



**GLOBAL IMPACT MONITORING:
SAVE THE CHILDREN UK'S EXPERIENCE OF IMPACT
ASSESSMENT**

Simon Starling, Marta Foresti and Helen Baños Smith

January 2004

Save the Children UK

SC UK is the leading UK charity working to create a better future for children and young people. We work in over 60 countries among the world's most impoverished communities, to help children, their families and communities to be self-sufficient. Alongside long-term development work, we also provide critical support to the victims of emergency and disaster.

SC UK's work focuses on four main areas. By having such a focus, SC UK can maximise use of its resources and expertise, to work effectively and efficiently to bring the greatest benefits to the lives of children. The areas of focus are called the 'Four Goals for Children' and are listed below:

1. Basic services enjoyed by all children (education, health and HIV/AIDS)
2. Children protected and respected as citizens
3. Children safeguarded in emergencies
4. Child focused economic policies

1. INTRODUCTION

Until recently, the social mission of most Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) has tended to exempt them from the levels of scrutiny on issues of performance and accountability found in the private or public sectors. The last few years however have seen NGOs working in international development and relief paying increasing attention to demonstrating the impact of their work on those they purport to help.

In 2001, Save the Children UK began developing a new framework for assessing the impact of its work in order to improve the organisation's accountability as well as learn from its work to maximise its impact. This paper documents some of SC UK's experience in developing the new framework, and some of the lessons we have learned from implementing it in two-thirds of our 60 country programmes. It aims to provide a frank account of the process, its strengths and weaknesses, and draw some conclusions about improving impact assessment processes. It is hoped that our experiences may be of interest to other development actors, many of whom are grappling with similar issues.

Section 2 focuses on why development agencies are wrestling with the issue of impact assessment and some of the theoretical challenges they face. Section 3 covers the development of SC UK's impact assessment framework, and its links to rights-based approaches to development. Section 4 documents lessons learned on both a theoretical and practical level. Sections 5 and 6 conclude by looking at some of the work currently being undertaken to address the lessons learned and some of the issues that remain to be addressed by the development sector as a whole.

2. ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT AND RELIEF WORK

2.1 What is impact?

Impact is a widely used but rarely defined term (Wainwright, 2003). In general, impact assessment focuses more on the implications of development and relief interventions in the medium and long-term, as opposed to their immediate outputs (though documenting these is still an important part of the process). For its purposes, SC UK has defined impact as the extent to which our work has produced lasting or significant **changes** in the lives of children, young people and their communities. These changes can be positive, negative, intended or unintended.

2.2 Why assess it?

Assessing the impact of our work is critical. It allows us to:

- determine the extent to which objectives are being fulfilled
- improve our accountability to those we work with - in SC UK's case, children and young people, our partners, the international development community, trustees and donors
- feed learning from our work into strategic policy and planning processes and advocacy in order to enhance the quality and impact of our work
- share learning with others (e.g. NGOs, bilateral and multilateral aid agencies, governments, partners) who can use it to inform their own efforts

2.3 Why is it difficult?

Attempting to 'measure' the impact of development and relief work is rarely straightforward¹. In the complex economic, social and political environments in which development agencies work, identifying a **causal relationship** between a particular activity and a particular outcome is usually difficult and sometimes impossible. Myriad factors contribute to change and **attributing change** to the actions of one agency is fraught with difficulty. This becomes even more challenging when examining the impact of **long-term development processes**, where impacts may occur only years after interventions have been completed. Moreover, **impact is largely subjective** - a positive change for one person or group may not be so for another. As NGOs increasingly engage with policy processes they are encountering particular problems with assessing the impact of their **advocacy work**, and more problematic still, demonstrating that policy change will indeed provide positive impacts for the most vulnerable (see Save the Children, 2003).

¹ The complexities of impact assessment are well documented - see Fowler (1997); Roche (2000); Wainwright (2003).

3. TOWARDS A RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH TO IMPACT ASSESSMENT: THE GLOBAL IMPACT MONITORING (GIM) FRAMEWORK²

In 2001, staff of the Learning and Impact Assessment team were tasked with improving the way the organisation measured and summarised the impact of its work and its progress towards change objectives at all levels. The project aimed to:

- improve impact monitoring and impact assessment
- enhance the quality and impact of SC UK work through improved institutional learning and better informed management decision making
- improve transparency and accountability to all relevant stakeholders, including our partners, children and their communities, donors, and management at all levels
- aid strategy processes and policy and advocacy development

After a period of research and consultation within and outside the organisation, the team produced a framework and process known as *Global Impact Monitoring (GIM)*.

The key elements of *GIM* are:-

- a focus on impact, i.e. on changes as a result of our work and on the key processes leading to such changes
- a common framework which offers some comparability across country programmes and regions within a particular theme of work
- a country level process that identifies positive and negative changes in people's lives in conjunction with external and internal stakeholders

3.1 The *GIM* framework

SC UK's work is underpinned by a commitment to making a reality of the rights of children, first spelt out by our founders over 75 years ago and now enshrined in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (*CRC*). Its work is guided by a 'Child Rights Programming' approach, which draws on four key principles enshrined in the *CRC*: the best interests of the child; survival and development; children's participation; and non-discrimination. Child Rights Programming aims to create a balance between three 'pillars' of work to address child rights - practical actions to address rights violations and gaps in provision; strengthening structures and mechanisms that promote and protect children's rights; and building constituencies supportive of children's rights (Save the Children, 2001).

Drawing on the principles, in particular the themes of non-discrimination and participation, the *GIM* framework breaks impact into five 'dimensions of change' to facilitate identification and analysis (see Box 1). These dimensions are necessarily generic, but are used to summarise specific examples of impact for each theme of work

² The Global Impact Monitoring framework was developed by Marta Foresti, Simon Starling and John Wilkinson with inputs from Claire McGuigan and others at Save the Children UK.

(e.g. food security work in Zimbabwe; education work in Vietnam). The framework is flexible, and applicable to advocacy as well as project based work.

BOX 1. THE FIVE DIMENSIONS OF CHANGE

1. Changes in the lives of children and young people

Which **rights** have been better fulfilled? Which rights are no longer being violated?

2. Changes in policies and practices affecting children's and young people's rights

Duty bearers are more **accountable** for the fulfilment, protection and respect of children's and young people's rights. Policies are developed and implemented and the attitudes of duty bearers take into account the best interests and rights of the child.

3. Changes in children's and young people's participation and active citizenship

Children and young people **claim their rights** or are supported to do so. Spaces and opportunities exist which allow participation and the exercise of citizenship by children's groups and others working for the fulfilment of child rights.

4. Changes in equity and non-discrimination of children and young people

In policies, programmes, services and communities, are the most marginalised children reached?

5. Changes in civil societies' and communities' capacity to support children's rights

Do networks, collations and/or movements add value to the work of their participants? Do they mobilise greater forces for change in children and young people's lives?

3.2 The GIM process

The judgements of those directly involved in our work - particularly children and young people, programme participants, partners and SC UK staff - are key for a meaningful assessment of its impact. The GIM process actively involves external stakeholders in the identification and analysis of impact.

Programme staff decide which stakeholders to involve and how, building on existing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. This might involve bilateral meetings with stakeholders, or a specific impact review meeting involving a variety of stakeholders. The idea is that qualitative and quantitative data collated from a variety of sources (i.e. monitoring systems, project documents, stakeholders' comments, etc.) are shared and explained before the meeting and analysed and cross-checked during the meeting in conjunction with key stakeholders. This includes a specific attempt to elicit any **unintended** and/or **negative** impacts.

Programme directors are then responsible for co-ordinating the production of a Country Impact Report. This summarises evidence collected from review meetings with stakeholders as well as other sources (evaluation or progress reports, monitoring data, official statistics, etc.) under the five dimensions of change. It asks managers to assess progress towards objectives and document the processes that led to change. It

also draws out main learning points and how these can be used to improve future programming (see Appendix 1 for the report format). While the report is compiled by SC UK staff, the process of collecting, analysing and cross-checking data in conjunction with external stakeholders should improve objectivity and provide a more realistic picture of impact.

4. LESSONS LEARNED FROM IMPLEMENTATION

GIM was piloted in 2001/2 in 15 country and sub-regional programmes. Following revisions based on feedback from participants an expanded second phase took place in 2002/3, involving 34 countries and 3 sub-regional programmes (around two-thirds of SC UK's global portfolio). This section highlights some of the key lessons learned.

4.1 Theoretical framework

Overall, GIM proved successful as a practical way to mainstream impact assessment in to SC UK programmes and policy work. It was also seen as a practical way to put Child Rights Programming principles into practice. Unsurprisingly it was better understood and implemented by programmes with more experience of rights-based approaches.

Flexibility and comparability. The framework proved flexible enough to accommodate the specific features of a diverse range of programmes, and simple enough to be implemented with limited guidance and support. It allowed some comparability across programmes, although this was limited by the diversity of objective and impacts achieved, even within one theme. It is progressively being used by programmes for other purposes such as evaluation ToRs, developing project indicator frameworks and supporting programme planning.

Timeframe. Some felt that an *annual* process of impact assessment revealed little new evidence of substantive impact given the long-term nature of the work. Moreover, impact assessment timeframes that do not relate to the programme itself may make change harder to assess (e.g. stakeholders found it much harder to answer questions about changes within the last financial year, for example, than against specific reference points within the programme).

Participation and Equity. Attempting to measure the impact of our work in relation to children's participation and active citizenship (Dimension 3), and equity and non-discrimination (Dimension 4), proved difficult and impacts under these dimensions were less well documented than for the other dimensions. This does not mean that programmes were not impacting in these areas but reflects confusion around the principles of participation and equity as both means to an end as well as ends in themselves. As programmes are often designed specifically to tackle discrimination or participation of marginalised groups, changes were sometimes documented as direct impacts (Dimension 1) or impacts on policy and practice (Dimension 2).

4.2 In country process

Learning. The GIM processes created opportunities for learning by making time and space for analysis. Learning was not only about the impact of our work, but also the strengths and weaknesses of our approaches. The process:

- Tested the rigour and appropriateness of programmes' monitoring and evaluation systems.
- Sharpened programme design by testing the assumptions behind programmes and the changes they are trying to achieve.

However, it proved harder to report impact where programme objectives were not change-oriented, and some programmes noted that they collected data needed to fulfil the requirements of funding agencies rather than data needed to assess impact.

Accountability. Stakeholders' feedback from their participation in impact assessment processes was positive and welcomed as an improvement in transparency. While this represents one step towards improving accountability to those we work with it is recognised that this is part of a much wider ranging process. SC UK is currently undertaking work to improve its accountability to children, not only in terms of policy and programme design and review but ultimately in governance of the organisation (Lansdown, 2003). Internally, a wider range of people, including regional advisers, programme officers and policy advisers are now involved in the analysis and assessment of work at country programme level.

Partnership. Engagement in impact assessment processes has enabled partners and other stakeholders to better understand SC UK's goals and principles, increased understanding of issues and constraints, and facilitated a rich exchange of experience and information. Many programmes reported improving relationships with partners and stakeholders as a result. However, there are complex issues in terms of trust, transparency and objectivity owing to power dynamics between people and organisations. Impact assessment processes must be carefully facilitated in order to create a space where people feel able to talk about both positive *and* negative impacts, whatever the complex web of relationships. While programmes did report some obstacles (e.g. partners unused to being critical, communities unwilling to jeopardise support), in general it was possible to manage these processes in a way that allowed for honest debate and constructive criticism.

Resources. Any increases in resources needed to implement GIM related principally to the more inclusive nature of the process. There *is* a time, and to a lesser extent financial, implication in collecting and analysing information in conjunction with other stakeholders. This was of concern to some programme managers, particularly in geographically large programmes. Whether extra resources are required depends largely on the degree to which stakeholders are already involved in programme planning and review. Additional resources required are likely to decrease over time as impact assessment processes become embedded in day to day work.

Staff skills. Creating safe spaces in which children and their communities, partners and others are able to highlight negative and positive impacts is a sensitive and skilled task, as is analysing the quantitative and qualitative data arising from impact assessment processes. These skills are not necessarily those that current staff have been recruited for, and in some cases programmes found it necessary to bring in external support.

Integration. There was widespread recognition that impact assessment needs to be integrated into programmes' existing planning and review mechanisms so that impact data can be collected and analysed on an ongoing basis.

Quality of evidence. The GIM process was relatively successful at producing examples of impact, though negative impacts were less frequently reported. The quality of evidence used to back up claims about impact varied. In some cases comments were overly generic or unsubstantiated (i.e. "children are experiencing direct benefits"). Use of data was generally poor, with numbers quoted often not placed in context. The best examples made good use of triangulation, using both quantitative and qualitative information from a variety of sources such as quotes from children and communities, official statistics, photographs, as well as monitoring data. The question of attribution surfaced in relation to advocacy work, with some programmes reluctant to claim any impact that could not be unequivocally proved to be the result of their work and their work alone, whilst others were happy to document changes in which they could have played only a small part in achieving.

4.3 Regional and global processes

Regional impact reviews. Several regional level impact analysis processes were carried out. These brought together regional desks and thematic advisers to reflect on the Country Impact Reports and to identify trends and gaps across the region. This was found to be a particularly useful learning process, and enabled regions to gain an overview of their work as well as strengthening understanding of cross-sectoral and cross-border work. Attempts to aggregate data worked well where countries within a 'region' (e.g. SC UK's South East Asia & Pacific programme) are relatively homogenous (e.g. the Mekong countries), but more difficult where countries are deemed 'special cases' within the region (e.g. China, Indonesia).

Global impact review. The process for analysing and summarising the impact of our work across the entire portfolio was the least well defined. Whilst global policy advisers spent time examining the country and regional reports corresponding to their area of expertise, the global process lacked the organisational buy in achieved at the other levels. Owing to the need to produce a 'readable' report, the production of a 'global impact report' becomes one of selecting some of the most significant or interesting examples from the country, regional or global levels for each theme of work. Despite this limitation, the Global Impact Report 2002/3 (Save the Children, 2004) was found to be extremely useful, as it was able to draw not only on evidence

collected in country and regional impact reports but other reports and evaluations as well as the knowledge and experience of global and regional thematic advisers.

5. IMPROVING IMPACT ASSESSMENT: CONTINUAL EVOLUTION

The improvement of methods of assessing impact is an iterative process, and SC UK continues to learn from and refine its mechanisms. This section outlines some of the work currently being undertaken to address the lessons documented in the last section.

5.1 Integrating programme planning and review processes

Work is now being undertaken to ensure integration and coherence between SC UK's impact assessment framework and other relevant processes. A new 'Country Planning and Review Process' will integrate planning, management reporting, impact assessment and learning into a single format. This will ensure that impacting on the realisation of children's rights and learning from our work will be central at all stages of the programme cycle. Country and thematic programme plans will identify impacts to be achieved using the five dimensions at the outset, identifying milestones upon which progress can be periodically reviewed. A 'light' annual reporting process will be accompanied by a detailed impact assessment of each thematic programme every two or three years. These reviews will take place at a time suitable to the programme and its stakeholders, rather than at a time determined by outsiders. It is likely that external evaluators will be involved in the detailed impact assessments to further improve objectivity. Clearer and impact focused objectives and milestones should facilitate impact focused monitoring systems and improve the quality of the impact assessment process. External stakeholders will be involved at all stages of the planning and review process, improving not only the relevance of impact assessment and learning but increasing transparency and accountability.

5.2 Improving quality of evidence

Further work is needed on improving the collection and analysis of quality evidence of impact at country level, and this will form the basis of ongoing monitoring and evaluation support. Critical to this is establishing mechanisms to provide feedback on Country Impact Reports. In general, programmes have 'learned through doing', learning how to improve their impact assessment processes on an iterative basis. As staff get used to the process, as they get appropriate feedback and support, and as an impact focus permeates the whole programme cycle, the quality of evidence produced should improve. The engagement of stakeholders in both planning and review processes should also encourage more reporting of negative/unintended impacts.

Work has begun to develop more specific guidance on the types of impact that might be expected within each of the four 'Goals for children'. This should enable better

comparability across programmes and provide clearer guidance to staff about likely impacts (see Appendix 2 for an example).

The question of attribution in an advocacy context remains a difficult one, and further work will address this and other methodological challenges of assessing advocacy work, building on the work started in 2003 with the publication of "Closing the Circle" (Save the Children, 2003). In the short term a better steer will need to be provided to country programmes on the question of attribution.

5.3 Utilising evidence and learning

Impact assessment processes only have value if the information generated is used effectively. Currently the rich information produced from the process is not being utilised as well as it could be to improve programming or in national and international advocacy work as well as internal policy development. Managers will increasingly be expected to demonstrate how lessons learned are feeding into their decision-making processes and future plans. An enhanced process is envisaged at the global level, similar to that at regional level, that brings senior programme and policy staff together to analyse impact and ensure the best use of the evidence produced.

5.4 Reporting to donors

The new approach to impact assessment should help focus programme's monitoring and evaluation systems on impact rather than donor's information needs. However, country programme staff will continue to have to report to their donors in the formats which donors demand, and this remains a key concern. However, the two are not mutually exclusive, and there has been some positive feedback from donors on *GIM* (the Department for International Development, for example, accepted the system as a basis for reporting on their Programme Partnership Agreement with SC UK). It is hoped that proactive use of an effective impact assessment system could encourage donors to be more flexible in their reporting requirements and help reduce incidences of multiple reporting on the same piece of work. It should also be noted that information collected for donors should also be used in the *GIM* process.

5.5 Human resources

Impact assessment processes may require a different set of skills than those upon which current recruitment is based. This may mean revisiting staff development priorities, job specifications and performance appraisal processes. Current systems are unlikely to reward analysis or facilitation skills, and incentive systems need to be created to ensure staff are encouraged to be self-critical and questioning of their own and their organisations' work.

6. CONCLUSION: TOWARDS A CULTURE OF LEARNING

SC UK's experience suggests that much can be done to improve the understanding and learning about the impact of development and relief work. It is also clear that improved impact assessment will not result from any one framework alone, however strong. It requires the engendering of a *culture* of constructive criticism and learning. This means not only creating an environment where external stakeholders can speak frankly about interventions and their impact, but one in which NGO staff are more reflective and are rewarded for acting upon learning. Creating spaces to enable such learning to happen present a resource challenge given that many development workers and agencies are already over-stretched.

The onus is on senior NGO managers to make the case that reflection and learning processes are not a costly luxury, but an investment and an essential part of the development process, and to match this rhetoric with the structures, resources and incentive systems to put it into practice.

International NGOs also need to take a more proactive approach with funding agencies to ensure common understanding about useful ways of measuring organisational impact and performance, aimed at reducing the multiple reporting burden on staff in international NGO field offices and particularly on southern NGOs³. This will require a mutual agreement to give up the 'fantasy of total control' (O'Neill, 2002) and strive to find an acceptable balance between measurement, management and accountability.

³ The British Overseas Agencies (BOAG) Evaluators group presented a paper to Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development based on its experiences of organisational performance assessment and highlighting some of the issues that NGOs and institutional funding agencies together need to address (see BOAG, 2003).

REFERENCES

- BOAG Evaluators Group (2003). *Towards Organisational Performance Assessment: experiences of strengthening learning, accountability and understanding social change*. Paper for OECD DAC conference, March 2003.
- Foresti, M. and Starling, S. (2003). *Global Impact Monitoring Guidelines*. Save the Children: London.
- Fowler, A. (1997). *Striking a Balance: A Guide to Enhancing the Effectiveness of NGOs in International Development*. Earthscan: London.
- Gosling, L. and Edwards, M. (2003). *Toolkits: A practical guide to planning, monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment*. Save the Children: London.
- Lansdown, G. (2003). *Involvement of children and young people in shaping the work of Save the Children: a report to the SC UK Board*. Save the Children: London.
- O'Neill, O. (2002). Lecture 3, "Called to Account", Lecture 4 "Trust and Transparency", BBC Reith lectures, March. www.bbc.co.uk/radio4
- Roche, C. (2000). *Impact Assessment for Development Agencies: Learning to Value Change*. Oxfam: Oxford.
- Save the Children UK (2001). *An Introduction to Child Rights Programming: concept and application*. Save the Children: London.
- Save the Children UK (2003). *Closing the Circle: from measuring policy change to assessing policies in practice*. Save the Children: London.
- Save the Children UK (2004). *Global Impact Report 2002-3*. Save the Children: London.
- Starling, S. & Molteno, M. (2003). *Global Impact Monitoring: Lessons Learned & Next Steps*. Save the Children: London.
- Starling, S. (2003). *Balancing Measurement, Management and Accountability*. INTRAC Conference, 31 March - 4 April 2003, Soesterberg, Holland.
- Wainwright, S. (2003). *Measuring Impact - A guide to resources*. NCVO: London.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Country Impact Report Format

INTRODUCTION

Purpose:

The purpose of this report is threefold:

- To summarise the impacts of SC UK work within a particular country programme or within a particular area of work, by highlighting examples of changes and processes leading to change, intended and unintended, positive and negative occurred in specific projects or activities.
- To provide an assessment of progress made in the previous year towards achieving the Country Strategic Plan (CSP) objectives.
- To identify key lessons learnt and how they are going to be integrated in future work.

WHO IS THIS REPORT FOR ?

Although the impact report is primarily aimed at internal SC UK audiences (national staff, RDs and POs, policy staff at HQ and in the regional office, management in the field and at HQ) it should also be seen as an opportunity to share findings and issues emerging with other stakeholders at the national level, with particular reference to partners, other agencies working in similar areas, as well as children and young people. Moreover, some of these stakeholders will be involved in the review process leading to the report and should therefore be considered as a main audience for the report itself.

THE PROCESS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF THE REPORT

This report is the main output of the Impact Review meeting and should therefore summarise in a concise manner the discussions, reflections and main findings emerging from this meeting. It should also draw substantially on other sources of relevant information, such as evaluations, reviews, and data collected externally (e.g. government statistics, reports from other NGOs, etc.). This report should represent the views and contributions of all those participating in the Impact Review meetings, including SC staff, partner organisations, children and young people and other relevant stakeholders. Examples and data (including specific examples of practice, aggregated quantitative data collected by projects or programmes, video footage, etc.) presented in this report should be drawn from a wide range of sources including:

- Projects and programmes evaluation reports
- Information provided by internal monitoring systems and reviews
- Situation analysis and baseline studies
- Internal discussions, discussions with partners and donors
- Information provided by stakeholders with particular regard to children and young people

The Programme Director has the final responsibility for the production and delivery of the report. The report should be sent to the regional desk in London by the deadline established by the Regional Director.

Structure of the report

There are five sections in this report as well as an appendix.

Section 1: Description of country or sub regional programme

Section 2: Update on major changes in the context of work

Section 3: Impact analysis of the programme work

Section 4: Assessment of progress towards achieving CSP objectives

Section 5: Lessons learned, conclusions and next steps (including how lessons will be fed into future programming)

NB: For countries or sub regions doing a thematic Impact Report, Sections 1-5 should only include information relevant for the specific programmes or projects (e.g. education, health, child protection etc).

Appendices:

- Collaboration with the Alliance
- Internal management and staffing issues
- Support from HQ and regional office

The report should not exceed **12-15 pages**.

SECTION 1: DESCRIPTION OF THE COUNTRY PROGRAMME (OR THEMATIC PROGRAMME)

- 1.1 NUMBER OF PROJECTS/PROGRAMMES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO THIS COUNTRY PROGRAMME OR THEMATIC PROGRAMME
- 1.2 Estimated annual budget (at the beginning of the year)
- 1.3 Actual budget spent so far this year (if very different from estimated budget)
- 1.4 *Proportion of sources of funding:*
External donors/grants
SC free money
- 1.5 Who are the main donors of this programme? What projects/activities/programmes do they fund?

SECTION 2: UPDATE ON MAJOR CHANGES IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PROGRAMME WORK

- 2.1 The external environment. This is an update of the situation analysis provided by the CSP. Please highlight only significant changes in the external environment that have had or are likely to have an impact on the programme work.
- 2.2 The internal context. Please highlight key internal events and changes that have had or are likely to have an impact of the programme work.

SECTION 3: IMPACT ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRAMME WORK

This section should be based on the synthesis of the findings emerging from the Impact Review meetings.

In this section you need to summarise the **impact** (i.e. **changes** occurred as a result of the activities undertaken by different projects/programmes/activities as outlined in the Operation Plan) of the country programme over the CSP period. Please use the five dimensions of change and related questions to summarise changes occurred in different areas of programme work (or in the thematic area covered by the GIM report).

Save the Children UK's five common dimensions of change

1. Changes in the lives of children and young people

Which **rights** are being better fulfilled? Which rights are no longer being violated?

2. Changes in policies and practices affecting children's and young people's rights

Duty bearers are more **accountable** for the fulfilment, protection and respect of children's and young people's rights. Policies are developed and implemented and the attitudes of duty bearers take into account the best interests and rights of the child.

3. Changes in children's and young people's participation and active citizenship

Children and young people **claim their rights** or are supported to do so. Spaces and opportunities exist which allow participation and the exercise of citizenship by children's groups and others working for the fulfilment of child rights.

4. Changes in equity and non-discrimination of children and young people

In policies, programmes, services and communities, are the most marginalised children reached?

5. Changes in civil societies' and communities' capacity to support children's rights

Do networks, coalitions and/or movements add value to the work of their participants?
Do they mobilise greater forces for change in children and young people's lives?

For each relevant area of work⁴ (e.g. education, health, child protection, etc.) of the CSP summarise the main impacts of the programme under the five dimensions of change listed above.

Please indicate to which **Goal for Children** the programmes or projects are contributing to (e.g. work in health and education contributing towards 'basic services being enjoyed

⁴ For countries doing a thematic report there will be only **one** area of work covered in this section.

by all children'; work on poverty and PRSPs towards 'child focused economic policies', etc.). The four Goals for Children are:

- Child-focused economic policies
- Basic services enjoyed by all children
- Children safeguarded in emergencies
- Children protected and respected as citizens

If some of the work does not fit into the four Goals, please highlight this and provide the analysis under a separate heading.

Please note the following:

- These five dimensions of change and are aimed at facilitating comparability of information between different areas of work and between information provided by different country programmes. They represent different areas in which we expect change to occur as a result of our work. **They are not additional objectives or activities; they are characteristics of the work in practice.**
- It may not be necessary to cover each dimension for each area of work/core area/strategic issue as **they might not all apply or be relevant.**
- Please **avoid describing the activities** that have taken place and **concentrate** instead **on the changes occurring** as a result.
- Please consider whether there are **examples of (potentially) negative impact** as a result of programme activities.

SECTION 4: PROGRESS MADE IN 2002 TOWARDS ACHIEVING THE CSP OBJECTIVES

This section should be completed by the PD.

In this section you need to assess the progress made during 2002 towards achieving the CSP objectives. **This assessment is to be based on the findings emerging from the impact analysis summarised in Section 3 of the report.** This assessment will be made by scoring the **extent to which progress has been made towards achieving each CSP objective using a 1-10 scale.**

In order to assess progress made for each CSP objective, you need to:

- Formulate your judgement on the basis of the **impact** of the programme as summarised in Section 3, i.e. progress made towards achieving objectives should be based on the **evidence** that changes are happening at different levels. If the impact analysis suggests that the programme is resulting in meaningful changes and yet objectives are not being achieved, it probably means that:
 - the CSP objectives are too ambitious and you should ensure that the new CSP will have more realistic ones,
 - or the circumstances of the programmes have changed, making it difficult to deliver on the original objectives (this should emerge in section 2)Similarly, if section 3 suggests limited impact in a particular area and yet you believe that the progress made towards achieving the objectives is satisfactory, it probably means that the objectives were not change oriented and too focused on activities or short term outputs.
- Use the CSP indicators to help you formulate your assessment of progress made. Are these indicators meaningful and useful? If not, consider changing them in the future using the five dimensions of change as a framework.

For each CSP objective, answer the following question by assigning a score between 1 and 10.

On the basis of the impact of the programme (i.e. changes happening under different dimensions), to what extent has progress been made towards achieving the CSP objective?

1= No progress 10= Objective achieved

Example:

Education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Obj1: to facilitate the adoption of quality approaches to ECD programmes and policy										
Obj2: as above										
Etc.										

SECTION 5: LESSONS LEARNT, CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

This section is aimed at drawing the **main lessons** emerging from the report and the *GIM* process and at establishing what needs to be done in order to learn and act on them.

5.1 What are you going to do about those objectives where not much progress has been achieved?

These are the objectives that have scored low (i.e. 1-5) in Section 4. There are different options you may want to consider. Please tick as appropriate and provide a brief explanation for each objective scoring 1-5:

- Nothing will be done. Why? (E.g. too late into the CSP to make any change; too early into the CSP to be able to achieve progress, etc.)
- Review the operational plan to make sure that the necessary activities to make progress next year are undertaken and that the necessary resources are in place (human and financial)
- Review and amend the CSP objective in order to make it more realistic (this might include eliminating the objective altogether if appropriate)

5.2 Are there any **unintended or unexpected** impacts of the programme? Why did they occur? If they are positive, how do you plan to build on them and integrate them in future work?

5.3 Are there any **negative** impacts of the programmes? Why did they occur? Is there anything you could do to mitigate them, e.g. to reduce the harm on children? What can be done to avoid them in the future?

5.4 What are the key **lessons to be learned** from reviewing the impact of programme work? How can these be built upon, shared with others and integrated in future work? NB: This is particularly relevant for countries doing a CSP review and/or developing a new CSP following the *GIM* process.

APPENDIXES (MAX 1 PAGE EACH)

- Collaboration with the *Alliance*; main changes, new initiatives or specific projects
- Staffing and internal management issues
- Usefulness, relevance and effectiveness of support from HQ and regional office

Appendix 2: Guidance on the types of impact that might be expected within each of the four 'Goals for Children'

Examples of types of impacts in **education** under each dimension of change.

Dimension 1: Changes in the lives of children and young people

- Children learn more, and learn more quickly
- Children enjoy school more
- More children are able to go to school
- Fewer children drop out of school
- Fewer children repeat grades in school
- Teachers stop treating children harshly; corporal punishment is no longer used
- Children are more confident in class, ask questions, learn through play and exploration

Changes in policies and practices affecting children's and young people's rights

- School fees are abolished
- Teaching in mother-tongue is allowed / supported by governments
- Basic education budget is increased, as a proportion of national income
- Teacher-training becomes more in-service than pre-service, less exam-based, delivered locally through continuous coaching
- Local authorities publish school education budgets
- School management committees are represented in district decision-making on education

Changes in children's and young people's participation and active citizenship

- Children join school management committees and their suggestions change what happens in schools
- Children are more active in their own learning, questioning teachers and learning from each other
- Children lead extra-curricular school activities, such as sports, school environment committees
- Children show visitors around the school, answering outsiders' questions confidently
- MDGs now use quality of education, as well as quantity as a measure

Changes in equity and non-discrimination of children and young people

- All children are involved in classroom discussion, questions and activities
- Equal numbers of girls and boys in school at all levels
- Teachers are seen to use group-work time to support less-able children
- Materials, curriculum and teaching style are all adapted to the needs of girls, disabled children and other marginalised groups

Changes in civil societies' and communities' capacity to support children's rights

- National NGOs or education networks are represented on national education planning groups, alongside government and donors

- National-level civil society representatives are presenting perspectives from their allies in villages and districts, not just their own individual expertise
- Different organisations working on education present common policy positions to government, or work through united advocacy alliances