

- **Earmarks, environmental compliance and FAF:** Participants, especially environmental officers, also highlighted earmarks, environmental compliance, and the FAF course content as having high application to their work. For many new hires, the course provided a foundation of knowledge that

enabled them to confidently use Reg. 216, draft 118/119 documents for their missions, and budget projects.

Intention to apply course concepts:

- All interviewees (100%) indicated that they plan to apply the course concepts/principles in the future.
- All interviewees (100%) indicated that they had been eager to change their behavior and/or practices regarding ENRM programming as they left the course.

Additional learning opportunities:

- All interviewees spoke enthusiastically about further developing their knowledge. Participants reaffirmed the relevance of the ENRM 201 Course (currently being developed) as they largely identified concepts related to application and the phases of the programming cycle. Other topics of interest included leadership and management skills, land management, conflict, and GCC. Lastly, some interviewees expressed frustration around difficulty in engaging in training, both due to workload and organizational policy (such as cost, time out of the office, travel restrictions).
- Several participants voiced appreciation for the varied learning methodologies used throughout the course, and many noted that the takeaways from various activities were both memorable and applicable to their jobs. The World Café, systems thinking activities, and field trip were repeatedly mentioned by participants. In addition, some participants also highlighted the value of being able to meet and learn from USAID trainers and colleagues.

Illustrative Quotes:

- “The course sparked my brain to be more integrative about looking at climate change. [Our mission is] definitely taking a broader view of what constitutes climate change now. I think it is fair to say that the course was like a paradigm shift for me.”
- “After Pretoria, I was asked for programs to include in the CMM (EGAT DCHA Bureau/CMM). Given this new understanding of “integration,” I was able to offer an idea of natural resources (NR) and conflict mitigation through NR (\$1.3 million). For every review or ideas of programs, I have tried to incorporate a concept of integrating NR. I was taught everything about NR and not about the integrations part of it. I learned the integration part of it in this training.”
- “I am part of a working with indigenous people from the Amazon to reduce social conflict, at the same time to protect and conserve biodiversity. It is going to be the first activity in the mission where Environment and other office will co-finance a project. They are now in the process of integrating activities in the design. The course really influenced me to do some of these. Because of the course, I saw that it was possible to do something like this in spite of regulation.”
- “We used the course concepts in the design of the new mission environment programs. The course helped us to understand the big picture - the full system, to look at the project in a more holistic way, and to accommodate earmarks definition during the process. We couldn’t get to integration of sectors, but of the systems (such as governmental issues, GCC, and water issues), so there are linkages among the projects.”

- “We are going through the budgeting exercise for this FY and trying to decide on how to budget the projects. I have been able to bring the earmarks attributions, review indicators for NRM, environment, GCC, and understand the different types of indicators...I was able to do this thanks to the course.”
- “To this date, I tell people this is the best training I have taken. It’s being more than a year and I still talk about it. A couple people I knew took the training after and they felt the same. It was well organized and innovative.”
- “I really wanted to implement [the course concepts] when I left, but my boss did not believe in it. I have started talking about the issues and possibilities and am waiting for the moment to come when I can manage an environment program.”

SECTION II: ENVIRONMENT IN DEVELOPMENT – SHORT COURSE

1. INTRODUCTION

The Environment in Development (Short) course was delivered five times in 2010; the following sections describe data results about general reactions to the training and learning from the training.

2. LEVEL ONE – REACTION

Level one evaluation is our measure of customer satisfaction. It provides information that can be used to improve the course or training program including immediate feedback about the content, trainers and the logistics of the course.

Data gathering method(s): For this section there is one indicator defined to measure “reaction.” To gather data for this level of evaluation, participants were asked to complete a written evaluation at the end of the face-to-face course that included both quantitative and qualitative questions. In addition, information about the demographics of the course participants was gathered through the USAID University LMS course registration system.

Indicator: Percentage of trainees that rate ENRM Environment in Development (Short) course as good to excellent.

100% of trainees rated ENRM Environment in Development (Short) course as good to excellent in FY 2010.

100% of trainees rated ENRM Environment in Development (Short) course as good to excellent since its launch January 2009.

	Delivery 1 (Jan 2009)	Delivery 2 (July 2009)	Delivery 3 (Oct 2009)	Delivery 4 (Dec 2009)	Delivery 5 (Mar 2010)	Delivery 6 (May 2010)	Delivery 7 (July 2010)	Cum. Result FY10 Only	Cum. Result All Courses
Demographic (total no. of participants and by gender)	21 Women – 10 Men – 11	18 Women – 9 Men – 9	22 Women – 12 Men – 10	13 Women – 6 Men – 7	25 Women – 11 Men – 14	13 Women – 5 Men – 8	13 Women – 6 Men – 7	86 Women – 40 Men – 46	125 Women – 59 Men – 66
Overall, how would you rate the course	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Trainers & Facilitators	100%	100%	100% ³⁷	100%	100 %	100%	N/A	100% - 4 courses	100% - 6 courses

³⁷For course evaluations for October 09, December 09, and March 2010, participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with the following statement: “The course trainers were familiar with the material, presented it well and were able to answer participant’s questions in a clear, helpful manner.”

Notes:

- For the short course, a five-point scale was used to evaluate the course quantitatively. These results capture rating from 3 – 5 as part of the indicator, as the middle rating of 3 was labeled as “good”, “achieved,” or “agree” depending on the question or evaluation used.

3. LEVEL TWO – EVALUATING LEARNING

Level Two evaluation measures the extent to which participants have changed attitudes, improved knowledge and/or increased skills as a result of attending the course.

In this section you will find results with respect to two indicators defined to measure “learning” and the results from different course deliveries as well as the cumulative result.

Data gathering method(s): To gather data for this level of evaluation, participants were asked to complete a written evaluation at the end of the face-to-face course that included both quantitative and qualitative questions on the course objectives.

Indicator: The percentage of participants that at the end of the course believe the training event helped them meet the learning objectives, allowing them to apply or understand the approaches or models presented in the course.

100% participants believed the course helped them meet Objective 1 and 95.8% Objective 2 in FY 2010.

Objective	D 1 (Jan 2009)	D 2 (July 2009)	D 3 (Oct 2009)	D 4 (Dec 2009)	D 5 (Mar 2010)	D 6 (May 2010)	D 7 (June 2010)	Cum. Result FY10 Only	Cum. Result All Courses
1.Programming and Integration Across Sectors: Understand the importance of environment in USAID programming and integration across sectors.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100% ³⁸	100%	100%	100%
2.FAF and Earmarks: Awareness of USAID’s Foreign Assistance Act (118/119) and Congressional earmarks related to environment and natural resource management.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	91.6% ³⁹	100%	95.8%	95.8%
3.Approaches: Have a basic knowledge of different approaches to integrated programming.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	83.3%	Obj. removed	83.3% (1 course)	83.3% (1 course)
Distance Learning Module									

³⁸ Note: This objective was different for the May 2010 course. The course objective language at this time was “Understand the importance of environment to other sectors and integrate environment into your programming.”

³⁹ Note: This objective was different for the May 2010 course. The course objective language at this time was “Be able to work within USAID’s Foreign Assistance Act (118/119) and Congressional Earmarks as related to ENRM.”

Objective	D 1 (Jan 2009)	D 2 (July 2009)	D 3 (Oct 2009)	D 4 (Dec 2009)	D 5 (Mar 2010)	D 6 (May 2010)	D 7 (June 2010)	Cum. Result FY10 Only	Cum. Result All Courses
The level and detail of information presented in the Environmental Trends distance-learning module was appropriate. How much do you agree with this statement?	DL not created	DL not created	94.4%	100%	81.8%	Not Asked	Not Asked	92.0%	92.0% (3 courses)
The DL Introduction to Environment Course added value to this one-day course in giving an overview of basic environmental trends.	n/a	n/a	Not Asked	Not Asked	Not Asked	41.7% ⁴⁰	77.7% ⁴¹	n/a	n/a

Notes:

- For the short course, a five-point scale was used to evaluate the course quantitatively. These results capture rating from 3 – 5 as part of the indicator, as the middle rating of 3 was labeled as “good”, “achieved,” or “agreed” depending on the question or evaluation.
- For some of the course offerings, data on individual objectives was not captured (N/A).
- Over time the course objectives have evolved, which may account for increases in ratings as the objective more accurately characterized what participants can expect from the course.
 - Objective 1 was originally “Understand the importance of environment to other sectors and integrate environment into your programming.”
 - Objective 2 was originally “Be able to work within USAID’s Foreign Assistance Act (118/119) and Congressional Earmarks as related to ENRM.”
- For the distance-learning course, we are getting some false data as more people are evaluating the course than have actually taken the course. Consistently, 2-4 more people are providing an evaluation of the DL course when they have not created a profile in the ENRM Gateway and/or have not participated actively in the course.

Illustrative Quotes:

General:

- “Good participatory approach, material very well organized and helpful.” (May 2010)

⁴⁰ Scale was Excellent to Poor.

⁴¹ Scale was Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree.

- “I appreciated the well-conceived lesson plan, prepared trainers and gifted facilitators. I also applaud the promotion of using integrated approaches that incorporate stakeholders in the planning model.” (June 2010)
- “For a brief overview, it was useful, succinct and relevant. Very little time wasted.” (December 2009)
- “The online piece and the morning portion was very basic. It felt too ample and repeated the pre-course work. Challenge us more.” (May 2010)
- “Thanks to all the trainers, it was great having so many present.” (October 2009)
- “Logistics and food well done.” (May 2010)

Objectives:

- “Would have preferred longer and more detailed presentation of subject matter and less sharing of general ideas at the beginning of the day.” (December 2009)
- “I think that you could have gone into more detail, such as success trends currently being used to design/implement/monitor programs to get concrete results.” (March 2010)
- “Links between environment and other sectors (especially economic growth) could have been discussed more.” (October 2009)
- “Would love more direct (even written) discussion of the practical difficulties of integrating environment.” (March 2010).
- “I think the exposure to the earmarks in the different NRM areas was very useful. Also the integrated approaches.” (May 2010)
- “Very good overview. Great incorporation of case studies/practical examples.” (June 2010)
- “Earmarks and USAID policies too complex to cover thoroughly in the time available.” (October 2009)
- “This is a complicated subject that’s hard to cover in-depth in a few minutes. The 118/119 section could provide more context, as the point of the exercise seemed lost on some people.” (May 2010)
- “There could be even more discussion on this, specifically how it is integrated in development of program/project strategy.” (June 2010)

Distance Learning:

- “Very elementary and did not run well.” (October 2009)
- “The distance learning was both appropriate and sufficient. A little bit more information could have been provided.” (December 2009)
- “The content was good. Could have been more advanced.” (March 2010)
- “I don’t believe it was essential to the course. For people with limited time and some awareness of trends it seemed like a bit of a process that did not clearly integrate with the course today. Integration matters.” (June 2010)

- “Not able to take the online learning course, read the emailed document – I found this document useful.” (June 2010)

SECTION III: FOUNDATIONS COURSE – ONLINE STANDALONE

1. INTRODUCTION

The Foundations Distance Learning Course was originally designed to be used as part of a blended learning experience with the ENRM Overview Course (face-to-face). Acknowledging that the information in this distance learning course should be available to anyone in the Agency, the ENRM-LI Steering Committee agreed to open the course up as a standalone module available at any time to USAID staff. This course has been open to Agency staff starting in July 2010 in its new format which includes pre- and post-course assessments. The official launch and advertising of this course will occur in conjunction with the ENRM Gateway launch in November 2010. This report captures data gathered from July 2010 through September 20, 2010.

2. LEVEL ONE – REACTION

Level one evaluation is our measure of customer satisfaction. It provides information that can be used to improve the course or training program including immediate feedback about the content, trainers and the logistics of the course.

Data gathering method(s): For this section there is one indicator defined to measure “reaction.” To gather data for this level of evaluation, participants were asked to complete an electronic evaluation at the end of the DL course. Also, given that the majority of participants were also part of the ENRM Overview course, some data was collected from participants in the face-to-face course evaluation and can be viewed in that part of this M&E document. In addition, information about the demographics of the course participants was gathered through the USAID University LMS course registration system and the ENRM Gateway.

Indicator: Percentage of trainees that rate CK2C training as good to excellent.

No data collected.

Indicator: The percentage of participants that at the end of the course believe the training event helped them meet the learning objectives, allowing them to apply or understand the approaches or models presented in the course.

80% of participants believed the course helped them meet course learning objectives in FY 2010.

	Results (as of September 2010)
Demographics	All participants were members of the ENRM Overview course. See the demographics for that section.
Rate how successfully this course achieved its objectives. (Overall rating)	80% Objectives fully achieved to objectives achieved
I would recommend this course to others.	100% Yes
Rating of the flow and functionality of the course (including pre-course assessment) in terms of user friendliness.	70% User-friendly

Note:

The overall course rating is based on participant ratings on achievement of the course objectives. The total percentage is that number of participants who rated the course a 4 to 5 in terms of successfully achieving its objectives.

Illustrative Quotes:

- “The course helped me to understand the topics I accessed and tuned me into a learning mood. The concepts of the environment and its relationship to human and economic development were made clear.”
- “The computer arrangement needs a little improvement in continuity. For example, when you complete a section of the course trying to get to the next section, it becomes difficult. One has to restart the program to get the next course.”
- “Information is relevant, overview of topics is helpful. I like the case study examples.”
- “Provide more case studies to broaden the understanding.”
- “It is a useful course for staff working in the environment and natural resources sector. I am planning to print and share the materials with some staff implementing environment and natural resources programs.”

3. LEVEL TWO – EVALUATING LEARNING

Level Two evaluation measures the extent to which participants have changed attitudes, improved knowledge and/or increased skills as a result of attending the course.

In this section you will find data on the two indicators defined to measure “learning” and the results from different course deliveries as well as the cumulative result.

Data gathering method(s): To gather data for this level of evaluation, participants were asked to complete a pre-course assessment. Participants scoring higher than 80% were not required to take the modules. Participants that did not pass were required to take the modules for which they did not pass and attain a score of 80% or more.

Indicator: The percentage of participants that passed the initial pre-course assessment with a score of 80% or higher.

45.0% of participants passed the pre-course assessment test with a score of 80% or higher.

Indicator: The percentage of participants that passed the post-course assessments with a score of 80% or higher.

85.7% of participants passed the post-course assessment test with a score of 80% or higher.

Assessment	# of Participants	Results	Result (% passing rate)
Pre-Course Assessment	20 participants have taken the pre-course assessment	9 participants passed (80% or higher)	45% of participants passed the full pre-course assessment
• <i>Ecosystems and Biodiversity</i>	20 participants took this part of the pre-course assessment	9 participants passed (80% or higher)	45% passed
• <i>Natural Resource Management and Integrated Water Resource Management</i>	20 participants took this part of the pre-course assessment	8 participants passed (80% or higher)	40% passed
• <i>Environmental Trends and Global Climate Change</i>	20 participants took this part of the pre-course assessment	11 participants passed (80% or higher)	55% passed
Post-Course Assessments	7 participants (average for all post-tests)	6 participants passed (80% or higher)	85.7% of participants passed (average for all post-tests)
• <i>Ecosystems and Biodiversity</i>	7 participants	6 participants passed (80% or higher)	85.7% of participants passed
• <i>Natural Resource Management and Integrated Water Resource Management</i>	7 participants	6 participants passed (80% or higher)	85.7% of participants passed
• <i>Environmental Trends and Global Climate Change</i>	7 participants	6 participants passed (80% or higher)	85.7% of participants passed

Notes:

- On the pre-course assessment, there were quite a few participants who scored 75% or above. If the pass assessment percentage was 75% or higher (answering 6 of 8 questions correctly for each section), the results of the above table would be changed in the following way:
 - Ecosystems and Biodiversity – increase from 45% to 65% of participants passing
 - NRM and IWRM – increase from 40% to 55% of participants passing
 - Environmental Trends and GCC – increase from 55% to 85% of participants passing

SECTION IV: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. OVERALL

Conclusions:

- Overall, the blended courses offered in 2010 have been very well received by participants; they were rated good to excellent by an average of 90.7% of participants.
- Overall, the ability of participants to achieve the learning objectives is rated at over 80% in the three courses monitored on this report. The Foundations course standalone received the lowest rating of the three courses (80%), which is still considered good. As the course is in its pilot stages it is recommended to follow the recommendations presented below.

Recommendations:

- Standardize the evaluations of all courses to reflect key data for all indicators.
- If possible, new trainers should either take the course or observe it before their first delivery. The team dynamic among trainers influences the success of the course and trainers' knowledge and experience in USAID have been highly rated in all courses. As new trainers are being incorporated into the training team, it is important to ensure their understanding of, and comfort with full course content, flow and methodology.

2. COURSE-SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

ENRM Overview Course:

- **Continue with Minor Updates:** Allow the course to continue being delivered without making major changes to the content, design and flow of the course. Overall, the course is working really well and is receiving consistently high ratings. The course has a good design and trainers are feeling satisfied with the content and the flow of the course. The course requires permanent updating of specific sessions that require current data, such as the earmarks session.
- **Test Your Knowledge Assessment:** A revision of the questionnaire to ensure clarity on questions is recommended, as well as highlighting quiz topics during the course. This quiz, intended to assess knowledge gained during the course, was piloted on July 2010; results are not in the 80% range as proposed in the indicator target.
- **Sustainability Session:** Apply the same changes made to the sustainability session during the July 2010 delivery and test the ratings of the session during the next delivery in Cairo. The lowest rated learning objective is the one related to participants' ability to apply principles of sustainability after the course. The best rating was achieved in July 2010 when several changes occurred: content was refined, World Café had a processing session after each question and one round was building upon the previous round; in addition, a Friday morning session about participants' experiences achieving sustainability was incorporated.
- **Post-course Engagement:** A more rigorous and regular follow-up process to keep participants engaged and updated with new technical information is recommended. A virtual check-in, through WebEx or

Adobe Connect, 4-6 months after the face-to-face delivery, may be the appropriate medium to assess application and provide updates to course content (e.g., earmarks).

- **Barriers to Integration:** During the behavior and application interviews, there were concerns raised around being unable to apply course concepts, namely integration, to programming. Giving more emphasis on barriers to integration during the application planning session may therefore be useful to participants.

Short Course:

- **Standardize the ENRM Short Course Objectives and Evaluation:** During FY10 the Environment in Development course continued to evolve. Changes to the course objectives and evaluation make it difficult to compare results from course to course. In addition, it provides mixed or no data in some cases for annual cumulative results. It is suggested that the final objectives and an evaluation be approved and used throughout the FY11 course deliveries.
- **Connecting with DLIs:** Of all the courses in the ENRM Learning Initiative, this course gets the widest range of participants. As we continue into FY11 it will be important to track the trends we are seeing in the evaluations to ensure the course content is still relevant.
- **Distance Learning Course:** Overall, the distance learning course was not rated highly by participants for a range of reasons: a) the basic nature of content, b) lack of integration in the face-to-face course, and c) functionality. There are several suggested recommendations for how to follow up on this item:
 - The Steering Committee may want to review the effectiveness, importance and level of content in the environmental trends module to assess whether or not it is a vital piece of the course.
 - If it is still a relevant piece of the course,
 - Consider enhancing the current content to include more USAID-specific examples and advanced information on environmental trends.
 - Offer the Environmental Trends Resource Document to participants as a pre-course reading on their welcome email. Pilot this for 2-3 FY11 courses and reassess if this new approach is working. As part of this, offer the link to additional materials, videos and weblinks on the Gateway to participants both before and after the course as part of the library.
 - Look at ways to enhance the connection to the materials in the face-to-face session.
 - If it is seen as critical to keep the online component, this module should be retested inside and outside the USAID firewall and adapted as needed. Also, based on the new functionality of the Moodle system, use new tools to improve the flow and usability of the course.

Foundations Course:

- **Take Out Pre-Course Assessment Indicator:** Upon reflection, the pre-course assessment indicator - “the percentage of participants that passed the initial pre-course assessment with a score of 80% or higher” - does not accurately capture the data that is really important for the Learning Initiative. Our original intention was to accurately measure the number of people who pass the course overall as captured accurately in the post-course indicator - “the percentage of participants that passed the post-

course assessment with a score of 80% or higher.” Therefore, we recommend eliminating the pre-course indicator for the Foundations course.

- **Take out the Pre-Course Assessment:** In looking at the data, over 50% of the people who took the pre-course assessment did not take the post-course assessments. We recommend only including one assessment for the course overall and allowing people to select if they would like to take it first to test out of the course.
- **Assessment Questions and Grading:** Consider doing an in-depth cross-analysis of the specific questions asked and the participant scores. For questions where many participants answer the question incorrectly (pre- or post- assessment), ensure the question is clear and accurately tests their knowledge of the content based on the course objectives. Also the Steering Committee might consider lowering the passing grades to 75% (6/8 questions correct per section) from 80%.
- **Improve Flow and Functionality of the Course:** With the new ENRM Gateway system coming on line in November, look to improve the different functionality, flow and freezing issues cited by participants. Also, test the current course inside and outside the USAID firewall for functionality once the new system is running.

ANNEX I: COURSE EVALUATION FORMS FOR ENRM OVERVIEW, SHORT, AND FOUNDATIONS COURSES



ENRM OVERVIEW COURSE

EVALUATION

JULY 26-30, 2010

Your evaluation of this ENRM Overview Course will help us improve offerings of the course in the future. Thank you for taking time to complete this evaluation form.

I. Overall, how will you rate this course:

Excellent 5	Very good 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1
----------------	----------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Comments:

II. Course Objectives and content:

Several objectives were stated at the beginning of the training. Using a scale from one to five, please rate the degree to which the training helped you meet each of these objectives.

a. Objectives: By the end of the course you will be able to:

Objective 1: Make a compelling case for ENRM’s role in international development as a platform for accomplishing multiple development objectives.

Successfully met 5	4	3	2	Not met 1
-----------------------	---	---	---	--------------

Comments:

Objective 2: Apply integrated ENRM models, approaches and techniques to Agency programming.

Successfully met 5	4	3	2	Not met 1
-----------------------	---	---	---	--------------

Comments:

Objective 3: Apply cross-sectoral thinking, program design and tools.

Successfully met 5	4	3	2	Not met 1
-----------------------	---	---	---	--------------

Comments:

Objective 4: Apply principles of sustainability.

Successfully met 5	4	3	2	Not met 1
-----------------------	---	---	---	--------------

Comments:

Objective 5: Understand and work with USAID's Foreign Assistance Framework, Congressional earmarks, and other USAID Policies and Regulations related to ENRM.

Successfully met 5	4	3	2	Not met 1
-----------------------	---	---	---	--------------

Comments:

Objective 6: Identify, access and use information resources relevant to ENRM activities.

Successfully met 5	4	3	2	Not met 1
-----------------------	---	---	---	--------------

Comments:

b. There was an appropriate balance between practical application and skill building vs. technical content. If not, what suggestions would you make to improve the balance?

Strongly Agree 5	4	Agree 3	2	Strongly Disagree 1
---------------------	---	------------	---	------------------------

Suggestions:

III. Learning and application:

a. What did you find most relevant about this course?

b. What is one specific action you will take to continue developing proposed Back Stop 40 NRM competencies? (Including training programs)

IV. The Distance Learning (DL) Foundations course:

a. The DL foundations course added value to these 5 days.

Strongly Agree 5	4	Agree 3	2	Strongly Disagree 1
---------------------	---	------------	---	------------------------

Comments:

b. After these five-day ENRM experience, what additional comments will you offer regarding the DL Foundations Course?

V. I would recommend this blended course (DL Foundation course and 5-day ENRM Overview) to others?

Strongly Agree 5	4	Agree 3	2	Strongly Disagree 1
---------------------	---	------------	---	------------------------

Comments:

VI. Course Delivery:

a. Course design and content (including flow of course, presentations, case studies & journaling)

Excellent 5	Very good 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1
----------------	----------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Comments:

b. The course material was (binder with power points, resources, USB, etc.)

Excellent 5	Very good 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1
----------------	----------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Comments:

c. Trainers & Facilitator

Excellent 5	Very good 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1
----------------	----------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Comments:

d. Logistical support and facilities

Excellent 5	Very good 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1
----------------	----------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Comments:

e. What other comments do you have about the training?

Providing your name and contact information is optional, but if you are interested in following-up with the training team on any of this feedback please provide the following information:

Name

Email Address



ENVIRONMENT IN DEVELOPMENT COURSE

EVALUATION

OCTOBER 12TH, 2010

Your evaluation of this Environment in Development Course will help us improve offerings of the course in the future. Thank you for taking time to complete this evaluation form.

I. Overall, how will you rate this course:

Excellent 5	Very good 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1
----------------	----------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Comments:

II. Course Objectives:

Several objectives were stated at the beginning of the training. Using a scale from one to five, please rate the degree to which the training helped you meet each of these objectives.

a. **Objectives:** By the end of the course you will be able to:

Objective 1: Understand the importance of environment to other sectors and integrate environment into your programming.

Successfully met 5	4	3	2	Not met 1
-----------------------	---	---	---	--------------

Comments:

Objective 2: Be able to work with regard to USAID’s Foreign Assistance Act, congressional earmarks, and other USAID policies and regulations related to environment and natural resources management (ENRM).

Successfully met 5				Not met 1
	4	3	2	

Comments:

Objective 3: Have gained a basic knowledge of different approaches to integrated programming.

Successfully met 5				Not met 1
	4	3	2	

Comments:

III. Learning and Application:

a. What did you find most relevant about this course?

IV. The Distance Learning (DL) Course:

a. The DL Introduction to Environment Course, added value to this one-day course in giving an overview of basic environmental trends.

Strongly Agree 5		Agree 3		Strongly Disagree 1
	4		2	

Comments:

b. After this training experience, what additional comments will you offer regarding the DL Introduction to Environment in Development Course?

V. I would recommend this blended course (DL course and Face to Face Course) to others?

Strongly Agree		Agree		Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

VI. Course Delivery:

a. Course design and content (including flow of course, presentations, activities, etc.)

Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor
5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

b. The course materials were (workbook and handouts):

Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor
5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

c. Trainers & Facilitator

Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor
5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

d. Logistical support and facilities

Excellent 5	Very good 4	Good 3	Fair 2	Poor 1
----------------	----------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Comments:

e. What other comments do you have about the training?

Providing your name and contact information is optional, but if you are interested in following-up with the training team on any of this feedback please provide the following information:

Name

Email Address



ENRM DISTANCE LEARNING FOUNDATIONS COURSE EVALUATION

Your evaluation of this ENRM Distance Learning Foundations Course will help us improve offerings of the course in the future.

Thank you for taking time to complete this evaluation form.

Please note: While we do ask for your name, this is for the sole purpose of providing you with a correct course completion certificate. Your name will not be attached to any feedback that you provide.

Enter your name as you would like it to appear on your course completion certificate:

Tell us why you decided to take this course:

I will be attending the ENRM Overview Course

I was interested in learning more about the environment sector

Other

How did you hear about the course?

Section 1: Course Access

Which sections of the distance learning program did you access? (check all that apply)

Pre-Course Assessment

Ecosystems

Biodiversity

NRM

IWRM

Environmental Trends

Global Climate Change

Section 2: Pre-Course Assessment

How would you rate the overall pre-course assessment?

Too Easy

Somewhat Easy

Just Right

Somewhat Difficult

Too Difficult

Please provide any comments on the questions and/or flow of the pre-course assessment:

Section 3: Objectives

If you took one or more sections of the course (beyond the pre-course assessment), answer the following questions:

Using a scale from one to five, please rate the degree to which the training helped you meet these objectives:

1 = objective was *not* achieved

5 = objective was *successfully* achieved.

Objective 1: Define basic concepts of the environment as they relate to human and economic development; and

Objective Not Achieved 1

2

3

4

Objective Successfully Achieved 5

Comments:

Objective 2: Articulate key approaches to understanding and addressing the interactions between human development and the environment.

Objective Not Achieved 1

2

3

4

Objective Successfully Achieved 5

Comments:

Section 4: Course Methodology

How would you rate the flow and functionality of this course (including the assessments)?

Not User-Friendly 1

2

3

4

User-Friendly 5

Comments:

Please provide any specific comments on the flow and functionality of the course.

What did you find most useful about this course?

What specific recommendations do you have about how to improve the course in the future?

Would you recommend this course to others?

Yes

No

Comments:

ANNEX II: FACE-TO-FACE “TEST YOUR KNOWLEDGE” ASSESSMENT QUIZ RESULTS

JULY 2010 – WASHINGTON, DC DELIVERY

1.) Which of the following statements best represents the approach(es) to development that is (are) gaining momentum at USAID based on lessons learned in the environment sector: **Responses**

Using a cross sectoral systems approach that takes a holistic view of the world and allows for interactions between sectors.	1	4.55%
Fostering early participation by all stakeholders, empowering them through involvement at all levels, including in decision-making processes.	2	9.09%
Taking an ecosystem approach to ensure quick wins	1	4.55%
a and b	18	81.82%
a and c	0	0%
Totals	22	100%

2.) In planning for the project you are seeing that building the social network between agricultural producers and consumers within the country’s market chain will be a critical for success. Based on this information, what type of integrated approach are you most likely to select as a basis for your programming? **Responses**

Spatial	0	0%
Stakeholder and actor-based	7	30.43%
Conceptual	0	0%
Economic	2	8.70%
All of the above	14	60.87%
Totals	23	100%

3.) A spatial integrated approach (landscape or seascape) focuses on geographic units that often have some inherent ecological basis (e.g. watersheds, wildlife ranges, vegetation system types, etc.). The main strength of this approach is that its scale captures major ecological features and wide-ranging fauna. Which of the following is an example of a Spatial Approach? **Responses**

Nature, Wealth and Power (NWP)	2	9.09%
System-Wide Collaborative Action for Livelihoods and Environment (SCALE)	2	9.09%
Value Chain Strategy	1	4.55%
Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM)	17	77.27%
Totals	22	100%

4.) Which statement(s) below best capture(s) why systems thinking is so important for ENRM programming:	Responses	
Systems thinking helps us to manage for the short term.	0	0%
Systems thinking identifies the tradeoffs between development and environment so costs can be shared equitably.	1	4.35%
Systems thinking hones in on one leverage point for intervention.	1	4.35%
Systems thinking identifies platforms for joint action by stakeholders and partners.	3	13.04%
A and B	0	0%
C and D	7	30.43%
B and D	11	47.83%
Totals	23	100%

5.) True or False: When looking at the Foreign Assistance Framework (FAF), standard Agency reporting indicators are defined primarily at the sub-element level.	Responses	
True	5	21.74%
False	18	78.26%
Totals	23	100%

6.) What are the four dimensions of sustainability?	Responses	
Economic, Information, Social and Governance	0	0%
Social, Environment, Governance and Participation	1	4.55%
Cultural, Economic, Integration and Environment	1	4.55%
Environment, Social, Governance and Information	0	0%
Governance, Social, Economic and Environment	20	90.91%
Totals	22	100%

7.) According to the GCC Adaptation Manual, which of the following steps does NOT correspond to the process for evaluation of climate change?	Responses	
Screen for vulnerability to climate risks;	0	0%
Identify mitigation and energy options;	16	72.73%
Analyze the options using the different criteria	2	9.09%
Select a course of action;	2	9.09%
Implement the project and	2	9.09%
Evaluate the effectiveness of the adaptation	0	0%
Totals	22	100%

8.) Supporting strategy and activity design, identifying environmental compliance issues, targeting opportunities for earmarked funds and increasing the sustainability of Mission projects and approaches are some of the benefits of:	Responses	
118/119 Analysis	12	54.55%

FAF	3	13.64%
Reg 216	3	13.64%
Earmarks	1	4.55%
None of the above	3	13.64%
Totals	22	100%

9.) True or False: Standard indicators measure what is being accomplished with USG foreign assistance funds and the collective impact of foreign and host-government efforts to advance country development.

	Responses	
True	11	47.83%
False	12	52.17%
Totals	23	100%

10.) Which of the following is not a critical element of sustainability?

	Responses	
Ownership and collaboration at all levels.	1	4.35%
Diversity of environment, society and culture.	7	30.43%
Creation new goals for existing institutional frameworks.	14	60.87%
Action at the appropriate scale.	1	4.35%
Committed government with supportive, enabling policy.	0	0%
Totals	23	100%

11.) What do program managers need to take into account to practice good adaptive management?

	Responses	
Changes in local context	0	0%
New discoveries about drivers and development challenges	1	4.35%
Incorrect hypotheses and assumptions	0	0%
Lessons learned through implementation successes and failures	0	0%
Areas of underperformance	0	0%
A, C and D	2	8.70%
B, D and E	2	8.70%
All of the above	18	78.26%
None of the above	0	0%
Totals	23	100%

ANNEX III: ENRM OVERVIEW COURSE BEHAVIOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

ENRM LEARNING INITIATIVE

EVALUATING BEHAVIOR – LEARNING APPLICATION

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

INTERVIEWER INTRODUCTION:

The purpose of this interview is to determine the extent to which participants in the ENRM Overview courses have been able to apply the approaches, principles and tools for environmental programming discussed during the course; and to understand the factors that have helped participants to apply those concepts or hindered the possibility.

We have successfully delivered 5 courses: (in Panama 2008, Pretoria and Washington DC 2009 and Cebu and Washington DC 2010). The results of this interview will help us assess the effectiveness of the program thus far and identify other learning opportunities or ways in which it can be made more practical for those who attend. Please be frank and honest in your answers. The information we are collecting is confidential & anonymous; at the end we will create one report with key themes, a quote or idea you expressed may be included in the report but not your name.

Thanks for taking the time to talk to us. This interview will take 30 minutes maximum.

QUESTIONS:

1. As you think back about the course experience, what are the key concepts or principles you remember from the course? As you look over these concepts which ones can you recall clearly or can you describe?"Have workbook handy.

2. What are some examples of ways in which those concepts or principles (list those mentioned in No. 1) have served you in your job or ways you have applied them?

Notes for interviewer: look for examples and good anecdotes if possible.

3. If you are not applying any of those concepts and/or principles that you were taught or encouraged to follow, what has hindered you?

Interviewer: take notes of the response first and try to match the reasons to the ones in the table below or under other.

	How Significant		
	Very	To some extent	Not
It was not practical for my job/situation			
I do not have management support			
Haven't found time			
I tried and did not work			
I do not believe in it			
I did not have enough knowledge/ information			
Other reasons			

Optional question for those who have not used concepts and principles -

4. To what extent do you plan to apply the course concepts/principles in the future?

a. Follow up question: What exactly are you planning to apply?

Large Extent	Some Extent	No Extent
--------------	-------------	-----------

b. Follow up question: If you do not plan to do use the concepts/principles, what are the reasons?

5. When you left the course, how eager were you to change your behavior or practices regarding ENRM programming (example: doing more integrated ENRM programming)?

Very Eager	Quite Eager	Not Eager
------------	-------------	-----------

Comments:

6. Thinking of our main objective for this interview: “determine to what extent participants in the ENRM Courses have been able to apply concepts/principles taught in the course”, do you have any additional comments?

7. What is one ENRM related learning opportunity you wish you could have now to better perform your job?

Interviewer notes. Future courses:

- *ENRM applications course –application of programming cycle applied to ENRM. With some content on technical areas: GCC three pillars (adaptation, sustainable landscapes and energy), biodiversity and forestry, food security and sustainable agriculture and Water/Coastal Marine. 5 day course to be delivered in January 2011 in Bogota, Colombia*
- *Conflict and Natural Resources Management: 2 days to be delivered in Bogota, Colombia as well.*
- *WASH (Water, Sanitation and Hygiene) – one week course to be delivered in Bangkok in January 2011 and in DC during the summer 2011.*
- *Please check our ENRM Learning Initiative website: <http://enrmlearning.org/>*