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INTRODUCTION

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID)/Vietnam Learns activity monitoring, evaluation, and learning plan (AMELP) clarifies the team’s approach to monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL).

Learns’ implementation is guided by a logic model and theory of change outlined beginning on page 3 that was updated in April 2020. The MEL approaches, priorities, and performance indicators in this plan flow from this logic model and theory of change and are outlined in detail below. In line with Automated Directives System (ADS) 201, this AMELP specifies:

- anticipated results under the activity;
- methods by which Learns will:
  - track progress towards results,
  - learn from implementation,
  - adapt implementation based on learning,
  - share its learning with key stakeholders; and,
- resource requirements and internal roles and responsibilities for MEL.

Learns has dedicated resources to operationalize this AMELP through its budget, including the labor categories which fund the Learns staff responsible for implementing this plan. A specific Learns staff member is responsible for each indicator and data collection approach, and for reporting results to USAID/Vietnam annually, semi-annually, or quarterly, depending on the indicator.

Updates to this plan will be provided to the Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR) for review and approval on an annual basis every September in line with work planning or when revisions to the plan are proposed.

The Learns team hopes that this AMELP can serve as an example for USAID/Vietnam’s implementing partners (IPs). Learns is committed to modeling effective MEL and collaborating, learning, and adapting (CLA) practices for effective activity management with the understanding that each activity, including Learns, should view AMELPs as a management tool which should be continuously used and regularly updated to capture ongoing learning and changing environments.
ABOUT LEARNS

ACTIVITY PURPOSE

As stated in the Learns contract, the purpose of the activity is to improve the effectiveness and sustainability of USAID/Vietnam’s programs. Learns aims to achieve this by promoting collaborative, evidence-informed programming at USAID and its partners. Learns support covers the range of USAID Program Cycle processes, including strategy implementation, project design and management, activity design and management, MEL, and CLA.

The specific contract objectives are to:

- strengthen USAID/Vietnam, IPs, and local entities’ (Government of Vietnam [GVN], local organizations) institutional capacity, particularly in monitoring, evaluation, learning, collaboration, and adaptive management, to achieve expected results.
- deepen use of monitoring, evaluation, and other types of data to support learning and improve performance at all levels.
- improve coordination, collaboration, and learning between USAID/Vietnam staff, GVN, IPs, and key stakeholders.

Given this scope, Learns works with multiple stakeholders, including USAID/Vietnam’s Program Development Office (PDO), technical offices and other support offices, IPs (including international and local partners), and other local stakeholders.

CONNECTION TO USAID PRIORITIES

While Learns does not formally fall under a USAID project, the purpose of the activity is to support USAID staff and IPs across the Mission’s entire portfolio and contribute to the achievement of the Mission’s updated strategy for 2020-2025. All offices across the Mission support Learns with a set budget allocation and, in turn, Learns provides Program Cycle support to USAID staff and partners. In this way, Learns supports all projects by better integrating monitoring, evaluation, collaborating, learning, and adapting approaches that support better design and implementation and ultimately better, more sustainable results as outlined in the logic model below.
THEORY OF CHANGE

CONTEXT

USAID/Vietnam has recently established a new Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) for 2020-2025, outlining its priorities for its development assistance in Vietnam. To effectively implement this strategy and manage towards results, the Mission has procured an institutional support contract (Learns) to act as a force multiplier for the Mission’s PDO. Learns staff and consultants provide ongoing technical assistance in Program Cycle processes (strategy, project design and implementation; activity design and implementation; MEL; and CLA) and build the capacity of USAID and partners in said processes.

The situation at the start of Learns (i.e., a snapshot of the current context) within the Mission and among its IPs per Program Cycle level (strategy, project, and activity) can be considered as follows:

- **Strategy design and implementation:** As of April 2020, the CDCS awaits final approval from USAID/Washington. The Mission needs support to:
  - communicate its new strategy within the Mission, among IPs, and to local stakeholders.
  - develop the Performance Management Plan (PMP) to track progress towards strategy-level results and support strategy-level learning and adapting.
  - reflect on implementation of the strategy and adapt the strategy as needed should the context change or new learning emerge.
  - connect strategy to other USAID/Washington strategic priorities such as the Journey to Self-Reliance (J2SR) and the Indo-Pacific Strategy (IPS).

- **Project design and implementation/management:** With the eventual approval of the CDCS, the Mission will be working through many updates to existing project designs and new project designs. The Mission needs support to:
  - develop project appraisal documents based on existing learning and in collaboration with key stakeholders.
  - develop or review project MEL plans to track progress towards project-level results and support project-level learning and adapting.
  - institutionalize the role of the project manager for effective management of projects.

- **Activity design and implementation:** Similarly, with new project designs, the Mission anticipates the procurement of new mechanisms. The Mission needs support to:
  - design new activities, including through co-creation approaches with local stakeholders and IPs.
  - support USAID and IPs in government approval processes at the activity level.
  - build the capacity of IPs in MEL and CLA to better manage their awards.
  - provide support to MEL planning, data quality assessments (DQAs), and learning at the activity level.

LOGIC MODEL & THEORY OF CHANGE

Against this backdrop, Learns supports USAID/Vietnam in its ultimate strategy-level goal of an “open, prosperous, and secure Vietnam that is effective and inclusive in tackling its own development challenges.” This overarching Mission strategy-level goal has been simplified to read “Sustainable and locally-owned development results achieved” for the purposes of demonstration in the center of Figure 1. Learns does not have direct control in achieving this goal, but its work will contribute to it by focusing on three interrelated activity objectives (the outer ring of Figure 1). The three objectives, as articulated here, relate directly to key performance objectives 1, 2, and 3 in the contract.
- Staff\(^1\) knowledge and skills in MEL and CLA improved
- Evidence\(^2\)-informed decision-making advanced (Evidence Use Component)
- Strategic\(^3\) collaboration between staff and local stakeholders strengthened (Local Engagement Component)

These three objectives are inter-related; for example, capacity building in conducting DQAs or in MEL planning will result in better quality data being available to inform decision-making. Similarly, collaboration with local stakeholders will result in potentially new perspectives and evidence that can inform decision-making. Capacity building for USAID staff in co-creation can also strengthen collaboration between staff and local stakeholders.

**FIGURE 1: LEARNS OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOME INDICATORS**

To achieve results, how Learns implements its interventions to achieve these objectives is just as – if not more – important than the activities themselves. These three objectives will contribute to a sense of joint ownership and commitment from target staff to integrate effective monitoring, evaluation, and CLA approaches into their work if Learns approaches its work in the following ways:

- Capacity building interventions will:
  a. always begin with the “why” – why the topic of the capacity building effort (i.e., Development Information Solution [DIS], DQAs, co-creation, CLA, etc.) is

---

\(^1\) Staff throughout refers to USAID and IP (including local partner) staff.

\(^2\) Evidence refers to the broad base of knowledge that results from special studies, evaluations, monitoring data, learning events, and reflective practice.

\(^3\) The word strategic is used here to denote collaboration that is done with a specific purpose with the right people at the right time. Learns does not want to promote collaboration for the sake of collaboration.
important and how it contributes to better development results to generate a sense of purpose in applying these approaches.

b. be tailored to the capacity building needs of target staff.

c. be designed based on good practices in adult learning.

- In line with Figure 2 below, evidence use interventions will:
  a. start with a clear understanding of use so that MEL activities are fit to purpose and tied to existing work processes (i.e., work planning) that enable use.
  b. be designed with those who will ultimately use the evidence to increase their buy-in.
  c. focus on the quality and credibility of data and information; low-quality data is not useful to inform decision-making.
  d. communicate evidence and learning in easily accessible ways.
  e. be carried out by credible people that evidence-users trust to produce high-quality evidence.
  f. provide opportunities for staff to internalize evidence, a critical and often missing component of ensuring evidence gets used.4
  g. promote a data use culture within the Mission and among IPs by establishing and supporting habits that enable use.

Below: The journey to evidence-informed decision-making requires a clear process for getting to evidence-use, effective collaboration with evidence partners, and an understanding of how political, organizational, and individual factors can influence whether evidence is ultimately used.

**Figure 2: Journey to Evidence-Informed Decision-Making**

- Local engagement interventions will:
  a. ensure collaboration is strategic rather than collaborating for the sake of collaboration (which has been shown to backfire5). Being strategic about collaboration means Learns will help USAID and IPs think through who they should be collaborating with, why, and what form that collaboration should take.
  b. be well facilitated to ensure high participation, effective decision-making, and commitment to next steps.

---
4 For more on evidence-informed decision-making, see this resource on the Journey to Evidence-Informed Decision-Making: Baker & Salib, USAID Learning Lab, 2017.
5 See findings on collaboration on page 2. USAID, 2020.
Across all three objectives, Learns will establish mechanisms to obtain feedback from target staff to continuously improve its approaches for better overall performance. This will also enable Learns to identify strategic interventions (beyond USAID-requested tasks) based on feedback and Learns’ experience supporting USAID that need to be incorporated into the Learns work plan.

If Learns achieves its objectives as outlined above and risks/threats are mitigated (see more on this below), then staff will have ownership of and be committed to improved Program Cycle processes. That ownership and commitment will contribute to staff behavior change:

- Staff, informed by evidence, continuously improve programming (both capacity building and evidence use interventions contribute to this intermediate outcome).
- Staff meaningfully engage local stakeholders in programming (both capacity building and local engagement interventions contribute to this intermediate outcome).

**USAID and IP staff are already making evidence-informed decisions and focusing on local engagement; Learns’ support is meant to contribute to staff doing this more systematically, intentionally, and with appropriate resources.** Staff ultimately have control over their behavior; as such, we can create the conditions (via interventions under the three objectives) that enable greater ownership and commitment from staff and, as a result, they take on these behaviors regularly and with intention.

If staff continuously improve based on evidence and increase meaningful local engagement\(^6\) in programming, they will contribute to the achievement of sustainable and locally-owned development results (the ultimate goal of this activity and USAID/Vietnam more generally). Both continuous improvement and local engagement are necessary to achieve more sustainable and locally-owned results in line with USAID/Vietnam’s strategy; only using evidence to continuously improve without meaningful local engagement could result in technically sound programming that does not have local buy-in. Local engagement without a strong evidence base for continuous improvement could result in high buy-in, but programming that is not technically sound or reflective of the experiences of a broader spectrum of Vietnamese society.

See the activity logic model below that illustrates the above theory of change narrative. Here are the key levels within the graphic:

- **Activity Goal:** Sustainable and locally-owned development results achieved. (center circle in the graphic below)
  - **Activity Purposes:** Staff, informed by evidence, continuously improve programming & staff meaningfully engage local stakeholders in programming. (ring outside of center circle)
    - **Activity Sub-Purpose:** Staff/stakeholder ownership of and commitment to effective Program Cycle processes increased. (ownership and commitment ring below)
    - **Activity Objectives:** (outer ring)
      1. Staff knowledge and skills in MEL and CLA improved
      2. Evidence-informed decision-making advanced
      3. Collaboration between staff and local stakeholders strengthened

---

\(^6\) The link between local engagement and more locally owned development results is well-established. For more on this linkage, see the [2018 CLA Case Competition Analysis](https://www.usaid.gov/management/measurements-learning-and-assessment/clas-developing-lessons-learning-case-study) (USAID, 2019, P. 20).
Risks/threats to establishing this sense of ownership and commitment among staff and subsequent intermediate outcomes include:

- **Unsupportive leadership:** If USAID, IP, and GVN leaders are not supportive of improved MEL and CLA and Program Cycle processes more broadly, then there will not be sufficient internal incentives for staff to change their behavior. As a result, Learns will not receive the attention and commitment of staff, leading to reduced levels of ownership and limited achievements of results.

- **Political considerations override learning and local engagement:** As a United States Government (USG) agency, it is possible that political considerations from Washington or the State Department take precedence over the evidence base or feedback from local stakeholders. When this happens, it can threaten staff motivation for effective MEL and CLA practices, reducing levels of ownership and limited achievement of results.

- **Learns is managed with a task-orientation (vs. a strategic orientation):** If Learns is seen and used by USAID solely as a task completion contract, this will limit the contract’s ability...
to see the big picture, understand context behind the technical work, and provide strategic insight and support that could benefit USAID and its partners.

**TABLE 1: THREATS AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Mitigation strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsupportive leadership</td>
<td>Discuss challenges with COR to determine possible actions. For example, Learns and the COR may opt to focus energy on teams with better enabling conditions or may try and address barriers directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political considerations override learning and local engagement</td>
<td>Learns and the COR and other Activity Managers may identify where there is flexibility to respond to evidence and local feedback despite those important political considerations. For example, perhaps what USAID has to do is pre-determined, but how they accomplish it may be more easily influenced by evidence and local feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-orientation (vs. a strategic orientation)</td>
<td>Frequent discussion with USAID to gain more context and identify value-add opportunities for Learns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key assumptions include:

- Staff ultimately have control over their behavior; as such, we can create the conditions that enable these behaviors, but ultimately, it is outside of Learns’ direct control as a contract. Staff are bought into the support Learns provides and are willing to be more intentional in their implementation of the Program Cycle.
- In addition, the enabling conditions for success are important assumptions that, if not realized, can negatively affect the achievement of results.
  - Learns will model a collaborative, learning-focused, and adaptive approach in how it manages and delivers services and capacity building so that staff are fully bought-into and committed to the approaches used.
  - There will be a high degree of trust between Learns and USAID and IPs based in meeting expectations and buoyed by strong, healthy, and collaborative relationships.
  - There will be sufficient resources, including time, to ensure USAID and IP staff can engage with Learns and their respective stakeholders to carry out these Program Cycle processes effectively.
  - USAID/Vietnam’s PDO treats Learns as an extension of the office to enable effective collaboration across a range of stakeholders: other USAID staff, IPs, and local stakeholders. This will enable USAID to make use of the full potential of Learns’ support and ensure that Learns has the background and context to be most effective.
LEARNING PRIORITIES

LEARNING QUESTIONS

Based on the theory of change above, Learns will focus on MEL efforts to address learning questions (LQs) under three broad themes:

**Progress towards results:**

**Question # 1:** Is Learns achieving its intended results within the three components? If yes, what is enabling this? What is hindering the achievement of results?

**Question # 2:** Is Learns’ approach engendering ownership and commitment among staff for improved Program Cycle processes? Is that leading to continuous improvement and meaningful local engagement? If yes, what is enabling this? What is hindering the achievement of results?

**Question # 3:** Has Learns’ support contributed to more sustainable and locally-owned development results? If so, how and under what conditions was this possible?

**Continuous improvement:**

**Question # 4:** Are there any unintended negative consequences as a result of Learns’ support? If so, what are they and how can they be mitigated?

**Question # 5:** What are the perceptions of target staff (and Learns’ staff) about Learns’ support? Do they consider our support useful, effective, and efficient? In what ways can we improve in response to this feedback?

**Shifts in context:**

**Question # 6:** How are shifts in USAID/Washington and within USAID/Vietnam affecting our ability to support the Mission and its IPs? What should we do in response to these shifts to ensure continued, positive results?
LEARNING ACTIVITIES

The questions under these three learning themes will be answered through various learning activities (MEL) described in greater detail below:

**Table 2: Learning Questions and Corresponding Learning Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning question</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question # 1</strong>: Is Learns achieving its intended results within the three components? If yes, what is enabling this? What is hindering the achievement of results?</td>
<td>Performance monitoring focused on outcome level indicators per component (see monitoring section below)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Contribution tracking of Learns’ contributions to higher-level outcomes. Based on performance monitoring data, Learns will hold internal quarterly reflections on its data &amp; discuss enabling factors and barriers.</td>
<td>Course correction if anticipated results are not achieved; use success factors and barriers to guide implementation of future activities; report and communicate about Learns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question # 2</strong>: Is Learns’ approach engendering ownership and commitment among staff for improved Program Cycle processes? Is that leading to continuous improvement and meaningful local engagement? If yes, what is enabling this? What is hindering the achievement of results?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Suggested performance evaluation or special study</td>
<td>Contribution tracking of Learns’ contributions to higher-level outcomes.</td>
<td>Inform approaches for future USAID, Social Impact, and other contractor-led support mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question # 3</strong>: Has Learns’ support contributed to more sustainable and locally-owned development results? If so, how and under what conditions was this possible?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous Improvement</strong></td>
<td>Performance monitoring (net promoter score)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Qualitative feedback from USAID Activity Managers at the end of major activities. After Action Review (AAR) for major activities. IP biannual meeting that serves as a feedback loop for Learns and USAID</td>
<td>Determine improvements to services in response to feedback. Share good practices in Mission support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifts in Context</td>
<td>Learning question</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question # 6:</strong> How are shifts in USAID/Washington and within USAID/Vietnam affecting our ability to support the Mission and its IPs? What should we do in response to these shifts to ensure continued, positive results?</td>
<td>Context monitoring – Semi-Structured quarterly discussions with COR and PDO leadership on changes in USAID/Washington or Mission context that could affect Learns’ work.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Context monitoring will feed into quarterly reflections</td>
<td>Determine how to mitigate changes in context or make use of them for greater impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERFORMANCE MONITORING

INDICATOR-BASED MONITORING

Learns measures its results through 10 performance indicators, six of which are outcome indicators. This may be a slightly higher ratio of outcome indicators to output indicators compared to other activities. Please see Annex I: Performance Indicator Tracking Table for more detail on the performance indicators (including disaggregation).

**TABLE 3: LEARNS PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Reporting Frequency</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE 1: Staff knowledge and skills in MEL and CLA improved&lt;br&gt;1.1</td>
<td>% of trainees with increased confidence to apply what they have learned in a Learns training</td>
<td>Retrospective pre- and post-training surveys</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Capacity Building Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE 2: Evidence-informed decision-making advanced&lt;br&gt;2.1</td>
<td># of Program Cycle services completed (also related to Objective 3)</td>
<td>Learns Activity Tracker</td>
<td>Semi-Annual</td>
<td>Chief of Party (COP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE 3: Strategic collaboration between staff and local stakeholders strengthened (Local Engagement Component)&lt;br&gt;3.1</td>
<td>% of participants reporting effective collaboration as a result of Learns support</td>
<td>Post-activity survey</td>
<td>Semi-Annual</td>
<td>CLA Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL QUALITY OF PERFORMANCE&lt;br&gt;4.1</td>
<td>Net Promoter Score (NPS)</td>
<td>Post-activity survey</td>
<td>Semi-Annual</td>
<td>DCOP/M&amp;E Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For an in-depth description of these indicators with baselines and targets for fiscal year (FY) 2020, please see Annex I: Performance Indicator Tracking Table. For definitions of these indicators and their data collection methods, please see Annex II: Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS).

**NON-INDICATOR-BASED MONITORING**

Based on Learns’ theory of change, staff will document instances of evidence generation, synthesis, internalization, and use (what is referred to above under learning activities as contribution tracking). Below is an example of what this would look like in practice:

**TABLE 4: EXAMPLE OF CONTRIBUTION TRACKING IN PRACTICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence generated</th>
<th>Evidence synthesis (if applicable)</th>
<th>Evidence internalization</th>
<th>Evidence use</th>
<th>Effect on design</th>
<th>Effect on development results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWT study – mention specific findings if possible</td>
<td>Evidence shared via briefs, outbrief presentation - Date</td>
<td>Participatory analysis workshop held on Date</td>
<td>Evidence referenced during the Theory of Change workshop on Date</td>
<td>Evidence informed Theory of Change and selection of priority approaches</td>
<td>To be determined (TBD) (updated once there is an evaluation or learning event)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTEXT MONITORING**

Learns’ senior staff will hold semi-structured discussions with the COR and PDO leadership on a quarterly basis to understand if there have been any shifts in context in USAID/Washington (policy changes that affect the Program Cycle or strategic direction of the Mission) or in USAID/Vietnam (changes in leadership or internal policies) that may affect Learns’ work. Questions may include:

- Have there been any changes in leadership or leadership priorities within the Mission that could impact our work? If so, what has changed and how do you think that could impact our work?
- Have there been any changes in Agency or State Department policy or strategies (i.e., J2SR, IPS, etc.) that we should be aware of? If so, what has changed and how do you think that could impact our work?
- Have there been any shifts in the enabling conditions for success of Learns or the enabling conditions for effective Program Cycle implementation within the Mission? If so, what has shifted and how do you think that could impact our work?

Information gained from these conversations will be shared within Learns as an input to our quarterly reflections to determine if there are changes in context we should leverage or those that need to be mitigated to avoid negative impact.

**EVALUATION**

Learns proposes a performance evaluation (or possibly a special study) towards the end of the contract. The evaluation is suggested to focus on answering the following learning/evaluation: Has Learns’ support contributed to more sustainable and locally-owned development results? If so, how and under what conditions was this possible? (See Learning Questions above.)

Answers to this question could shed light on whether support contracts can contribute to the achievement of Mission-level results and how that contribution happens. It can help capture the key achievements of Learns and provide recommendations for future similar activities. This could inform contractors’ work around the world to support Missions and inform USAID’s designs of support contracts in the future. Learns is willing to cover the cost of the evaluation or special study or is open to working collaboratively with USAID on a fully independent, external evaluation about this.
and/or other evaluation questions. Although the Mission has not announced plans to conduct an external evaluation of Learns at this time, Learns will support all data collection efforts if the Mission should choose to do so at a later date.

**TABLE 5: PROPOSED EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Evaluation</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possible evaluation questions</strong></td>
<td>Has Learns’ support contributed to more sustainable and locally-owned development results? If so, how and under what conditions was this possible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed start date – estimated completion date</strong></td>
<td>TBD per USAID’s preference. No earlier than Year 4 of the contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated cost</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation or Special Study (TBD) – United States Dollar (USD) $50,000 – $200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEARNING**

Additional learning activities not covered by Learns’ monitoring and evaluation include:

- At the conclusion of any evaluation, special study, assessment, or other major activity (above USD $50,000 or the first time Learns is providing a type of service):
  - The Learns COR will solicit feedback from USAID Activity Managers about Learns’ performance incorporating questions from Learns’ post-activity survey when relevant.
  - Learns will hold an **AAR** and document lessons.
  - If relevant, before carrying out similar activities for a second time, Learns staff will conduct **Before Action Reviews** with Social Impact Inc.’s (SI’s) Home Office staff or amongst each other to apply lessons from previous experiences.
- Learns will hold biannual meetings with IPs\(^7\) to act as a feedback loop on Learns’ support to the IP community, create relationships with IPs, and model openness and commitment to getting and using feedback.

Learns will institutionalize organizational learning and adaptive management by using learning (from its monitoring, evaluation, and other learning approaches) to inform work planning:

- Learns will time its data analysis from monitoring and other learning activities to inform annual work plans. The annual work plan is due at the end of each fiscal year. To enable adaptive management, Learns will ensure its annual analysis is complete by the end of July with a stocktaking and reflection exercise conducted in August to directly inform work plan updates.
- Additional reflections will take place within a month following the end of each quarter with USAID (except in July when the reflection will be pushed to August to inform work planning in September). Learns will also have an internal reflection in February of each year. Following each Pause & Reflect event, the Learns Activity Tracker and associated scoping documents should be updated – whenever relevant – to incorporate management decisions made during these events, and should also be included as part of the annual work planning process and design.

See the Schedule section below for more details on the timing of MEL and adaptive management processes.

---

\(^7\) These meetings could be combined with learning symposiums if that makes sense given purpose and timing of each.
## KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

### DATA COLLECTION & LEARNING METHODS

Learns will collect data for its indicators and other learning through the data collection tools described below. Data in this section refers more broadly to the knowledge collected by the Learns team in alignment with this AMELP. Each staff person identified below is responsible for creating the data collection method, ensuring staff understand how to use it, and updating the method as needed based on learning.

### TABLE 6: DATA COLLECTION & LEARNING METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>LQ and/or Indicator</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retrospective pre- and post-survey</td>
<td>Surveys post-training to determine change in confidence levels[^8]</td>
<td>LQ 1, Ind 1.1</td>
<td>Capacity Building Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training: attendance sheets &amp; training materials</td>
<td>Daily attendance sheets for training sessions along with required training documentation to add training to Training and Exchange Automated Management System (TEAMS)</td>
<td>LQ 1, Ind 1.4</td>
<td>Capacity Building Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMELP review rubric</td>
<td>AMELP review rubric established by Learns in Year 1 in line with ADS guidance and good practices</td>
<td>LQ 1, Ind 1.2</td>
<td>DCOP/M&amp;E Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQA tracker</td>
<td>Tracking sheet with all indicators requiring DQA and associated timing</td>
<td>LQ 1, Ind 2.2</td>
<td>DCOP/M&amp;E Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQA review rubric</td>
<td>DQA review rubric established by Learns in Year 1 in line with ADS guidance and good practices</td>
<td>LQ 1, Ind 1.3</td>
<td>DCOP/M&amp;E Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learns activity tracker</td>
<td>Basic information and status of all Learns activities</td>
<td>LQ 1, Ind 2.1</td>
<td>COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-activity survey</td>
<td>Depending on the nature of the activity, Learns will survey participants for their feedback. See the PIRS for indicators mentioned here for more detail.</td>
<td>LQ 1, Ind 2.3, 3.1, 4.1</td>
<td>CLA Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution tracking</td>
<td>Spreadsheet tracking evidence use</td>
<td>LQ 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>CLA Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context monitoring semi-structured discussions</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview protocol with running notes</td>
<td>LQ 6</td>
<td>CLA Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP feedback discussions</td>
<td>Facilitated biannual sessions with session reports</td>
<td>LQ 4, 5</td>
<td>CLA Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pause &amp; Reflect sessions</td>
<td>Facilitated team sessions with session summaries. Some held with USAID, some within Learns.</td>
<td>All LQs</td>
<td>CLA Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before Action Reviews &amp; After</td>
<td>Interview staff who have undertaken similar activities (Before Action Review) and</td>
<td>LQ 4, 5</td>
<td>Activity Managers with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^8]: For more on the retrospective pre- and post-survey, see this resource (AEA, 2017): Starting at the End: Measuring Learning Using Retrospective Pre-Post Evaluations by Debi Lang and Judy Savageau.
### Method Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>LQ and/or Indicator</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Reviews</td>
<td>reflect on activity once completed (AAR)</td>
<td>LQ 4, 5</td>
<td>COP &amp; COR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity close-out check-in</td>
<td>Learns will provide a template for the COR to interview USAID Activity Managers post-activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DATA STORAGE

Broadly speaking, Learns stores the information collected via the methods above on its internal SharePoint site. The availability of the data online means that all staff can access, review, and discuss their data at any point in time. However, trackers will be locked to editing so that only those responsible for data collection can make changes. Learns will use USAID’s DIS to report on data collected, as relevant. For the training indicator, Learns will report into TEAMS, USAID’s global training information management system, when trainees are non-USAID staff and training exceeds 16 hours.

### DATA QUALITY

Learns may conduct DQAs to examine the validity, integrity, precision, reliability, and timeliness of its indicators if requested by USAID or deemed necessary by the Learns COP. DQAs ensure decision-makers are aware of data strengths and weaknesses, and whether data can be used to make management decisions.

### DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis will be the responsibility of the Learns DCOP/M&E Director. There will be close coordination between the DCOP/M&E Director and the Learns CLA Director to ensure that data analysis feeds into reflections within the team and with USAID so that learning is used to influence management approaches and decisions. Analysis will be done in accordance with data disaggregation requirements outlined in the Performance Indicator Tracking Table (PITT).

### KNOWLEDGE APPLICATION

As outlined above in the adapting section, this AMELP is ultimately designed for use. Data collected and analyzed will feed directly into reflections that influence scopes of work and work plans. Actions or changes identified as a result of learning are the responsibility of the associated Activity Manager; his/her supervisor, and ultimately the COP, will ensure that knowledge is applied to improve Learns’ work.

### REPORTING

Learns will report indicator-related progress, updating its PITT on a quarterly basis (indicators reported quarterly will be included each time; indicators reported semi-annually or annually will be reported at the appropriate time). More qualitative and outcome-focused progress will be reported on an annual basis along with the Annual Progress Report (due at the end of October each year), informed by indicator results as well as more qualitative data collection, reflection and analysis conducted throughout the year and at the end of each fiscal year.
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Learns’ DCOP/M&E Director will facilitate and organize the implementation of this AMELP. The Capacity Building Director, CLA Director, and COP will be responsible for creating trackers and reporting on the indicators and data collection tools assigned to them. For information on roles and schedules specific to indicators and other learning processes, please see Table 3 and Table 6 above.

The DCOP/M&E Director will be responsible for analysis of data gathered from learning activities. The CLA Director will be responsible for organizing and facilitating quarterly reflections based on data analysis provided, conducting context monitoring, and facilitating the biannual IP meeting to get feedback from IPs. Learns’ Activity Managers will be responsible for conducting Before Action Reviews and AARs and will receive support from the CLA Director.

The Learns COR will reach out to USAID Activity Managers following the completion of major activities to get their feedback on Learns’ performance and share that with Learns’ COP (we propose the COR does this as USAID staff may be forthcoming and comfortable sharing their feedback with him).

Once changes are agreed upon (based on learning), relevant supervisors, and ultimately the COP, are responsible for ensuring they are implemented and using learning to inform work planning.

ESTIMATED RESOURCES

Learns has dedicated appropriate resources to operationalize this AMELP. Funding to collect data is found in Learns’ budget under its labor categories. These line items provide resources for those responsible to conduct data collection and prepare the information for reporting to USAID/Vietnam. Learns already possesses the equipment to operationalize this AMELP.
SCHEDULE

The below schedule ensures that learning will be timely and tied to regular work planning cycles to enable adaptation.

**Table 7: Schedule for Tracking Learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quarterly Pause &amp; Reflect with USAID</td>
<td>Update to scoping documents or activity tracker as relevant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1. Update to PITT &amp; Quarterly Pause &amp; Reflect with USAID</td>
<td>Internal reflection</td>
<td>Update to scoping documents or activity tracker as relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Annual Progress Report (update to PITT analysis from July)</td>
<td>2. Context Monitoring</td>
<td>3. Implementing partner discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Context Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ongoing: Other learning activities (AARs, post-activity surveys, etc.); Updates on scoping documents or activity tracker, as relevant*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quarterly Pause &amp; Reflect with USAID</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1. Annual data analysis &amp; update to PITT</td>
<td>Annual Big Picture Pause &amp; Reflect with USAID*</td>
<td>Annual workplan submitted/update to AMELP (including targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Update to PITT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Context Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Context Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. IP discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ongoing: Other learning activities (AARs, post-activity surveys, etc.); Updates on scoping documents or activity tracker, as relevant*

The evaluation or special study will take place towards the end of the fourth year of the contract.

---

9 Note that contractually, this Pause & Reflect is supposed to happen in July; however, Learns proposes delaying this slightly to August to enable adaptive management by taking place right before work planning.
USAID Learns plans to revisit its AMELP formally in September each year. It can also be updated at any time based on significant new learning that results in changes to Learns’ theory of change or changes in context (completion of Mission PMP, for example). The DCOP/M&E Director is responsible for subsequent updates to the AMELP and this change log.

Table 8: AMELP Change Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective date of change:</th>
<th>Change made by:</th>
<th>Description of change:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **April 30, 2020**        | CLA Director in collaboration with COP & DCOP/M&E Director | • Changed performance monitoring indicators (see below rationale)  
• Increased number and variety of learning activities  
• Added suggested evaluation  
• Incorporation of learning questions that drive M, E, and L efforts  
• Added adapting section and more information on knowledge management  
• Added a schedule of MEL tasks |
| **May 15, 2020**          | CLA Director in collaboration with COP, DCOP/M&E Director, and Capacity Building Director | • Added PIRS for all indicators; based on the process of updating the PIRS, made related updates to the PITT.  
• Removed the co-creation indicator because it will be tracked by USAID/Washington using Global Acquisition and Assistance System (GLAAS)  
• Updated the AMELP indicator (1.2) to match Learns’ anticipated capacity building approach (previously: % of AMELPs with improved quality following Learns support). This previous version was incentivizing Learns to not support implementing partners before an initial AMELP score. However, to work collaboratively with IPs and avoid an audit-like relationship, Learns will provide upfront support before IPs submit their AMELPs. Now the indicator reads: % of new AMELPs that meet minimum quality standards.  
• Updated Indicator 2.3 to better capture the intended change from Learns’ efforts. Previously read: % of staff who report access to useful information for programming decisions as a result of Learns support. Now reads: % of participants that report Learns support has helped them make evidence-informed decisions. It is now broader than USAID to incorporate other potential stakeholders and focuses more on the use of information rather than access to information.  
• Updated targets to more accurately reflect expectations in Year 1. Outcome indicators are currently planned for reporting starting in Year 2, but if relevant activities close out in Year 1, Learns may report on those outcome indicators.  
• Removed reference to required DQAs as none are required for Learns’ indicators  
• Removed reference to the annual staff survey, opting instead for post-activity surveys to get feedback in real-time |
# Rationale for changes to performance indicators – April 30, 2020

The table below provides justification for changes to indicators from the October 2019 submission.

**TABLE 9: CHANGES TO PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Indicator in the October 2019 AMELP</th>
<th>Removed or Changed</th>
<th>Reason for removal or changes made in the April 2020 AMELP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of USAID/Vietnam staff who report access to useful, empirical data as a result of Learns support</td>
<td>Changed</td>
<td>Changed empirical data to be broader (evidence) and focused the indicator more on using evidence rather than access to information (indicator 2.3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of recommendations made by Learns and implemented by USAID/Vietnam and IPs</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>This incentivizes Learns to come up with recommendations rather than facilitating recommendation-setting within the USAID and IP teams. Given our focus on ownership and commitment to adapting, we do not see this as an appropriate incentive or indicator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of USAID priority targets for collaboration engaged through Learns support</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>This indicator is unclear and difficult to measure. The level of effort required to measure this is high given its relatively low utility for decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of stakeholders receiving technical assistance in MEL and CLA as a result of the USAID Learns activity</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>This indicator will be hard to measure as even having meetings with staff could be considered technical assistance. Our goal is not to provide the greatest number of people with services but to provide high-quality services, no matter how many stakeholders are engaged. We have included the NPS indicator to ensure we are tracking quality of our services (Indicator 4.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of USAID/Vietnam staff who report using AidTracker+ or DIS effectively</td>
<td>Changed</td>
<td>Using DIS effectively leaves significant room to interpretation – depending on what survey respondents consider to be effective. All training efforts will be evaluated based on whether trainees have increased confidence in applying what has been learned (Indicator 1.1). This will be disaggregated by training topic, and DIS will be one topic that is tracked separately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of organizations targeted for technical assistance on track according to technical assistance plan</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>This indicator is difficult to measure, and the level of effort required outweighs the utility for decision-making. In addition, Learns does not have any authority to ensure technical assistance plans are followed; there is a high possibility that excellent technical assistance does not result in organizations taking action and that this outcome would not be a reflection of Learns’ support but rather internal organizational dynamics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of USAID activities with AMELPs aligned to the Mission’s PMP</td>
<td>Changed</td>
<td>Rather than only looking at whether AMELPs are aligned to the PMP, we have broadened this indicator to look at overall quality of AMELPs supported by Learns (Indicator 1.2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Indicator in the October 2019 AMELP</td>
<td>Removed or Changed</td>
<td>Reason for removal or changes made in the April 2020 AMELP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of indicators receiving a DQA by Learns</td>
<td>Changed</td>
<td>We have adjusted this to be a more meaningful outcome indicator that looks at timeliness of DQAs (Indicator 2.2) and quality of data (Indicator 1.3) rather than the number of indicators that are assessed for data quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of data collection and analysis tasks conducted by Learns</td>
<td>Changed</td>
<td>Rather than looking only at data collection and analysis tasks, we have broadened this to look at Program Cycle services completed. This will enable us to track additional services completed by Learns, including project designs and activity designs. This change will also make the tracking much more manageable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of stakeholders participating in USAID decision making as a result of Learns</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>This indicator will be hard to measure as what constitutes decision-making is very open to interpretation. In addition, our goal is not to increase the number of people engaged in decision-making as that can often result in greater inefficiencies and have negative repercussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of USAID staff reporting successful collaboration, coordination, and learning with key partners</td>
<td>Changed</td>
<td>This indicator has been broadened to include more than USAID staff (given collaboration will be with IPs and local actors and their perspectives are critical) and will look at effectiveness of collaboration as defined by 1. collaboration achieving its intended purpose and 2. conducted in an efficient manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX I: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR TRACKING TABLE

### TABLE 1A: Performance Indicator Tracking Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Method/ Source</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year 1 Target (FY 2020)</th>
<th>Year 2 Target (FY 2021)</th>
<th>Year 3 Target (FY 2022)</th>
<th>Year 4 Target (FY 2023)</th>
<th>Year 5 Target (FY 2024)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>% of trainees with increased confidence to apply what they have learned in a Learns training</td>
<td>Retrospective pre- and post-survey</td>
<td>Sex, staff type, training topic</td>
<td>Post-training; reported quarterly</td>
<td>Capacity Building Director</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>% of new AMELPs that meet minimum quality standards (also related to Obj 2)</td>
<td>AMELP rubric scores pre- and post-Learns support</td>
<td>Operating unit (OU), local or international partner</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>DCOP/M&amp;E Director</td>
<td>TBD based on final IP assessment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Evolving quality of data collected (also related to Obj 2)</td>
<td>DQA review rubric scores pre- and post-Learns support</td>
<td>OU, local or international partner</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>DCOP/M&amp;E Director</td>
<td>Per DQA (pre-support)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

10 This indicator will be tracked beginning in Year 2 to allow for sufficient time for Learns’ efforts to affect results.

11 This indicator will be tracked beginning in Year 2 to allow for sufficient time for Learns’ efforts to affect results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Method/ Source</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year 1 Target (FY 2020)</th>
<th>Year 2 Target (FY 2021)</th>
<th>Year 3 Target (FY 2022)</th>
<th>Year 4 Target (FY 2023)</th>
<th>Year 5 Target (FY 2024)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Output (subject to DQA)</td>
<td># of trainees that have completed training events on Program Cycle related subjects</td>
<td>Attendance sheets, training agenda, training material</td>
<td>Sex, trainee type, subject of training, type of training</td>
<td>Quarterly &amp; Annual</td>
<td>Capacity Building Director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBJECTIVE 2: Evidence-informed decision-making advanced**

| 2.1 | Output | % of Program Cycle services completed (also related to Obj 1) | Learns Activity Tracker | Type of service, OU | Semi-Annual | COP | 0 | 60 | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| 2.2 | Output | % of indicators that undergo a DQA per the schedule required by USAID policy | DQA tracker | OU | Annual | DCOP/M&E Director | TBD | TBD | TBD | 100% | 100% | TBD |
| 2.3 | Outcome* | % of participants that report Learns support | Post-activity survey | Sex, participant type (USAID or not USAID) | Collected post-activity; reported semi- | CLA Director | N/A | N/A | 75% | TBD | TBD | TBD |

12 Targets for the subsequent FY will be revisited and updated by September of the previous FY. In this specific case, Learns needs to finalize its work plan to determine the trainings it will offer for the year to estimate the number of trainees. The same applies for other indicators with targets TBD in outyears.

13 Targets in outyears will be based on annual work plans (similar to # of trainees - indicator 1.4).

14 The baseline for this indicator will be determined at the conclusion of the IP assessment (in progress). Targets for outyears will be updated based on the baseline.

15 The asterisks on indicators 2.3 and 3.1 represent higher level outcomes that the Learns management team will pay particular attention to throughout the life of the contract. If Learns does not achieve the targets associated with these indicators (and other key outcomes), the management team will revisit its theory of change and approach to implementation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Method/ Source</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year 1 Target (FY 2020)</th>
<th>Year 2 Target (FY 2021)</th>
<th>Year 3 Target (FY 2022)</th>
<th>Year 4 Target (FY 2023)</th>
<th>Year 5 Target (FY 2024)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Outcome*</td>
<td>% of participants reporting effective collaboration as a result of Learns support</td>
<td>Post-activity survey</td>
<td>Sex, participant type (USAID or not USAID)</td>
<td>Collected post-activity; reported semi-annually</td>
<td>CLA Director</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBJECTIVE 3: Strategic collaboration between staff and local stakeholders strengthened**

3.1 Outcome* % of participants reporting effective collaboration as a result of Learns support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Method/ Source</th>
<th>Disaggregation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year 1 Target (FY 2020)</th>
<th>Year 2 Target (FY 2021)</th>
<th>Year 3 Target (FY 2022)</th>
<th>Year 4 Target (FY 2023)</th>
<th>Year 5 Target (FY 2024)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Post-activity survey</td>
<td>Sex, participant type, type of engagement</td>
<td>Collected post-activity; reported semi-annually (starting in Year 2)</td>
<td>DCOP/M&amp;E Director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL QUALITY OF PERFORMANCE**

4.1 N/A NPS

---

16 The Net Promoter Score (NPS) is calculated by 1) surveying your stakeholders/clients and asking them, “On a scale of 0 to 10, how likely are you to recommend Learns’ services to a colleague?” 2) Categorize respondents: scores of 0-6 indicate the survey respondent is a detractor; 7-8 are passive; and 9-10 are considered promoters. 3) Calculate the NPS by disregarding the passives and subtracting the percentage of detractors from the percentage of promoters. The score can range from -100 to 100. The average NPS for the professional services industry (as a benchmark) is +43 per Survey Monkey. For more see this resource.
USAID PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET (PIRS)

**USAID Vietnam**

**DO:** N/A

**IR:** N/A

**Indicator:** Percentage of trainees with increased confidence to apply what they have learned in a Learns training

**Ind #** 1.1

**Rationale:** This indicator will be used by Learns senior management to determine the effectiveness of training provided to USAID and IP staff. If Learns is below the target, the Capacity Building Director will explore further why there may be lower than anticipated confidence levels among trainees to apply what they have learned and adjust training approaches as required.

**Is this a Standard “F” Indicator?** No

**If this an IPS indicator?** No

**Is this Indicator used for USAID reporting?** No

**If yes, which year(s)?** N/A

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):**

**Definition of Training**
A training event is defined as involving: 1) a setting intended for teaching or transferring knowledge, skills, or approaches; 2) a formally designated instructor or lead person; and 3) a defined curriculum, learning objectives, or outcomes.

Training can include long-term academic degree programs, short- or long-term non-degree technical courses in academic or in other settings, seminars, workshops, conferences, on-the-job learning experiences, observational study tours, distance learning, or similar activities as long as it includes the three elements above.

Coaching and mentoring, meetings, or other efforts that could have educational value but which do not have a defined curriculum or objectives are generally not considered to be training unless they meet the three definitional standards for training identified above.

**Definition of Trainee**
Trainees include all stakeholders (USAID staff, local stakeholders, and implementing partners most typically) who participate as a learner in a training event organized by Learns. Will not count: USAID staff who attend to monitor the activity, USAID Learns staff who support the training event, guest speakers, trainers, trainer assistances, facilitators, and interpreters.

**Definition of “Increased confidence”**
To determine whether trainees report increased confidence to apply what they have learned, after each training event, Learns will be using a “Retrospective Pre-Post” to measure if there has been an increase, decrease, or no change in confidence levels pre- and post-training. The trainees will be asked the same question at the conclusion of each training using the same measurement as outlined below:

Please check the box under the number that indicates your level of knowledge and degree of confidence in applying course-related skills both before and after completing the training:

1: Very low – No knowledge of related subject and very limited confidence to apply skills
2: Low – Limited related knowledge and competence in applying related skills
3: Moderate – Moderate level of related knowledge & ability to apply skills but more needed
4: Moderate high – Reasonable amount of related knowledge and confidence to apply related skills
5: High – Solid knowledge base and confident in my ability adequately use related skills

**How do you rate your knowledge and confidence level in applying related skills?**

**BEFORE** attending the training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFTER** attending the training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A trainee will be considered as having increased their confidence only if there is an increase between the before and after score and the after score is at least a 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased level of confidence?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEFORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aggregation**
- **Numerator:** Number of trainees surveyed since the beginning of the reporting fiscal year that have increased confidence to apply what they learned
- **Denominator:** Number of trainees surveyed since the beginning of the fiscal year

**Note:**
- Quarterly results are cumulative from one quarter to the next within any given fiscal year.
- Training reports will also capture percentage of participants reporting improved levels of confidence among those trained during the training only.
- If a trainee participates in more than one training during the reporting period, her/his survey result will be counted once for each training event she/he participated in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Percentage of trainees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data type:</strong></td>
<td>Percentage (number of trainees reporting improved confidence/ number of trainees trained by Learns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disaggregated by:**
- Sex (M/F/Other)
- Participant type (USAID, international implementing partner, local implementing partner, government, private sector, other)
- Type of training
- Subject of training
- Reporting period

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Individual/Office:</th>
<th>CB Director &amp; CB Specialist with analysis support from M&amp;E department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency:</strong></td>
<td>Data collection: After every training event Reporting: Quarterly (cumulative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source:** Retrospective pre- and post-surveys administered at the end of each MEL Learns training workshop.

**Data Collection Method:** Trainees fill out the survey at the training event. Survey results will be stored in a trainee database for further analysis, aggregation and disaggregation and as a management tool raising flags when participants report no or insufficient improvements.

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

(*) Guidelines on DQAs: To be conducted for each performance indicator reported to external entities, including PPR or IPS reporting. DQA must occur after data have been collected on a new indicator and within 12 months prior to the new indicator data being reported. A DQA must be conducted every three years thereafter.

**Based on guidelines, does this indicator need to be Data Quality Assessed?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Based on guidelines, does this indicator need to be Data Quality Assessed?*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes ___  No <em>X</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Anticipated Quality Limitations (as applicable):**

1. Limited response rates could reduce the utility of the data.
2. Language barriers may affect survey responses. Translation of the survey questions may alter their meaning slightly and reduce precision when aggregated.

**Actions to Address Limitations (as applicable):**

1. In order to ensure higher response rates, Learns plans to provide the survey at the end of the training event (rather than via a separate communication later). For in-person training events, Learns will use both Quick Response (QR) code and direct link so that participants can fill out the survey on their laptop or smartphone, in order to increase the response rates.

2. Depending on the nature of participants, Learns may provide the survey in both English and Vietnamese and allow participants to select the language they are most comfortable responding in. In order to reduce errors in translation, Learns will have its Vietnamese staff unfamiliar with the English version translate the Vietnamese version back to English to make sure that translation matches the original intent in English.

**TARGETS & OTHER NOTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Target</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Year 1 target: 80%</th>
<th>Year 2 target: 80%</th>
<th>Year 3 target: 80%</th>
<th>Year 4 target: 80%</th>
<th>Year 5 target: 80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:**

There is no baseline target for this indicator as none is available (there is no data related to level of confidence before Learns existed).

**Changes to the Indicator (if applicable):**

**Date:**

**Other Notes:**

**Date:**
USAID PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET (PIRS)

USAID Vietnam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage of new AMELPs that meet minimum quality standards with the support from Learns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Rationale:**
This is an outcome indicator related to Objective 1 (staff knowledge and skills in MEL and CLA improved) as well as Objective 2 (evidence-informed decision-making advanced). This indicator measures whether Learns efforts have been sufficient to enable implementing partner to meet minimum AMELP quality standards. The reason why new AMELPs are being focused on in the indicator is because it will be difficult to influence the quality of existing AMELPs, although Learns will track AMELP review scores for all AMELPs received, regardless of whether they are for new or existing activities. The primary users of this data will be Learns senior management (especially the DCOP) and the USAID/COR. If quality is not improving, Learns will revisit its capacity building strategy and process for engaging IPs and A/CORs in AMELP development.

Is this a Standard “F” Indicator? No

Is this an IPS indicator? No

Is this Indicator used for USAID reporting? No

**Description**

**Precise Definition(s):**

**Definition of AMELP**
Activity Monitoring Plans (AMELPs) are defined in ADS 201. This indicator refers to all AMELPs for new Activities (“IP projects”). Upon award, USAID will organize a kickoff event to introduce the new IP/Activity to the Learns team and initiate the technical support process to the development of the new AMELP, typically due within 75 days upon award.

**Definition of “Meet minimum AMELP quality standards”**
AMELP quality standards will be measured using the Learns AMELP Review scoring sheet (“Rubric”) examining the strength of scored AMELP based on multiple criteria currently broken down into 35 different qualitative questions (28 of which are considered ‘required’ criteria). The following numeric values correspond the following qualitative assessment for each criterion:

0 - Not present (not mentioned or included in the plan)
1 - Does not meet standards (low quality below minimum standards)
2 - Meets minimum quality standards
3 - Exceeds minimum quality standards (above average, high quality)
4 - Excellent (could be shared as a model)

For all required criterion, a minimum score of 2 (range from 0 – 4) must be reached throughout the following 7 AMELP Review sections:
1. Activity description
2. Theory of Change & Logic Model
3. Monitoring
4. Evaluation plan
5. Learning
6. Knowledge data/information management
7. MEL tasks and responsibilities

Therefore, for an AMELP to meet minimum quality standards, each and all required criteria must have individually met level 2 (“Meets minimum quality standards”).

**Definition of Technical Assistance**
Learns support refers to all technical assistance including training, one-on-one coaching, weekly check-in with implementing partners based on the result of the diagnostic review, as well as capacity-building training events. The assumption is that Learns will be providing technical assistance and training to new and existing implementing partners to ensure minimum quality of AMELPs is met. In cases when a formal review is triggered by
USAID without any technical assistance from Learns in the development of the AMELP, that AMELP is also not be counted in both the numerator and denominator of this indicator.

**Attribution: Learns contribution to improved quality**

This indicator will serve as a proxy measure of Learns’ overall contribution to improved AMELP quality standards through a variety of ways including:

1) **TA kickoff** – AMELP technical assistance is initiated at a kick-off event in the presence of both IP and USAID; one Learns MEL team member will also then be assigned the responsibility to offer technical support throughout the AMELP development process.

2) **CB training sessions** – Depending on the identified interest/needs and the availability of time and existing training modules, Learns may invite IP staff members to participate in capacity-building training workshops designed to help improve the quality of the AMELP.

3) **Baseline diagnosis** – At the drafting stage, another Learns team member will:
   - Make Comments on the AMELP document itself, offering guidance on how to improve the quality of the document and identifying key gaps to be addressed.
   - Score the draft AMELP using scoring criteria of the AMELP review tool to help highlight areas most likely requiring greater attention. (Note: at this stage, no comments will be made in the actual review sheet, only in the AMELP document).

4) **Ongoing TA** – Supported by the comments/suggestions and diagnosis scores, the Learns team member leading on the technical assistance support will remain a resource to help finalize and meet required quality standards.

5) **Formal review** – Once deemed ready for formal submission to USAID, the Learns reviewer will formally score the AMELP with related comments when applicable and will share the formal review with USAID highlighting areas of strength/weaknesses, and making overall recommendations on whether the AMELP may be ready for formal approval or whatever steps may be required to achieve finalization.

**Note on timelines**

As per USAID guidance: following the submission of the AMELP draft (when the diagnosis score is also done), the implementing partners will have 5 weeks to revise the AMELP with technical support from Learns (it could be shortened if implementing partner already had a strong base). Learns will trigger the formal review once the AMELP has reflected the issues/gaps identified at the diagnostic scoring stage.

**Aggregation**

Each time USAID formally requests that Learns provide technical assistance, the date of formal kick-off event in the presence of USAID, the IP, and Learns will be recorded in its AMELP Quality tracker (see below). Other key elements include IP name, Activity name, reviewer name, TA name, AMELP name, diagnosis score, the formal review score as well whether the reviewed AMELP was recommended for approval by USAID (i.e., met minimal quality standards). The tracker will also allow Learns and USAID to monitor, over time, how long it takes for the AMELP to be developed since the tracker will record kick off date and final review date.
**Numerator:** All AMELPs reviewed by Learns that meet minimum quality standards (upon the formal review within the reporting period).

**Denominator:** All AMELPs that benefited from Learns’ technical support and were formally reviewed during the reporting period.

AMELPs will be counted under denominator only when the formal review is completed within the reporting period. If the AMELP's formal review is not completed within the fiscal year, that AMELP will be reported in the next fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Unit of Measure:</strong></th>
<th>Percentage of AMELPs within a fiscal year</th>
<th><strong>Data type:</strong></th>
<th>Percentage (number of AMELPs numerator/number of AMELPs denominator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Disaggregated by:**
- Operating unit managing agreement within USAID
- Partner type: local or international

### PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Responsible Individual/Office:</strong></th>
<th>DCOP/M&amp;E Director</th>
<th><strong>Frequency:</strong></th>
<th>Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Data Source:** AMELP rubric scores
AMELP scores database

**Data Collection Method:** Learns will review all AMELPs shared by USAID using the AMELP Review rubric (scoring sheet) to measure multiple parameters of quality as outlined above. Scores will be logged in a database keeping track of TA start date, diagnosis date, formal review date, IP name, Activity name, TA staff name, reviewer name, scores, and whether AMELP met all minimum quality standards.

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

(*) Guidelines on DQAs: To be conducted for each performance indicator reported to external entities, including PPR or IPS reporting. DQA must occur after data have been collected on a new indicator and within 12 months prior to the new indicator data being reported. A DQA must be conducted every three years thereafter.

Based on guidelines, does this indicator need to be Data Quality Assessed?*

| Yes ___ | No _X_ |

Anticipated Quality Limitations (as applicable): There will be different staff conducting AMELP reviews and they may have different interpretations that could affect scoring.

Actions to Address Limitations (as applicable): Learns will train staff in how to use the rubric and ensure as much consistency as possible. In the case where a second review is triggered, the same person who did the initial review will do the second review. In addition, to reduce bias, a different person will provide TA (whenever possible).

### TARGETS & OTHER NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Target</th>
<th>TBD</th>
<th>Year 1 target:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Year 2 target:</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>Year 3 target:</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>Year 4 target:</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>Year 5 target:</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** (if applicable) TBD Baseline following the review of existing AMELPs against the updated AMELP review rubric. Learns will begin its capacity building efforts towards the end of Year 1; as a result, Learns will start tracking this indicator in Year 2 after initial support and training has been provided.

Over time, we expect that quality will improve as USAID and IPs understand the value of better quality, USAID requires higher standards from IPs, and USAID staff support and reinforce Learns’ efforts to improve quality.

Changes to the Indicator (if applicable): Date:

**Other Notes:**
**USAID PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET (PIRS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USAID Vietnam</th>
<th>DO:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IR:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator:** Evolving quality of data collected

**Ind #** 1.3

**Rationale:** This outcome indicator is intended to complement indicator 1.2, as a proxy measurement of Learns’ contribution to achieving Objective 1 (staff knowledge and skills in MEL and CLA improved) as well as laying the foundations to achieve Objective 2 (evidence-informed decision-making advanced). Indicator 1.2 looks at the improved quality of AMELP overtime, while indicator 1.3 looks at the improved quality of data collected under AMELPs (measured though DQA results) to proxy measure Learns’ contribution to improved MEL skills and quality of evidence.

Through this indicator, it is assumed that Learns’ overall technical assistance (including in-person technical support, development and sharing of user-friendly guidelines, hosting of capacity-building training, technical support to database development…) are contributing to the improved quality of evidence collected under designated performance indicators.

The primary users of this data will be the Learns senior management (especially the DCOP) and the USAID/COR. Based on results and related analysis, Learns will continue to develop and continuously seek to improve its approach and technical assistance strategy along with all associated elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is this a Standard “F” Indicator?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>If this an IPS indicator?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is this Indicator used for USAID reporting?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If yes, which year(s)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION**
**Precise Definition(s):**

**Definition of DQAs**

The DQAs which Learns will count towards the measurement of evolving data quality will be those conducted with the direct technical engagement of Learns using the Learns DQA rubric (scoring sheet) which incorporates a list of 24 questions/sub-criteria broken down into the five above overall criteria.

Once USAID requests Learns’ technical support to conduct a DQA, the team will prepare for the DQA trip, organize the kickoff meeting to share the purpose of the DQA, conduct the DQA, and validate the findings with the debrief with USAID and implementing partner to provide recommendations, suggestions, and an action plan.

**Criteria used to assess the quality of data collected under Performance Indicators**

Data quality standards will be measured using the quality standards as documented in ADS 201.3.5.8 including:

1. **Validity:** Data should clearly and adequately represent the intended result
2. **Integrity:** Data should have safeguards to minimize risk of transcription error or data manipulation
3. **Precision:** Data should have a sufficient level of details to permit management decision making
4. **Reliability:** Data should reflect consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time
5. **Timeliness:** Data should be available at a useful frequency, should be current, and should be timely enough to influence management decision making

Learns will use a scoring sheet (“Rubric”) to examine multiple sub-criteria, broken down into 24 different qualitative questions. Each indicator (and related data) will be assessed (or DQA-ed) and scored using the Learns’ DQA rubric assigning a numeral score to each of the 24 sub-criteria as follows:

0 - Not present (not mentioned or included in the plan)
1 - Does not meet standards (low quality below minimum standards)
2 - Meets minimum quality standards
3 - Exceeds minimum quality standards (above average, high quality)
4 - Excellent (could be shared as a model)

All the scores of each question will be summed up and will be used as the final overall DQA score for that indicator (the range is TBD as part of year 1 baseline). Technical assistance will likely be triggered when minimum scores are not met, and most frequently occurring data quality issues will also likely contribute to the design and focus of Learns training modules.

**Attribution: Learns contribution to improved quality**

This indicator will serve as a proxy measure of Learns’ overall contribution to improved data quality standards through a wide variety of interventions, including: technical assistance on the development of AMELP, ongoing in-person technical assistance post-AMELP approval including the ongoing development of improved data collection and data aggregation systems, capacity-building training events, user-friendly guidelines as well as IP participation in a variety of other Learns facilitated events aimed at boosting the perceived value of evidence in decision-making processes.

Year 1 average DQA scores will serve as a baseline with the understanding that Learns will likely not have contributed to the quality of data collected/reported through indicators mostly developed prior to any direct Learns technical engagement with the IP. Over time, it is assumed that average DQA scores will progressively improve since:

- an increasing number of DQA-ed indicators will have been designed as part of Learns’ technical support to AMELP development, as opposed to indicators developed prior to the start of the Learns contract; and
- the quality of PIRS and associated data-collection and aggregation methods should be increasingly impacted by Learns’ cumulative technical support to both IPs (as outlined above) as well as the Mission.
Aggregation
Each time USAID formally requests Learns’ support to conduct a DQA, the overall total score will be recorded in its DQA scoring tracker (see below). Other key elements such as IP name, Activity name, assessor name, overall score, date of assessment, whether the indicator is being DQA-ed in year 1 or year 3, whether the associated AMELP benefited from Learns technical support, and whether the DQA ‘passed’ overall required quality standard to be reported on the PPR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DQA Date</th>
<th>DQA Stage</th>
<th>IP Name</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>USAID Unit</th>
<th>Learner Percenter</th>
<th>Was the AMELP Developed with DQA TA?</th>
<th>If so, other PPR</th>
<th>DQA Overall Score</th>
<th>DQA Overall Score (Wt)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 DQA</td>
<td>Year 2 DQA</td>
<td>Year 3 DQA</td>
<td>Year 4 DQA</td>
<td>Year 5 DQA</td>
<td>Year 6 DQA</td>
<td>Year 7 DQA</td>
<td>Year 8 DQA</td>
<td>Year 9 DQA</td>
<td>Year 10 DQA</td>
<td>Year 11 DQA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Numerator:** Total scores of all DQAs having been conducted with Learns’ technical support since the beginning of the fiscal year.

**Denominator:** Total number of DQAs having been conducted with Learns’ technical support since the beginning of the fiscal year.

**Note on the setting of targets** –
- Year 1 results will act as a baseline score (average score of all DQAs conducted) since indicators DQA-ed on that year will not have been part of AMELPs which were designed with the support of Learns, nor will Learns have yet engaged with the IP in any significant way to help improve MEL data-collection systems;
- At the end of year 1, Learns should also be able to determine estimated average scores each year, and expect year-on-year averages to increase as percentage of DQA-ed indicators linked to Learns TA increases, along with the cumulative effect of Learns’ overall engagements to help improve quality of data.

**Unit of Measure:** DQA total scores based on Learns DQA rubric (scoring sheet)

**Data Type:** Integer

**Disaggregated by:**
- IP name, Activity name, USAID unit
- DQA date, DQA stage, DQA overall score
- Whether the indicator is part of an AMELP which was developed with the technical support of Learns (attribution)

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Individual/Office:</th>
<th>Frequency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCOP/M&amp;E Director</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source:**
- DQA rubric (score sheet)
- DQA review database

**Data Collection Method:**
When conducting a DQA, Learns will use a DQA Rubric (scoring sheet) to examine all related criteria. Once the trip is completed, the tool will be filled (including comments) and scores calculated before being recorded in DQA database.

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

(*) Guidelines on DQAs: To be conducted for each performance indicator reported to external entities, including IPP or IPS reporting. DQA must occur after data have been collected on a new indicator and within 12 months prior to the new indicator data being reported. A DQA must be conducted every three years thereafter.

| Based on guidelines, does this indicator need to be Data Quality Assessed?* |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| Yes ___                      | No _X_             |
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**Anticipated Quality Limitations (as applicable):** The scoring process when conducting DQA may be partially impacted by the subjective judgment of the assessor.

**Actions to Address Limitations (as applicable):** Learns will ensure that all DQAs are internally reviewed by another team member to reduce potential degrees of subjectivity before being submitted to USAID. The debriefing session on DQA results will also help to validate the accuracy of scores.

**TARGETS & OTHER NOTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Target</th>
<th>Year 1 Target</th>
<th>Year 2 Target</th>
<th>Year 3 Target</th>
<th>Year 4 Target</th>
<th>Year 5 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** (if applicable) Learns is going to support USAID to conduct DQA to meet the compliant requirement at the end of Year 1; as a result, by the end of Year 1, Learns will have a baseline of an average score. The indicator will be monitored over time with the assumption that as receiving technical assistance from Learns via: AMELP development, DQA, one-on-one technical assistance, weekly checking, database strengthening, improvement in this indicator will be achieved.

**Changes to the Indicator** (if applicable): Date:

**Date:**

**Other Notes:**
### USAID PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET (PIRS)

**USAID Vietnam**

**DO:** N/A  
**IR:** N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator:</th>
<th>Number of trainees that have completed training events on Program Cycle related subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ind #</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:** Training in support of overall capacity building is a major focus under the contract; tracking this will enable Learns senior management to tell the story of Learns’ capacity building efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is this a Standard “F” Indicator?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>If this an IPS indicator?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is this Indicator used for USAID reporting?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If yes, which year(s)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):**

A training event is defined as involving: 1) a setting intended for teaching or transferring knowledge, skills, or approaches; 2) a formally designated instructor or lead person; and 3) a defined curriculum, learning objectives, or outcomes.

Training can include long-term academic degree programs, short- or long-term non-degree technical courses in academic or in other settings, seminars, workshops, conferences, on-the-job learning experiences, observational study tours, distance learning, or similar activities as long as it includes the three elements above.

Coaching and mentoring, meetings, or other efforts that could have educational value but which do not have a defined curriculum or objectives are generally not considered to be training unless they meet the three definitional standards for training identified above.

If a training has not been completed by the end of the reporting period, it will be counted in the next reporting period.

This indicator focuses on delivery of training that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. This may include the provision of funds to pay instructors or lead persons, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure the delivery of the training. This indicator does not include courses for which the USG only helped to develop the curriculum.

**Definition of trainees**

Trainees include all stakeholders (USAID staff, local stakeholders, and implementing partners most typically) who participate as a learner in a training event organized by Learns. USAID staff who attend for monitoring the activity, USAID Learns staff who support the training event, guest speakers, trainers, trainer assistances, facilitators, and interpreters will not be considered trainees.

USAID ADS standards require that participants attend a minimum of 80% of total course hours to be considered as completing a course. People who attend multiple, non-duplicative trainings can only be counted once in a reporting period, even if they take different trainings. Therefore, the quarterly counts may be higher than the annual count (the annual report will remove duplication across the quarters). To monitor the attendance of trainees, attendance sheet will be applied for training with the duration more than 4 hours (half-day). For half-day training, the list of participants will be used as the attendance sheet.

**Note:**

- Quarterly results are cumulative from one quarter to the next within any given fiscal year.
- If a trainee participates in more than one training during the reporting period, her/his attendance will be counted once for each training event she/he participated in.

**Unit of Measure:** | **Data** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of people (trainees)</td>
<td>Integer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Disaggregated by:**
- Sex (M/F/Other),
- Participant type (USAID, international implementing partner, local implementing partner, government, private sector, other)

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Individual/Office</th>
<th>CB Director &amp; CB Specialist with analysis support from M&amp;E department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency:</strong></td>
<td>Data collection: After every training event. Data Reporting: Quarterly, result being cumulative from one quarter to the next within any given fiscal year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Data Source: | Attendance sheets/Participant lists |

**Data Collection Method:**
At each training, Learns will collect attendance per the above guidelines. Participant list will be collected during the participant registration session, prior to the beginning of all training events and will be the source of data for training four hours or under. For training over four hours, trainees will need to sign in using the attendance sheets each day of the training. Learns will maintain a training database that consolidates all the information required for this indicator in one place.

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

(\*) Guidelines on DQAs: To be conducted for each performance indicator reported to external entities, including PPR or IPS reporting. DQA must occur after data have been collected on a new indicator and within 12 months prior to the new indicator data being reported. A DQA must be conducted every **three** years thereafter.

| Based on guidelines, does this indicator need to be Data Quality Assessed? | Yes ___ No _X_ |

**Anticipated Quality Limitations** *(as applicable):*
Trainees will be counted more than once if attending different training sessions; But when the same person attends the same training session (refresher training on the same subject), Learns will attempt to count the attendance of this individual only once.

**Actions to Address Limitations** *(as applicable):*
The most reliable approach to avoid double counting of individuals attending the same training session is to assign trainees with a unique identification number. Learns will use the mobile phone number of the trainees as the primary identification number to identify participants attending the same training event more than once within the same reporting period.

**TARGETS & OTHER NOTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Target</th>
<th>Year 1 Target:</th>
<th>Year 2 Target:</th>
<th>Year 3 Target:</th>
<th>Year 4 Target:</th>
<th>Year 5 Target:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** *(if applicable)*
Targets will be based on annual work plans. For Year 1, because trainees will only be counted once even if they attend multiple sessions, Learns has reduced the target to 50 trainees.

**Changes to the Indicator:** *(if applicable):*  
Date: 

**Other Notes:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USAID Vietnam</th>
<th>DO:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IR:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind #</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Program Cycle services completed**

As an on-demand contract serving the evolving technical needs of multiple players at the USAID and Implementing Partner (IP) level, Learns will be asked to conduct a wide variety of ah-hoc and emerging activities, often inter-related, and yet difficult to anticipate and to plan for in a linear manner. All services offered by Learns however should fall under different levels of USAID’s Program Cycle (at the strategy/Mission, Project, or Activity level) and serve distinct purposes (design, monitoring, evaluation, CLA, or MEL). To help quantify and qualify Learns activities throughout the life of the contract, Learns will aim to complete a targeted number of Program Cycle services each year, tracked through its Learns activity tracker.

This output indicator provides a snapshot of the services provided and will be used by Learns to provide a description of the types of services the contract provides. Disaggregation will enable Learns and the Program Development Office to determine if the proportion of services is in line with contract expectations and could help inform USAID in the future about the types of activities to anticipate under as support contract like Learns.

**Is this a Standard “F” Indicator?** No  
**If this an IPS indicator?** No  
**Is this Indicator used for USAID reporting?** No  
**If yes, which year(s)?** N/A

**DESCRIPTION**

**Definition of Program Cycle Services**

Program cycle services are services conducted by the Learns team falling within the scope of the Learns Activity, serving at least one of the Objectives as defined in the AMELP. A service must have a clear client within the Mission (note that Learns’ work plan does not count as a service, but the quarterly Pause & Reflects benefiting USAID staff will). Services include a variety of activities such as:

- **Technical support** – to build or reinforce MEL/CLA capacity either through on-the-job training or more formal training events
- **Events** – the facilitation of events, meetings, processes to help reflect, learn, and adapt more evidence-based practices, systems, or strategies,
- **Studies, Assessments and Evaluations** – Activities designed to help learn, adapt, and improve designs or management practices, etc.

**Definition of completed**

All services counted need to be approved by the Learns COR (either through the workplan or via email) and be completed/submitted within that given fiscal year. Services will be considered “completed” when:

**Definition of Program Cycle Services**

Program cycle services are services conducted by the Learns team falling within the scope of the Learns Activity, serving at least one of the Objectives as defined in the AMELP. A service must have a clear client within the Mission (note that Learns’ work plan does not count as a service, but the quarterly Pause & Reflects benefiting USAID staff will). Services include a variety of activities such as:

- **Technical support** – to build or reinforce MEL/CLA capacity either through on-the-job training or more formal training events
- **Events** – the facilitation of events, meetings, processes to help reflect, learn, and adapt more evidence-based practices, systems, or strategies,
- **Studies, Assessments and Evaluations** – Activities designed to help learn, adapt, and improve designs or management practices, etc.
Precise Definition(s):

- Definition of completed:
  All services counted need to be approved by the Learns COR (either through the workplan or via email) and be completed/submitted within that given fiscal year. Services will be considered “completed” when:

  a) Technical support – The responsible Activity Managers (as identified in the Learns Act Tracker) will send an email “ACTIVITY COMPLETION EMAIL” to USAID as follows:

     “We would like to request your confirmation of ACTIVITY COMPLETION as per the expected scope of the activity (Learns Act X.XX). This confirmation also assumes that you have received any related documentation which should be filled in USAID relevant folders for internal Knowledge Management purposes.

     If any of the anticipated scope of Learns support still needs to be provided, please do let us know. If follow on Learns support (beyond the original scope) is required, also please let us know so a follow-on activity(ies) can be triggered.”

  b) Events – The responsible Activity Managers (as identified in the Learns Act Tracker) will send an email “ACTIVITY COMPLETION EMAIL” to USAID after the event has taken place and any post-event survey has been administered and results shared.

  c) Studies, Assessments and Evaluations – Each of these will require Learns COP to seek formal approval of associated final reports which will then be posted on the DEC and DDL when appropriate. Approval of the final report and its posting on the DEC will act as confirmation of activity approval.

USAID emails confirming Activity completion will be saved in a dedicated folder for “Confirmation of Activity Completions” in SI-Learns’ SharePoint site. Emails will be saved using a name specifying the date of the confirmation of completion and the relevant Learns Activity number(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Number of services</th>
<th>Data type:</th>
<th>Integer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Disaggregated by:

- Level: Strategy/Mission (anything beyond an individual activity or individual project); Project (related to the project level as defined by ADS201); Activity (individual mechanism/agreement with an implementing partner).

Purpose: Design, Monitoring, Evaluation, CLA, or MEL. Monitoring will cover DQA or performance or context monitoring; evaluation will cover evaluations per USAID evaluation policy. The greatest potential overlap is between MEL and CLA. MEL will be used to categorize services that cover one or more of the following: monitoring, learning/CLA, or evaluation, such as AMELP, PMELP, or PMP support. CLA will be used to cover services that involve intentional collaboration, reflection, adaptive management, knowledge management, and other aspects of the CLA framework not covered by the MEL category.

Note: Learns may decide to disaggregate Program Cycle activities further, adding for example additional purpose types.

---

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Individual/Office:</th>
<th>COP</th>
<th>Frequency:</th>
<th>Semi-Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Source:</td>
<td>Learns Activity Tracker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Method:</td>
<td>Count based on the Learns Activity Tracker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

(*) Guidelines on DQAs: To be conducted for each performance indicator reported to external entities, including PPR or IPS reporting. DQA must occur after data have been collected on a new indicator and within 12 months prior to the new indicator data being reported. A DQA must be conducted every three years thereafter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Based on guidelines, does this indicator need to be Data Quality Assessed?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Quality Limitations (as applicable):</td>
<td>Human error in counting the number of services. Mis-categorizing a service, particularly for the purpose disaggregation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Actions to Address Limitations

*as applicable:*
- Automate the count in excel.
- Clearly defined categories per above definitions and including those definitions in the tracking sheet as a helpful reference.

### Targets & Other Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Target</th>
<th>Year 1 Target: 60</th>
<th>Year 2 Target: TBD*</th>
<th>Year 3 Target: TBD*</th>
<th>Year 4 Target: TBD*</th>
<th>Year 5 Target: TBD*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:**

*Given the on-demand nature of this Activity, targets in outyears will be based on annual work plans.*

**Changes to the Indicator**

*if applicable:*

**Other Notes:**
**USAID PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET (PIRS)**

**USAID Vietnam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DO:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IR:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator:** Percentage of indicators that undergo a DQA per the schedule required by USAID policy

**Ind # 2.2**

**Rationale:** This is an output indicator to measure objective 2 – Evidence-informed decision-making advanced. According to the How-to Note: Conduct a Data Quality Assessment, for a new indicator that is subject to a DQA, a DQA must be conducted after data collection has started and within 12 months prior to the new indicator data being reported externally. And after the initial DQA, a DQA must be conducted at least once every three years thereafter. This indicator measures whether with the support from Learns, DQAs have been conducted in a timely manner.

This data will be used by Learns senior management, particularly the DCOP, and COR to determine whether DQAs are being completed in a timely manner. If not, Learns will explore what is causing this and determine corrective measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is this a Standard “F” Indicator?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>If this an IPS indicator?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is this Indicator used for USAID reporting?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If yes, which year(s)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):**

**Denominator:**
All indicators that are required for a DQA according to USAID’s ADS 201 in a given fiscal year:
- New indicators after data collection has started and within 12 months prior to the data being reported externally
- Existing indicators whose three-year due date falls within the current reporting period

**Numerator:**
All indicators that are required to undergo a DQA per ADS201 and in fact undergo a DQA in a given fiscal year.

**Unit of Measure:** Percentage of indicators

**Data type:** Percentage (numerator (indicators)/denominator (indicators) as described above)

**Disaggregated by:** Operating unit within USAID

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Responsible Individual/Office:** DCOP/M&E Director

**Frequency:** Annual

**Data Source:** DQA tracker

Data quality assessments for the indicators

**Data Collection Method:** DQA tracker will be used to track both denominator and numerator of this indicator

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

(*) Guidelines on DQAs: To be conducted for each performance indicator reported to external entities, including PPR or IPS reporting. DQA must occur after data have been collected on a new indicator and within 12 months prior to the new indicator data being reported. A DQA must be

Based on guidelines, does this indicator need to be Data Quality Assessed?*

| Yes ___ | No _X_ |

**Anticipated Quality Limitations (as applicable):** N/A

**Actions to Address Limitations (as applicable):** N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Target</th>
<th>TBD</th>
<th>Year 1 target: TBD</th>
<th>Year 2 target: TBD</th>
<th>Year 3 target: TBD</th>
<th>Year 4 target: TBD</th>
<th>Year 5 target: TBD</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes on Baselines/Targets:</strong> (if applicable)</td>
<td>The baseline for this indicator will be determined at the conclusion of the IP assessment (in progress). Targets for outyears will be updated based on the baseline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to the Indicator</strong> (if applicable):</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Other Notes:** | }
USAID PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET (PIRS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator:</th>
<th>Percentage of participants that report Learns support has helped them make evidence-informed decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ind #</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:**
This is an outcome indicator to measure objective 2: Evidence-informed decision-making advanced. This indicator together with indicator 3.1 represents higher level outcomes that the Learns management team will pay particular attention to throughout the life of the contract. If Learns does not achieve target associated with this indicator (and other outcomes), the theory of change and approach to implementation will be revisited. This indicator will be collected from year 2 of the activity.

**Is this a Standard “F” Indicator?** No
**If this an IPS indicator?** No
**Is this Indicator used for USAID?** No
**If yes, which year(s)?** N/A

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):**

- **Definition of Participant**
  Participants refers to USAID staff, local stakeholders, and implementing partners staff most typically.

- **Definition of Learns support**
  Learns support refers to, but is not limited to, providing special studies, assessments, evaluations, and facilitating learning events.

- **Definition of ‘help make evidence-informed decisions’**
  To determine if decisions were informed by evidence, participants will be asked, whether “The [study, evaluation, learning event] will inform/has informed decisions about our portfolio”. Respondents will be asked to respond based on a five-point scale as follows:
  1. Strongly disagree
  2. Disagree
  3. Neutral
  4. Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

  Only when individuals surveyed answer 4 (Agree) or 5 (Strongly Agree) will Learns consider that the study/evaluation/learning event has helped make more evidence-informed decisions.

**Data Aggregation**

- **Numerator:** Number of participant survey respondents who select 4 (agree) or 5 (strongly agree).
- **Denominator:** Number of individuals having responded to the related survey question after having received Learns support as defined above.

Learns will keep aggregate and analyze survey responses at the end of each related activity and saved results in the assigned Learns Activity folder. Results per activity will be logged into Learns CLA indicator tracker, allowing for a disaggregation of results by gender and type of respondent (USAID/non-USAID).

Results will be reported semi-annually and cumulated on an annual basis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
<th>Data type:</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Disaggregated by: | - Participant or staff type: USAID or not USAID | - Sex – M, F, Other |

### PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Individual/Office:</th>
<th>CLA Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency:</td>
<td>Collected post-activity; reported semi-annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source:</th>
<th>Survey response database Surveys; CLA indicator tracker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Data Collection Method: | Once a relevant activity has closed, Learns’ COR will send a survey to participants. In the case of learning events, the survey may be completed at the event itself. |

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

(*) Guidelines on DQAs: To be conducted for each performance indicator reported to external entities, including PPR or IPS reporting. DQA must occur after data have been collected on a new indicator and within 12 months prior to the new indicator data being reported. A DQA must be conducted every three years thereafter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Based on guidelines, does this indicator need to be Data Quality Assessed?*</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Anticipated Quality Limitations (as applicable): | 1. Limited response rates could reduce the utility of the data 2. Language barriers may affect survey responses. Translation of the survey questions may alter their meaning slightly and reduce precision when aggregated. |

| Actions to Address Limitations (as applicable): | 1. In order to ensure higher response rates, Learns plans to tell participants about the survey during the activity scoping process so they know about it in advance. At learning events, QR codes will be used so that participants can fill out the survey on their smartphones, increasing response rates. 2. Depending on the nature of participants, Learns may provide the survey in both English and Vietnamese and allow participants to select the language they are most comfortable responding in. In order to reduce errors in translation, Learns will have its Vietnamese staff unfamiliar with the English version translate the Vietnamese version back to English to make sure that translation matches the original intent in English. |

### TARGETS & OTHER NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Target</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Year 1 target:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Year 2 target:</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>Year 3 target:</th>
<th>TBD</th>
<th>Year 4 target:</th>
<th>TBD</th>
<th>Year 5 target:</th>
<th>TBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Notes on Baselines/Targets: | The target is set for Year 2 only since Learns will not collect data for this indicator in Year 1. Target for Y3, Y4, and Y5 will be developed based on the actual achievement in Year 2. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes to the Indicator</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(if applicable):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Other Notes: | |
USAID PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET (PIRS)

USAID Vietnam

DO: N/A
IR: N/A

**Indicator:** Percentage of participants reporting effective collaboration as a result of Learns support

**Ind #:** 3.1

**Rationale:** Learns will be involved in facilitating collaboration between stakeholders (USAID, GVN, local partners, implementing partners, etc.). We assume that if Learns facilitates collaboration well, participants will report effective collaboration. The CLA team within Learns will use this data to inform its approach to facilitating collaboration among stakeholders. If Learns does not meet targets, it will need to investigate further why participants are not reporting effective collaboration and use that information to inform USAID’s collaboration efforts and facilitation approaches.

**Is this a Standard “F” Indicator?** No
**If this an IPS indicator?** No

**Is this Indicator used for USAID reporting?** No

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):**

**Definition of Participant**
Participants includes stakeholders (USAID staff, local stakeholders, and implementing partners most typically) who participate in a co-creation process or collaborative learning event.

**Definition of Learns support**
“As a result of Learns support” refers to collaboration facilitated by Learns.

**Definition of “Effective Collaboration”**
To determine whether participants report effective collaboration, after each co-creation process or collaborative learning event, participants will respond to a survey that specifically asks them about effective collaboration. If there are multiple events tied to the same process (under the same purpose), surveys will be done at the end of the entire process. The aspects of effective collaboration below have been adapted from the Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory. The three aspects of effective collaboration are:

1. Participants report benefiting from being involved in the [collaboration or collaborative (process/event/other)].
2. Participants report that those involved in the [collaboration or collaborative (process/event/other)] invested the right amount of time in the collaborative effort.
3. If relevant: Participants report that what was accomplished through the [collaboration or collaborative (process/event/other)] would have been difficult for any individual (or organization) to accomplish by him/her/itself.

Respondents will be asked to respond to above questions using a five-point scale as follows:

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

Participants who count as reporting effective collaboration must:

- answer 4 (Agree) or 5 (Strongly Agree) to questions 1 and 2 above.
- In cases where question 3 is relevant, participants must answer 4 (Agree) or 5 (Strongly Agree) with at least 2 of the 3 statements (summarized above) in the survey.
Data Aggregation

Denominator: All participants that respond to the post-activity survey.
Numerator: Participants that agree or strongly agree with at least two of the three of statements (summarized above) in the survey.

Learns will keep aggregate and analyze survey responses at the end of each related activity and saved results in the assigned Learns Activity folder. Results per activity will be logged into Learns CLA indicator tracker, allowing for a disaggregation of results by gender and type of respondent (USAID/non-USAID) – similarly to ind. 2.3. Results will be reported semi-annually and cumulated on an annual basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Data type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Percentage (number of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with at least 2 of the statements /number of survey participants)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disaggregated by: Sex (M/F/Other), participant type (USAID or not USAID)

### PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Individual/Office:</th>
<th>Frequency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLA Director &amp; Senior Learning Specialist with analysis support from M&amp;E department</td>
<td>Data collection: Post-event or collaborative process Reporting: Semi-annual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey response database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys/Survey Monkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA indicator tracker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection Method: Post-activity written survey

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

(*) Guidelines on DQAs: To be conducted for each performance indicator reported to external entities, including PPR or IPS reporting. DQA must occur after data have been collected on a new indicator and within 12 months prior to the new indicator data being reported. A DQA must be conducted every three years thereafter.

Based on guidelines, does this indicator need to be Data Quality Assessed?*  Yes  ____  No  _X_

Anticipated Quality Limitations (as applicable):
1. There are multiple ways to define effective collaboration; these questions are not comprehensive in determining whether collaboration is effective.
2. Limited response rates could reduce the utility of the data.
3. Language barriers may affect survey responses. Translation of the survey questions may alter their meaning slightly and reduce precision when aggregated.

Actions to Address Limitations (as applicable):
1. Learns has selected these three aspects of effective collaboration as they are aspects that Learns can directly influence in how it facilitates collaboration. In addition, Learns is limiting the number of questions about effective collaboration to increase response rates and reduce survey burden on participants.
2. In order to ensure higher response rates, Learns plans to provide the survey at the end of the event (rather than via a separate communication later). Learns will use QR codes so that participants can fill out the survey on their smartphones, increasing response rates.
3. Depending on the nature of participants, Learns may provide the survey in both English and Vietnamese and allow participants to select the language they are most comfortable responding in. In order to reduce errors in translation, Learns will have its Vietnamese staff unfamiliar with the English version translate the Vietnamese version back to English to make sure that translation matches the original intent in English.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Target</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Year 1 target: 75%</th>
<th>Year 2 target: 75%</th>
<th>Year 3 target: 75%</th>
<th>Year 4 target: 75%</th>
<th>Year 5 target: 75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:**
(If applicable)

There is no baseline target for this indicator as none is available (there is no data related to effective collaboration before Learns existed).

Learns assumes that not all participants will perceive collaboration to be effective; this is entirely normal based on experience facilitating multi-stakeholder processes. Out of 4 people, Learns aims that 3 would find the collaboration effective (75%).

**Changes to the Indicator**
(If applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Other Notes:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USAID Vietnam</th>
<th>DO:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator:</td>
<td>IR:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Promoter Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind #: 4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:** This indicator is used to monitor the perception of Learns’ clients about the contract’s performance. If the score is below the industry average, then Learns will conduct follow-on interviews or focus groups with stakeholders to determine how Learns can improve.

**Is this a Standard “F” Indicator?** No

**Is this IPS indicator?** No

**Is this Indicator used for USAID reporting?** No

**Description**

**Precise Definition(s):**

Definition of Net Promoter Score

The Net Promoter Score (NPS) is the world’s leading metric for measuring customer loyalty. NPS serves as an alternative to traditional customer satisfaction research and aims to measure the loyalty that exists between a service provider and a consumer. It comes from the question, “How likely is it that you would recommend Learns to a colleague?”.

The respondent is asked to select a rating on a 0-10 scale, with 0 being the least likely to recommend and 10 being the most. Once the responses come back, you would segment each respondent into one of three groups, based on their rating: Promoters (9 or 10 rating), Passives (7 or 8 rating), and Detractors (0 through 6 rating).

You can then calculate your NPS using the following formula:

NPS = % of Promoters — % of Detractors

Note: You can get the percentage of Promoters by taking the total number of Promoters, dividing it by the number of respondents, and multiplying the result by 100. You would do the same to get the percentage of Detractors, only you would use the total number of Detractors instead of Promoters.

The resulting score can range from a low of -100 to a high of +100.

**Unit of Measure:** NPS score

**Data Integer**

**Disaggregated by:**

- Participant or staff type: USAID (operating unit), local partner, international partner, government, private sector, other
- Sex – M, F, Other
- Type of engagement

**Plan for Data Collection by USAID**

**Responsible Individual/Office:** DCOP/M&E Director

**Frequency:** Collected post-activity and reported semi-annually

**Data Source:** Staff survey database

**Data Collection Method:** Following the completion of an activity, Learns will survey activity stakeholders via the Learns COR asking the NPS survey question.

**Data Quality Issues**

(*) Guidelines on DQAs: To be conducted for each performance indicator reported to external entities, including PPR or IPS reporting. DQA must occur after data have been collected on a new indicator and within 12 months prior to the new indicator data being reported. A DQA must be conducted every three years thereafter.

Based on guidelines, does this indicator need to be Data Quality Assessed? Yes ___ No _X_
### Anticipated Quality Limitations (as applicable):

1. Limited response rates could reduce the utility of the data.
2. Language barriers may affect survey responses. Translation of the survey questions may alter their meaning slightly and reduce precision when aggregated.

### Actions to Address Limitations (as applicable):

1. In order to ensure higher response rates, Learns plans to share with beneficiaries about the survey when a technical assistance was given so that they will know about it in advance. Plus, QR codes will be used so that beneficiaries can fill out the survey on their smartphones, increasing response rates.
2. Depending on the nature of participants, Learns may provide the survey in both English and Vietnamese and allow participants to select the language they are most comfortable responding in. In order to reduce errors in translation, Learns will have its Vietnamese staff unfamiliar with the English version translate the Vietnamese version back to English to make sure that translation matches the original intent in English.

### TARGETS & OTHER NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Target</th>
<th>Year 1 Target</th>
<th>Year 2 Target</th>
<th>Year 3 Target</th>
<th>Year 4 Target</th>
<th>Year 5 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** (if applicable)

Learns will collect this indicator from Year 2. While the score can range from -100 to 100, the average NPS for the professional services industry (as a benchmark) is +43 per Survey Monkey. The target for Year 3, Year 4, and Year 5 will be adjusted based on the actual achievement of Year 2.

**Changes to the Indicator:** (if applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Notes:**
United States Agency for International Development
Hanoi, Vietnam