



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

CAPITALIZING KNOWLEDGE, CONNECTING COMMUNITIES

UPDATED PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN



OCTOBER 2012

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 2012
Author:	CK2C Team

Cover photo: Applied Environment and Natural Resources Management (ENRM) Programming Course participants at the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center (SERC), Edgewater, Maryland, June 2012.

CONTENTS

- CONTENTSI
- TABLES AND FIGURESII
- BACKGROUND3
- PERFORMANCE MONITORING3
- PROJECT-SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT MONITORING4
- MONITORING CUSTOMER SATISFACTION..... 4
- ANALYZING DATA AND REPORTING RESULTS..... 4
- TASK 1 INDICATORS AND TARGETS5
- TASK 2 INDICATORS AND TARGETS7
- TASK 3 INDICATORS AND TARGETS 10
- TASK 4 INDICATORS AND TARGETS 14
- CUSTOMER SATISFACTION INDICATORS AND TARGETS 17
- ANNEX A: TASK 3 DATA DETAILS AND MODULE INDEX.....21
- ANNEX B: TASK 3 MONITORING AND EVALUATION REPORT ..28

TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLES

Table 1: Task 1 Indicators 5
Table 2: Task 1 Targets 6
Table 3: Task 2 Indicators 7
Table 4: Task 2 Targets 8
Table 5: Task 3 Indicators 10
Table 6: Task 3 Targets 11
Table 7: Task 4 Indicators 14
Table 8: Task 4 Targets 15
Table 9: Monitoring Customer Satisfaction—Indicators 17
Table 10: Monitoring Customer Satisfaction—Targets 18

BACKGROUND

USAID's Capitalizing Knowledge, Connecting Communities (CK2C) Program will be implemented over the period October 1st, 2007 to September 30th, 2013. 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 (<http://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) and Training Resources Group (TRG).

DAI will use its web-based management information system (TAMIS – Technical and Administrative Management Information System) 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. The present 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) Office. The current report covers the period from October 2011 through September 2012. Additional monitoring and evaluation information related to Task 3 can be found in Annexes A and 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. In addition, we provide supplemental, detailed information on Task 3 monitoring and evaluation in Annexes A and B.

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. CK2C will prepare annual reports on progress toward meeting performance and impact targets.

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.

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	10	53	12	24
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	3 ³	46 ⁴	3 ⁵	6
2011 Target	2	6	2	5
2011 Actual	2 ⁶	41	3 ⁷	15
2012 Target	2	6	2	5
2012 Actual	1 ⁸	32	1 ⁹	5
2013 Target	2	25	1	3
2013 Actual				

² Data for October – December 2009 was removed from the 2009 Actual to eliminate double counting with FY2010 data. The CK2C work plan 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. These data are collected from the website software metrics. Note: In the updated FY2010 PMP report there was a font error. The number appeared to be 464, but it was really 46 (the last 4 was a footnote that did not appear in superscript font).

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.

⁶ This number represents final draft studies for Mozambique and Botswana.

⁷ This number represents exercises in Mozambique, Botswana and the Philippines.

⁸ This number represents the final study for the Philippines; it should be noted that the final, consolidated southern Africa study is in progress at the time of this report.

⁹ This number represents the consolidated southern Africa stocktaking workshop which took place in Johannesburg in November of 2011. The second stocktaking exercise planned for FY12 was postponed due to CK2C's 1-year extension through the end of FY13.

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 ¹⁰	Annual	Annual
End Users	USAID, Partners	USAID, Partners	USAID, Partners	USAID, Partners

¹⁰ 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 ¹¹ 2 – number of new website accounts	Number of new FRAME web-based user contributions	Number of active Partner Pages supported by FRAME website ¹²
Life of Project Target	86	1 – n/a 2 – 2,100	3,650	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 ¹³	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 Asia – 1 Africa – 2 LAC – 4	1 – 2,115 2 – 480	609 Total Blogs – 4 Comments – 4 Resources – 333 Questions – 46 Answers – 94 Topics – 17 Favored Items – 54 GeoExplorer Activities – 57	14 Total Africa – 3 LAC – 3 US – 8 NGO – 5 US Gov – 5 USAID program – 3 University – 1
2011 Target	20	1 – 1,600	750	15

¹¹ 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.”

¹² Both actual and target figures for this indicator are cumulative.

¹³ Data for October – December 2009 was removed from the 2009 actual to eliminate double counting with FY2010 data. The CK2C work plan 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
		2 – 400		
2011 Actual	34 Total Women – 16 Men – 18 US – 21 Asia – 2 Africa – 6 LAC – 1 Europe – 4	1 – 2,674 2 – 568	506 Total Blogs – 11 Comments – 10 Resources – 283 Questions – 41 Answers – 70 Topics – 7 Favored Items – 43 GeoExplorer Activities – 41	New Restructured Total ¹⁴ - 7 Africa – 2 US Forest Service – 3 USAID program – 2
2012 Target	23	1 – 1,700 2 – 400	800	15
2012 Actual	30 Total Women – 16 Men – 14 US – 23 Asia – 2 Africa – 2 LAC – 0 Europe – 1	1 – 2,093 2 - 259	Total – 585 Blogs – 35 Comments – 80 Resources – 310 Questions – 32 Answers – 32 Topics – 18 Favored Items – 43 GeoExplorer Activities – 24	Total - 7 Africa – 2 US Forest Service – 3 USAID program – 2
2013 Target	15	1 – 2,000 2 – 300	600	7
2013 Actual				

¹⁴ With the upgrade of FRAMEweb during FY2011 CK2C reorganized the way communities and partner pages were listed in FRAMEweb, and in so doing, we decided to roll many of the partner pages into themed communities (there were 8 cases like this). We did not completely eliminate partner pages, but only kept separate partner pages for the communities that are being managed by outside groups (e.g., ABCG, and US Forest Service). It is not CK2C's goal to continue to expand the number of partner pages – instead we are hosting communities under specific themes (e.g., Climate Change, or Biodiversity and Conservation).

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 ¹⁵ offered 1 – courses 2 – modules	Number of e-learning courses offered and delivered 1 – courses designed 2 – courses delivered
Life of Project Target	1160	1135	1 – 41 2 – 169	1 – 16 2 – 68
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 ¹⁶	133 Total USAID Staff - 133 Face-to-face training – 133 E-Learning – 60 Region – data not collected Gender – data not collected	133 Total USAID Staff – 133 Face-to-Face training – 133 E-Learning - 60 Region – data not collected Gender – data not collected	1- 7 courses 2 – 16 modules	1 – 2 2 – 3
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	127 Total USAID Staff – 127 Face-to-face training – 127 E-Learning – 127	1 – 9 courses 2 – 20 modules	1 – 4 2 – 7 ¹⁷

¹⁵ 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.

¹⁶ Data for October – December 2009 was removed from the 2009 actual to eliminate double counting with FY2010 data. The CK2C work plan and annual reporting period changed from a calendar to a fiscal year cycle at the request of USAID in 2010.

¹⁷ The ENRM Foundations e-learning course is now offered as a stand alone course, open for trainees throughout the year, and is not counted towards discrete deliveries as in previous PMP reports.

Task 3	Overall Impact 1	Overall Impact 2	Performance 3.1	Performance 3.2
	Region: AFR – 9 ASIA – 20 E&E – 4 LAC – 8 ME – 1 Washington – 85 Gender – 58 F/ 69 M	Region: AFR – 9 ASIA – 20 E&E – 4 LAC – 8 ME – 1 Washington – 85 Gender – 58 F/ 69 M		
2011 Target	250	250	1 – 9 courses 2 – 40 modules	1 – 2 2 – 14
2011 Actual	185 Total USAID Staff - 185 Face-to-face training – 179 E-Learning – 104 Region ¹⁸ : AFR – 14 ASIA – 2 E&E – 3 LAC – 13 ME – N/A Washington – 95 Gender – 71 F/ 56 M	185 Total USAID Staff - 185 Face-to-face training – 179 E-Learning – 104 Region ¹⁹ : AFR – 14 ASIA – 2 E&E – 3 LAC – 13 ME – N/A Washington – 95 Gender – 71 F/ 56 M	1 – 9 courses 2 – 36 modules	1- 9 2 – 21
2012 Target	275	275	1 – 9 courses 2 – 34 modules	1 – 5 ²⁰ 2- 19
2012 Actual	183 ²¹ Total USAID Staff - 181 Face-to-face training – 88 E-Learning – 28 Blended ²² – 67 Region ²³ : AFR – 31 ASIA – 10 E&E – 7 LAC – 5 ME – 4 Washington – 98 Gender – 92 F/ 63 M	183 Total USAID Staff - 181 Face-to-face training – 88 E-Learning – 28 Blended – 67 Region: AFR – 31 ASIA – 10 E&E – 7 LAC – 5 ME – 4 Washington – 98 Gender – 92 F/ 63 M	1 – 8 ²⁴ courses 2 – 36 modules	1 – 6 2 – 22

¹⁸ The data for this category is incomplete as no regional data was available for the WASH (Bangkok) and 3Ts (Bogota) courses.

¹⁹ The data for this category is incomplete as no regional data was available for the WASH (Bangkok) and 3Ts (Bogota) courses.

²⁰ The short course has not had e-learning since mid-2011.

²¹ The annual target was not met due to the cancelation of two courses and low E-learning participation.

²² Blended courses are face-to-face with e-learning modules as part of the course.

²³ Data represents face-to-face deliveries only.

²⁴ Two deliveries of the short course were cancelled due to low registration.

Task 3	Overall Impact 1	Overall Impact 2	Performance 3.1	Performance 3.2
	DLI (FSO) – 71 FSN – 20 BS40 - 72	DLI (FSO) – 71 FSN – 20 BS40 - 72		
2013 Target	200	200	1 – 10 courses 2 – 41 modules	1 – 7 2- 23
2013 Actual				

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 tools and analyses produced ²⁵
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. ²⁶	USAID's Forestry and Biodiversity Office 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), short publications ²⁷ (#2) and Biodiversity Guide (#3).	CK2C helps to develop technical learning products, tools and strategies to promote biodiversity conservation best practices to a wide audience.
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
Reporting	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual
End Users	USAID, Partners, Public	USAID, Partners, Public	USAID, Partners, Congress, Public	USAID, Partners, Public

²⁵ Per USAID's request, we have eliminated the previous indicator that reports against seminar series targets and replaced it with the present, broader indicator that measures the number of tools and analyses produced.

²⁶ The target audience for this survey is the wider SCAPES partner community and associated USAID field staff. This segment constitutes a proxy for overall impact since support to the SCAPES learning activity is regular and discrete, and the audience(s) is a communications target.

²⁷ The term 'fact sheets' has been replaced by 'short publications' to reflect a broader range of publications.

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 tools and analyses produced
Life of Project Target	75% of respondents rate products good-excellent	30,000	1– 4 annual 118/119 2– 15-17 other publications 3– 1 Biodiversity Guide	14
Baseline Data	Zero	22,980 ²⁸	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	85% overall ²⁹ Quality: 100% Utility: 72% Accessibility: 83%	25,693 ³⁰	1– 1 annual 118/119 ³¹ 2– 3 other publications ³²	7
2011 Target	75% of respondents rate products good-excellent	28,000	1– 1 annual 118/119 2– 3-4 other publications 3– 1 Biodiversity Guide	4 ³³
2011 Actual	88% overall ³⁴ Quality: 91% Utility: 91% Accessibility: 82%	21,206 ³⁵	1– 0 annual 118/119 ³⁶ 2– 5 other publications ³⁷ 3– 0 Biodiversity Guide ³⁸	4 ³⁹
2012 Target	80% of respondents rate	30,000	1– 1 annual 118/119	4

²⁸ This figure captures unique Forestry page views on USAID external site (10,167) and unique Biodiversity page views on USAID external site (12,813).

²⁹ The survey was sent to 65 individuals and had an 11% response rate. This number was updated in 2012 from previous PMP versions due to slight transposition errors with the utility and accessibility numbers.

³⁰ 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 RM portal: 208; Unique Forestry page views on USAID external site: 9,979; Unique Biodiversity page views on USAID external site: 13,821; and access to hard copy of Biodiversity/Forestry (118/119) report: 800.

³¹ The annual 118/119 report was in final draft form and through various stages of clearance at the end of FY 2010.

³² This figure includes three publications: postcard, GCP evaluation printing and FY2010 Biodiversity and Forestry Report Executive Summary brochure.

³³ The targets for FY2011 and FY2012 have been reduced to reflect the reduction in CK2C support for the seminar series per USAID request.

³⁴ The survey was sent to 109 individuals and had, approximately, a 10% response rate. This number was updated in 2012 from previous PMP versions due to slight transposition errors with the quality, utility and accessibility numbers.

³⁵ This figure captures: Unique Forestry page views on USAID external site: 8,581; Unique Biodiversity page views on USAID external site: 12,425; and access to hard copy of Biodiversity/Forestry (118/119) report: 200. The number is lower than expected due to CK2C's reduced level of support to the seminar series.

³⁶ USAID has moved forward with a much abridged version of the 118/119 report. The FY2011 report is still in process and will likely be produced in FY2012.

³⁷ This figure includes five publications: Biodiversity and Forestry Annual Report Executive Summary, SCAPES Brochure, 2 editions of the SCAPES Update, and a 508-compliant Mongolia EIA.

³⁸ The Biodiversity Guide was not completed in FY2011 due to a delay in obtaining sufficient input from USAID writers. It is now expected to be completed and published in FY2012.

³⁹ This includes the following tools, analyses and learning products: SCAPES NR Governance Strawman, Background Review of NR Governance Systems, Data Collection and Analysis Methods for NR Governance, and NR Governance Effectiveness Measures.

Task 4	Overall Impact	Performance 4.1	Performance 4.2	Performance 4.3
	products good-excellent		2– 3-6 other publications 3– 1 Biodiversity Guide	
2012 Actual	96% overall ⁴⁰ Quality: 100% Utility: 89% Accessibility: 100%	17,654 ⁴¹	1– 1 annual 118/119 2– 6 other publications ⁴² 3– 0 Biodiversity Guide ⁴³	9 ⁴⁴
2013 Target	80% of respondents rate products good-excellent	30,000	1– 1 annual 118/119 2– 3-6 other publications 3- 1 Biodiversity Guide	2
2013 Actual				

⁴⁰ Data was collected via a survey that went out to 103 individuals with an 8.7% response rate.

⁴¹ This figure captures a variety of sources: unique visitors to the FRAMEweb SCAPES page: 468; unique Forestry page views on USAID external site: 6,898; unique Biodiversity page views on USAID external site: 8,545; unique page views of new landing pages on USAID external site: 943; and access to hard copies of communications materials such as the BUILD, FLA and SCAPES flyers and the Biodiversity Annual Report: 800. The figure is lower than the target due to a number of factors including that the USAID site has been updated with the majority of the biodiversity and forestry pages in an older format. Existing links are broken which reduces traffic directed to those sites. We anticipate reaching the target of 30,000 by next year once new biodiversity and forestry webpages are introduced to the new USAID site.

⁴² This figure includes six publications: BUILD flyer, FLA flyer, SCAPES Brochure and 3 editions of the SCAPES Update.

⁴³ The Biodiversity Guide was not completed in FY2012 due to a delay in obtaining sufficient input from USAID writers. It is now expected to be completed and published in FY2013.

⁴⁴ This includes the following tools, analyses and learning products: Six Biodiversity Policy Analytical Reports (Biodiversity Literature Review, Gender Analysis, Donor Funding, Country Commitment Index, Priority Countries, and M&E Assessment); SCAPES NR Governance Tool; SCAPES CCA Partners Best Practice Report; and SCAPES CCA EbA Grey Literature Review.

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 ⁴⁵	Percentage of discussion group members that rate FRAME-based discussions as 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

⁴⁵ 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 as 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 to 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 ⁴⁶	TBD	80%	78.2% average Tools and Resources 85% Technical Assistance 60% ⁴⁷ Facilitation 81% Information Updates 87%	91.5% average ENRM Overview & Foundation Course 89% ⁴⁸ ENRM Short Course 94% ⁴⁹	N/A
2010 Target	80%	80%	80%	80%	70% of respondents rate products good to excellent
2010 Actual	ENRM Overview – 86.7% ⁵⁰	76% ⁵¹	76.5% average Tools and Resources 82% Technical Assistance 69% Facilitation 70% Information Updates 85%	96.7% average ENRM 101 - 93.3% ENRM One Day – 100%	82% overall ⁵² Quality: 100% Utility: 66% Accessibility: 80%
2011 Target	80%	80%	80%	80%	75% of respondents rate products good to

⁴⁶ 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.

⁴⁷ 40% of people surveyed stated that they had no opinion.

⁴⁸ This number is based on participant evaluations of meeting ENRM Overview and Foundation course objectives.

⁴⁹ This number is based on participant evaluations of meeting the overall goal of the ENRM Short Course objective.

⁵⁰ This data is derived from the level 3 evaluation.

⁵¹ Survey response and data collected increased by 7%.

⁵² The survey was sent to 65 individuals and had an 11% response rate.

	Overall Impact	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4
2011 Actual	84% ⁵³	79% ⁵⁴	68.5% (EN) 64% (FR)% ⁵⁵ (overall averages) Tools and Resources 69% (EN) 67% (FR) Technical Assistance 64%(EN) 63% (FR) Facilitation 67% (EN) 56% (FR) Information Updates 74% (EN) 71% (FR)	93.7% average ENRM Overview Course - 92% ENRM Applications Course – 100% 3Ts course – 92.5% Environment Matters (short course) – 90.5%	excellent 87% overall ⁵⁶ Quality: 90% Utility: 90% Accessibility: 80%
2012 Target	80%	80%	80%	80%	80% of respondents rate products good to excellent
2012 Actual	88% ⁵⁷ ENRM Overview Course – 100% Applied ENRM Programming ⁵⁸ Course – 83% WASH Overview Course – 80%	80% ⁵⁹	83% ⁶⁰	97% average ENRM Overview Course – 93% Applied ENRM Programming Course – 96% 3Ts course – 100% Environment Matters (short course) – 100% WASH Overview Course – 95% Water and Food Security – 96%	96% overall ⁶¹ Quality: 100% Utility: 89% Accessibility: 100%
2013 Target	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
2013 Actual					

⁵³ Percentage taken from the level 3 evaluation for the ENRM Overview Course results in 2011.

⁵⁴ There were less English respondents in the FY2011 survey, but the number of French respondents tripled. For FY2011 we've included the French satisfaction data, but there were too few Spanish language respondents to include.

⁵⁵ English (EN) and French (FR) numbers were included for FY2011.

⁵⁶ The survey was sent to 109 individuals and had, approximately, a 10% response rate.

⁵⁷ Percentage taken from the level 3 evaluation for the ENRM Overview Course, Applied ENRM Programming and WASH results in 2012; please refer to the detailed Task 3 M&E report in Annex B for more information.

⁵⁸ Course formerly named the ENRM Applications Course.

⁵⁹ Data collected from FRAMEweb Assessment survey (via Sonjara); totals reflect EN, FR, and ESP combined.

⁶⁰ Data collected from FRAMEweb Assessment survey (via Sonjara); totals reflect EN, FR, and ESP combined.

⁶¹ Data was collected via a survey that went out to 103 individuals with an 8.7% response rate.

ANNEX A: TASK 3 DATA DETAILS AND MODULE INDEX

2012 Actuals F2F courses:

- Courses offered: 1 ENRM overview course, 1 Applied ENRM Programming course, 2 short courses, 1 3Ts course, 1 WASH course and 1 Water and Food Security Course, 1 TOT= 8 total
- Modules offered: 7 for ENRM overview course, 9 for Applied ENRM Programming course, 3 (x2 = 6) for short courses, 2 for 3Ts courses, 4 WASH, 7 Water and Food Security, 1 TOT = 36 total

F2F Courses designed:

- 1 Water and Food Security
- 7 modules for Water and Food Security course

2012 actuals e-learning:

- Number of courses designed: 1 PEF = 1 total
- Courses offered: 2⁶² foundations courses, 1 WASH, 1 Fundamentals of ENRM, 1 3Ts, 1 PEF = 6 total
- Modules offered: 6 for foundations courses, 3 for WASH course, 7 for Fundamentals , 1 for 3Ts courses, 5 PEF = 22 total

2013 Target – F2F:

- Courses offered: 1 ENRM overview course, 1 Applied ENRM Programming course, 3 short courses, 1 TOT, 1 WASH course, 2 3Ts courses; 1 Water and Food Security course = 10 total
- Modules offered: 7 for ENRM overview course, 9 for Applied ENRM Programming, 3 for each short courses (total 9), 4 for WASH course, 2 for each 3Ts course(4 total), 7 for Water and Food Security, 1 TOT = 41 total

2013 Target – e-learning:

- Number of courses designed: 1 SCALE
- Courses offered: 1 DL foundations course (continuous), 1 Fundamentals of ENRM course, 1 PEF course (continuous), 2 3Ts -Conflict and NRM course, 1 WASH course, 1 SCALE (continuous) = 7 total
- Modules offered: 6 for Foundations stand-alone course, 7 for Fundamentals of ENRM course, 4 for PEF course (ongoing), 1 for Conflict and NRM course (Total 2), 1 for WASH course, 4 SCALE = 23 total

⁶² Counts for 1 delivery as a prerequisite of ENRM Overview and 1 continuous offering

Module Structure for our reference:

One-Day 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 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.

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 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"> Participants will understand what a systems thinking approach is and how it is relevant to development. Participants will 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

Module	Specific Learning Objectives
	<p>in ENRM programming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make informed decisions regarding which approaches might be most relevant to different contexts
<p>IV. Institutional and legislative Frameworks Impacting USAID Programming in the Environment Sector: FAF; 117, 118 and 119 and Earmarks.</p>	<p>At the end of the session participants will be able to:</p> <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, Section 118/119, and environmental compliance including Regulation 216. • Apply the Agency’s legislative and institutional frameworks effectively to achieve broad development goals.
<p>V. Sustainability</p>	<p>At the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <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.
<p>VI. Tools for an Integrated Approach</p>	<p>At the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <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).
<p>VII. Bringing it all together</p>	<p>At the end of this session, participants will be able to:</p> <p>To address common challenges faced in carrying out integrated and sustainable ENRM programming in a Mission context.</p>

E-learning – ENRM Overview Foundations Course – Structure

Module	Specific Learning Objectives
<p>I. Ecosystems</p>	<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.
<p>II. Biodiversity</p>	<p>At the end of the session participants will be able to:</p>

Module	Specific Learning Objectives
	<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 cost the lost 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 Resources 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 livelihood that inform USAID's approach.
V. Integrated Water Resources 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.

Face to Face ENRM Applications Course Structure/Modules:

Module	Specific Learning Objectives
I. Setting the context	At the end of the session participants will be able to:

Module	Specific Learning Objectives
	<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 the 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 the 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 the 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 your causal model. • Identify cross-sectoral activities that will achieve desired results. <p>Understand and create a results framework using a causal model.</p>
III. M&E	<p>At the end of the session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify to ENRM relevant indicators. • Understand 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"> Apply best practices to program sustainability.

Face to Face Water and Food Security Modules:

1. Water and Food Security: Introduction to Basic Terms and Definitions
2. Water and Food Security: Why do we care?
3. Principles for Food Security and Water Resources Management
4. USAID Institutional and Legal Frameworks Impacting Water and Food Security
5. Approaches, Best Practices and Tools: Water Resources Management
6. Approaches, Best Practices and Tools: WASH
7. Approaches, Best Practices and Tools: Water Productivity

2012 Targets

PEF e-learning course structure:

Module	Specific Learning Objectives
I. Introduction to Earmarks	At the end of the session participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Articulate the legal basis of earmarks for the Agency. Navigate the process of programming earmark money and know what resources are available.
II. Water earmark	At the end of the session participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply specific water earmark requirements to ENRM programming scenarios that demonstrate appropriate justification and attribution.
III. GCC	At the end of the session participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply specific GCC earmark requirements to ENRM programming scenarios that demonstrate appropriate justification and attribution.
IV. Biodiversity	At the end of the session participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply specific Biodiversity earmark requirements to ENRM programming scenarios that demonstrate appropriate justification and attribution.
V. Additional Earmarks	Optional: Food Security, etc. depending on FY11 earmarks

Fundamentals of ENRM E-learning Structure/Modules:

Module	Specific Learning Objectives
I. Overview Course Refresher	At the end of the session participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand the key ENRM concepts including, what works, systems thinking, integrated approaches and sustainability.
II. Setting the Context	At the end of the session participants will be able to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Articulate how USAID strategic planning and ENRM

Module		Specific Learning Objectives
		<p>programming fit together.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the key ENRM principles for programming. • Identify other key variables (technical, bureaucratic and interpersonal) that impact internal ENRM programming processes.
III.	Assessment	<p>At the end of the 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).
IV.	Design	<p>At the end of the session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulate the steps of design process.
V.	M&E	<p>At the end of the session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe different types of indicators. • Understand the role of the PMP in M&E.
VI.	Implementation and Adaptive Management	<p>At the end of this session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the principles of adaptive management. • Describe different tools and methodologies for adaptive management.
VII.	Technical and Cross-Cutting Areas E-book	<p>At the end of the session participants will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better understand the fundamentals of key ENRM technical and cross-cutting sectors.

ENRM and Conflict E-learning Structure/Modules:

Module	Specific Learning Objectives
<i>Module I – The Basics</i>	<p><i>Module I – The Basics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overview of the 3Ts • Getting up to speed – technical sessions: LTPR, ENRM-Biodiversity and CMM-Conflict • Applying Systems Thinking to 3Ts • Speed dating: Pastoralists resources, Forests, Extractive Industries
<i>Module 2– Working the Program Cycle</i>	<p><i>Module 2– Working the Program Cycle</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated Assessment – leading to design • Designing integrated programs for 3Ts • Sequencing Activities in Complex Integrated Conflict Sensitive Programming

ANNEX B: TASK 3 MONITORING AND EVALUATION REPORT

ENRM Learning Initiative Monitoring and Evaluation Report FY 2012

INTRODUCTION:

This is the third Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) report of the Environment and Natural Resources 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 will present data about courses effectiveness measured for face to face and distance learning courses delivered during 2012. In order to create a system that allows ENRM LI Steering Committee to follow the data collected, the report is keeping the same structure as the initial two reports and will continue presenting cumulative data when available.

As mentioned in the previous reports all training courses effectiveness is measured by the general satisfaction of the participants in the course (level 1) and by their learning (knowledge acquire and skills developed or improved – level 2). The five day blended courses include another effectiveness measurement given by the changes in behavior (level 3) which refers to the percentage of participants able to apply in their work one concept or skill received during the ENRM Overview, Applied ENRM Programming and WASH courses. This M&E system follows Dr. Jim Kirkpatrick training evaluation system⁶³. This report will highlight how the results of this measurement are achieving identified indicators, will specify the different methods utilized to collect data, and offer recommendations to continue keeping a good level of effectiveness or to improve it.

ENRM Learning Initiative – ENRM LI primary objective:

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:

- 1. 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.*
- 2. Creating virtual spaces to offer different self-directed learning resources and stimulate networking and knowledge sharing.*
- 3. Improving the strategic coordination of course offerings and learning efforts in the ENRM sector.*

⁶³ Kirkpatrick, Donald L & Kirkpatrick, James D. Evaluating Training Programs. © 2006.

SECTION I: ENRM Overview Course

1. Introduction

The ENRM Overview course was delivered once in 2012; the following sections describe data results about 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 seven 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 (Indicator 1) 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.

Before analyzing quantitative results for the ENRM Overview delivered in April 23 to 27, 2012,

Indicator 1: Percentage of trainees that rate ENRM Overview training as good to excellent.
92.9% of trainees rated the ENRM Overview Course as good to excellent in FY 2012.
90.84% of trainees rated the ENRM Overview Course as good to excellent since its launch in 2008.

	2008 - Panama	Jan 2009 - Pretoria	July 2009 - DC	Jan 2010- Cebu	July 2010, DC	June 2011 Ghana	April 2012, Washingt on DC	Cumulati ve Results since 2008
No. of participants.	16	19	23	18	23	25	14	138
Overall How will you rate the course⁶⁴	88.70%	88.6%	87%	94%	92.7%	92%	92.9%	90.8%
Questions about course content and DL :								
<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 	N/A	84.21%	85%	73.3%	86.4%	56% ⁶⁵	85.7%	78.4%

⁶⁴ This percentage is the media per course of meeting learning objectives table presented in Indicator 2. Results of responses to the question about rating the course from good to excellent are only presented for the July 2010 and April 2012 courses.

⁶⁵ This percentage is lower than in years before given the number of DLIs – Backstop 40 who took the course and felt they already have the technical background offered by this course and required much more scenario based or simulation based work during the course.

make to improve the balance?								
• The DL foundations course added value to these 5 days.	N/A	84.2%	100%	87.5%	81.8%	24% 56% not response ⁶⁶	80% ⁶⁷	87.5%
• I would recommend this blended course (DL Foundations course and 5-day ENRM Overview) to others	93% ⁶⁸	94.7%	100%	100%	92.7%	72% ⁶⁹ 20% did not respond	92.9%	92.2%
Course Delivery: (rated Excellent and Very good) Course design and content	70% ⁷⁰	100%	85.7%	93.8%	92.8%	92% 8% did not respond	100%	90.6%
Course material	86.7% ⁷¹	100%	95%	100%	100%	96%	100%	96.8%
Trainers and Facilitator	100% ⁷²	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%	100%	99.4%
Logistic Support and facilities	86.7% ⁷³	100%	100%	68.8%	100%	92%	100%	92.5%

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 the two indicators (Indicator 2 and Indicator 3) 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.

⁶⁶ Again, lower results given the number of DLIS who were participants on this course (the Foundations course is tailored to USAID people working in environment with little or none environment background).

⁶⁷ From all participants, 9 tested out the course. Only 5 participants took the complete course. Therefore, 7 participants did not respond to this question. For future courses there is not option to test out of the course.

⁶⁸ Results include counting responses such as good, excellent, very good and divided by number of responses. Qualitative data available.

⁶⁹ Seen as a good intro for those who do not have an environment background. Or as a good refresher of basic concepts.

⁷⁰ Same as No. 2

⁷¹ Same as No. 2

⁷² Same as No. 2

⁷³ Same as No. 2

Indicator 2: 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.
For FY 2012: 100% of participants believed the course helped them meet objective 1, 100% objective 2, 100% Objective 3, 100% objective 4, 100% Objective 5 and 100% objective 6.
FY 2008 to 2012: 93.4% participants believe the course helped them meet objective 1, 91.6% objective 2, 93.7% Objective 3, 86.1% objective 4, 93.7% Objective 5 and 97.5% objective 6.

Objective	2008 - Panama	Jan 2009 - Pretoria	July 2009 - DC	Jan 2010- Cebu	June 2010, DC	July 2011 Ghana	April, 2012, Washington DC	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%	96%	100%	93.4%
2. Applying ENRM: Apply integrated ENRM models, approaches and techniques to Agency programming.	86%	84.2%	91.3%	93.1%	90.9%	96%	100%	91.6%
3. Cross-sectoral: Apply cross-sectoral thinking, program design and tools.	88%	84.2%	91.3%	100%	92.7%	100%	100%	93.7%
4. Sustainability: Apply principles of sustainability.	84%	84.2%	69.6%	76.5%	92.7%	96%	100%	86.1%
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%	100%	100%	93.7%
6. Resources: Identify access and use information resources relevant to ENRM activities.	94%	100%	95.6%	100%	92.7%	100%	100%	97.5%

Notes:

- For FY 2011 and 2012 given the background of participants, percentages include responses to 3, 4 and 5 in the scale.

PARTICIPANT QUOTES, FY 2012

- “I can see that a number of the tools will be useful to me in my work for sorting through complexities in designing programs/projects.”
- “It was a lot of information to absorb but the various activities/discussions have helped to bring it all together.”
- “Just wow. Trainers and facilitators were outstanding. Engaging and competent with amazing, creative methods to draw out discussion.”
- “Adding a few skills development activities (like doing a 2 min elevator pitch to Mission leadership) - or how to do active listening might help build skills of environment officers in being persuasive.”
- “So far the best I have received at AID.”
- “The field trip was good, but it would have been nice to get more representation from the local community. Could have been shorter.”

Additional participant quotes from FY 2008 to 2011 can be found in Annex II.

Indicator 3:

Data Gathering Method(s): For this level of evaluation, data collection began in the July 2010 Overview delivery. Participants were asked to participate in a face-to-face course quiz, and data was captured anonymously through the electronic polling system, TurningPoint.

Indicator 3: Percentage of participants that rate 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)
80.52% of participants rated 80% or higher in the “test your knowledge” assessments applied at the end of the course in July 2012, compared with 62% in 2010, and 72.8% in 2011.

Question	% Correct Response
<p>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: (multiple choice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Using a cross sectoral systems approach that takes a holistic view of the world and allows for interactions between sectors. b) Fostering early participation by all stakeholders, empowering them through involvement at all levels, including in decision-making processes. c) Programming biodiversity, climate change and food security funds separately to facilitate clarity for stakeholders d) <i>a and b (Response)</i> e) a and c 	71.4%
<p>2.) During program planning your team determines that building and enhancing the social network between sustainable agriculture producers and consumers will be critical for success. Based on this information, what category of integrated approach are you most likely to select as a basis for your programming? (multiple choice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Spatial b) <i>Stakeholder and actor-based (Response)</i> c) Conceptual d) Economic 	85.7%
<p>3.) A spatially 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 strengths of this approach are that its scale captures major ecological features and wide-ranging fauna and allows for conservation activities to address the most pressing threats and drivers on target ecosystems. Which of the following is an example of a Spatial Approach? (multiple choice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Nature, Wealth and Power (NWP) b) System-Wide Collaborative Action for Livelihoods and Environment (SCALE) c) Value Chain Strategy d) <i>Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) (Response)</i> 	78.6%

4.) Which statement(s) below best capture(s) why systems thinking is so important for ENRM programming: (multiple choice)	100%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Systems thinking helps us to manage for the long term. b) Systems thinking identifies the trade-offs between development and environment for informed decision-making. c) Systems thinking helps identify leverage points for intervention d) Systems thinking identifies platforms for joint action by stakeholders and partners. e) A and B f) <i>All of the above (response)</i> 	
5.) True or False: When looking at the Foreign Assistance Framework (FAF) , standard Agency reporting indicators are defined primarily at the sub-element level. (multiple choice):	42.9%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • True • <i>False (response)</i> 	
6.) What are the four dimensions of sustainability? (multiple choice)	100%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Economic, Information, Social and Governance b) Social, Environment, Governance and Participation c) Cultural, Economic, Integration and Environment d) Environment, Social, Governance and Information e) <i>Governance, Social, Economic and Environment (response)</i> 	
7.) According to the GCC Adaptation Manual, which of the following steps does NOT correspond to the process for evaluation of climate change? (multiple choice)	71.43%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Screen for vulnerability to climate risks; b) <i>Identify climate change mitigation and energy options; (response)</i> c) Analyze the options using the different criteria; d) Select a course of action; and e) Evaluate the effectiveness of the adaptation 	
8.) Supporting USAID strategy and activity design, identifying potential contradictions between activities, targeting opportunities for earmarked funds, increasing the sustainability of Mission projects, and approaches are some of the benefits of: (multiple choice)	50%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>118/119 Analysis (response)</i> b) FAF c) Regulation 216 d) Earmarks e) None of the above 	
9.) True or False: Standard indicators measure what is being accomplished with USG foreign assistance funds in order to report to Congressional and other constituents. (multiple choice)	100%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>True (response)</i> b) False 	
10.) Which of the following is not a critical element of sustainability? (multiple choice)	92.9%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ownership and collaboration at all levels. 2. Diversity of environment, society and culture. 3. <i>Maximizing producer revenues in a two-year USAID program cycle.(Response)</i> 4. Action at the appropriate scale. 5. Committed government with supportive, enabling policy 	
11.) What do program managers need to consider to practice good adaptive management? (multiple choice)	92.9%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Changes in local economic and/or ecological contexts 	

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. New information about drivers and development challenges 3. Incorrect hypotheses and assumptions 4. Lessons learned through implementation successes and failures 5. Areas of underperformance 6. A, C and D 7. <i>All of the above (response)</i> 	
Overall media percentage	80.52%

Recommendations:

- Continue announcing the quiz to participants in advance and encourage the reviewing of materials.
- Questions 5 and 8 received low scores. Review clarity of these two questions for the future course.

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.

Indicator 4: 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.

100% 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.

Data Gathering Method(s): This indicator was measured by interviewing a sample of 5 additional participants from the course delivered in Ghana in June 2011. As a cumulative sample, 24 participants have been interviewed from the 6 courses delivered, which makes this a sample of 17.3% of the total participants (138) of the ENRM Overview courses delivered in Panama, Washington DC (2), South Africa (Pretoria), Philippines (Cebu) and Ghana (Accra) between June 2008 and June 2011. The ENRM Overview course delivered in DC in 2012 was not included as this evaluation.

Results:

Key concepts applied after the course:

- **Earmarks, environmental compliance and FAF:** From the five participants interviewed, four highlighted that understanding the structure and framework of how environment funds are programmed in the Agency was the most important topic for them. 4 of the 5 participants interviewed were DLIs. For them understanding the Earmarks was a key takeaway.
 - *“Earmarks was the most important session because it explained the nuts and bolts of what you need to program environment funds in USAID”.*As we look at the three reports, the Earmarks session has been a key take away in the past as well.
- In this new set of interviews, **systems-thinking** was again added as an important conversation during the training, especially the activity where participants role play all stakeholders in a room. Two participants mentioned that when they go to talk with their stakeholders (communities especially) they think about how any potential intervention can affect their life. This experience was complemented with the field trip to the Park and the fact that they had the opportunity to see community members presenting and having their own agenda.
 - *“Important to see how community members have their own agenda, this was an important lesson for me”.*
- Participants found value in the **interaction with their Foreign Service Nationals (FSN) colleagues**, learning from them and again observing the difference between the issues discussed by DC participants and Mission participants. For the DLIs interviewed, learning from those in the Mission was a key take away from this course. At the same time, for the only person interviewed that did not have an environmental academic background, the main takeaway from the course was learning how the agency deals with the environment and the vision from DC.
- In addition, **Sustainability** was a topic that offered insights for some people as well as the **tools for integrating approaches**.

The Level of Application:

The level of application of these concepts varied among participants: All five participants have been able to apply at least one concept from the course. Three participants with strong environmental backgrounds

mentioned that they are working on achieving integration in their Missions but cannot attribute their knowledge to the course only. However, they acknowledge that it was a concept highlighted and reinforced during the course.

Three participants have been applying their earmarks knowledge. One of them, for example, is in a Mission that has Biodiversity funds and she is using the criteria explained during the course to review a proposal and ensure they comply with the criteria. Another participant said that she has all biodiversity, water and GCC funds and the course helped her to understand what kind of money she has.

In terms of the System Thinking approach –two participants have been using the concept to establish connections with other portfolios or to prepare for their engagement with their local communities.

Intentionality to apply course concepts:

The five new interviewees confirmed previous statistics.

- All interviewees (100%) indicated the 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. Because of their environmental backgrounds, they were eager to apply the concepts.

In response to the question asking for additional comments, the interviewees, all DLIs with academic backgrounds in environment, mentioned that the course is important for new USAID employees and especially for people with no environmental background.

Some participants from the Missions suggested finding innovative ways to bring this learning to the FSNs and the Missions in general. Some ideas offered were to make modules that either Washington Staff could offer when they travel or online modules Environment Officers could use to facilitate training sessions.

Additional learning opportunities:

All interviewees spoke enthusiastically about further developing their knowledge. The learning needs were very different among the 5 participants interviewed:

- Learn some specifics, for example what does a good assessment look like? Or a good work plan? How to do a vulnerability analysis?
- Learning about REDD but more from implementers. Maybe a practical week with implementers.
- More on conservative agriculture and food security, how to fit it on NRM practices.
- Having an Environment Officers conference, similar to what Program Officers have.
- GIS training.
- Land tenure course.

- *“The ENRM Overview course gave me the basics on how to program environment funds and the Applied ENRM Programming Course brought these concepts together in a more cohesive way”*
- *“The course helped me to understand the importance of environment”.*
- *“The ENRM Overview Course is not a course for people with good academic background and experience in other agencies about Environment”*
- *“I got an overall impression of how FSNs think about environmental issues and their challenges”*
- *“The course was instrumental for me to be able to put a GCC pilot project proposal together.”*

General ENRM Overview Course Recommendations

- The ENRM Overview course was designed with a specific target audience in mind - “USAID staff managing environment programs that not necessarily were environment experts or had environment background but are managing environment programs in the field”. When delivering the course to an audience that have academic backgrounds in environment and not USAID field experience, the course content and methodology needs to be adjusted.

Section II: Applied ENRM Programming Course (previously called Applications Course)

1. Introduction

The ENRM Applications course was piloted in 2011 in Bogotá, Colombia, and was delivered a second time in July 2012 in DC. The following sections describe data results about general reactions to the training and learning from the training. This report includes for the first time the behavior application evaluation for this course.

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 (Indicator 1) 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 1: Percentage of trainees that rate ENRM Applications training as good to excellent.
95.6% of trainees rated the ENRM Applications Course as good to excellent in FY 2012.
97.8% of trainees rated the ENRM Overview Course as good to excellent since its launch in 2011.

	Jan 2011 - Bogotá, Colombia	June 2012 – Washington DC	Cumulative Results since 2011
Demographics:	17 ⁷⁴	24	41
No. of participants by gender	Women – 7 Men – 10	Women – 13 Men – 11	
Overall how will you rate the course	100% ⁷⁵	95.6%	97.8%
Questions about course content and DL - rated agree to strongly agree:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The course simulation allowed a real USAID-like application of knowledge and skills discussed during the course (program cycle phases and the core ENRM technical areas). 	93.8%	82.6%	88.2%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This course requires a DL pre-requisite component; did that component add value to these 5 days? 	81.8% ⁷⁶	86.9%	84.35%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would recommend this blended Applied ENRM Programming course (DL and face-to-face) to others 	92.3% ⁷⁷	95.7%	94%

⁷⁴ Note: One participant departed early from the course and did not turn in an evaluation form. All percentages are based on 16 evaluations unless otherwise noted.

⁷⁵ Note: The scale of “good to excellent” includes ratings of 3,4 and 5 on a 1 to 5 point scale.

⁷⁶ Note: Eight participants did not respond to this question as they had not taken the DL course prior to the face-to-face course. Therefore, this question is based on 8 participant responses.

⁷⁷ Note: Three participants did not respond to this question. Therefore, this question is based on 13 participant responses rather than 16.

Course Delivery: (rated Excellent and Very good) ⁷⁸ Course design and content	87.6%	95.6%	91.6%
Course material	80.0% ⁷⁹	100%	90%
Trainers and Facilitator	93.8%	100%	96.9%
Logistic Support and facilities	93.8%	100%	96.9%

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 the two indicators (Indicator 2 and Indicator 3) 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 2: 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.
For FY 2012 100% participants believe the course helped them meet objective 1 and 82.6% objective 2.
FY 2011 to 2012: 96.9% participants believe the course helped them meet objective 1, 88.2 objective 2.

Objective (Not met to successfully met)	Bogota 2011	June 2012 – Washington DC	Cumulative Results since 2011
1. Operationalize key Environment and Natural Resource Management concepts and approaches (integration, systems and sustainability) throughout the USAID program cycle, including: Assessment, Design, M&E and Adaptive Management and Implementation.	93.8% ⁸⁰	100%	96.9%
2. Better understand the state-of-the-art in key Environment and Natural Resource Management sectors and be able to apply and integrate these issues into environmental programming.	93.8%	82.6%	88.2%

Notes:

- For all courses ratings includes results from scales 3 to 5 (Successfully met).

⁷⁸ Note: The scale of “excellent to very good” includes ratings of 4 and 5 on a 1 to 5 point scale.

⁷⁹ Note: One person did not respond to this question. Therefore, the percentage is based on 15 participant responses.

⁸⁰ Includes 4 and 5 in the scale from not met to successfully met.

Sample Quotes from June 2012

- *“It was well conceived to integrate the concepts and approaches throughout USAID program cycle.”*
- *“One of the best things about the course was how to best utilize funding streams.”*
- *“I would have liked more examples of experiences designing and implementing integrated programming, despite bureaucratic barriers.”*
- *“There was science/state-of-the-art conveyed that I will actually be able to (and will) apply.”*
- *“More emphasis would have been better on integrating cross-sectoral, initiative and earmark monies, country case studies.”*
- *“I think this course does a better job than most with the field trip - this was truly beneficial.*
- *“Most useful DL I've ever seen. Made the course much more growth oriented rather than 'beginner.'”*
- *“Make the DL material supported with actual USAID practical experience.”*
- *“Instruction was excellent though more application to the real-world would have been nice.”*

5. 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.

Indicator 4: 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.

83% 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.

Data Gathering Method(s): This indicator was measured by interviewing a sample of 4 participants from the Applied ENRM Programming Course delivered in Bogota in FY 2011 and 2 from Applied ENRM Programming Course delivered in DC in FY 2012. A total of 6 participants have been interviewed out of the 2 courses delivered, which makes this sample of 15% of the total participants (40) of the Applied ENRM Programming Courses.

Results:

Key concepts applied after the course:

- **Programming Environment Funds – Biodiversity, Water and GCC earmarks:** 4 of the 6 participants interviewed mentioned how the course helped them crystalize the concepts about earmarks and funding. The simulation was an important part of the process and received good comments from a couple interviewees. Related to this topic, participants mentioned the importance of thinking about indicators specific to the earmarks they have in their Missions and also the need to think about earmarks during the design phase.
- **Programming Phases:** This was another content area mentioned by the participants interviewed. Some interviewees had applied aspect of assessment or design or monitoring and evaluation. Following are concrete examples:
 - How to do assessment with more or less resources – this as an important concept for people in the Missions, it seems based on the interviews that the course helped to change the belief that assessment was only possible with a lot of resources.
 - The amount of time design takes and the importance of getting agreement with the design team. One participant mentioned that this was very clear during the simulation, especially given the different personalities involved.
 - Regarding M&E one participant mentioned that the course provided some basics to start a PMP.

- With less strength than the previous content areas, participants alluded to the conversations about **Agriculture and Food Security** as a good insight; however they also mentioned the need to get deeper on the topic to better understand the linkages between Food Security and NRM.
- Participants also referred to the **field trip** as a key learning opportunity during the course, both the one in Colombia and the one in the Chesapeake Bay (specifically the visit to the Smithsonian Research Center). At the same time one participant mentioned that the learning may be enhanced if field trips are to a current USAID project.

The level of application:

Five of the six participants interviewed are applying at least one course concept in their work. Again, most of them are environment officers and they are implementing biodiversity, water or GCC activities; applying their learning around earmarks and directives as well as related indicators.

Concrete examples are:

- One participant is working on activities related to the biodiversity and water earmarks; looking for ways to implement activities that can be attributable to those earmarks.
- Another participant is mainly involved with GCC activities and is using the course binder as a resource.
- Another participant is working on environment programming, reviewing PMPs and writing SOWs. The course was instrumental in given her the skills for that.

Intentionality to apply course concepts:

The six interviewees are very eager to apply the concepts learned in the course:

- 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.

Learning Opportunities:

In general participants are looking for more learning opportunities for:

- Concrete conversations about what works and what does not work when doing programming and when managing environmental funds. Getting together to discuss life experiences.
- More conversations about programming water, GCC and biodiversity activities even without earmark resources.
- Linkages between economic growth and NRM
- Technical areas, such as sustainable tourism, infrastructure, sanitation, land use and property rights.

Note: three of the six interviewees have taken both the ENRM Overview and the Applied ENRM Programming Courses, two them also took the 3Ts course. The three participants recognized the importance of the ENRM Overview Course and highlighted that the course is more tailored to non-environment people and, if possible, it should be marketed for people from other sectors and program officers. They agreed that the course is needed and can help to deliver the environment message.

They also agreed that the Applied ENRM Programming Course is relevant and should continue avoiding the repetition about the earmarks, though a more technical training is still needed.

FY 2012 Quotes:

- *“I still remember the required reading before the course; it offered an overview of the different topics”*
- *“I have been working on designing a program since January, the course gave good basics and helped with my ability to do design and write a PMP”*
- *“When I got back from the course, my boss asked me to revise an Action Memo, and I had the knowledge, skills and enthusiasm to do it, the course helped me with that”*
- *“I have taken several courses in the last year, including this one, now I am heavily involved on GCC and environment programming, reviewing PMPs, doing SOWs, etc., all thanks to the courses I took”.*

4. Course-specific Recommendations

- More intentionally target the course to people with more than 2 years of experience managing/designing environment programs; ideally the course should bring at least 20% of participants with more than 5 years of experience as well; this will respond to the need participants expressed of deeper conversations. Is this a good reason for delivering the course in the regions?
- Revise or set the right expectations for objective number 2 : “Better understand the state-of-the-art in key Environment and Natural Resource Management sectors and be able to apply and integrate these issues into environmental programming”. The new DLIs recently graduated from Master’s Degree programs in Environment define “state of the art” in a more rigorous way.
- Remember that what is important for this course is to help DLIS and others to translate what they have learned into “actionable USAID programs”
- The DL Fundamentals of ENRM Applications- DL course was well received, but still had a mixed evaluation. For some it was the best DL ever and for others it was very basic. One common feedback is that the course is very long. Therefore we recommend:
 - a. Making the reading more specific, shorter and maybe creating a summary and allowing people to read what they need.
 - b. Revise it looking for making it more fully integrated into the training design. As part of this process, USAID trainers will need to be fully committed to not only reviewing and suggesting enhancements for the DL and connecting to the site.
- Continue ensuring availability of an Experienced Training Team: The field experience and knowledge of technical/programming work at USAID was critical to the course. Without it neither the presentations nor coaching sessions would have been possible as the course is designed.

Section III. WASH Course

1. Introduction

The Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) course has been delivered five times as of July 2012; three of those times were deliveries in Africa made in 2009 under a different contractual mechanism. The fourth delivery, in February 2011 in Bangkok, and the fifth delivery, in July 2012 in Washington DC were under CK2C. This year the WASH course followed the same evaluation method and format as the other ENRM LI courses.

In 2012 we have data collected. As of 2011, the course was delivered without a written evaluation at the end of the course. A reflection/evaluation questionnaire was applied at the end of each day with open ended questions, aiming to understand what was useful at the end of each session and what was not useful. Additional questions about training methods and presenters were asked every day.

In this section, we present the results of the 2012 evaluation and qualitative data about course delivery in 2011. Level 3 evaluation for the course delivered in DC in 2011 was difficult to collect, therefore is not included in this course. The final M&E report in September 2012 will include data about Level 3 for the courses delivered in DC in 2011 and 2012.

The quantitative data results can be found in the table below.

2. Qualitative and quantitative data about course content, methods and trainers

Indicator 1: Percentage of trainees that rate WASH Training as good to excellent.
95.6% of trainees from July 2012 rate WASH Training as good to excellent.

	2011 Bangkok	2012 July
No. of participants.	20	24 Women – 12 Men – 12
Overall How will you rate the course (good to excellent)	N/A	95.6%
Course Delivery:		95.6%
Course content and methodology		
<p>Course design, and methodology: Did the methodology used to deliver the WASH overview course facilitate your learning? This question was asked at the end of each day and an average of 18 participants responded positively every day.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Yes, the group work with our outstanding, knowledgeable and diverse colleagues is rewarding.” • “Game and classroom style. I have learned a lot.” • “Yes, group discussions and practical application of the concept of integration helps me understand the subject better.” • “Always good to do group work with people from other 	

	missions.”	
Course materials	N/A	95.6%
Trainers and Facilitator What feedback would you offer the presenters? The question was asked every day and an average of 7 participants responded daily with positive comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The quiz sessions are great.” • “Good presentations with excellent text/visuals.” • “Less power points.” • “Liked the high competence level.” 	95.7%
Logistic Support and facilities	N/A	95.6%

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 the two indicators (Indicator 2 and Indicator 3) 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 2: 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. For FY 2012: 91.2% of participants believe the course helped them meet objective 1, 91.3% objective 2, 91.3% objective 3, and 87% objective 4.

Objective (Not met to successfully met)	Bangkok 2011	July 2012 – Washington DC
1. Describe why the WASH sector is important for USAID.	N/A	91.2%
2. Discuss and apply institutional and legal requirements to USAID programming in the WASH sector.	N/A	91.3%
3. Examine proven interventions in Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene that are available to accomplish WASH objectives.	N/A	91.3%
4. Plan how to apply USAID resources and programming mechanisms to address challenges and comply with regulations in the WASH sector - leading to effective and responsive WASH programming.	N/A	87% ⁸¹

⁸¹ 3 people chose not to respond to this question.

Sample Quotes 2012

- *“The course was excellent not only for the content and material covered but also the passion expressed by trainers and supporting staff.”*
- *“The coverage of topics, the mix of trainers, the field visit and the duration ... these are some of the 'excellent' elements of this course.”*
- *“Less case studies more technical. Perhaps build a technical station approach to program.”*
- *“I feel better prepared with dealing with the new USAID Water and Development Strategy particularly in terms of doing integrated projects. The food was great.”*
- *“Please keep it as it is. The facilitator was absolutely fantastic and I would definitely recommend her for future WASH training courses.”*
- *“You could add in some more case studies around successes and failures of programs.”*
- *“Earmark session; integrated programming!!! Both are critical to success in advocating with mission colleagues and external parties.”*
- *“Thorough understanding of the WASH sector, its planning and effective integration of WASH with other program activities.”*

5. 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 a WASH training program. As mentioned before given the difficulties in collecting data from participants from the 2011 course, this data will be included in the final report. The results from the course from the Africa deliveries and the Bangkok course are included in Annex V.

Recommendations

- Revise the Distance Learning pre-work to be more engaging and more fully integrated into the training design. As part of this process, USAID trainers will need to be fully committed to not only reviewing and suggesting enhancements for the DL, but also connecting to the site and reading participant posts so they can integrate their questions and thoughts into the flow of the F2F course.
- Update the training materials with an eye toward new trainers who will be observing and preparing to the train the course in the future.

Section IV: Treasure, Turf and Turmoil: The Dirty Dynamics of Land and Natural Resource Conflict (3Ts) Course

1. Introduction

The 3Ts course was delivered twice in 2011, and once in April 2012. Since 2012, CK2C has been responsible for the design, logistics and facilitation of the course, with technical input from ARD. CK2C. The following sections describe 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 two deliveries of the training in 2011, and last delivery in 2012.

2. Level 1 – 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 (Indicator 1) 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 1: Percentage of trainees that rate the 3Ts course as good to excellent.
100% of trainees rated the 3Ts Course as good to excellent in FY 2012.
95% of trainees rated the 3Ts Course as good to excellent since FY 2011.

	Jan 2011 - Bogotá, Colombia	June 2011 Ghana	April 2012, Washington DC	Cumulative Ratings since 2011
Demographics:				
No. of participants	20	20	14 Women – 8 Men – 6	54
Overall how will you rate the course (good to excellent were taken into account)	90%	95%	100%	95%
Questions about course content and DL - rated agree to strongly agree:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pre-course reading added value to these two/three days⁸² 	75% ⁸³	80% ⁸⁴	66.7% ⁸⁵	73.9%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would recommend this blended course (DL and Face to Face) to others 	85%	85%	93.3%	87.8%

⁸² The course in Bogota, Colombia was two days and the course in Ghana was a 3 day course.

⁸³ 4 participants did not respond as they did not have time to take the DL before the course.

⁸⁴ The DL from the course was changed to a pre-course reading, so this percentage corresponds to the answer to the question if the pre-course reading added value to these 3 days.

⁸⁵ Participants' evaluation of the reading varied. For some it was too basic, for others it was good and for others after taken the course they found the value.

	Jan 2011 - Bogotá, Colombia	June 2011 Ghana	April 2012, Washington DC	Cumulative Ratings since 2011
Course Design and Content: (Rating included good to excellent).	75%	80%	100%	85%
Course material (Rating included good to excellent).	80%	80%	86.6%	82.28%
Trainers and Facilitator (Rating included good to excellent).	100%	95%	93.3%	96.1%
Logistic Support and facilities (Rating included good to excellent).	100%	85%	86.7%	90.6%

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 the two indicators (Indicator 2 and Indicator 3) 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 2: 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.
For FY 2012 delivery 3 (Washington DC): 100% of participants believe the course helped them meet objective 1, 93.3% objective 2 and 100% objective 3.
For FY 2011 delivery 2 (Ghana): 95% participants believe the course helped them meet objective 1, 80% objective 2 and 75% objective 3.⁸⁶
For FY 2011 delivery 1 (Colombia): 95% participants believe the course helped them meet objective 1, 90% objective 2 and 90% objective 3.

Objective (Not met to successfully met)	Colombia 2011
1. Understand critical connections among ENRM/biodiversity, LTPR and conflict to better conceptualize, design and manage integrated programs <i>(Includes ratings from 3 to 5 in a scale of not met (1) to successfully met (5).</i>	95%
2. Be able to use these concepts in simulated assessments of complex conflict situations <i>(Includes ratings from 3 to 5 in a scale of not met (1) to successfully met (5).</i>	90%
3. Learn about adaptive management, conflict-sensitive monitoring and evaluation, and other tools that allow managers to review and adapt to changing conflict and NRM situations. <i>(Includes ratings from 3 to 5 in a scale of not met (1) to successfully met (5).</i>	90%

⁸⁶ Data is not combined given the fact that between the two deliveries the objectives of the course changed.

The course objectives changed from the pilot delivery in February 2011 in Bogota, to the second delivery in Ghana, in June 2011. These same objectives were used in Washington DC, April 2012 delivery.

Objective (Not met to successfully met)	Ghana 2011	Washington DC 2012	Cumulative Ratings
1. Identify critical connections among NRM/Biodiversity, LTPR and conflict. <i>(Includes ratings from 3 to 5 in a scale of not met (1) to successfully met (5).</i>	95%	100%	97.5%
2. Use key USAID tools and resources for integrated programming in complex scenarios. <i>(Includes ratings from 3 to 5 in a scale of not met (1) to successfully met (5).</i>	80%	93.3%	86.7%
3. Apply concepts to design and manage integrated strategies and programs <i>(Includes ratings from 3 to 5 in a scale of not met (1) to successfully met (5).</i>	75%	100%	87.5%

4. Sample Quotes

Sample Quotes 2012:

- *“I thought the course was a good length, used real world situations (grounded) and clearly emphasized key points.”*
- *“I feel the course does a good job elevating awareness of the nexus for NRM, LTPR and conflict issues.”*
- *“I really liked the assessment tool activity. I thought it was very helpful to have trainers with us during the activity to answer questions, facilitate (when needed) and provide insight.”*
- *“Role of integration in development programming. The course very strongly connects learning to the USAID context.”*
- *“I think many colleagues would benefit from the general concepts/techniques introduced in the course e.g. systems approach, conflict ... not just those involved in NRM, biodiversity.”*
- *“I sincerely appreciate the effort made in the design and preparation of this course offering ... and the attention of the trainers during the course. I hope the course is offered for others in the future.”*

5. Specific Recommendations:

- Add another case study to have a broader focus, not only Africa. Consider a LAC or Asia case.
- Reduce the Systems Thinking presentation and find a different methodology so participants can participate in the three technical sessions (Land Tenure, Conflict Equation, Biodiversity and Forestry).
- Keep the course to 3 days if delivered in DC, making an effort to have a CMM trainer and also allowing time for deeper conversations about the issues.

Section V: Water and Food Security Course

1. Introduction

The Water and Food Security Course was delivered once in August 2012. The following sections describe general reactions to the training, learning from the training, and behavior/application of course content after the training.

2. Level 1 – 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 (Indicator 1) 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 1: Percentage of trainees that rate the Water and Food Security Course as good to excellent.
95.8% of trainees rated the Course as good to excellent in FY 2012.

	August 2012 - Washington DC
Demographics:	26
No. of participants	Women – 13 Men – 13
Overall how will you rate the course (good to excellent were taken into account)	95.8%
I would recommend this course to others (good to excellent were taken into account)	95.8%
Course Design and Content: (Rating included good to excellent).	83.4%
Course material (Rating included good to excellent).	83.3%
Trainers and Facilitator (Rating included good to excellent).	95.8%
Logistic Support and facilities (Rating included good to excellent).	91.7%

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 the two indicators (Indicator 2 and Indicator 3) 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 2: 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.
For FY 2012 Washington DC: 100% of participants believe the course helped them meet objective 1, 95.8% objective 2 and 91.7% objective 3.

Objective (Not met to successfully met)	August 2012
1. Describe the conceptual linkages between water and food security and champion the importance of integrating these issues to achieve positive development outcomes. <i>(Includes ratings from 3 to 5 in a scale of not met (1) to successfully met (5).</i>	100%
2. Apply institutional and legal requirements for USAID programming in the water and food security sectors including work with USAID's Foreign Assistance Framework, Congressional directives, earmarks, Presidential Initiatives, and other USAID policy and regulations. <i>(Includes ratings from 3 to 5 in a scale of not met (1) to successfully met (5).</i>	95.8%
3. Identify, access and use tools to assist in the development and management of integrated and sustainable water and food security programs. <i>(Includes ratings from 3 to 5 in a scale of not met (1) to successfully met (5).</i>	91.7%

4. Sample Quotes 2012

- *All of the trainers and facilitators were professional, knew their material and were very enthusiastic and passionate about delivering their materials.*
- *Excellent technical knowledge and good presentation skills - a few small rough patches (certain exercises mainly) but excellent for the first edition.*
- *I think it would be beneficial for USAID Administrators to take this course with the regular class or a separate class for Administrators.*
- *Good overview and solid understanding of main issues with H2O and FS.*
- *The general overview of water activities was useful. The rain-fed agriculture section was the most practical.*

5. Specific Recommendations:

- Develop pre-course readings for participants to provide a common foundation to build on in the course
- Refine presentations overall and make the delivery more interactive
- Develop more participant handouts, trainer “cheat sheets” for activities, and additional resources for the workbook/USB drives
- Streamline the final case activity and consider more active format (e.g. role play)

Section VI: Environment Matters (previously called Environment in Development: Short Course)

1. Introduction

The Environment in Development (Short) course was delivered four times in 2011; the following sections describe data results about general reactions to the training and learnings 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 (Indicator 1) 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 1: Percentage of trainees that rate ENRM Environment Matters (Short) course as good to excellent.
100% of trainees rated ENRM Environment Matters (Short) course as good to excellent in FY 2012
92.8% of trainees rated ENRM Environment Matters (Short) course as good to excellent since its launch January 2009

Course delivery date and location		Demographics	Overall How will you rate the course	Trainers & Facilitators	Logistical Support & Facilities
1	Jan 2009 Arlington VA	25	88.9%	100.0%	<u>N/A</u> ⁸⁷
2	July 2009 Arlington, VA	23	100.0%	100.0%	N/A.
3	Oct 2009 Arlington, VA	23	94.4%	94.5% ⁸⁸	N/A
4	Dec 2009 Bethesda, MD	13	92.3%	84.6%	N/A
5	Mar 2010 Arlington, VA	25	82.6%	91.3%	N/A
6	(May 2010/ Arlington, VA)	13	75.0%	100.0%	83.4%
7	(July 2010/ Arlington, VA)	13	92.3%	N/A.	<u>N/A</u> [3]

⁸⁷ No quantitative data was captured on this question

⁸⁸ For 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.”

Course delivery date and location		Demographics	Overall How will you rate the course	Trainers & Facilitators	Logistical Support & Facilities
	Cumulative results FY10 (Oct-Sept)	87	87.8%	92.6% (4 courses)	83.4 % (1 course only)
8	Nov 2010 Arlington VA	26	70.0%	N/A.	N/A
9	Feb 2011 RRB	22	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
10	April 2011, Arlington VA	16	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
11	August 2011 Arlington VA	13	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%
	Cumulative results FY 2011	77	90.5%	97.3%	97.3%
11	November 2011 Arlington VA	16	100%	100%	93.8%
12	August 2012 Arlington VA	18	100%	100%	100%
	Cumulative results FY 2012	34	100%	100%	96.9%
	Cumulative results All Courses		92.8%	96.6%	92.5%

Notes:

- For all courses, ratings from scales of 4 to 5 are captured including:
 - Objective Fully Achieved or Achieved
 - Goal Fully Achieved or Achieved
 - Very Good to Excellent

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 the two indicators (Indicator 2 and Indicator 3) 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 2: 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 believe the course helped them meet objective 1 and 93.5% objective 2 in FY 2012.*

Objective/ Delivery		1. Programming and Integration Across Sectors: Understand the importance of environment in USAID programming and integration across sectors ⁸⁹	2. FAF and Earmarks: Awareness of USAID's Foreign Assistance Act (118/119) and Congressional earmarks related to environment and natural resources management. ⁹⁰	Course materials good to excellent	Course Design and Content good to excellent
1	Jan. 2009 DC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Jul. 2009 DC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Oct. 2009 DC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Dec. 2009 DC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	March 2010 DC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	May 2010 DC	100.0%	50.0%	N/A	N/A
7	Jul 2010 DC	92.3%	100.0%	N/A	N/A
	Cumulative results 2010	96.5%	75.0%	N/A	N/A
8	Nov 2010 DC	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	N/A
9	Feb 2011 RRB	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
10	April 2011 DC	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	95.0%
11	August 2011 DC	93.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cumulative results 2011	98.3%	100.0%	100.0%	98.3%
12	November 2011 Arlington, VA	100%	93.7%	93.7%	100%
13	August 2012 Arlington VA	100%	93.3%	93.3%	100%
	Cumulative results 2012	100%	93.5%	93.5%	100%
Cumulative Result All Courses 2009-2011		98.3%	89.5%	96.8%	99.15%

Notes:

- According to 2010 recommendations and responding to participants' feedback, the DL was cancelled and participants are receiving a reading as a pre-course assignment.
- For some of the course offerings, data on individual objectives was not captured (indicated by N/A).
- 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."

⁸⁹ For May 2010 course this objective read: "Understand the importance of environment to other sectors and integrate environment into your programming."

⁹⁰ For May 2010 course this objective read: "Be able to work within USAID's Foreign Assistance Act (118/119) and Congressional Earmarks as related to ENRM."

Participant Quotes 2012

- *“This was a very helpful overview of the importance of the environment in USAID's programming. I enjoyed both the environment technical material as well as the USAID programming & finding insights.”*
- *“I found the whole course interesting. I particularly liked the explanation of the earmarks and the integrated approaches and systems thinking sessions.”*
- *“Would like to use this training as a networking opportunity. For example, a list of participants, with backstop, posting and emails would be helpful.”*
- *“Loved the earmark part. Very informative and helps put USAID's environment work in an agency and USG context.”*
- *“Facilitator and trainers were all excellent (which is exceptional!)”*

Additional participant quotes from FY 2008 to 2011 can be found in Annex IV.

4. Specific Course Recommendations

- The new design will be fully tested this year, as for the first delivery it seems to work well, therefore we propose to continue making minor enhancements to the new course design and materials.
- Ensure that we prepare all materials with an eye towards new trainers who may be delivering the course for the first time.
- Make agreements with seasoned trainers to serve as mentors in the coming year.

Section VII: 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). In FY 10-FY11, the course was modified to include pre- and post-course assessments. In FY12, the course was re-launched as standalone DL course, meaning it was open to all interested individuals.

Since the launch of the online standalone, 10 participants with no connection to the ENRM Overview or Applied ENRM Programming course have completed the course and responded to the course evaluation. In FY12, 15 participants completed the online learning modules as part of a course pre-requisite (either for ENRM Overview or for Applied ENRM Programming).

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 (Indicator 1) 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 1: Percentage of trainees that rate CK2C training as good to excellent.
Not data collected.

Indicator 2: 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.
92.5% of participants believe the course helped them meet course learning objectives in FY 2012.

	Results (for FY 2012)
Number of participants (not connected to the ENRM Overview or Applications courses)	9
Percentage of participants who felt the course achieved Objective 1: Define basic concepts of the environment as they relate to human and economic development	92%
Percentage of participants who felt the course achieved Objective 2: Articulate key approaches to understanding and addressing the interactions between human development and the environment.	93%
I would recommend this course to others.	100% Yes

Notes:

- 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.
- Note that not all participants who accessed and/or completed the course responded to the evaluation survey

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 the past, information was collected on two indicators (Indicator 2 and Indicator 3 below) defined to measure “learning” and the results from different course deliveries as well as the cumulative result. In FY11, based on the results of previous trainings, USAID Trainers and theCK2C team decided to disable the pre-course assessment and revise the post course assessment process. See the two sets of data (FY10-FY11 and FY12).

FY10-FY11 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.

Indicators:

- The percentage of participants passed the initial pre-course assessment with a score of 80% or higher. *57.3% of participants passed the pre-course assessment with a score of 80% or higher.*
- The percentage of participants that passed the post-course assessments with a score of 80% or higher. *100.0% of participants passed the post-course Ecosystems and Biodiversity assessment with a score of 80% or higher. 85.7% of participants passed the post-course NRM and IWRM assessment with a score of 80% or higher. 77.3% of participants passed the post-course Environmental Trends and GCC assessment with a score of 80% or higher.*

Assessment	# of Participants	Results	Result (% passing rate)
Pre-Course Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ecosystems and Biodiversity</i> • <i>Natural Resources Management and Integrated Water Resources Management</i> • <i>Environmental Trends and Global Climate Change</i> 	89 participants have taken the pre-course assessment	51 participants passed (80% or higher)	57.3% of participants passed
Post-Course Assessments			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ecosystems and Biodiversity</i> 	10 participants	10 participants passed (80% or higher)	100.0% of participants passed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Natural Resources</i> 	21 participants	8 participants passed (80% or higher)	85.7% of participants passed

<i>Management and Integrated Water Resources Management</i>		higher)	passed
• <i>Environmental Trends and Global Climate Change</i>	22 participants	17 participants passed (80% or higher)	77.3% of participants passed

Notes:

- The results listed in the Level Two evaluation include participants taking the course as a prerequisite as well as participants taking the course as a standalone.
- The post-course assessment is composed of three separate quiz components: 1)Ecosystems and Biodiversity; 2) Natural Resources Management and Integrated Water Resources Management; and 3)Environmental Trends and Global Climate Change. Thus, we cannot report on the average number of participants who passed the post-course assessment as a whole.

FY12 Data gathering method(s): To gather data for this level of evaluation in FY11, participants were asked to complete a post-course assessment. Participants scoring higher than 80% were marked as passing the course. Participants that did not pass were asked to review the modules and retake the assessment.

Indicators:

- The percentage of participants that passed the post-course assessment with a score of 80% or higher. *100.0% of participants passed the post-course with a score of 80% or higher.*

Assessment	# of Participants	Results	Result (% passing rate)
Post-Course Assessment	10 participants	9 participants passed (80% or higher)	90% of participants passed

4. Specific Course Recommendations

- Revisit and refine the course content and post-course assessment. Note that this course material is now over 2 years old and may need to be updated/refine to reflect new information.
- Upgrade the course to include audio and more interaction/examples. Invest in developing audio narrative to accompany the learning sessions. Also look for different opportunities to increase interaction for participants and integrate more USAID specific case examples.
- Continue to Improve Flow and Functionality of the Course: Look to improve the different functionality, flow and freezing issues cited by participants. Also, look for new systems upgrades for reporting, tracking completions, etc.

Section VIII. Programming Environment Funds (PEF) DL Stand Alone Course

1. Introduction

The Programming Environment Funds (PEF) Distance Learning Course was designed as a standalone distance learning course to provide just in time learning and information on current funding in the environment sector at USAID. From FY11-FY12, the course was designed, developed, beta tested and there was a soft launch in April 2012. Currently all course modules are open for participation except the Water module which will be completed in FY13.

Since the soft launch of the online course, 4 participants have completed the available modules and responded to the course evaluation.

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 (Indicator 1) 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.

Indicator 1: Percentage of trainees that rate CK2C training as good to excellent.
Not data collected.

Indicator 2: 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% of participants believe the course helped them meet course learning objectives in FY 2012.

	Results (for FY 2012)
Number of participants	4
Percentage of participants who felt the course achieved Objective 1: Articulate the legal basis of funding requirements for the Agency.	100%
Percentage of participants who felt the course achieved Objective 2: Know how funding allocations are made, how to navigate the process of programming environmental funding and what resources are available.	100%
I would recommend this course to others.	100% Yes

Notes:

- 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.

Specific Course Recommendations

- Complete the Water Module.
- Update all modules based on new funding information in Spring 2013. This will include adding the new 2-pagers for each “earmark” as they are updated.
- Develop and execute a hard launch communications strategy.
- Continue to capture and integrate feedback from participants to enhance the course content and functionality.

SECTION IX: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Be more explicit and intentional in collecting participants' concrete application actions/intentions the last day of each face to face course. Maybe create a conversation about it: What can they apply now? What will be difficult? What can they commit to? Although the level 3 evaluation – Behavioral Change or Concrete Use of Learning in the Job is getting good responses, it seems still a bit general. We also propose to make improvements to the M&E process:
 - Follow up with a select number of participants for interviews 2 months after the course
 - Send a survey to all participants 3 or 4 months after the course
- Create a standalone version of the Applied Fundamentals so that other USAID staff can benefit from the good information provided
- Implement a “communications strategy” for all the standalone distance learning DL courses to increase participation and collect better data about DL courses of the ENRM LI. Review the communications strategy for all blended learning DL components and enhance as needed.

Annexes:

Annex I: ENRM Overview Course

Annex II: ENRM Overview – Level Two Participant Quotes from FY 2008 to 2011

Annex III: ENRM Overview – Level Three Participant Quotes from FY 2008 to 2011

Annex IV: Applied ENRM Programming Course (previously called Applications Course)

Annex V: WASH Course

Annex VI: Treasure, Turf and Turmoil: The Dirty Dynamics of Land and Natural Resource Conflict (3Ts) Course

Annex VII: Environment Matters (previously called Environment in Development: Short Course)

Annex I: ENRM Overview Course

2010 ENRM Overview Quiz

Question	Percentage with correct answers
<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Using a cross sectoral systems approach that takes a holistic view of the world and allows for interactions between sectors. b. Fostering early participation by all stakeholders, empowering them through involvement at all levels, including in decision-making processes. c. Taking an ecosystem approach to ensure quick wins. d. a and b (Response) e. b and c 	81.82%
<p>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?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Spatial b. Stakeholder and actor-based (Response) c. Conceptual d. Economic e. All of the above 	30.43%
<p>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?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Nature, Wealth and Power (NWP) b. System-Wide Collaborative Action for Livelihoods and Environment (SCALE) c. Value Chain Strategy d. Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) (Response) 	77.27%
<p>4. Which statement(s) below best capture(s) why systems thinking is so important for ENRM programming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Systems- thinking helps us to manage for the short term. b. Systems -thinking identifies the tradeoffs between development and environment so costs can be shared equitably. c. Systems thinking hones in on one leverage point for intervention. d. Systems- thinking identifies platforms for joint action by stakeholders and partners. e. A and B f. C and D g. B and D (Response) 	47.83%
<p>5. True or False: When looking at the Foreign Assistance Framework (FAF), standard Agency reporting indicators are defined primarily at the sub-element level.</p> <p>False</p>	78.26%
<p>6. What are the four dimensions of sustainability?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Economic, Information, Social and Governance b. Social, Environment, Governance and Participation c. Cultural, Economic, Integration and Environment d. Environment, Social, Governance and Information e. Governance, Social, Economic and Environment (Response) 	90.91%
<p>7. According to the GCC Adaptation Manual, which of the following steps does NOT correspond to the process for evaluation of climate change?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Screen for vulnerability to climate risks; b. Identify mitigation and energy options; (Response) c. Analyze the options using the different criteria; d. Select a course of action; e. Implement the project and 	72.73%

f. Evaluate the effectiveness of the adaptation		
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: a. 118/119 Analysis (Response) b. FAF c. Reg 216 d. Earmarks e. None of the above	54.55%
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. True	47.83%
10.	Which of the following is not a critical element of sustainability? a. Ownership and collaboration at all levels. b. Diversity of environment, society and culture. c. Creation new goals for existing institutional frameworks. (Response) d. Action at the appropriate scale. e. Committed government with supportive, enabling policy	60.87%
11.	What do program managers need to take into account to practice good adaptive management? a. Changes in local context b. New discoveries about drivers and development challenges c. Incorrect hypotheses and assumptions d. Lessons learned through implementation successes and failures e. Areas of underperformance f. A, C and D g. B, D and E h. All of the above i. None of the above	78.26
Overall Media		65.52%

2011 ENRM Overview Quiz

Question	% with correct answer
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: (multiple choice) f) Using a cross sectoral systems approach that takes a holistic view of the world and allows for interactions between sectors. g) Fostering early participation by all stakeholders, empowering them through involvement at all levels, including in decision-making processes. h) Taking an ecosystem approach to ensure quick wins. i) <i>a and b Response</i> j) a and c	96%
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? (multiple choice) e) Spatial f) <i>Stakeholder and actor-based (Response)</i> g) Conceptual h) Economic i) All of the above	28%

<p>3.) A spatially 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 strengths of this approach are that its scale captures major ecological features and wide-ranging fauna and allows for conservation activities to address the most pressing threats and drivers on target ecosystems. Which of the following is an example of a Spatial Approach? (multiple choice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e) Nature, Wealth and Power (NWP) f) System-Wide Collaborative Action for Livelihoods and Environment (SCALE) g) Value Chain Strategy h) <i>Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) (Response)</i> 	84%
<p>4.) Which statement(s) below best capture(s) why systems thinking is so important for ENRM programming: (multiple choice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> g) Systems thinking helps us to manage for the long term. h) Systems thinking identifies the trade-offs between development and environment for informed decision-making. i) Systems thinking helps identify leverage points for intervention j) Systems thinking identifies platforms for joint action by stakeholders and partners. k) A and B l) <i>All of the above (response)</i> 	92%
<p>5.) True or False: When looking at the Foreign Assistance Framework (FAF) , standard Agency reporting indicators are defined primarily at the sub-element level. (multiple choice):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • True • <i>False (response)</i> 	52%
<p>6.) What are the four dimensions of sustainability? (multiple choice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> f) Economic, Information, Social and Governance g) Social, Environment, Governance and Participation h) Cultural, Economic, Integration and Environment i) Environment, Social, Governance and Information j) <i>Governance, Social, Economic and Environment (response)</i> 	84%
<p>7.) According to the GCC Adaptation Manual, which of the following steps does NOT correspond to the process for evaluation of climate change? (multiple choice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> f) Screen for vulnerability to climate risks; g) <i>Identify climate change mitigation and energy options; (response)</i> h) Analyze the options using the different criteria; i) Select a course of action; and j) Evaluate the effectiveness of the adaptation 	76%
<p>8.) Supporting USAID strategy and activity design, identifying potential contradictions between activities, targeting opportunities for earmarked funds, increasing the sustainability of Mission projects, and approaches are some of the benefits of: (multiple choice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> f) <i>118/119 Analysis (response)</i> g) FAF h) Reg 216 i) Earmarks j) None of the above 	36%
<p>9.) True or False: Standard indicators measure what is being accomplished with USG foreign assistance funds in order to report to Congressional and other constituents. (multiple choice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) <i>True (response)</i> d) False 	92%

<p>10.) Which of the following is not a critical element of sustainability? (multiple choice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Ownership and collaboration at all levels. 7. Diversity of environment, society and culture. 8. <i>Maximizing producer revenues in a two-year USAID program cycle.(Response)</i> 9. Action at the appropriate scale. 10. Committed government with supportive, enabling policy 	84%
<p>11.) What do program managers need to consider to practice good adaptive management? (multiple choice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Changes in local economic and/or ecological contexts 9. New information about drivers and development challenges 10. Incorrect hypotheses and assumptions 11. Lessons learned through implementation successes and failures 12. Areas of underperformance 13. A, C and D 14. <i>All of the above (response)</i> 15. None of the above 	76%
Overall media percentage	72.8%

Annex II: ENRM Overview – Level Two Participant Quotes from FY 2008 to 2011

- “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 info at the end of the days was diminished, the facilitators really tried to make the activity participatory and active”. (Pretoria, January 2009)
- About balance 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 ENRM a-fresh given the world trends. (Cebu, January 2010)
- 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)
- “Best USAID training available and applies directly to our work and development” (DC, June 2010)
- “It was wonderfully participatory, though I think you could ask participants to present case studies/issues/challenges/successes”. (DC, June, 2010)
- “Very good tools and resources and I feel that the materials and instruction was practical and relevant” (Ghana, July 2011)
- “Very good overview course, but a little too similar to the one-day foundations course” (Ghana, July 2011)
- “The focus on integrating multiple sectors in a comprehensive stakeholder approach is a valuable skill I will continue to use regularly”. (Ghana, July 2011)
- “I’m getting a feeling for the tools but think it will take some practice with real life examples to really be able to apply them.” (Ghana, July 2011)
- “I would especially recommend to people from other sectors who have very little NRM experience/background.” (Ghana, July 2011)
- I thought the trainers and facilitators were very knowledgeable in both technical content but also workshop design and implementation. (Ghana, July 2011)
- “Who’s the intended audience? Need more non-Environment people, so please advertise” (Ghana, July 2011)

Found most useful:

- “The exposure, training in the utilization of the systems approach to development programming”. (Panama, June 2008)
- “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)
- “Emphasis on integration in programming and the need to design and implement activities with a focus on sustainability”. (DC, July 2009)
- About trainers: “Wonderful mix of expertise. Appreciated their willingness to participate and offer advice beyond course sessions”. (DC, July 2009)
- “Laying out in very explicit terms how the ENRM is the foundation for all development work” (Pretoria, January 2009)
- “Journaling and feedback sessions are critical and it was good that time was devoted to them. - Participative sessions are always preferable - 'speed dating' segments were a good way to get a lot of info transmitted quickly”. (Pretoria, January 2009)
- “Please encourage other Mission sectors to attend, especially EG and Program that way, they will understand the environment sector”. (DC, July 2010)

General:

- “Very good course in presenting a compelling case for ENRM as a key factor to achieve/coordinate multiple do objectives that I will bring back to the job”. (Panama, June 2008)
- “As a new approach to development - ENRM’s role could surely be used as platform for achieving multiple development objectives, but the course needs longer time to achieve the objective.” (Pretoria, January 2009)

- “I understand and completely agree with them (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)
- “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)
- “Interesting to learn that even with earmarks there’s room/flexibility for defining activities/use of funds”. (Panama, June 2008)
- “One of the strengths of the training was the explanations of earmark, policies etc. Well done”. (Pretoria, January 2009)
- Abundant information resources relevant to ENRM were availed and internet web sites shown which helps to access quite easily. (Pretoria, January 2009)
- Sometimes we focus too much in our own area, this training helps us think across sector and apply integrated approach for program design. (Cebu, January 2010)
- While this was not the most exciting part of the course, I thought it was particularly well conveyed (Cebu, January 2010)
- “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)
- “The role play is one of my best sections. Do more of this approach in all courses. It helps catch the missing pieces in a practical way”. (DC, July 2010)

Annex III: ENRM Overview – Level Three Participant Quotes from FY 2008 to 2011

- “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 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.”
- “The course methodology helped me to capture more and being alert during the course”.
- “Test during the course was really good. It helped me to confirm what I learned”.
- “The way the material is presented, the workbook is a reference for me, I have it on my desk, and it is a book I use in my daily life”.
- “Incredible foundation about how USAID approaches NRM around the World. What I got, was appreciation about approaches and perspective conveyed in the training, the incredible importance of engaging all sectors of the society right from the start”.
- “Appreciation for developing and providing these trainings –You have done an amazing job, having so many USAID experts involved in providing the training. 100% support”.
- “I do appreciate that you are calling participants 6 or 7 months later to ask for how they are applying the course”.

Annex IV: Applied ENRM Programming Course (previously called Applications Course)

- “Excellent sessions in class, especially the simulations. Great training team! Great logistics team! Excellent learning experience”. (Bogotá, January 2011)
- “The course provided a complete set of important topics that are necessary to develop an NRM activity at the Mission level.” (Bogotá, January 2011)
- “Outstanding technical and presentation style. The trainers are what make the course – an outsourced course would not be the same.” (Bogotá, January 2011)
- “Great idea to simulate. Was a good learning experience to have to learn-by-doing with formal teach and discussion vs. the on the job ‘doing’.” (Bogotá, January 2011)
- “I think we need more on implementation - we don't need to do a whole module on procurement mechanisms and agreement/contracts management - but instead, how about more on these implementation pieces unique to ENRM, e.g., more on PES; something on host country implementation, examples unique to ENRM” (Bogotá, January 2011)
- “All the trainers and facilitators did an excellent job, are very knowledgeable and, took the time to look for answers to our questions.” (Bogotá, January 2011)
- “Overall, it has been one of the most useful trainings I have taken at USAID. Note: A page with key words and # of pages where the key word is mentioned will facilitate navigating the written material.” (Bogotá, January 2011)

Most relevant about his course:

- “Programming cycle and monitoring and evaluation and funding to most relevant to my work.” (Bogotá, January 2011)
- “The real world types applicators of assessment, M&E, and adaptive management.”
- “Good discussions of practical impressions and working within the governments and political influences and with different visions of money.” (Bogotá, January 2011)
- “Learning about the different earmark and initiative's criteria and actions that are allowed.” (Bogotá, January 2011)
- “USAID Pillars; Financial; Adaptation; Monitoring and Evaluation; Assessment.”
- “About GCC information. Sustainable landscape. Monitoring and Evaluation.” (Bogotá, January 2011)

Annex V: WASH Course

2011 Sample Quotes

What about WASH course sessions was particularly useful for you?

- “I have a better idea of WASH in USAID’s context. I also understand that in most cases WASH funding is tied to earmarks (water earmark) but other earmarks (GHI, FIF, GCC, etc.) can be used to fund it.”
- “Definition of WASH.”
- “To distinguish what elements are in WASH.”
- “It was good to hear and know about the regulatory template that we should keep in mind before implementation.”
- “Legal framework and budget water earmarks -> earmark requirements.”
- “Governance issue is critical in best practices interventions.”
- “To identify the four pillars of the sustainable services.”
- “Better understanding sanitation facilities and potential for financing/no subsidy.”

Level 3 – Evaluating Behavior – Data from 2009 and February 2011.

Indicator 4: 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.
90.9% of interviewees reported they have been able to start implementing at least one of the WASH approaches, principles or tools taught during the course.

Data Gathering Method(s): This indicator was measured by interviewing a sample of 10 participants from the WASH Overview courses delivered in Dakar, Maputo and Nairobi in 2009 and in Bangkok in March 2011.

Results:

Key concepts applied after the course:

WASH Integrated Programming: For all interviewees, the most common and compelling takeaway from the WASH Course was around the importance of integrated programming that supplemented water with sanitation and hygiene. Key aspects of that integrated programming are the focus on behavior change and on community-led interventions.

About half the interviewees felt the course’s emphasis on integration helped to broaden (if not completely shift) their perspectives on how to approach their work. This was especially true for those who had not previously been involved in WASH programming. On the other hand, those with WASH experience 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 following the course, others were able to actively contribute to team planning discussions, still others used it as part of monitoring and evaluating partner activities, 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. 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 (reduced earmark funding; shifting of money to other programs).

Cross-Sectoral Programming: Many participants have been able to continue already established cross-sectoral WASH activities with schools and health institutions, in some cases expanding water projects to

include sanitation and hygiene. Several interviewees reported having conversations with other departments about integrating WASH activities with Feed the Future. However, it seems that other cross-sectoral integration has yet to be implemented in WASH programming.

Earmarks, environmental compliance: The majority of participants highlighted learning about earmarks as one of the most useful aspects of the course. This knowledge was put to use in designing and budgeting projects. Two participants identified environmental compliance as something they have begun to undertake because of the course.

Intentionality to apply course concepts:

- All interviewees (100%) indicated that 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 WASH programming as they left the course.

Additional learning opportunities:

- All interviewees spoke enthusiastically about further developing their knowledge, and expressed interest in the following courses: ENRM 201, Global Climate Change, Water and Climate Change, Water and Food Security, and ENRM Applications.
- Several interviewees recommended an advanced WASH course where active WASH managers from different missions would come together to share lessons learned, challenges, etc.

Sample Quotes

“I was given the big task of managing a \$2 million water earmark. I was wondering if I was doing the right thing. The only thing to guide me was the training. The tension wasn’t there any more after the training. We were able to award the competitive agreement to an NGO. I would have needed close supervision without the training, but instead was able to do it on my own.”

“The course was eye-opening. I had to design a new water program, and I looked at it through the lens of my newfound WASH perspective. With my natural resources background, I would have overlooked sanitation and hygiene, especially the behavior change component. I would have thought that if they just got the water, everything would be fine, we would have solved the problem.”

“When I visit projects in the field, it’s very useful to see what behaviors have changed in the community. Before, as an economist, I only looked for how many people got water, received services. Now after the course, I look for what behaviors have changed.”

“I shared the training materials with my counterparts. I found out that they knew more than I realized. This opened up discussions, they spoke more in confidence and shared the challenges they were experiencing in implementation. Before, they said everything was fine, and I couldn’t see many things.”

“This kind of course is very important. The mission should give more opportunities to attend to people working in program offices, the strategists. Sometimes they are analyzing country situations, and those concept papers are the basis for projects and programs. Otherwise, they will just continue with traditional programs.”

“The course increased my personal understanding and knowledge of the sector, made it easier to have conversations and understand what the technical people were talking about, what they were prioritizing and why. I am better able to understand our water problems and contribute at the up-front design stage with good questions and observations.”
(Program Officer)

“In the past, I focused on a top-down approach to sanitation issues. I now see the benefits of involving the community in the process. I am trying to introduce this with our implementing partners.”

“After coming back from the course, I had a much better picture of the earmark the types of activities that were allowed and not allowed, and the flexibility of cross-sectoral work such as with Feed the Future and climate change.”

“I sit in the economic growth office. WASH sits in the health office. We’ve come up with a clear mechanism to develop a WASH team that includes Democracy and Governance, Economic Growth, and Health Team members.”

“I’m applying these concepts in new projects that are coming. When I assess and evaluate these projects, I incorporate the integrated program view, and if the project doesn’t have that, I don’t give it a good evaluation.”

“I discussed these concepts with government counterparts in planning, preventing and preparing for inevitable cholera outbreaks as part of our disaster response work. I got the Ambassador to support the WASH approach, and OFDA to augment the funding related to hygiene best practices.”

Annex VI: Treasure, Turf and Turmoil: The Dirty Dynamics of Land and Natural Resource Conflict (3Ts) Course

2011 Sample Quotes

- “Good introduction to LTPR and conflict issues in the NRM context. Helpful for me since I come from the NRM background, but need to consider other issues.”
- “Should be a day longer in order to go deeper in some concepts.”
- “I think it was a hard course to design. I appreciate the effort. However, there was no clear focus. We went all over the place. Presentations were too basic. No room to tackle the “tough” issues.”
- “Again, it was a good overall introduction. I would have liked to have more time on the different types of assessments.”
- “Feel like I have come away with a greater understanding and appreciation of the links between LTPR, NRM, and conflict and knowledge of the tools that could be applied to such situations.”
- “Good intro to conflict and LTPR as they relate to NRM.”
- “More application of the tools would have been good, as well as examples from other regions.”
- “Good sharing and discussion of available AID tools though wondering what useful tools or methods exist outside of Agency in these technical areas.”
- “I enjoyed the group work exercise and flow over the 3 days - building on discussions. I also really enjoyed Marks session and group work on Madagascar.”

2011 Specific Recommendations:

- The course will benefit of a more unified methodology in the breakout sessions, particularly the sessions on NRM/biodiversity, CMM and LTPR. For the next delivery, it will be important to clarify what we want participants to take away from those sessions.
- Given the diversity among the target audience, some participants suggested to further and deeper exploration of the tools presented, particularly the LTPR matrix.

Annex VII: Environment Matters (previously called Environment in Development: Short Course)

- Good participatory approach, material very well organized and helpful (May 2010)
- 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 were 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)
- I would have liked to see more examples, suggestions or discussion about what has really happened. (May 2010)
- 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)
- It was a little tricky to navigate and I felt it did not really contribute to today – it felt repetitive with the morning's work. (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)

Participant Quotes 2011

- “Fast moving, loved set up where we had chances for interaction and moving around.”
- “Great course to have, thanks!”
- “Great having a workbook to take home.”
- “What I found most useful: Instilling environmental issues into non-environment USAID employees.”
- “What I found most useful: Real good scenarios and on the ground experiences are very helpful to illustrating points.”

- “Discuss key issues v. earmarks, and dwell more on directives, as they are also a significant part of the discussion. Do not assume questions will be answered in the earmark round robin too little time.”
- “What I found most useful was the Madagascar example. What I wondered was, how many more examples like it are out there.”
- “More on how to access, or ask for environment resources. Less on how to develop/ design programs and not what I thought class was about.”