CAPABLE PARTNERS PROGRAM (CAP)

Training Report:

Certificate Program in Evaluation for the ATSEC Anti-Trafficking NGO Network in South Asia

ATSEC

September 15, 2006

USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

CAP is implemented by
AED
Academy for Educational Development
in partnership with
MSI
Management Systems International

Table of Contents

1. Background 1

2. Course Curriculum 2

3. ATSEC Course Participants 3

4. Course Instructors and Observers 4

5. Course Materials and Schedule 4

6. Participant Evaluation Teams 5

7. Topical Focus of the Evaluations 6

8. Participant Knowledge Gains from Phase I 7

9. Products and Discussion Outcomes from Phase III Exercises 9

10. Instructor Observations and Recommendations 13

ANNEXES

Annex A. Core Phase I Curriculum – MSI Certificate Program in Evaluation 19
Annex B. Illustrative Agendas for Phases I and III 21
Annex C. Participant List 23
Annex D. Evaluation Review Criteria 25
Annex E. Pre-Test Results 27
Annex F. Meta Evaluation Group Reports 43

1. Background

The evaluation training described in this report was conducted in collaboration with the Action Against Trafficking and the Sexual Exploitation of Children (ATSEC) network, and was sponsored by USAID/DCHA/PVC-ASHA through its Capable Partners Program (CAP).[1] The CAP program, which was initiated in 2003, is designed to help strengthen the organizational and technical capacities and sustainability of NGOs, community based organizations, networks and other local partners. Under this program, CAP facilitated an institutional self-assessment within ATSEC/India to identify its strengths and weaknesses and develop overall plans for strengthening this network. The choice of ATSEC as a network that was ready for training in evaluation emerged, in part, as a result of this experience.

From a network development perspective, the purpose of this evaluation course for ATSEC was not simply to train individuals. It was also intended to develop network-level capacity in each participating State chapter. To accomplish this, individuals nominated to participate in the course and the organizations they represent were told that participation depended upon the willingness of the individual and their organization to designate those who received training an ATSEC chapter Evaluation Resource Person, who would, from time to time, be able to provide assistance on evaluation matters to other NGOs in their local (state or national) chapter or to their ATSEC chapter as a whole. This agreement was codified in the participant nomination form that candidates and their organizations submitted to the head of ATSEC/India, through which CAP offered this course. Wording from the agreement to serve as a long term Evaluation Resource Person, which all ATSEC course participants and their organizations were party, is shown below:

> *If you are accepted for the Certificate Program in Evaluation course ATSEC/India will host in 2006 and are designated as an **"ATSEC Evaluation Resource Person"** for your State (or for the non-Indian ATSEC organization you represent) will your organization make available 10-15 days of your time each year, as needed, to help your own organization and other ATSEC member organizations in your area plan and carry out evaluations of the effects/impact of their anti-trafficking initiatives? **If you believe that you will be able to fulfill this commitment to ATSEC***

[1] The MSI Certificate Program in Evaluation was first offered in 1997 through a USAID-funded NGO strengthening program, in Russia, for a group of individuals from non-governmental organizations (NGOs), universities, private firms and the Moscow city government who had expressed an interest in learning how to evaluate social service programs to a USAID funded NGO strengthening program. The program evolved into its present form over a several year period following its initial offering when MSI taught the program as a course for the Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University, in Washington, D.C. Since then, it has been provided to over 100 additional NGOs in Russia, Armenia and Malawi under other USAID-funded NGO strengthening programs. The MSI Certificate Program in Evaluation has also been offered for USAID staff 11 times, for a total of over 200 USAID participants. In Uganda, two of these courses for USAID staff also provided this training for more than thirty USAID implementing partner organizations.

as a whole, please say "yes" below and provide the name of the senior person in your organization who is approving this commitment on behalf of the organization that employs you. *The commitment of your organization as an institution is important and will be recognized by ATSEC as a contribution to the network's overall effort.*

In addition to gaining a long-term commitment from participants to utilize the skills they acquired in this course for the benefit of ATSEC chapters, the head of ATSEC/India also worked with member organizations to identify candidate programs that teams of course participants would examine during Phase II of the course and for which they would prepare written evaluation reports.

2. Course Curriculum

The MSI Certificate Program in Evaluation is an experiential learning course comprised of three phases: two weeks of classroom work, separated by one week of field work to evaluate a field project or program (see Annex A for the list of modules).

The objectives of the course are to ensure that participants:

- Understand the role of evaluation in the program and activity management cycle;
- Improve skills they need to prepare high quality, utilization-focused evaluation Scopes of Work;
- Understand the importance of ethics in evaluation;
- Develop the capacity to carry out an evaluation that will produce the kind of information needed to answer evaluation questions;
- Learn how to review and critique evaluation plans and draft evaluation reports with an eye on improving them; and
- Utilize evaluation findings to inform management decisions.

The core curriculum for the Certificate Program in Evaluation covers the full cycle of an activity or project evaluation as well as the role of an evaluator in that process. Topics normally included in the Phase I curriculum range from articulating the questions an evaluation must address to writing evaluation scopes of work (SOWs). Also covered are methods for collecting data, data analysis techniques, and evaluation report writing.

Phase II is carried out by participant teams, comprised most often of a minimum of three individuals. These individuals travel to the site where the program they will evaluate is being carried out and work together, on site, to gather data, undertake an initial analysis of what they found and agree upon the main findings, conclusions and recommendations they will include in the report they prepare after completing their field work.

Phase III curriculum includes a review and critique of participant fieldwork, as well as a number of supplementary modules such as assessing cost-effectiveness through an evaluation. Topics covered in Phase III build upon skills that the participants have already acquired. During Phase

III, each team makes an oral presentation, simulating the presentations evaluation teams are asked to make in missions. While one team reports, the class scores the report and presentation against a set of criteria for judging the quality of an evaluation (see Annex D for the list of criteria for reviewing an evaluation). During each presentation, participants play the role of the Mission Director, technical staff, and representatives of the organization that had been evaluated.

Phase III also includes opportunities for participants to examine patterns in findings from their evaluations through a program level or meta-evaluation. They are also able to examine monitoring and evaluation (M&E) capacity in the countries in which they work.

While the list of topics covered is an important indication of the technical level of the course, the experiential nature of this training is what distinguishes it from many other courses. At every step, course participants have to apply what they are learning. Throughout the course they are experiencing steps in the evaluation process that they will likely use again when they return to their organizations, e.g., preparing Scopes of Work (SOW) or reviewing draft evaluations. Participants finish the course with a much better sense of what evaluation SOWs require of those who they ask to carry out evaluations. Through the course, by virtue of the level of detail at which they examine the project they are assigned, most participants also come away with an appreciation of good project design and a heightened awareness of the relationship between good design and the achievement of results. The course also instills in most participants a deeper understanding of the concept of teamwork and an appreciation of its merits for such tasks as program design and evaluation.

3. ATSEC Course Participants

Twenty five (25) participants completed all three phases of the Certificate Program in Evaluation offered for ATSEC member organizations. The nineteen (19) ATSEC participants from India were chosen by their state level ATSEC chapters and represented those chapters as well as their own organizations. In addition, three participants from Bangladesh represented their national ATSEC network, as well as their individual organizations. One participant from Nepal and one from Sri Lanka also represented both their own organizations and their national ATSEC networks.[2] A list of course participants and the organizations they represent is provided in Annex C.

Most participants (67% of the 21 that completed a course pre-test questionnaire) indicated at the start of the training program that monitoring and evaluation is a component of their job, with

2 The final participant in the course was CAP's course assistant who joined in when a third member of one of for one of the early teams to go to the field was needed.

only one participant (5%) reporting that monitoring and evaluation is their primary responsibility.

4. Course Instructors and Observers

Instructors for the Certificate Program in Evaluation course for ATSEC were Molly Hageboeck, CAP's course designer and senior evaluator and Alexander Borovykh, who serves as the Director of the Institute for Public Development in Moscow. Ms. Hageboeck, who, in an earlier era headed USAID/PPC's Evaluation Systems Division, has been a member of the teaching staff for this course since its creation. Mr. Borovykh is also a senior MSI trainer who has co-taught this course for NGOs in both Russia and Armenia. During both phases of the course, Dr. Manabendra Mandal, the head of ATSEC/India observed multiple course sessions including all of the participants' presentations of their evaluation plans and findings. USAID/India's anti-trafficking advisor, Nandita Baruah, also attended sessions during Phase I and Phase III, and provided participants with an overview at the start of the course of the kinds of evaluation questions that USAID would be interested in should participant evaluations address them. During Phase III, Adele Liskov, Acting Director of USAID/DCHA/PVC-ASHA and the Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO) for the CAP program, and Joan Goodin, MSI Senior Associate and Associate Director of CAP, observed all course sessions and actively participated in evaluation report review and critique sessions, from which all participants benefited.

5. Course Materials and Schedule

For Phase I and Phase III, participants, instructors and appropriate CAP and USAID course observers received course notebooks with hard-copy versions of the PowerPoint slides for these modules. The manuals also included supplementary reading materials linked to each module.

The course agenda serves as a loose guide to the sequencing and timing of presentations and exercises, and is provided at the start of Phase I and Phase III, along with the caveat that it will not be followed rigidly. The illustrative agendas for Phases I and III of the course given for ATSEC are provided in Annex B.

In addition to these materials, ATSEC course participants were provided with an information kit on performance monitoring during Phase III. This addition to the regular materials provided was in response to participant requests during the Phase I session on course objectives and expectations. A number of individuals said in that session that they also needed training that would help them to monitor their organization's programs and projects. MSI provided this supplementary kit of materials and held a special session during Phase III on monitoring to accommodate these requests.

6. Participant Evaluation Teams

During the first afternoon of Phase I of the course, participants chose the teams on which they would participate as evaluators during Phase II of the course. Generally speaking, three individuals make up a team for fieldwork purposes, though in some instances, when the logistics for carrying out field assignments dictate, teams of four are permitted. This size team is capable of carrying out all of the assigned tasks within the time allotted, as long as the size of the evaluation task is reasonable. The team can visit only one or two sites; those must be within a reasonable distance of each other and not inherently inaccessible.

During the team selection session, rules were established which participants must follow in selecting which team they will join. For this course the rules for selection included the following:

- Participants could not be on the teams that evaluated programs run by their own organizations.
- Both men and women were to be represented on each team.
- Teams on which participants from Bangladesh and Sri Lanka participated had to be teams that could do their field work immediately following Phase I, so that international travel requirements could be minimized.

Once teams were organized, they worked as a group throughout the the remainder of Phase I to develop their plans and approaches for their Phase II evaluations. These teams remained together during Phase II and for much of Phase III when they presented their findings orally, received feedback, and modify their evaluation reports accordingly.

As a result of their group work, every team ended Phase I with a reasonable Scope of Work in hand and good preliminary ideas about how they would carry out their fieldwork. Some teams took more time than others in Phase I to begin developing the questionnaires they would use and identifying the roles that each would play on the evaluation team. Teams that did this often reported in Phase III that it helped them to have done so. A few teams that accomplished less by way of advanced preparation during Phase I reported when they returned in Phase III that they wished, in retrospect, that they had done more advance planning at a detailed level before they went to the field. Other teams, who had drafted questionnaires and other instruments during Phase I, reported that this had been useful, but several such teams also said that they had to make significant modifications once they started using their draft instruments with the kinds of informants from whom they needed information. Only a few of the teams from this particular class took the time to pre-test their data collection instruments, as the course instructors advised. Those that did reported during Phase III that doing so made their field work more efficient.

In addition, the field experiences of several teams indicate that some amount of elapsed time between Phase I and the start of fieldwork actually helped a team do a better job with its evaluation. That elapsed time allows participants to absorb Phase I and focus systematically on Phase II in a manner that jumping directly into Phase II does not permit.

After completing their field work, participants prepared a full draft of their evaluation reports, including annexes that contain the various data gathering instruments they used. They are expected to follow guidelines provided for report preparation given to them during Phase I. Participant teams submitted their reports roughly a week before the start of Phase III. Every report was then shared electronically with all participants. By the time they return for Phase III, most participants had read through all of the reports and were prepared to provide oral comments as well as score evaluations on a standardized rating sheet (Annex D). This rating sheet not only highlights strengths and weaknesses of an evaluation for its authors but it also helps the reviewer to become a focused and critical reader by drawing his or her attention to important aspects of each evaluation.

When they returned for Phase III, participants in the ATSEC course made oral presentations of their findings and critiqued each other's reports. Having developed a good rapport during Phase I, participants in this course joined in these reviews in the spirit of constructive criticism, often offering very practical suggestions to each other about how their evaluation reports could be improved by making adjustments in the organization of the reports, bringing data forward from annexes to support statements about findings, or making their recommendations more specific and clear with respect to who should act upon them. ATSEC and CAP's course observers also offered comments and suggestions to participant teams in the same spirit.

7. Topical Focus of the Evaluations

The course instructors learned that it is useful to select a set of evaluations for the fieldwork that have something in common. This way, in Phase III, the individual project or activity evaluations carried out in Phase II can be used as the basis for the meta or program-level evaluation. Further, this allows students to draw common findings from all evaluations and use them to frame conclusions, lessons and, where relevant, draft recommendations for USAID.

To this end, CAP consulted with the head of ATSEC/India to determine what types of anti-trafficking initiatives would benefit most from evaluations by participant teams. The three topics ATSEC selected as the focus topics for this course were:

- Awareness raising programs that focus on the leadership segment of communities rather than on potential victims;
- Rescue operations, which are a key element of anti-trafficking initiatives that secure the safety of trafficking survivor/victims, and
- Shelter homes, with specific respect to the range and quality of services they provide to trafficking survivor/victims.

Under each of these topics, ATSEC/India identified at least three specific programs as candidates for evaluation. During Phase II, participant teams from this course evaluated two of the three candidate programs in each of the first two topical categories and all three in the third category. Logistical difficulties in reaching one site and in scheduling field work for international participants led to the selection of only seven of the nine original candidate programs, and teams of four rather than three individuals in several cases.

A list of the evaluations completed by course participants is provided in Box 1 below.[3]

8. Participant Knowledge Gains from Phase I

The phased nature of the Certificate Program in Evaluation provides multiple opportunities for assessing knowledge gains. The first opportunity comes at the start of Phase 1 when a pre-test is administered to determine participant's prior exposure to concepts that will be covered in the course. Knowledge gained from the first classroom phase of the course is directly assessed at the end of the week. This first post-test covers some items included in the pre-test. A second opportunity to assess participant knowledge gains comes during Phase III, when instructors and participants assess the completeness and quality of the evaluations produced by participant teams. At the end of Phase III participants provide their overall evaluation of the course and their self-assessment of the skills they have acquired.

For the ATSEC course, pre-test responses revealed that participants entered the course with quite varied levels of understanding of both monitoring and evaluation. With respect to evaluation, 38% of the 21 participants that completed the pre-test form indicated that evaluation was a new topic in which they had no previous training. At the other end of the spectrum, 76% of the group had previously been exposed to evaluation concepts in either a formal or informal training program. The remainder had some familiarity with the topic from books and other documents they had read. Roughly the same picture pertained with respect to their prior knowledge of monitoring.

- The number of participants who said that they had a very good understanding of the concept of evaluation rose from three (3) on the pre-test to 20 at the end of Phase I, out of the 21 individuals who completed both forms.

3 Since these evaluations were carried out for ATSEC member organizations on a semi-confidential basis, their release is under the control of the head of ATSEC/India with whom the CAP-MSI team collaborated on this training.

Box 1. List of Evaluations Completed by Course Participants for ATSEC Member Organizations

AWARENESS RAISING AMONG LEADERSHIP GROUPS

- Hemant Borker, Ajit Sarma, Kanchana Mala, and Alakshendra Pratap Singh. *Evaluation of ATSEC/Bihar Awareness Raising for Community Leaders*
- Syed Manir Hossain, Itrat Jahan and M. Sarika. *Evaluation of Cross Border Project on Anti Trafficking Awareness Raising*

RESCUE AND REPATRIATION PROGRAMS

- Sabin Gurung, Rupa Kumari and Narmada Purohit. *Evaluation of the Rescue Program to Stop Trafficking and the Oppression of Children and Women (STOP).*
- Kirti Mishra, Aparna Singh, A.G Kharbhih and Rajesh Kumar. *Evaluation of the Rescue Work of Odanadi Seva Samsthe, Mysore (Karnataka)*

SHELTER CARE FOR TRAFFICKING VICTIMS

- Dipak Prasad, Sandhya Mangsataram, Aprajita Mishra and Eranga Amali. *Evaluation of the Prayas Shelter Home.*
- Debashish Das, Rupa Bhattacharya, and Tashkeel Khan. *Evaluation of the Shelter Home of Maiti Nepal.*
- Kohinoor Begum, Kishore Mohanty, Ajit Rao and Mahua Sur Ray. *Evaluation of the Women's Interlink Foundation (WIF) Shelter Home for Second Generation Being Trafficked (SGBT), Survivors of Trafficking, Children of HIV/AIDS Infected Parents.*

- The number who said that they understand the differences between findings, conclusions and recommendations in an evaluation report rose from 6 to 18 during Phase I
- The number who felt confident that they could develop a scale to be used when asking questions about changes in attitudes rose from 1 to 12 during this same period.

The pattern of changes noted in these responses was fairly typical for Phase I of the course. Conceptual advances are the greatest in this phase, whereas mastery of specific techniques seems to advance more during Phase II when participants apply what they have learned in Phase I. Copies of the participants' pre-test results, along with their end of Phase I and end of Phase III course assessments are provided in Annex E.

In addition to checking on knowledge gains, the end of Phase III course evaluation also asks participants for their views on how well the course achieved the six objectives set forth in the course's curriculum. Participant evaluations show that 100% or close to it rated the course as fully achieving the first two objectives (shown on page 2). Nearly 85% of the participants rated the course as fully achieving the last two objectives on this list. For the other two objectives a rating of fully achieved was given by 75% of the participants, and the remainder, in each instance indicated that those course objectives had been partially achieved.

Final evaluations of the course also showed that 92% of the participants felt competent to write high quality evaluation Scopes of Work by the end of the course, and 83% felt that they had the competence to play an expert evaluator role on a future evaluation team.

9. Products and Discussion Outcomes from Phase III Exercises

In addition to providing participants with feedback on their evaluation reports and oral presentations, Phase III provides several exercises that focus at the program or meta-evaluation level to identify patterns of findings across evaluations. Topics also covered include: the utilization of evaluation findings; assessing cost-effectiveness of programs and projects during evaluations; and individual and chapter-level action plans outlining what participants hope to do to improve the evaluation capacity of their organizations once they return home.

A. Program level or Meta-Evaluation Exercises

The program or meta-evaluation exercises conducted during Phase III of the Certificate Program in Evaluation are designed to illustrate for participants that the skills they have developed in Phases I and II can be applied at higher levels to look at sets of complementary projects that aim at achieving a common program-level goal or to examine similar programs across regions, states or countries. This is to understand patterns and to identify approaches that are more successful than others, even when a broadly comparable project approach is used (e.g., rescue operations, livelihood skill training, etc.).

For the ATSEC class, the meta-evaluation exercise focused on lessons that could be derived from the evaluations conducted by participants about the three main topics on which those evaluations focused, namely awareness raising among leadership groups; rescue operations and shelter care. For the meta-evaluation exercise, which involves reviewing all evaluation reports to locate relevant information, participants were organized into three teams. At least one participant from every field evaluation team served on each of these meta-evaluation groups, thus ensuring that in every group there was someone who knew what each evaluation had found that had a bearing on the questions the meta-evaluation exercise addressed. That set of questions is shown below in Box 2 .Participant responses to these questions highlighted patterns across projects. Thus, for example:

Box 2. Meta-Evaluation Questions for the ATSEC Participants

Group 1

- What evidence do the evaluations provide concerning relationships between NGOs and government in anti-trafficking and victim assistance programs?
- What do the shelter and rescue evaluations tell us about the kinds of psychosocial interventions NGOs undertake in programs where they are working with trafficking victim/survivors and the effectiveness of those psychosocial interventions?

Group 2

- What evidence do the evaluations provide about the role of communities in anti-trafficking and victim assistance programs?
- What evidence do the evaluations provide concerning awareness of trafficking dangers, laws, regulations and trafficker methods and appropriate ways of working with victim/survivors among vulnerable populations, communities, local government, police, prosecutors and judges and shelter home staff?

Group 3

- What evidence do the evaluations provide about the kinds of recordkeeping and activity and results monitoring being carried out in anti-trafficking and victim assistance programs?
- What evidence do the evaluations provide about the kinds of activities undertaken in NGO programs to ensure that victim/survivors who leave shelters or rescue situations remain safe and are not re-trafficked and the effectiveness of these activities?

- Across all of the programs evaluated, ATSEC participants found that monitoring was a weakness. This was particularly true for instance in which the real impact of the program occurs after a trafficking victim/survivor leaves the site where the NGO is providing assistance. As a result, programs have less information than the participants thought was desirable on what happens to rescue victims after they leave a shelter. Information was scarce or lacking about how victims apply the vocational skills they have acquired or, indeed, whether they were living safely and well out of danger of being re-trafficked or exploited or ostracized in some way. Participants suggested that all NGOs needed to improve in this area and that ATSEC could play a role in this regard.
- Asked specifically, in a meta-evaluation question, about evidence that would show that victim/survivors are safe and are not being re-trafficked after they leave shelters, the participants found almost no evidence in their evaluations that indicated that enough follow-up was being done on individuals who left shelters to tell for sure whether they have

remained in safe circumstances. Participants noted that in part this lack of evidence is a function of the fact that victim/survivors tell shelter personnel that they do not want further contact, as it might alert people in the communities to which they go about their trafficking experience, which was not something that all victim/survivors wanted known.

- Based on their evaluations, participants also noted that while follow-up was lacking, there was strong evidence that all rescue and shelter programs try to provide victim/survivors with livelihood skills to equip them to take care of themselves and not again become victims of traffickers. Vocational and life skills were found to be taught in shelters and in at least one case victim/survivors were helped to make contact with banks that could help them with their start-up business expenses. Participants suggested that further study might turn up information on what practices are really most effective in this regard. They felt that better information about what really works would help other NGO programs do a better job in this regard.

- For shelter programs, participants found during the meta-evaluation that there was no strong pattern of professional, psychosocial counseling in shelters. This was one example, participants suggested, of a lack of awareness on the part of shelter homes of such standards for care as exist in national laws. Data from the evaluations showed that, while some programs included regular counseling, some use counseling only to help reduce trauma at the start of a shelter stay. Others did not provide regular counseling, in part because they lack the funds or staff to do so.

- One rescue-shelter program compensated for this by engaging survivors as peer counselors. Where counseling was provided and participants had seen counseling records, they noted that these records did not describe stages or changes in client conditions. Further, the participants noted that psychosocial counseling, when offered, was not well integrated with other types of shelter care. That is, it was not part of a holistic approach that tailored care to a victim/survivor based at least in part on her psychosocial condition. A key shelter exception in this regard was a rescue and shelter operation that has introduced dance therapy and other innovative techniques for addressing psychosocial issues. Beyond the shelter, one rescue program was noted for engaging in family and community counseling when victim/survivors returned home, at least when there was some evidence of ostracism or the possibility of ostracism of the victim/survivor. Counseling is an area where participants felt ATSEC could help play a role in defining appropriate practices and ensuring that shelters have access to professional counselors.

- Addressing the question of the role of communities in anti-trafficking programs more generally, participants found that most programs involve communities to some degree. In

some cases, the NGO provides training to community groups, in others it seeks the help of existing community groups, for instance, with victim repatriation. In most programs, however, community involvement was not a central element of the activity. Reviewing these data, participants drew the conclusion that NGOs could do more to involve communities. They also felt, however, that further study on best practices in this regard would be needed to ensure that additional efforts to involve communities in various types of anti-trafficking work would actually improve program results.

- Turning to relations between NGO programs and government organizations, the participants found that shelter and awareness-raising programs had generally good relations with the government agencies with which they work, as well as with village committees. They also noted that, in programs where the NGO provides training in anti-trafficking to government and community entities, relationships are usually good. The situation was somewhat different with respect to rescue programs, where relations with the police, while usually good on paper, may be somewhat tense in practice. Across projects it was clear that the role of the police and the role of NGOs in rescues sometimes raises issues. That is, when NGOs play an active role they are taking up what the police may see as their role. Participants concluded that this tension may sometimes be productive, but they also noted that there is a need to monitor NGO relationships of this sort. They suggested that ATSEC may be able to play a role in this regard and help to improve NGO-police relationships where they become frayed.

Points summarized above came out of class discussion based on worksheets participants used to present the results of their three-hour meta-evaluation session, in which each team addressed two cross-cutting questions. Participant raw data worksheets for this exercise are provided in Annex F.

B. Tools for Improving the Monitoring of Anti-Trafficking Programs and Projects

As noted above, for ATSEC, MSI added a segment to Phase III on performance monitoring. An overview presentation was given by the class instructors and a discussion of issues ensued. As relevant, participant attention was drawn to elements of the monitoring "kit" CAP had prepared , which included information from MSI's files, as well as from USAID and other donors, on Logical Frameworks and Results Frameworks, as well as on performance indicators and the development of performance monitoring plans (PMPs). Through this discussion, the CAP instructors recognized the need for examples of how participants' programs fit into larger Results Frameworks. Participants also needed sample indicators to give them an idea of what should be measured to assess performance at various levels of a Results Framework. Accordingly, the instructors developed a draft of a "sector-wide" Results Framework for the anti-trafficking field and a set of sample indicators at each level which, while preliminary in nature, was shared with participants.

C. Participant Action Plans

Action planning is always the final segment of the Certificate Program in Evaluation. For ATSEC, the action planning segment of Phase III was divided into two parts. Participants developed individual plans for improvements they will help make in their own organizations. Through the class discussion of participant evaluation plans, it became apparent that many participants hope to make improvements in the programs their organizations implement as well as in their organization's monitoring and evaluation systems. This was particularly true of participants who served on evaluation teams that looked at program which were similar to those their organization implements.

In addition to planning for improvements participants feel they can make in their own organizations, they worked in groups (e.g., all of the Bangladesh participants in one group, all of the Delhi-based participants in another) to come up with Action Plans for the kinds of assistance they will try to provide to their respective ATSEC chapters. In some instances, these chapter-level Action Plans may end up serving as a monitoring and evaluation agenda for the chapter.

Following completion of the course, one of the first tasks before all graduates will be to seek support within their organizations for implementation of their plans. Highlights of the Actions Plans participants produced for both purposes are provided in Box 3 and Box 4 below. Of note in these plans is the fact that, in most instances, participants included items that focus on program design, or at least the cause and effect "program theory" aspect of program design, as well as both monitoring and evaluation . As discussions of Action Plan agenda items indicated, participants felt that better design and good monitoring are an important foundation for evaluation. Strengthening clarity about the intended results of their organizations' programs and projects, and then monitoring achievement with respect to those results, was something that participants universally felt their organizations needed to do. When it came to their plans for ATSEC chapters, leadership in evaluation is an important role that participants wanted to encourage.

10. Instructor Observations and Recommendations

Instructor observations with respect to gains in participant knowledge and skills during this course are consistent with those of the participants themselves, as recorded in their course evaluations. In many instances, the degree to which individuals developed was impressive. Participants who started the course with some background in evaluation, as well as those who were new to this topic, advanced during the course. While some are fully prepared to lead new evaluation initiatives in their organizations and ATSEC chapters, others may continue to need moral if not technical support as they move forward. One interesting and encouraging result in this regard is that individual participants tended, during the Action Planning segment, to identify which other participants they intended to turn to for help in making improvements at the ATSEC chapter level. This sort of "buddy system" will very likely be beneficial to participants who are

Box 3. Highlights of Participant Action Plans for Improving their Own Organizations

- Provide a briefing or sharing about the course and try to mobilize interest in monitoring and evaluation in the organization.
- Provide a more detailed orientation/skill building session on M&E concepts for the organization staff.
- Help the organization develop a strategy or statement about the role of evaluation (and monitoring) of the organization's projects and programs.
- Help organizations develop their M&E "system" – meaning established procedures and requirements for what will always be done to monitor and evaluate projects/programs the organization implements.
- Inventory the organization to determine who has relevant skills and the commitment needed to help strengthen M&E in the organization.
- Establish a Evaluation or M&E focal point person in the organization.
- Introduce the Logical Framework as a way to characterize projects and make it easier to monitor and evaluate them.
- Introduce indicators as tool for systematically monitoring performance in projects/programs.
- Develop a specific plan for carrying out evaluations in the organization.
- Introduce mid-term evaluations as a way of learning what is and is not working in projects/programs at a point where making improvements is still possible.
- Plan and conduct a first evaluation in any organization that has never had an evaluation – as a way of demonstrating what evaluation is about and how the organization can benefit from evaluation.
- Develop a tool box or library of evaluation (and monitoring) information about techniques that will serve as a resource for the staff.
- Review prior evaluations and identify recommendations on which no action has been taken and orchestrate a process for initiating action on these evaluation recommendations.
- Institute a post-evaluation practice that engages the organization in making decisions about what recommendations to accept, how to implement them and who will implement them.
- Put an evaluation follow-up system in place to track whether evaluation recommendations have been implemented.
- For decentralized organizations, build a pyramid (hold a sort of TOT) so that information about M&E and skill building training can be shared down through the organization.

Box 4. Highlights of Participant Action Plans for Helping their ATSEC Chapters Strengthen the Evaluation Capacity

West Bengal:	Do a sample or "model" evaluation of joint program being run by several ATSEC members to help everyone learn about evaluation and its benefits.
Northeast Region of India:	As a team help members undertake one or two evaluations in the region over the year for partner organizations.
Haryana:	Undertake a trafficking situation report that deals with trafficking coming through Haryana from other states; invite states like ATSEC/Rajasthan that did not come to the training to participant as a way to build skills.
Delhi:	Inventory existing evaluation skills and systems in member organizations; establish coordination on M&E among members
Bangladesh:	Provide an orientation to member organizations and help partners to do evaluations
Nepal:	Conduct an information sharing activity with members and help them develop an ATSEC M&E strategy
Bihar:	Inventory members as to their definitions and understandings of M&E and then work with them to arrive at a common understanding
Jarkhand:	Provide an orientation to M&E to members as a preliminary step and then work toward a common understanding among all ATSEC members.
Sri Lanka:	Inventory evaluation skills among members and form a larger M&E team or committee that can do a TOT session and then help other members improve M&E
MP and Chattisgarh:	Develop a common understanding of M&E "systems" and their purposes
Orissa:	Working as a team with Jarkhand and Wes Bengal help ATSEC Chapters develop and idea of what good M&E looks like and an understanding of what is already being done by chapter members.

still new to evaluation and may need quick assistance, even in the form of answers to questions from their course colleagues, especially in the first year after program completion.

Based on past experience, course instructors are reasonably confident that, in NGOs where there is support at the top for monitoring and evaluation improvements, participants from this course will be able to take their organizations forward in these areas.

With respect to making the same sort of gains at the ATSEC chapter level, additional steps may be needed to ensure that a climate for improved monitoring and evaluation is created where participants can flourish. This responsibility lies with the ATSEC network, in particular with the head of ATSEC/India who also serves as the chair of the ATSEC regional network. Setting the stage for chapter-level and network-wide improvements in monitoring and evaluation will require encouraging the ATSEC chapters to open the door for the kinds of assistance that Certificate Program graduates can provide. It will also require following up with course graduates on a periodic basis to see what has been accomplished. To that end, both the CAP team and the head of ATSEC/India have retained full copies of the Action Plans prepared by participants for each of the ATSEC chapters represented in the course. In addition to following up with individual participants or clusters of participants, ATSEC/India needs to consider how to draw upon the knowledge and skills of course graduates to develop awareness and skills in evaluation in States chapters not represented.

Annexes

Annex A	**Course Curriculum**
Annex B	**Illustrative Agendas for Phases I and III**
Annex C	**Participant List**
Annex D	**Evaluation Review Criteria**
Annex E	**Pre-Test and Course Evaluations**
Annex F	**Participant Meta-Analysis Worksheets**

Annex A. Core Phase I Curriculum – MSI Certificate Program in Evaluation

- **The Evolution of the Concept** introduces participants to a range of ideas about the purpose of evaluation, the role of stakeholders in the evaluation process and other concepts that help to define this discipline.
- **Evaluation in the Project Cycle** places evaluation into the context of development programs.
- **Evaluation and the Evaluation Officer in USAID**. This module, which is linked to evaluation culture, was designed to provide participants with an understanding of the pioneer role USAID has played in evaluation among development agencies and the importance it continues to attach to evaluation as a management tool.
- **Monitoring and Evaluation – What's the Difference**? This module highlights the evolution of monitoring from a concern with budget and schedule to the kind of performance monitoring systems found in development organizations today. The different and complementary roles of monitoring and evaluation are defined.
- **Evaluation Scopes of Work (SOW)**. This module focuses on all of the elements of an evaluation scope of work and the role these elements play in procurement and in guiding the work of an evaluation team.
- **Evaluation Questions**. This is a core module that highlights the importance of questions as focus of an evaluation. Differences in the types of questions that are appropriate for mid-term, final, and impact evaluations are examined.
- **Evaluation Schedule and Budget**. This module complements the SOW module by providing guidelines from experience about the level of effort needed for each stage of an evaluation. Basic scheduling concepts are also reviewed. The module focuses on the fact that time and budget constraints on evaluations require evaluators to make practical choices with respect to the methods to be used for data collection and analysis.
- **Values and Ethics in Evaluation**. Basic concepts are discussed, including the need to guard against bias, the need to avoid leading questions, and other common problems in evaluation.
- **Building an Evaluation Team**. This module briefly introduces basic team selection and management concepts appropriate to evaluation.
- **Evaluation Design**. This module focuses on the development of a framework for carrying out an evaluation. The methods that are used to develop evaluation questions play a central role in soliciting responses that are appropriate and manageable. Evaluation plans are presented as composites of the best methodologies selected to address the questions in evaluation SOW.
- **Sampling**. This topic is included to assist participant evaluation teams in selecting sites they will visit as well as individuals they will interview. Probability and non-probability sampling are explained and the appropriate uses of both defined.
- **Data Collection Toolbox.** This module introduces participants to a wide range of data collection approaches including observation, the use of instruments to collect information and interrogation, or the art of asking questions. Reactive and non-reactive methods of data collection are discussed.
- **Data Analysis** is a module that teaches participants to focus on how data will be analyzed when an evaluation plan is prepared. Basic analysis techniques are presented for quantitative and qualitative data.
- **Evaluation Reports.** This module focuses on the differences between findings, conclusions and recommendations. A sample report outline is provided, highlighting these three elements and indicating what kinds of materials are best relegated to an evaluation report annex.

Additional Topics – MSI Certificate Program in Evaluation

- **Program Theory**. This segment focuses on the underlying logic of the types of projects participants will evaluate.
- **Evaluation in the USAID Automated Directives System**. This module, which is sometimes useful as a closing to Phase I review module, takes participants through the USAID ADS on evaluation, allowing them to discover at the end of the course that they already understand all parts of this guidance.
- **Utilization of Evaluations**. This module focuses on steps that can be taken both at the start of an evaluation and once it is completed to help ensure that utilization occurs. This issue is introduced in Phase I through discussions and key readings. The issue is addressed in greater detail in Phase III.
- **Assessing Cost-Effectiveness through Evaluation.** This module provides an overview of techniques for incorporating a cost-effectiveness analysis in an evaluation. Given time constraints, and that participants are not expected to incorporate this type of analysis in their field work in Phase II, this module is often presented during Phase III.
- **Multi-Method Evaluation**. As evaluations increasingly utilize a multi-method strategy for gathering data, the need has arisen for techniques that help evaluators integrate information from different sources in their analysis. The module introduces an innovative approach for weighting data from different sources.
- **Data Quality.** The module on data quality helps participants put the experience they gain in assessing the quality of evaluations carried out during the course into a broader context. This module draws on USAID's ADS data quality assessment guidance.
- **Program, Cross-Site and Meta Evaluation.** This module introduces participants to program level evaluation, which for USAID includes evaluations undertaken at the level of a Strategic Objective. The module also covers cross-site evaluations, which for USAID, often means topical evaluations of similar activities in several Missions. Meta-evaluation, a term that is generally used to describe reviews of existing evaluations to assess either their quality or the substantive lessons they provide is also included in this module. Practical application of both meta-evaluation techniques and cross-site evaluation techniques takes place during Phase III of the course.
- **Gender in Evaluation.** The module focuses on a variety of issues that may trigger data disaggregation, e.g., concerns about differential impacts on people living in different locations; of different age groups or ethnic backgrounds; with different levels of education or income, etc. Participants learn to address gender in evaluations and how this variable may impact data collection and analysis.
- **Participatory Evaluation**. This topic, touched on in Phase I, is revisited, in the light of participant field experiences. Having carried out an evaluation, course participants have a better basis for understanding both the complexity and potential value of involving a range of stakeholders, including beneficiaries, in evaluations at the design stage, during data collection and analysis; in the framing of recommendations, and as recipients of evaluation results.
- **Evaluation Standards.** This module introduces participants to a set of standards for practitioners of evaluation that have been established and promulgated by the American Evaluation Association. The module also examines the cross-cultural validity of these standards, drawing upon participant knowledge of their own cultures and upon published research into the cross-cultural validity of these evaluation standards. Evaluation Capacity in the Region. This module introduces course participants to efforts underway around the world to build evaluation capacity at the national level in developing and transition countries. Participants receive information on grass-roots evaluation networks and associations that are emerging in these countries. In Africa, this discussion focused on the continent wide African Evaluation Association and linked national-level organizations at the national level in a number of countries.

Annex B. Illustrative Agendas for Phases I and III

Phase I Certificate Program in Evaluation
Indicative Schedule – ATSEC -- Not Exact

Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
9:00	*Welcome and Introductions* *Course Structure and Objectives*	*What Makes an Evaluation Influential?* *Evaluation Questions*	*Evaluation Design*	The Art of Asking Questions *Review of team efforts to prepare interview questions and an observation checklist.*	Teams Presentations (Oral/Written) of their Evaluation Plans
10:45	Break	Break	Break	Break	Break
11:00	*Evaluation in the Program Cycle* Travel Reimbursements	"Client" views on key evaluation questions. Team time to develop evaluation questions and get ready for afternoon presentations	*The Data Collection Toolkit*	*Selecting Samples from a Population*	Presentations continue *Teams turn in their Evaluation Plans at end of their presentation*
1:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	
2:00	*Preparing for an Evaluation* Teams Established for Phase II Evaluations	Team presentations of program theory and evaluation questions – 5 minutes per team & 5 minutes discussion	Teams start work on their Evaluation Plans (*Getting to Answers*) Values and Ethics in Evaluation	*Data Analysis*	Planning for Phases II and III *Participant evaluation of Phase I*
3:45	Break	Break	Break	Break	Break
4:00	Team time: Investigate team information kit ▪ Write or diagram the project/ program logic *on Tuesday)*	*Effective Evaluation Teams* ▪ Self-interview teammates *Evaluation Schedules and Budgets* ▪ Discuss travel and hotel preferences with Narmada by end of the day	Preparing for field work. Each team prepares two tools for their evaluation tool kit: ▪ Draft interview questions ▪ Draft a checklist for something the team needs to observe.	Team time to complete their Evaluation Plans	Session ends
5:30	Session Ends	Session Ends	Session Ends	Session Ends	
On Your Own	Reading: Influential Evaluations (Tab 1.F)	Reading: Complete assignment on reviewing evaluations and assessments	Readings: Interviews (Tab 8 K) Objectivity in Social Science Research (Tab 7 A)	Reading: Guide to Construction of an Evaluation Report (Tab 11.A)	

Phase III Certificate Program in Evaluation
Indicative Schedule – ATSEC -- Not Exact

Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
8:30	Welcome Back Review of team experiences/key problems faced *Process for Presenting and Reviewing Evaluation Reports*	6th Team Presentation 7th Team Presentation	Team Time on Report Revisions	Back to the Future: ▪ *Strengthening Monitoring Systems* ▪ *Incorporating Cost-Effectiveness into Evaluations*	Teams turn in Revised Evaluation Reports *Roles and Responsibilities in Integrating Evaluation into the ATSEC programs*
10:15	Break	10:45 Break	Break	Break	Break
10:30	1st Team Presentation 2nd Team Presentation	Summary Comments from ATSEC & USAID Stakeholders – Focus for Finalizing Reports *Synthesizing Findings from Mixed Method Evaluations*	Team Time on Revisions continues	Presentations from Meta-Evaluation Working Groups	***Developing Action Plans*** **Time to Work on Action Plans** *Action Plan Reports*
12:30	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
1:30	3rd Team Presentation 4th Team Presentation	Instructor Overview of Priorities for Team Evaluation Revisions Team Time: Teams establish priorities and team assignments for rewriting report to meet Friday deadline & get started	*Program Evaluation* Meta-Evaluation Questions and Procedures for Working Groups	*Evaluation Culture - - Discussion* **Evaluation Standards** *Strengthening the Utilization of Evaluations*	Building Evaluation Capacity in South Asia Course evaluation Graduation Party & Certificates Issued
3:15	Break	Break	Break	Break	Course Ends
3:30	5th Team Presentation	Team Time	Working Groups continue and prepare presentations.		
Session ends daily at 5:00					
	Participants complete all scoring sheets to turn in by Tuesday noon		Reading: *Evaluation Culture*		

Annex C. Participant List

Name	ATSEC Member Represented		Phase I	Phase II	Phase III
	Organization	Country			
Itrat Jahan	Association for Community Development – ACD	Bangladesh	●	●	●
Syed Manir Hossain	UDDIPAN	Bangladesh	●	●	●
Kohinoor Begum	BNWLA	Bangladesh	●	●	●
Sabin Gurung	Maiti Nepal	Nepal	●	●	●
Eranga Amali Kalupahana	Migrant Services Centre	Sri Lanka	●	●	●
Hemant Borker	Lok Vikas Evam Anusandham Trust, Indore (M.P.)	India	●	●	●
Tashkeel Khan	STOP, New Delhi	India	●	●	●
A.G. Kharbhih	Impulse (ATSEC India) Shillong,	India	●	●	●
Sandhya Mangsataram	IWCDC, Imphal	India	●	●	●
Aprajita Mishra	ATSEC – Jharkhand	India	●	●	●
Kirti Mishra	Development Support Team ATSEC – Haryana,	India	●	●	●
Kishore Mohanty	fellowship Bhadrak, Orissa,	India	●	●	●
Dipak Prasad	Centre for Development Civil Society Organization	India	●	●	●
Polsani Ajit Rao	HELP , ATSEC – Andhra Pradesh	India	●	●	●
Ajit Sarma	Voluntary Health Association of Tripura	India	●	●	●
Alokshendra Pratap Singh	Vigyan Foundation, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh	India	●	●	●
Rajesh Kumar	ATSEC, Bihar, Jan Jagaran Sansthan	India	●	●	●
Rupa Kumari	Jan Jagaran Sansthan, ATSEC Bihar,	India	●	●	●
M. Sarika	Paraj samajik Sanstha, Uttranchal	India	●	●	●
Aparna Singh	ATSEC, Delhi Prayas	India	●	●	●
N. Kanchanamala	Tamil Nadu, Indian community welfare organization	India	●	●	●
Debashish Das	ATSEC, West Bengal, organization- women's Interlink foundation	India	●	●	●
Mouhua Sur Roy	ATSEC, west Bengal, organization- Bhorukha Public Welfare Trust	India	●	●	●
Rupa Bhattacharya	ATSEC – West Bengal, organization- SLARTC	India	●	●	●
Narmada Purohit	None (MSI staff)	India	●	●	●

Annex D. Evaluation Review Criteria

Evaluation Review Criteria	Rating[4]
Does the Executive Summary concisely state the main points of the evaluation?	
Does the report adequately summarize the context in which the activity took place and the problem it addressed.	
Does the report include a copy of the full evaluation Scope of Work as an annex?	
Does the report clearly state the purpose of the evaluation?	
Does it describe the evaluation questions clearly in the body of the report?	
Does the report adequately separate and specify the project's inputs, its direct results (outputs), higher level results and goals, so that a new reader would understand the logical structure of the project and what it was suppose to accomplish?	
If the logical structure of intended results was unclear in the project's documentation, does the report attempt to restate the project's intentions in a more logical sequence or manner, i.e., setting the stage for a systematic review of accomplishments?	
Does the evaluation state how the team planned to determine whether activities and intended results were achieved? Does it identify the indicators the project expected would be used to judge success at each level of the project's logical structure?	
Does the evaluation provide a clear description of how it went about collecting data on activities and each of the levels of results it examined, i.e., are data collection methods described in terms of the specific kinds of data they were used to gather, or simply listed all together?	
Did the evaluation team describe any creative or innovative solutions they used deal with data collection problems they faced?	
Are the evaluation's data limitations, i.e., its weak areas from a methods and data standpoint identified?	
Are the evaluations FINDINGS clear and related to major dimensions of the project, i.e., activities, direct results, higher level results or goals? and to the evaluation questions the team set out to answer?	
Are FINDINGS supported by relevant quantitative or qualitative data?	
When quantitative data are presented as percentages, is it always clear what the total number of cases was for which the percentage was calculated, i.e., is the N (denominator) always stated?	
Is there an effort to explain FINDINGS about the project through an analysis of its "if-then" hypotheses about cause and effect relationships in the project design? Are alternative hypotheses considered, i.e., alternative reasons for success or failure other than the project activities?	
Is there a clear distinction in the evaluation report between CONCLUSIONS and FINDINGS?	
Is every CONCLUSION in the report supported by a specific or clearly define1d set of FINDINGS?	
Are RECOM1MENDATIONS presented separate from CONCLUSIONS?	
Are CONCLUSIONS that may have weak evidence to support them clearly identified?	
Are all RECOMMENDATIONS presented in the evaluation report clearly supported by a specific or clearly defined set of FINDINGS and CONCLUSIONS?	
Are the RECOMMENDATIONS presented relevant and practical?	
Are the RECOMMENDATIONS responsive to the purpose of the evaluation?	
Does the report have a Table of Contents	
Does the report have a Glossary, where acronyms are used extensively	
Does the report have questionnaires or other study instruments – as an appendix	
Are reference materials and works cited identified in an annex?	
Is the organization of the report clear, delineating each topic well and providing enough subheadings for easy reading?	
Does the presentation highlight important information in any special way?	
Is the analysis of data the team collected reasonably complete, i.e., data from all sources used and analyzed?	
Are charts and graphs used to present or summarize data?	
Does the evaluation report give the appearance of a thoughtful, well-researched and well organized effort to objectively evaluate what worked in the project, what did not and why?	

[4] O = No; 1 = Partial; 2 = Yes

Annex E.

Pre-Test Results

End of Phase I Evaluation

End of Phase III – Final Course Evaluation

USAID – CAP -- ATSEC
MSI Certificate Course in Evaluation – Phase I

Pre-Test

Name:_____
(optional)

A. How would you describe your previous experience with monitoring and evaluation? Put ***only one X in each column***, one to describe your formal knowledge of monitoring and one for evaluation.

Level of Experience	Monitoring	Evaluation
I have previously received formal training on this subject before	**8**	**7**
I have been informally trained on this subject by colleagues	**12**	**9**
I have read materials on this subject by never been trained by anyone	**9**	**5**
I have not read much nor been trained in this subject. It is new to me.	**10**	**8**

B. Are you directly responsible for monitoring or evaluation in the organization for which you work?

__1__ Yes, it is my main job
__14_ Yes, but it is only part of my job
__6__ No, it is not one of my direct responsibilities

C. Have you every participated on a team that carried out a formal or planned evaluation of a project?

__8__ Yes _13__ No

D. Even if you have not been trained before, there are some concepts with which you may be familiar. Please complete the table below by putting an X in the column that best describes your familiarity with each idea.

Concept or Idea Presented in the Training Program	How Well I Understand the Concept or Idea		
	Not well	Somewhat	Very well
The meaning of the term evaluation	2	16	3
The difference between a finding or fact, a conclusion and a recommendation	4	11	6
How to select a sample that is not biased	7	10	3
Why evaluators usually treat beneficiary data as being confidential.	4	15	2
When an evaluation is needed	2	12	6
How to use a cross-tabulation to display and analyze the answers to two questions at the same time.	9	10	1
When to use open-ended questions and when to used closed-ended questions	5	8	7
The difference between monitoring and evaluation	1	16	4
How to make observation a systematic data collection tool	7	9	2
What to do to increase the likelihood that an evaluation will be utilized	11	6	3
The difference between a group interview and a focus groups interview.	2	12	6
How to create a scale that can be used to gather data on opinions or perceptions	9	10	1

USAID – CAP -- ATSEC
MSI Certificate Course in Evaluation – Phase I

Participant End of Phase I Assessment

Name: _____
(optional)

A. Understanding of Concepts

(Place a X in the box that describes your level of understanding)

Concept or Idea Presented in the Training Program	How Well I Understand the Concept or Idea		
	Not well	Somewhat	Very well
The meaning of the term evaluation		4	20
The difference between a finding or fact, a conclusion and a recommendation	1	4	18
That both monitoring and evaluation gather information about *what* happened in a project or program		3	20
That evaluations are expected to provide information about *why* projects are/are not succeeding	2	3	18
That evaluation is different from auditing	1	7	16
How to select a sample that is not biased		7	15
Why evaluators usually treat beneficiary data as being confidential.		3	21
That the questions asked by clients and other stakeholders should be the main focus for an evaluation team	2	2	19
What to do to increase the likelihood that an evaluation will be utilized		9	13
That comparison – before and after, or Project A to Project B is		5	19

Concept or Idea Presented in the Training Program	How Well I Understand the Concept or Idea		
	Not well	Somewhat	Very well
almost always an element of a good evaluation			
How to use a cross-tabulation to display and analyze the answers to two questions at the same time.	4	12	8
That evaluation teams have a right/obligation to ask sponsors and clients to clarify the evaluation purpose and questions if they are not clear in an evaluation Scope of Work	2	5	17
When an evaluation is needed		2	22
How to write a closed-ended question		7	17
When to use open-ended questions and when to used closed-ended questions		7	17
That creating more precise definitions and measures for projects is often part of an evaluator's job.		14	10
That most project evaluations try to compare planned to actual performance	2	5	17
The difference between a probability and non-probability sample	3	7	14
How to make observation a systematic data collection tool	1	11	12
That an evaluation team must make a special effort if it wants to learn about the unplanned results of projects and programs	1	6	17
That when an innovative project is evaluated, the evaluation comparisons are sometimes built into the project design in the form of a "comparison" group that does not receive project services	2	7	14

Concept or Idea Presented in the Training Program	How Well I Understand the Concept or Idea		
	Not well	**Somewhat**	**Very well**
That existing data and information may be used by an evaluator. Evaluators do not have to rely only on the new data they collect themselves.	1	5	17
That the process of data collection can cause a reaction, i.e., that people often try to give evaluators the answers they think the evaluators want.		8	15
How to prepare tables and other formats for recording data from different interviews and site visits in a common way		7	15
The role of an evaluation officer in USAID	5	2	10
The difference between a group interview and a focus groups interview.			21
That evaluation teams actually design a structure or framework for an evaluation before they go out to gather data	1	3	19
How to create a scale that can be used to gather data on opinions or perceptions	1	10	12

B. Evaluation of the Workshop

Please rate the usefulness of workshop elements listed below using a ✔ in the appropriate column

Workshop Element		Participant Ratings of Usefulness of Training Elements **(One = low and Five = high)**				
		One	**Two**	**Three**	**Four**	**Five**
Trainers	Molly Hageboeck					20
	Sasha Borovykh					15
Course Content: Presentations and Slides	Monitoring and Evaluation					14
	Scope of Work		2	1	7	14
	Reconstructing Program Theory			6	6	12
	Evaluation Questions		1	4	3	16
	Teams, Schedule and Budget			5	6	13
	Managing Evaluation Teams			4	6	14
	Evaluation Design		1	3	6	12
	Data Collection Toolbox/Asking Questions			1	9	14
	Sampling			6	6	12
	Data Analysis			5	5	14
	Evaluation Reports			2	5	14
Participant Notebooks – Readings and Handouts				3	10	
Class Exercises	In Class Exercises				7	11
	Team Preparation for Phase II Evaluations			3	7	13
Opportunities for Participation and Discussion				6	17	

C. What was most useful in Phase I of the Course?

- Information on all the related subjects including examples and tasks this made themes easy to understand.
- Knowledge of programme theory of change.
- Difference between monitoring and evaluation; how to formulate evaluation questions
- Definition of monitoring and evaluation and the purpose of evaluation; Different stages and steps involved in evaluation
- Team work, individual presentation; the lessons about the evaluation.
- Having a clear understanding of M and E and the basic difference of them.
- Evaluation design. Everything was useful because this topic is very new to me; in phase 1 understand the importance of evaluation for a project and how we should evaluate a project in specific goals.
- Encouraging cooperative. Molly and Alexander gave their best efforts. I learned a lot of new things and am thankful for all of them.
- Slide presentation with examples
- Maintaining quality of evaluation
- Before this training M and E was almost unknown to me, but phase 1 has taught me what is M and E? Why is it necessary & how to do it?
- The rigors involved in framing the evaluation question and the clarity in distinction with research questions; understanding theory of change; Demystification of Quantitative data analysis; The course pack
- Designing logic frame and theory of change for any project; how to ask close-ended question; For any evaluation relying on different sources, not only one source.
- Teaching methodology; designing logical framework/Theory; designing questions for evaluation; data analysis (quantitative/qualitative); reporting
- Teamwork, communication + teaching method, theory
- Content, the course
- The session related to preparation of plan for evaluation plan including - ; session related to difference between findings, and recommendations
- Whole content was very useful
- Difference between M and E; Its usefulness, pros and cons; evaluation plan, its reporting; techniques used in evaluation report
- Definition of logical frame of monitoring and evaluation, interview process, question preparation, formatting

D. What was least useful during Phase I?

- I did not find any least important session
- More explanation regarding sampling & data analysis method are necessary if we want to be expert in M and E?
- All participants should participate
- Difference form Auditing

- Wood pencil and the writing pad provided during training

E. Suggestions for topics I would like to learn about in Phase III of the course (the second classroom phase, after teams have completed their field work).

- Oral presentation skills 2) writing good evaluation reports 3) skills that a good evaluation officer possesses
- Monitoring – LFA; Preparing reports
- More detail on monitoring; theory of change
- More info on monitoring and how to monitor the project in our own organization. Difference between monitoring and evaluation
- Monitoring
- I like to have a clear and vast concept of the topic Monitoring with support
- More on evaluation
- As I feel monitoring is equal important part of the evaluation we need to put some kind of thrust on the monitoring also; performance appraisal will help us in monitoring the staff performance we need to look into that also
- I shall eagerly wait for phase III of this course
- Monitoring
- Step by step procedures of conducting monitoring and evaluation program with examples
- Precise on steps of evaluation, its' methods, etc.
- Data analysis should be brief
- Monitoring tools
- Monitoring project implementation
- Monitoring and data analysis
- More focus on the monitoring of project design; monitoring of programs indication and methodology tools
- Monitoring, record keeping, monitoring reporting
- Monitoring reporting
- A detailed discussion/session on monitoring
- Monitoring
- More on data analysis (which analysis is applicable for which situation); Monitoring the program and find out the drawbacks of that and implement in the existing program
- Monitoring, its importance; methods used, how to prepare a monitoring report; design

USAID – CAP -- ATSEC
MSI Certificate Course in Evaluation – Phase III

End of Course Evaluation

A. Purposes of the Certificate Program

The Certificate Program in Evaluation had six objectives:

1. Understand the role of evaluation in the program and activity management cycle.
2. Improve skills needed to prepare high quality, utilization-focused evaluation Scopes of Work.
3. Understand the importance of ethics in evaluation.
4. Develop the capacity to carry out an evaluation that will produce the kinds of information needed to answer evaluation questions.
5. Learn how to review and critique evaluation plans and draft evaluation reports – with an eye to improving them.
6. Improve understanding of how to utilize evaluation findings to inform management decisions.

Overall Achievement of Course Objectives

Keeping in mind these objectives, please give us your honest assessment of this course:

		Fully	Partially	Marginally	No
1	Did the course achieve Objective 1?	24			
2	Did the course achieve Objective 2?	23	1		
3	Did the course achieve Objective 3?	18	6		
4	Did the course achieve Objective 4?	19	5		
5	Did the course achieve Objective 5?	20	4		
6	Did the course achieve Objective 6?	20	4		

B. Phase I: Classroom Training

Thinking back to Phase I of this course, please answer the following questions

		Too Much	Right Amount	Not Quite Enough	Not at all
7	Did the classroom experience in October provide you with sufficient theory on the purposes, ethics and evolution of evaluation?	6	16		
8	Did the classroom experience give you enough information on evaluation design to develop a valid and efficient approach to your field evaluation assignment?	7	17		
6	Did the classroom experience give you enough information on methods of collecting data for you to select and apply appropriate data collection methods to your field assignment?	11	11	2	
7	Did the classroom experience give you enough information on data analysis techniques for you to organize, summarize, interpret and display the data you collected?	7	11	5	
8	Did the classroom experience give you enough insight into good project design for you to identify project design weaknesses in the projects you evaluated as part of your field assignment?	5	17	2	
9	Did the classroom experience give you enough information to write a professional report on the evaluation you carried out during your field assignment?	5	17	2	

10. What suggestions do you have to make about improving Phase I of this course?

- More time and detailed explanations
- Not long enough
- More in-house teamwork
- Learn more monitoring system techniques
- More time and group work
- Go in-depth about monitoring

C. Phase II: On-Site Evaluation

Thinking back to the evaluation you carried out as part of a team, please answer the following questions. If you did not participate in the fieldwork portion of this course, please skip to Section D of this questionnaire.

		Fully	Partially	Marginally	Not at all
11	Was your "team" able to function effectively as a "team" in the manner that the course had suggested is appropriate for evaluation work?	19	5		
12	Looking back, do you feel that your team developed an adequate plan for its fieldwork?	19	5		
13	Looking back, do you feel that you collected the data that you needed to prepare your evaluation report?	8	15	1	
14	Looking back, do you feel that you adequately analyzed the data you collected?	11	13		
15	Looking back, do you feel that you had enough time to complete your field assignment?	12	7	2	3

16. If you did not have enough time, what aspect of your evaluation suffered from insufficient time?

- Proper coordination
- Analysis findings
- No interviews with targeted stakeholders by evaluation team
- Data collection
- Meeting with people
- Data gathering and translation
- Gathering qualitative data
- Collection of field data

17. Was the choice of evaluating community development projects a good idea?

19 Yes, 5 No Reply

18. Did the Phase II on-site evaluation research and report writing phase of this course justify the expense and effort involved?

17 Fully 6 Partially 1 Marginally0 Not at all

19. What suggestions do you have to make about improving Phase II of this course?

- Have experienced evaluators leading every phase
- More follow-up evaluation
- Issue letters informing NGOs of training and evaluation phases
- Not enough time
- Team should not be all new members
- More time to complete field reports
- More background info of organizations to be evaluated
- Members should have better understanding of local language

D. Phase III: Classroom Work

		Very important	Important	Marginally Important	Not at all
20	How important to your overall experience was the task of making a presentation on your evaluation?	21	3		
21	How important for you was the discussion among all teams of their field assignment experiences?	20	4		
22	How important was the feedback session for your team with the course instructors?	20	4		
23	How important was your participation in an effort to look across the project evaluations and develop general findings about the whole group of projects, i.e., the cross-project analysis?	17	5	1	
24	How useful were the additional training sessions presented during this classroom phase (see list below)	7	6		
25	Data Quality	14	7	2	
26	Program, Cross-Site and Meta-Evaluation Approaches	17	4	1	
27	Evaluation Standards	15	6	3	

28. What suggestions do you have to make about improving Phase III of this course?

- More explanation of topics
- Too little time
- Do another presentation of the field report
- Focus more on data analysis
- Focus more on monitoring
- Monotonous
- More time on evaluation standards
- Introduce fewer concepts on the last day

E. Final Thoughts

29. Please mark the statements which best describe the overall assessment of the impact of this course on your knowledge and skills. (Put a mark in the 3rd column for as many statements as may as apply)

a	The course was interesting but it is not likely that I will be able to use much in my future work.	2
b	I did not find much in this course that was relevant or useful for my work.	
c	I may not be able to participate in many evaluations in the future, but I now have a good understanding of how to use evaluations to learn more and improve my organization's programs	10
d	The course gave me enough experience that with some technical assistance, I am now confident that I am able to develop evaluation scopes of work that will result in evaluations my Mission finds informative and useful.	22
e	Because of what I learned in this course, I am now able to participate on an evaluation expert member of an evaluation team.	20
f	I now feel sufficiently confident of my evaluation skills that I could be a team leader and principle author of a project evaluation for USAID or any other international donor organization.	8
g	By funding my participation in this three week off-site course, my organization is unlikely to fund my participation in other training courses.	4
h	Because I am a part time Evaluation Officer in addition to other duties, this course was too long	2

30. Is there any information you learned in this course – or skills you developed – that you have already applied in your Mission. If you have already found ways to apply what you have learned to your work in your Mission, please briefly describe those applications.

- Methods of data collection
- Evaluation procedures

- Obtaining findings/drawing conclusions
- System evaluation
- Evaluation methods
- Developing program design
- Providing orientation to field staff
- Providing useful recommendations to management
- Theory of change

31. Reflecting on what you have learned in this course, how would you compare it to other USAID training courses you have take – considering both the length of the course and its cost to your Mission?

Much less useful than other USAID training courses I have taken	Somewhat less useful than other USAID training courses I have taken	About the same as other USAID training courses	Somewhat more useful than other USAID training courses I have taken	Much more useful than other USAID training courses I have taken
2			4	2

32. Reflecting on what you have learned through this course, can you suggest any other type of training course or experience that would have provided you with the same level of knowledge and skills – but at a lower cost, in terms your organization's investment of time, travel and other costs your organization bore directly to provide you with this training?

- Report writing
- Fundraising
- Follow-up training
- Project proposal development
- Project coordination
- Field research

33. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your experience with this course?

- More courses would be helpful
- Please send study materials
- Built confidence
- Didn't focus on monitoring
- Should be paid travel allowance in US $
- Inclusion of data collection methods and application thereof would have been useful

Annex F. Meta Evaluation Group Reports

Meta-Evaluation Template

Group: ___1__ Question: what evidence do the evaluations provide concerning relationships between NGOs and government in anti--trafficking and victim assistance program?

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[5]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Shelter – Prayas Prayas has good linkages with the government shelter home and in the year 2006 January to May, 13 girls rescued were sent to Nirmal chaya and 3 in Gay Ghat Patna. Girls from government shelter home comes and stay in prayas shelter home and receives vocational training for self empowerment (pg-6)	The NGO are sending the survivors to the government shelter home and even survivors from government shelter home are receiving vocational training but the evidence clearly does not indicate a good relationship as it is not clear that so many people have been rescued an so many sent to shelter home neither says out of the total number so many have received formal education.	Networking effort should utilize Govt. health, other social security and livelihood program and other infrastructure for the trafficked victims. This approach should be carried out by the State National & Regional Secretariat.
	Networking with government are being utilized in case of registration of new residents from the police custody and also in Govt. education structure but it can be utilized more in the case of Govt.'s health facilities and existing vocational scheme for the residents of home. The evidence shows that the surveillance	The nature and duration of the training with specific goals and objectives should be clearly mentioned so as to evaluate its performance and achievement in real terms. The state Chapter should develop follow up strategy
Shelter - Maiti Nepal Has developed surveillance groups and they are working with the police personnel and the Village development committee and 52 persons are engaged in the surveillance groups and they are working in the Indo Nepal Border. The surveillance groups are		

5 Include the page number for evidence cited for cases (draft version of report)

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[5]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
working towards the reintegration and prevention of trafficking of women and children with close liaison of the police personnel and the VDC at transit points along the border.	group in coordination with police personnel and VDC are doing vigilance to rescue the trafficked victim but there is no data available on how many victims have been rescued by the surveillance groups. Though there is enough numbers of training on prevention of trafficking involving a good number of participants but there is no evidence (data/any report) on impact of training to achieve the goal. Odanadi administration has not to much of mutual understanding with police administration and hence mutually the rescue process is not much of effective.	with logical framework and along with they should go for periodic evaluation of the program. ATSEC state chapter should work complementary to the govt. and their should be more number of orientation , Exposure of govt. officials and NGO along with.
Shelter - WIF The survivors of WIF(out of 60, 45 children) get formal education from the government school.		
Awareness - SLARTC SLARTC has conducted a lot of orientation and sensitization programs for the judiciary(five districts and 25-30 judges in one program), lawyers, panchayat members(19 districts with 50-60 participants) and police officials including BSF (pg-8)		
Awareness – ATSEC/Bihar 18 meetings with the Panchayti Raj Institutions with 30 participants in one meeting, 16 with the police officials with 30 participants.		
Rescue – Odanadi The director of OdanadiI stated that the police process is very slow(taking permission from superior takes time). The police states that Odanadi should take up the job of reintegration and repatriation and rescue operation should only be left		

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[5]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
for the police to take up.		
Rescue - STOP Delhi High court has initiated a **Suo Moto** based on which STOP and police will be involved in all rescue operation, STOP will arrange the stay of girls in government shelter home and STOP and the home authorities will provide trauma counseling, medical assistance and other facilities to the survivors, Stop will handover the girl to the relevant NGO in presence of state government officials and STOP will monitor the process of reintegration and reports matter to the high court on a regular basis. (In year 2005 68 survivors have been rescued but since its inception 520 have been rescued and 483 have been repatriated .		

Meta-Evaluation Template

Group: ___1__ Question: what do the shelter and rescue evaluations tell us about the kinds of psychosocial interventions NGOs undertake in programs where they are working with trafficking victim/survivors and the effectiveness of those psychosocial interventions?

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[6]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Shelter – Prayas There is immediate counseling, trauma & regular counseling when need arises. The initial counseling remains focused on the Rules and Regulations of the home and common to all the children. There is also proper documentation of each case. (pg-8)	The focus of mental health issues is not getting priority. It is observed that the NGOs are only focusing on counseling to reduce the trauma. It is observed that the assessment of stages of psychosocial changes in survivors is not properly reflected in case file. Lack of routine and process counseling. There is not enough counselor recruited in the shelter home to do the regular	In terms of psycho social intervention the NGO should include other types of therapy such as behavioral therapy to reduce trauma. There should be proper document of each counseling sessions to measure the stages of development as well as the impact of counseling in survivors mind. ATSEC chapter who are in process of shelter and rescue process should have routine counseling (one to one and group counseling)

6 Include the page number for evidence cited for cases (draft version of report)

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[6]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Shelter - Maiti Nepal All supervisors of the home get regular counseling. 1 senior counselor, 2 asst counselors are presently working in this unit. Each individual victim goes through 7-8 counseling sessions by three months. After adequate sessions if counselor feels she can send her to the psychiatrist for proper medication. (pg-9) In case any survivors face any stigma/discrimination at the family/ society, the counseling unit counsels the parents as well as the neighborhood as long as it needed. There are some social motivators also working for this purpose who make a rapport with the victim's family to make the situation in favor of the victim. (pg-9)	counseling.	by the professional and there should be proper documentation of psycho – social improvement of victim. The State Chapter should possess the professional counselor in capacity proportion with the resident in the shelter. (1counselor:30resident.) for 4 session of counseling with each resident in a month.

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[6]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Shelter - WIF The staff of the home are quite sensitized to handle the trafficking issues and they have good bondage between residents and staff. But it was also found out of 60 residents 5 to 6 cases who are running under depression, trauma and mental agony who need regular counseling. There is no regular counselor in the home and neither any systematic counseling are takes place. One of the staff used to do the counseling as and when required.(pg-9).		
Awareness – SLARTC Not applicable		
Awareness – Not applicable		
Rescue – Odanadi One counselor do the counseling of 86 residents based on their need.		
Rescue – STOP Two counselors are doing counseling for 50 residents in the home. They are also doing counseling to the Nirmal chaya. There are 50 survivors who are acting as peer counselor.		

Meta-Evaluation Template

Group: 2 Question: What evidence do the evaluation provide about the role of the communities in antitrafficking and victim assistance programs

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[7]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Shelter – Prayas: Report: Interaction with the children of the bal greh, sponsorship program in terms of aid/donation for education, clothing and health Lack of systematic follow up and linkages with the reintegrated children (Page 6, 7, 8, 11)	For Combating of trafficking involvement of IRPFs, PRIs, NGOs, SHGs, affected communities & civilian societies is very important.	ATSEC should promote the best practices throughout the region through its member chapters. ATSEC should develop a resource pool for supporting all the partner organizations in the region. Chain of network should be formed for the rescued victims??????
Shelter - Maiti Nepal Report, document Involvement of VDC- rescue, shelter, reintegration and rehabilitation(Page No. 10)		

7 Include the page number for evidence cited for cases (draft version of report)

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[7]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Shelter - WIF: Report, meeting, interview Community is sending their children to the shelter home of WIF (page 2 & 23		
Awareness – SLARTC: Report, photograph, group interview Involvement of women SHGs, youth groups in awareness through nukkad natak, campaign etc.		
Awareness – ATSEC/Bihar: Meeting, report, interview, field visit IRPF model (page no. 23) Involvement of PRIs (page no. 21) Involvement of NGOs (24)		

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[7]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Rescue – Odanadi: interview with district coordinator, Mandya, Documents & news paper clippings Vigilance committee in the three districts/village/taluka-prevention/rescue/monitoring vulnerable groups Role of media- dissemination of trafficking stories &initiating debates, press conference (page no. 17)		
Rescue – STOP: Interview with the vigilance committee member, news paper clippings Information & plan to conduct raid, shelter for temporary basis, pressurizes law enforcement, Role of media, women volunteer for conducting awareness (page no. 5)		

Question – 2: awareness of trafficking dangers, laws, regulations, trafficker methods?

Appropriate ways of working with victims, survivors, vulnerable group, communities, local government, police, prosecutors and judges, and shelter home staff?

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[8]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Shelter – Prayas Rehabilitation of the children in the shelter home can not be limited for the over all growth and development of the children after their reintegration with the communities. Poor follow up of the reintegrated children/families Lack of capacitated staff in the field of psychosocial counseling, Lack of supportive baseline documents and records maintenance. (KII interview, documents, & FGD)	Awareness generation programs for the targeted stakeholders are not sufficient to address the issue of trafficking Holistic approach for the victims welfare is lacking	long term intervention programs for awareness generation and victims support should be implemented by the ATSEC
Shelter - Maiti Nepal: Unit of psychosocial counseling should maintain updated registers (Page 12) (Discussion, interview, documents)		

8 Include the page number for evidence cited for cases (draft version of report)

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[8]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Shelter - WIF: The behaviour of residential staff towards the inmates was quite rational and there are quite sensitive towards the issue. Teachers providing backup services for the inmates were not effective. There was not much variation in the vocational trainings provided to the victims of trafficking and SGBT. (KII interview, GD,)		
Awareness – SLARTC: Migration, poverty, Follow up sessions More involvement of departments, In-depth orientation to the grass root project staffs (Interview, GD)		

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[8]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Awareness – ATSEC/Bihar: The state of Bihar is very vulnerable due to open border with Nepal, extreme poverty, socio-cultural scenario, existence of strong networks of pimps, lack of awareness and high rate illiteracy. Poor implementation of ITPA & JJ Act Sensitization workshop at various level IEC material in local languages (Interview, report) page- 6,21, 22		
Rescue – Odanadi: (Page 1) Documents based on Odanadi Study: Trafficker methods: not limited to prostitution alone but also for purposes like forced labor, for illegal marriages, domestic slavery, organ transplantation and for camel races Formation of Manabi Seva Sangha (collective) Unconventional psychosocial counseling such as cycle jatha, walking expedition, inculcating hobbies, (page 26, 27, case studies, group interview)		

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[8]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Rescue – STOP: Due to extreme disparity of wealth continuing and pervasive inequality due to class, caste, gender biases, erosion of traditional family system and values the victims are attracted with the lure of money and cities but to their ignorance and illiteracy easily caught in the hand of pimps/traffickers Media sensitization work shop Legal manual for documenting the best practices to be adopted by the judiciary and law enforcement agencies. Follow up of repatriated victims (Interview, legal manual, report) Page no- 18 & 19		

Meta Evaluation

Group: 3 (Amali, Aparna, A. G. Kharbhih, Hemant, Kishore, Manir, Rupa B, Rupa K)
Question: What evidence do the evaluations provide about the kinds of record keeping and activity and results monitoring being carried out in anti trafficking and victim assistance programs?

A: **Record Keeping**

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[9]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Shelter - Prayas Lack of documents maintaining. Case files photos, handouts, health cards, follow-up, reintegration records	All organizations are maintaining records but not in a systematic and organized manner	1.All organizations should strengthened their record keeping and documentation through capacity building programmes organized by ATSEC
Shelter - Maiti Nepal Supporting documents are inadequate, only clinical case files of every survivors and brochures are present		

[9] Include the page number for evidence cited for cases (draft version of report)

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[9]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Shelter - WIF Registers of residents were provided shelter, records of health status of residents are maintaining. Records of persons rescued in persons, photos of residents, records of residents given vocational training, records of persons got married, records of persons provided assistance for IG		
Awareness - SLARTC Inadequate numbers of annual report and project report as well, project documents/proposals are not filling in a systematic way, 60 government officials and panchyat members took part in orientation programme		
Awareness – ATSEC/Bihar Improper maintenance of records, registers, case files, documents related with training campaign were present		

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[9]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Rescue - Odanadi Documents were maintaining in local language i.e. not sharable, documents related with legal proceeding, files of press clippings, records of CD were present		
Rescue – STOP Records of legal proceeding were present but not sharable, records related with rehabilitation programmes are present		

Group-3

Question: What evidence do the evaluations provide about the kinds of record keeping and activity and results monitoring being carried out in anti trafficking and victim assistance programs

B: Activity & Result Monitoring

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[10]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Shelter – Prayas Care and protection, Counselling, sponsorship, educational programme (Formal & non-formal), vocational training, Income generating activities (Sanchey Prayas, Petrol Pump, Beauty Parlor), After Care (Balgreh), extracurricular activities, medical facilities	Many activities are being implemented by the organizations but the results of few activities are monitored	1. All activities should be result Oriented. For these, the project ma Managers should take initiative in Implementing result oriented activities 2. There should be regular Monitoring system(external &internal) created by ATSEC
Shelter - Maiti Nepal Counselling, education (Formal & non-formal), vocational training, medical facilities, legal awareness programme, Broader Surveillance team		
Shelter - WIF Counselling, education (Formal & non-formal), vocational training, medical facilities,		

10 Include the page number for evidence cited for cases (draft version of report)

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[10]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Awareness - SLARTC Development of IEC material, Baseline surveys, training of police, panchat and judiciary, vocational training for youth and self help group,		
Awareness – ATSEC/Bihar Training programme for stakeholders, diciary, vocational training, rally awareness campaign, screening of films on trafficking		
Rescue - Odanadi Rescue, training programmes, legal support to victims, counseling, psychosocial therapies, Manavi Sewa Sangha, Vigilinat Committees , vocational activities, helpline		
Rescue – STOP Rescue, legal support to victims, counseling, psychosocial therapies, Community Vigilance Group,		

Meta-Evaluation Template

Group: 3

Question: What evidence do the evaluations provide about the kinds of activities undertaken in NGO programs to ensure that victim/survivors who leave shelters or rescue situations remain safe and are not re-trafficked and the effectiveness of these activities?

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[11]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Shelter - Prayas Conducting in-house training (vocational training, life skills), sponsorship programmes, after care, educational programmes, home visits, networking, correspondence, family counseling, counseling with medical aid	• Follow-up system of trafficked survivors are not adequate • Some organization are identified best practices like Manvi Sewa Sangha, Inter-religion Priest Forum, which were effective in rehabilitation and	• Effective follow-up systems should be developed by the Partner organizations • Best practices should be replicated by ATSEC Members
Shelter - Maiti Nepal Counselling, legal awareness, broader surveillance group, networking with VDC, vocational training, education		

[11] Include the page number for evidence cited for cases (draft version of report)

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[11]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Shelter - WIF Vocational training, education, marriage, linkage with banks, formation of self help groups, implementing integrated development programmes for at risk community, community building	reintegration of survivors	
Awareness - SLARTC Networking, formation of self help groups, formation of youth group, advocate groups, workshop with duty bearers and care givers		
Awareness – ATSEC/Bihar Networking, vigilance committees, self help groups, Inter-religious Priest Forum,		
Rescue - Odanadi Unconventional psychosocial therapies like Cycling Jatha/Walking Expedition, Manavi Sewa Sangha, vigilance committees, rehabilitation, vocational training, education, counseling		

Data or Evidence Found Regarding the Question in the Evaluations[11]	Group's Interpretations or Conclusions about what the Evidence Found in the Evaluations Means or Implies	Group's Answer to the Question that Was Posed – What the Group Thinks USAID Should be Told Regarding this Question
Rescue – STOP Community based vigilance, vocational training, counseling, education, life skill training, legal support		