



RESOURCE HUB FOR DEVELOPMENT (RHD)

.....Development for All Kenyans.....

Resource Hub for Development Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures February 2013

Contents

- I. **Background to RHD M&E**4
 - Why M&E in the RHD?4
 - The Special Nature of the RHD from an M&E Perspective4-5

- II. **RHD M&E Policy**5
 - Objectives of M&E5-6
 - Guiding Principles6
 - Monitoring and Evaluation Criteria7
 - Methodologies, Frameworks, and Indicators7-8
 - Monitoring Program9
 - Evaluation Program9
 - Feedback and Dissemination10
 - Managing the RHD M&E Program10
 - Roles and Responsibilities11

- III. **RHD M&E Procedures**12
 - Monitoring Program13-14
 - Evaluation Program15-16

- IV. **Glossary of Key Terms**17-18

1. **Resource Hub for Development (RHD)** is a national, non- governmental, non religious and non-political Organization operating in Kenya with its Head Office based in Kisumu City. R.H.D was founded in August 2010 after the expansion of the service need by the previous Women of Action Community Organization (WACO) which was by then operating as a (CBO) in Nyakach. From then, the organization name was changed and registered under the NGO’s Coordination ACT of Kenya as Resource Hub for Development (RHD) and its geographical area of focus expanded to cover all the poor, marginalized rural regions of Kenya. The mission is to alleviate poverty and empower poor marginalized rural communities through economic and social programs. We stand to change the lives of individual and families in the poorest communities in Kenya by promoting initiatives and sustainable development solutions which advocates facilitating lasting change, strengthening development capacity for self help, providing economic, social opportunities and relief to the poor. The organization major projects involve; Health Care, Water - Sanitation & Hygiene (WaSH), Education, Agriculture, Environmental Management and Energy conservation, Housing and Settlement, HIV/Aids, Information, Micro-finance and Management, Humanitarian Relief, Youth and Women Empowerment, Social and Cultural Programs -Peace Building, Volunteerism, Population and Reproductive health and welfare. RHD works with the poorest of the poor marginalized, isolated rural communities nationwide to identify and solve core problems. The Instrument for the Establishment of the RHD Operational Strategy and the RHD Operational Programs provide the strategic context for monitoring and evaluation of activities within the RHD.
2. The need for establishing Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures at the RHD arose from the conclusions and recommendations of the RHD Board of Directors –AGM” (2013). One of the key points made in this evaluation was the importance of an effective monitoring and evaluation system. The Board of Directors’ evaluation found that the RHD “has not been successful in establishing a mechanism for systematically learning from experience as a RHD-wide operation” and “no RHD-nationwide system had been set up to systematically gather and disseminate this information and to track and monitor RHD strategies, operations, and projects.”
3. When the RHD was founded in 2010, the RHD Board of Directors was entrusted with the responsibility for developing, adopting, and evaluating the operational policies and programs for RHD financed activities. Regarding evaluation responsibilities, the RHD Board Members requested that the RHD Directors prepare a paper on M&E policies and procedures under RHD operations. This was presented in RHD Board of Directors – AGM” (2013), which provided a set of concepts laying out the goals, scope of evaluative activity, procedures, and funding needed for an effective program in the RHD to monitor and evaluate its performance.
4. A systematic framework for M&E was later presented to the RHD Board of Directors – AGM” in December (2013) and approved. The present M&E policies and procedures document sets out the principles of monitoring and evaluation as applicable to RHD-

supported activities. The operational standards of the procedures introduced in this paper will be developed later, as may be needed by RHD partners.

5. This document is presented in three parts. The first part provides background information explaining the need for M&E policies and procedures at RHD. The second part presents the policies, objectives, and overall purpose of the RHD M&E policies. And the third part describes the M&E procedures that are required and that should be followed by all partners responsible for the implementation of RHD projects. A glossary of terms used in this document is also included.

I. Background to RHD M&E

Why M&E in the RHD?

6. There are several reasons why M&E in the RHD is essential:
 - M&E is a necessity for producing consistent RHD-nationwide information that will allow RHD accomplishments to be determined within the context of the implementation of RHD projects—across a number of partners, a variety of counties, and a community of project types in several focal areas at sites within Kenya.
 - M&E enables the comprehensive assessment of RHD’s effectiveness and impacts.
 - M&E is not only an instrument to measure progress in attaining development for all Kenyans benefits but also should be considered an intrinsic part of this progress.
 - M&E ensures that accountability is a critically important issue based on transparent procedures, oversight, and data-based reporting.
 - M&E adds significantly, in its own right, to RHD’s learning and capacity-building goals because (a) it facilitates the use—in the appropriate projects—of the best existing scientific knowledge to monitor (in some cases) some changes sought by the program in the RHD focal areas; and (b) it ensures the development of monitoring and evaluation skills RHD-nationwide.
 - M&E helps the entire RHD enterprise to become progressively more cost-effective by building on the lessons of both successes and failures early enough for them to make a difference. To accomplish this, M&E ensures that what is being learned is effectively disseminated.

The Special Nature of the RHD from an M&E Perspective

7. M&E policies and procedures, in the context of the RHD, must take into account the features that make the RHD a distinctive initiative and institution. As presented, the mission of RHD is to alleviate poverty and empower poor marginalized rural communities through economic and social programs through international cooperation, partnership, and collaboration across many diverse institutions.

8. RHD has a special role in learning what works in program operations and making this knowledge available to participating partners, organizations and influential leaders at all levels of RHD activity. Therefore, RHD needs to put in place a system of monitoring and evaluation that generates and disseminates this knowledge.
9. Integral with the process for mission achievement is the linkage of RHD activities with the county development plans and strategies of the recipient community/ county, making RHD initiatives community-driven and based on community priorities. The M&E policies and procedures at RHD need to assess how the national dimensions of the focal areas are incorporated into these plans and strategies at regional and community levels.
10. The multiplicity of formal and informal relationships with a diverse group of stakeholders calls for RHD to be able to provide a continuing flow of information on program status, performance, and impact. A key aspect of these relationships is the requirement for full transparency and appropriate participation in RHD operations. RHD monitoring and evaluation processes and reports will, thus, need to be open and the findings and recommendations widely shared.
11. Although RHD requests new and additional grant and concessional funding to meet the agreed incremental costs of measures to achieve community development benefits, RHD needs to ensure the cost-effectiveness of its activities. M&E promotes accountability to the RHD and its partners.
12. In view of the organizational arrangements for carrying out RHD-funded activities, the concepts and practices of M&E need to be well established in each project. It is expected that, in a number of instances, M&E capacities will need strengthening, with particular emphasis on capacities to track and assess performance and impact. These capacities can be enhanced by linkages to a network of universities and other partners with responsibilities, skills, and interests in sustainable development trends and their measurement. These linkages should, however, go beyond typical consultant relationships to provide for the actual transfer of M&E skills.

II. RHD M&E Policy

Objectives of M&E

13. M&E policy at the RHD has four objectives:
 - To monitor and evaluate **results** and **impacts** of RHD activities
 - To provide a basis for **decision-making** on amendments and improvements of policies, strategies, program management, procedures, and projects
 - To promote **accountability** for resource use against objectives by participating partner, donors, and executing organization.
 - To document, provide feedback on, and disseminate results and **lessons learned**.

14. More specifically, the purposes of the RHD M&E are to *monitor, evaluate, and disseminate* RHD project-related information and lessons on: the performance of projects as well as adequacy of policies and procedures; the changes in country *capacities* for addressing sustainable development issues; the changes in *policies affecting* development; benefits of projects and programs; and the adequacy of RHD guidelines and procedures on project cycle management. In particular, the policy has the overarching function to keep RHD management abreast of the performance of RHD engagements and operations at all levels.

15. RHD M&E policy objectives will be implemented through the following activities:

- Ensuring that monitoring and evaluation functions are established and operating effectively within RHD and other relevant cooperating partners
- Establishing criteria for measuring performance, results, and impact
- Undertaking special evaluation studies related to RHD nationwide interests and responsibilities to guide decisions on RHD policies and operations
- Developing mechanisms for the feedback and dissemination of RHD experience as well as good practices
- Providing M&E data and information to assist the RHD in meeting its informational responsibilities to the RHD Board, other project partners, and the general public.

Guiding Principles

16. RHD M&E is guided by the following principles:

- Operational monitoring and evaluation will build on the existing systems of the RHD partners, Agencies with the harmonization of monitoring, evaluation, and dissemination practices and outputs to meet RHD mission requirements.
- Scientific and technical aspects of monitoring and evaluation will draw on the advice and recommendations of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP).
- Evaluation practices will follow established standards, ensuring the credibility, impartiality, transparency, and usefulness of evaluation projects.
- A project logical framework approach will be employed.
- Coordination by the Senior M&E Coordinator will serve to ensure uniformity of guidelines and criteria, procedures, and reporting so that the RHD nationwide objectives and performance can be tracked, analyzed, and assessed, consistently and fairly.

Monitoring and Evaluation Criteria

17. In general, monitoring and evaluation practices at RHD explore five criteria that are applicable to projects, programs, and thematic or community-level monitoring and evaluation but that do not all need to be systematically reviewed in all cases.

These five specific monitoring and evaluation criteria used in combination provide the decision-maker with essential information in connection with present and future decisions on projects and programs.

Impact: Measure both the positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects on society caused by the project(s) or program(s) under evaluation.

Effectiveness: measures the extent to which the objective has been achieved or the likelihood that it will be achieved.

Efficiency: assesses the outputs in relation to inputs, looking at costs, implementing time, and economic and financial results.

Relevance: gauges the degree to which the project or program at a given time is justified within the national and regional/local level and development priorities.

Sustainability: measures the extent to which benefits continue from a particular project or program after RHD assistance/external assistance has come to an end.

Methodologies, Frameworks, and Indicators

18. This section will address a number of M&E methodological aspects such as: (a) monitoring and evaluation practices; (b) the use of project logical frameworks; and (c) the development of performance and impact indicators.

Monitoring and Evaluation Practices

19. A number of different methods are needed to answer questions of processes and institutional development as well as environmental impact. A mix of methods will be employed, such as quasi-experimental design methods for time series analyses, implementation surveys, structured interviews, and process analyses, and qualitative approaches (participatory evaluations and beneficiary assessments). These alternative approaches to monitoring and evaluation will be employed separately or together to provide differentially conclusive but complementary evidence on program and project performance and impact. The methods employed will need to be determined for each of the monitoring and evaluation exercises.

20. As a general rule, RHD strongly encourages the active inclusion and involvement of all key stakeholders in all monitoring and evaluation activities.

Project Logical Framework

21. The logical framework approach is an essential monitoring and evaluation project design instrument that facilitates results oriented project implementation and sound monitoring and evaluation. This approach establishes the links between goals, objectives, outputs, and inputs through verifiable indicators and specifications of the assumptions that underlie these relationships. Testing of the logical framework against objectives and the external environment/circumstances must be a recurring exercise.

Scientific Contexts, Performance, and Impact Indicators

22. RHD's Operational Strategy underscores the multifaceted and cross-disciplinary goals and activities in diverse focal areas of RHD. Since RHD's monitoring and evaluation will essentially address issues of whether, and at what cost, the organization's strategic and other objectives have been achieved, multidisciplinary physical and social science approaches in evaluation would be required. This necessitates consultations routinely with a broad spectrum of the scientific community. STAP provides advice particularly in the identification of indicators. Likewise, a broad relationship with other organization, partners or community is also essential, especially based on their dissemination and advocacy roles as well as insights and competence in various areas like participatory approaches.
23. There are several ways of defining performance and impacts indicators. One way is based on the concept of causality. In the RHD context, impacts on the environment have mostly been caused by natural, political, economic, or social processes. The inter-relationships between natural and social processes have been demonstrated by many studies and research.
24. Both monitoring and evaluation methodologies and program and project frameworks are dependent on well-developed sets of indicators. These indicators provide the basis for before-and-after analyses and describe the effects (positive and negative) of program and project interventions, anticipated and unanticipated, intended and unintended. Thus, another way of defining indicators is according to the following four categories:
- Indicators of program and project implementation in the various focal areas that enumerate the delivery of technical services, operating funds, and capital inputs with related disbursements and the resulting outputs generated (facilities created, activities and participatory processes organized, etc.)
 - Indicators of institutional change that demonstrate capacity development, attitudinal and awareness shifts, and policy reorientations
 - Indicators of project impact in national and local terms that demonstrate the environmental accomplishments of the RHD programs

- Indicators of socio-economic conditions that are interrelated with the environmental results and impacts, including measures of the consequences of project interventions.

Monitoring Program

25. RHD nationwide monitoring system is an essential tool for improved performance, planning, and portfolio and project management. One of the elements of this monitoring program is the monitoring of a project's progress in implementation and in achieving its overall goals. In addition, and on the basis of a minimum common format, each project will build into its design a monitoring and evaluation component, funded by project resources. This will include a baseline assessment, at a level appropriate to each project, to establish the conditions existing prior to project implementation and a monitoring program carried out during implementation which may include, where appropriate, participatory modes of monitoring and evaluation.
26. An important outcome of the monitoring program at the project level is the annual portfolio performance reports, which provide an analysis of the aggregated results of individual project monitoring.

Evaluation Program

27. The types of project evaluations conducted by the various partners responsible for project implementation include mid-term reviews, implementation completion reports, performance audit reports, and independent terminal evaluations. These partners are responsible for the implementation of the project evaluations together with the project executing agencies. A distinction should be made between internal reviews performed by staff in the responsible operational division and evaluations carried out by persons who are independent of project operations. The latter may be conducted by staff members of the evaluation departments or external evaluators on contract.
28. The performance of the RHD Operational Programs (OPs) is evaluated in relation to their objectives. Among other factors, evaluation exercises will take into account guidance of the meeting of the parties/partners to the Board, strategic considerations of RHD that cut across all programs, several strategic considerations specific to each program, RHD's operational principles for its work programs, and project selection criteria.
29. In addition to evaluation of OPs, the project M&E committee at RHD will conduct and coordinate cross-cutting evaluations that provide the opportunity to assess topics of concern to all operational programs. The range of topics would include, for example, aspects of institutional development (participation, capacity building, policy formulation, technology comparisons), funding arrangements (incremental costs, co-financing, technical and financial assistance), management and operations responsibilities, best practices in M&E arrangements, and application of lessons learned.

30. Finally, the RHD project committees has requested on several occasions a comprehensive assessment of RHD's performance to address the overriding issues of overall performance, like national impact and benefits of RHD programs, as well as the appropriateness of RHD programs and priorities.

Feedback and Dissemination

31. An essential and integral part of monitoring and evaluation is the feedback and dissemination of the analyses, findings, recommendations, and lessons learned. This calls for clearly identified tasks, resources for their implementation, designated dissemination responsibilities, and identification of the needs of the end users. It requires using techniques that promote and facilitate the integration of findings and lessons into RHD's programs and projects and, more broadly, into all related efforts that advance the achievement of Millennium Development Goals and national benefits.

32. The main components of dissemination include:

- Transparency in the availability of information from monitoring and evaluation activities
- Ease of access to relevant monitoring and evaluation information, as required by decision-makers and other users, including full disclosure of non-confidential information
- Special initiatives to engage policy and operations decision-makers and program stakeholders in internalizing the lessons from experience and best practices
- Requirements for the use of lessons and best practices in the development of new policies and projects
- Systematic action on the follow-up of findings and recommendations that flow from the M&E program
- Specific dissemination programs for partners and country focal points.

33. Some of the main dissemination techniques will include: preparation of reports, summaries, and abstracts; electronic information systems; management and staff review sessions; wide participation in project review processes by project staff, task managers, and intended beneficiaries; special analyses of experience in project documents; and country and community seminars and workshops and reference services.

34. The primary end users of monitoring and evaluation products are: RHD board, partners, STAP and related stakeholders and other interested members of the public. Each dissemination product will identify the intended primary and secondary recipients.

Managing the RHD M&E Program

35. M&E is a shared responsibility within the RHD partnership; each institution and their management and technical staff members participating in RHD-funded activities will also be required to participate in M&E.

Therefore a coordinated approach is required for managing the organization and resources allocated for M&E activities, taking into account both the nature of the RHD initiative and the need for integrated production of reliable and valid information.

36. RHD is committed to having a multiyear evaluation strategy that links and guides yearly planning and reporting of evaluation and monitoring work. The RHD Board of Directors develops, in consultation with other partners and as appropriate with the donor agencies under expanded opportunities, a monitoring and evaluation plan on a rolling 3-year basis in the Organization Plan and on an annual basis in the context of the RHD budget.
37. Monitoring and evaluation activities are seen as an investment rather than a cost. By investing in these activities, RHD gains credibility that translates in better relations with all its stakeholders. Furthermore, improved learning translates into more effective and efficient practices. Funding for these activities comes from RHD corporate and project budgets and is divided among the partners funding for M&E activity that is an integral part of projects is covered by the project budgets.
38. The organization and structure of the RHD's M&E program is based on the following two premises: (a) the M&E program is coordinated and guided by the RHD Project M&E Committee; and (b) monitoring and evaluation, especially at the project level, is a responsibility of all the partners involved in carrying out RHD-funded activities.

Roles and Responsibilities

RHD Board of Directors

- Approves the Organization Plan and the annual budget which includes M&E activities
- Reviews results of evaluations and monitoring activities.

RHD Project M&E Committee

39. The RHD Project M&E Committee's has the lead responsibility for:
 - Preparing RHD nationwide minimum M&E standards and procedures
 - Conducting evaluations of RHD's overall performance
 - Conducting evaluations of programs, and cross-cutting issues
 - Conducting periodic project impact evaluations
 - Coordinating the annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and reporting their results
 - Updating and implementing a dissemination strategy for M&E results and lessons.
40. In addition, the RHD Project M&E Committee shares responsibilities for the following tasks with other teams of the RHD Board of Directors:
 - Ascertaining that program recommendations are submitted for decision in the RHD Board and the Partner , as appropriate, and monitoring the implementation of the decisions

- Identifying program-level indicators and collecting data to monitor performance on program indicators
 - Assuring that results and lessons identified through M&E activities are adequately reflected in public information about RHD.
41. Other RHD project teams and the partners will provide advice on M&E components of RHD projects, including indicators, within their respective focal areas. They also will participate in program or cross-cutting reviews, studies and evaluations, and the annual Project Implementation Reviews.

Partners

42. The RHD Partners/ Donor Agencies have lead responsibility for:
- Designing monitoring and evaluation plans for projects and adequately monitoring the implementation of projects against performance indicators
 - Reporting annually on project performance in the context of the PIR
 - Conducting terminal project evaluation of all projects and making them publicly accessible
 - Conducting mid-term evaluations as well as other evaluations at the project level during project implementation whenever appropriate
 - Ascertaining that recommendations from evaluations are submitted for decision-making within their agencies, as appropriate, and monitoring the follow-up of such decisions.
43. In addition, RHD Partners/ Donor Agencies are encouraged to conduct impact evaluations of RHD projects after project completion.
44. Finally, the RHD Board of Directors will support the RHD Project M&E Committee and others within the RHD partnership on the following:
- Participating in program studies, evaluations, and crosscutting reviews
 - Participating in identifying program indicators
 - Backstopping studies of RHD's overall performance
 - Assisting in the dissemination of publications and other products prepared by the RHD Project M&E committee/ team.

III. RHD M&E Procedures

45. The M&E procedures are intended to present monitoring and evaluation activities requirements for RHD-financed projects. These procedures build on existing M&E systems, policies, and procedures in the Partner/ Donor Agencies. In some cases, the Partner/ Donor Agencies' own procedures will go beyond the requirements described here. Where this is the case, it is expected that those procedures will be followed.

However, where the RHD M&E procedures are more demanding, the RHD standards will be met. The operational standards for these procedures will be prepared, when necessary, in consultation with the Partner/ Donor Agencies.

Monitoring Program

Project Level

46. This section describes the minimum requirements for monitoring regular RHD projects (those involving Donor funding of US \$ 10,000.00 or more), medium-size projects (those receiving up to US \$1 million in Donor funding), and enabling activities under expedited procedures (Enabling Activities).
47. **Regular projects** are required to use the logical framework approach (LFA). The LFA will contain clear statements of project goals, objectives, outputs and inputs, objectively verifiable indicators, baseline measures for indicators, and sources of information to measure progress. Project designs will include a discussion of key assumptions and the internal and external risks to the attainment of the project's objectives. **Medium-size projects** are not required to use the LFA but will have clear statements of goals and objectives as well as indicators to measure progress.
48. **Both regular and medium-size project designs** should include plans for monitoring and evaluation, and as appropriate, collection of baseline data as well as adequate provision for their funding. These plans should identify how performance information from monitoring and evaluation activities is intended to be used to guide project management towards accomplishing project objectives. Monitoring plans will include the definition of each performance indicator and unit of measurement; description of the data source(s) for the indicator; baseline data and methods for data collection or calculation; frequency and schedule of data collection; and individuals responsible for ensuring data availability. Performance indicators should be chosen in such a way that they are direct, objective, and practical, in the sense that most data would be made available at intervals consistent with management needs. Quantitative indicators would be preferable. However, if qualitative indicators are used, they must be defined so as to permit regular, systematic, and relatively objective judgment regarding change in "value" or status of the indicator to facilitate assessments of the before and after, or with and without, the project situation. When identifying performance indicators, partners will consider "common" indicators that may have been identified for each focal area program.
49. **Enabling activities** will have clear statements of goals and objectives, indicators, baseline measures, and data sources, but are not required to use the LFA. Progress on enabling activities implementation will be reviewed through an annual stock-taking exercise.

Program Level

Project Implementation Review (PIR)

50. The Project Implementation Review (PIR) is a monitoring tool to assess implementation progress and the likelihood of attaining the projects' objectives. The review is based on project objectives and performance indicators identified at the time of design and modified as appropriate during implementation.
51. The RHD Project M&E Committee/ team coordinate the annual PIR. Individual project reviews are conducted by the Organization or partner responsible for implementing the project. The Senior M&E Coordinator, in consultation with the Partner/ Donor Agencies, the RHD Board of Directors, and STAP, issues detailed guidance for each year's review. PIRs include all active regular projects and medium-size projects which have been under implementation for at least one year by November 30 of the current PIR year. PIRs are not required for enabling activity projects under expedited processes.
52. In addition to individual PIRs on regular projects, the organization submit reports that summarize trends, progress, and issues in their portfolios and include a summary of recommendations and follow-up actions prompted by project evaluation reports.
53. Based on the results of the PIRs, annual reviews, and other monitoring and evaluation activities, the RHD Project M&E Committee/ team coordinates the preparation of an annual report, the *Project Performance Report*, which is presented to the RHD Board of Directors by the RHD Senior M&E Coordinator before submission to the project Partner/ Donor Agency(s).

Program-Level Indicators

54. RHD program indicators are intended to provide a means to quantitatively monitor RHD's projects and non-project activities at a strategic level. The indicators are chosen to measure progress towards RHD broad program objectives, as well as aggregate results achieved through individual projects.
55. Program indicators are used within the context of program studies and evaluations and cross-cutting reviews. The results of this program-level monitoring are reflected in the Project Performance Reports.

Evaluation Program

Project Level

Mid-Term Evaluations

56. All projects with long implementation periods (e.g., over 3 or 6 years) are encouraged to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing the first review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to RHD Board decisions on transparency and better access of information during the implementation. Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify project design problems, and are essentially an internal activity undertaken for project management. Mid-term evaluations are to be conducted or reviewed by an independent evaluator not associated with the implementation of the project.
57. Other evaluations are also encouraged at other critical milestones in project implementation.

Terminal Evaluations

58. All RHD **regular projects** will carry out a terminal evaluation at project completion to assess project achievement of objectives and impacts. These evaluations are the responsibility of the RHD as the Implementing organization and should be conducted or reviewed by an independent evaluator not associated with the project implementation.
59. A terminal evaluation of a RHD-funded project (or previous phase) is required before a concept proposal for additional funding (or subsequent phases of the same project) can be considered for inclusion in a RHD work program.

Impact Evaluations

60. The RHD Project M&E Committee/ team and the Partner/ Donor Agency(s) will carry out, when appropriate, impact evaluations, typically 2-5 years following project completion. These impact evaluations will normally be done for a cluster of similar projects or for projects in the same RHD focal area, on a county, regional or national basis. Evaluation findings are reported to the RHD Board and reflected in the annual Project Performance Reports.
61. Given the long-term nature of many of RHD projects, projects are encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans that are sustainable after project completion.

Program Level

Program Evaluations, Cross-Cutting and Thematic Reviews

62. Program evaluations and cross-cutting reviews may comprise a focal area, an operational program, or cross-cutting issues such as community ownership, capacity development, CBO and private sector involvement, etc. They may be carried out by independent teams or by joint teams made up of RHD staff from the RHD Project M&E team and Partner/ Donor. In many cases, the teams may be composed of an independent team leader, some external evaluators, and RHD Board and Partner/ Donor staff members. Program evaluations involve visits to communities and project sites.
63. As an outcome of each annual Project Implementation Review, a limited number of topics are identified for in-depth review. The RHD Project M&E Committee/ team coordinate these thematic reviews, with a view to presenting results at the following year's PIR or when appropriate. The thematic reviews are not intended to be full program evaluations. Instead, they are generally conducted as desk studies, literature reviews, and/or workshops, with limited fieldwork or primary data collection.
64. The RHD Project M&E Committee/ team prepare recommendations for follow-up activities based on these reviews, studies, and evaluations for RHD management consideration and decision.

RHD Level

Evaluations of RHD's Overall Performance, Results, and Impact

65. An independent evaluation of the overall performance of the RHD is conducted every 3-4 years or as requested by the RHD Board of Directors. The independent evaluation assesses RHD project results and impacts; the progress made towards RHD's project objectives; the extent to which RHD has effectively implemented Board guidance, its operational principles, and other policies and procedures; and the degree to which recommendations from previous overall performance studies have been followed up. The evaluation is implemented by an independent team appointed by the RHD Senior M&E Coordinator, in accordance with the terms of reference criteria approved by the RHD Board of Directors and in consultation with the RHD CEO/Chairman.
66. As a follow-up to the overall performance evaluation, the RHD Project M&E Committee/ team will prepare an action plan, in consultation with Partner/Donor and for consideration and approval by the RHD Board, to respond to the evaluation's recommendations. The RHD Project M&E Committee/team monitors the action plan and reports on progress to the RHD Board as requested.

Glossary of Key Terms

Accountability is an agency's, organization's, or individual's obligation to demonstrate and take responsibility for performance in light of agreed expectations. (The functions of M&E promote accountability.)

Appraisals are overall assessments of the relevance, feasibility, and sustainability of a project prior to making a decision on whether to undertake it.

Efficiency assesses the outputs in relation to inputs, looking at costs, implementing time, and economic and financial results.

Effectiveness measures the extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.

Evaluations are systematic and independent assessments of ongoing or completed projects or programs, their design, implementation, and results with the aim of determining the relevance of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.

Impacts are the positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects caused by the projects or programs under evaluation.

Indicators are quantitative or qualitative statements that can be used to describe situations which exist and measure changes or trends over a period of time. (In the context of the logical framework approach, an indicator defines the performance standard to be reached in order to achieve an objective.)

Inputs are the funds, personnel, materials, etc., necessary to produce the intended outputs.

Lessons Learned are the lessons based on the findings of one or more evaluations, which are presumed to apply to ongoing or future project, and which often form a specific section of an evaluation report.

Logical Framework Approach is the tool for developing and monitoring the logical relationship between inputs, outputs, and objectives/goals that determines the implementation of a project via identification, formulation, appraisal, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

Monitoring is the continuous or periodic process of collecting and analyzing data to measure the performance of a program, project, or activity. (As an integral and continuing part of project/program management, it provides managers and stakeholders with regular feedback on implementation and progress towards the attainment of global environmental objectives.)

Objectives/goals are the ultimate and long-term development impact that is expected to be attained after the project purpose is achieved. (Objectives or goals define a project's success.)

Outputs are the planned results that can be guaranteed with high probability as a consequence of project activities.

Programs are a group of related projects or services directed toward the attainment of specific (usually similar or related) objectives.

Projects are planned undertakings designed to achieve certain specific objectives within a given budget and a specific period of time, and implemented in one or more sites.

The Project Cycle forms the stages of “life” of a project: concept development, preparation, appraisal, approval, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

Relevance is the degree to which a project or program can be justified within the local and national development priorities.

Reviews are comprehensive assessments of the progress of a program or component during implementation.

Stakeholders are people, groups, organizations, or other bodies with a “stake” or interest in the area or field where interventions and assistance are directed.

Sustainability is the ability of a project or program to deliver benefits to the target group for an extended period of time after completion.

Validity is the extent to which the information measures what it is intended to measure.

RESOURCE HUB FOR DEVELOPMENT (RHD)

Physical Office: Off – Obote Road, Kisumu

Postal: BOX 10958 - 00400, NAIROBI, KENYA

Tel: +254 754 724 762/ 724 685 154 / 723 414 198

E-MAIL: info@kenyadev.org

WEBSITE: www.kenyadev.org

**RHD Monitoring and Evaluation
Policies and Procedures
February 2013**