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How do you know if your work is having any impact?
Thursday, June 27, 2013

Webinar Agenda

• Introduction and Welcome – Anne-Claire Hervy
• Laying the foundation to discuss results monitoring – Presentation by Andrew Gilboy
• Discussion of challenges implementers face and tools available:
  - Building in an institutional focus to individual training
  - Results monitoring during training – challenges and tools
  - Results monitoring post-training – challenges and tools
• Discussion of suggestions for future webinar topics

Join the Knowledge Network:
http://agrilinks.org/working-group/26/about

Guidelines for the Webinar:
1. We have muted everyone so that the line remains clear. However, we hope for the webinar to be as interactive as possible. There are two ways to participate:
   • You can submit comments and questions via the question box at any point during the webinar. We will respond via that mechanism or bring your comment or question up for discussion in the conversation.
   • If you wish to speak and have a microphone on your computer, you can click the raise your hand button on your screen so that you can be called on to pose your question.
2. For any technical difficulties, please contact our staff member, Mark Varner, at mvarner@aplu.org or at 202-478-6023. You can also click on the “?” icon on your screen to connect to technical support from GoToWebinar.
How do you know if your work is having any impact?

Monitoring Your Training Program for Results

Presentation by:
Andrew Gilboy
June 27, 2013
The single common factor among all of us is that we manage training programs for developing countries. How we do that runs the gamut from a program that implements a fellowship grant for an individual to conduct graduate level research, to running a long-term capacity-building project with MA and PhD degrees for a single university or research institution. The challenge for all of us no matter where we fall along this spectrum is to find ways to build capacity in individuals and their institutions during and after the training. Whether your program focuses on training individuals with little reference to their institutions, or is actually located inside an institution, we all use training as our “change mechanism.”

USAID, and many others, would like us all to ensure that the results we’re getting from training have a positive impact on institutions even though we of course, are training individuals. The purpose of our four Webinars is to help you all, who are managing training of various types, find ways to increase the way training can change the institutions where the trainees will be working, or already are.

To do this, we’re organizing four Webinars on topics you indicate that you need help with. This first Webinar will address how you know if you’re programs are having an impact beyond the individual trained, and present a few ideas on what to do to increase that impact. The remaining three Webinars will be held in September and October – and we want your input on the subjects that would be of most interest.

Although many of you manage training in the agriculture-related sectors, the challenges are similar for those in health, education and governance. So we welcome all participants regardless of their sector focus. And welcome those whose primary interest is monitoring training and institutional performance.
Webinar Agenda

Intro & Presentation: 20 minutes  Sharing of Information: 70 minutes

✓ Laying the foundation to discuss results monitoring:
  *Powerpoint Presentation by Andrew Gilboy*

✓ Comments, questions and ideas from participants

  *Building an institutional focus to individual training*
  *Results monitoring during training: challenges & tools*
  *Results monitoring after training: challenges & tools*

✓ Suggestions for future Webinar topics
Commentary
Andrew Gilboy

We are using the word *impact* periodically to mean results obtained from our training interventions, not necessarily as it would be used when discussing an impact evaluation. Today we want to have a conversation about how to get results from training at the institutional level as well as at the individual level. Many of you are experts in managing individual training - assessing student potential, monitoring their progress, identifying great research topics that can have an impact in the students’ home countries and institutions. Some say that in the past we haven’t always paid sufficient attention to the institutions where students return to. Some also say that lack of funding impedes a focus on institutional capacity building. Others say that managing training is more within our manageable competency or interest and that we cannot impose or be accountable for changes at host country institutions.

We’re using the term *performance* in its institutional context – that is, the total output of an institution. What it produces. In interacting with institutions where trained students will be working, we can assess performance there so that we know if our returnees are applying their new knowledge and skills effectively. Increasing performance of institutions, even though it may not be included in your project’s scope of work, is nonetheless a result that USAID and other donors, and developing country institutions themselves, are looking for.

Recognizing these challenges, we hope to identify some workable, cost-effective ways to increase our impact on institutions through existing training programs.

Let’s focus today on the “monitoring” side of M&E (Monitoring and Evaluation) rather than the “evaluation” side. Tracking progress (monitoring) of course is a partner of evaluation (assessing whether anything changed). We want today however to spend time on the monitoring part. Without monitoring, you can’t know if your work is having an impact, either on the individual or an institution.
Evaluating Your Program’s Results:

*How do you know if your work is having an impact?*

- Training by Type and by Focus
- Monitoring results - Why do it? How to do it?
- Building institutional capacity – what does it mean?
- Training – what is the link to monitoring & building capacity?
Before we start, let’s take a look at the gamut I mentioned before of training implementers out there. Then we’ll look at monitoring. Why do it? How to do it? After that, let’s take a quick look at a term used widely – overused in the view of some – “building capacity” or “capacity building”. What does that mean? Finally, since we all are doing training, what is the link to monitoring and to capacity building?
Training by Type

- Long-term graduate degree training
- Leadership training
- Short-term technical training with certificate
- Short-term “one-off” training, whether off-the-shelf or tailored
- Study tours, conference attendance, etc.

Training Programs – by Focus

**Individual**
- Grants to “best & brightest” unemployed students
- Grants to qualified employees for further degree training
- Grants to graduate students or professors (research, etc.)

**Institutional**
- Project focused on or located at a single or several institutions where training is sponsored outside the country
- Project focused on or located at a single or several institutions where training is one of several interventions being used
Before we look at our subject, let’s understand the types of training going just to set the stage correctly. This list is not comprehensive – some programs probably don’t fit neatly into one category. But this gives you an overview of training implementation overall.

The first list is familiar – the types of training we are looking at. Please note that we are NOT looking at the last two types: one-offs and study tours. We are focusing on long-term training and leadership training primarily. Some short-term technical training could also be included depending on duration. We want to focus on how to monitor results of more than a brief training program.

The second list broadly situates training into two lists by their focus: individual or institutional. There are mixtures of these two broad categories to be sure, but it is useful consider the focal tendency of the training project discussed. The first – best & brightest – has fallen far out of favor – and we’ve learned that offering degree training to students who have never worked increases the risk of their not returning, since they have no institution waiting for them. Some projects focus directly on an institution while others focus largely on an individual’s increase in knowledge, skills and (hopefully), attitudes (KSA) and are not closely affiliated with an institution other than through grantee.
Why Monitor Results?

✓ provides key information to guide your activity or project (*internal*)

✓ drives decision-making at all levels (*internal*)

✓ enhances accountability (*internal/external*)

✓ engages participants in performance improvement (*internal/external*)

✓ provides evidence-based data for donors & partners (*external*)
Commentary
Andrew Gilboy

Why do we monitor the results of training? The most important reason to monitor impact is internal -- as a learning tool to help guide your project. No matter what the initial project design or idea was, a development intervention would need to adjust to evolving circumstances along the way. Project leaders therefore need information on where their training interventions were having the most impact? Making decisions based on empirical information is the goal – so that your project evolves in a way that leverages the successes you’re having.

Another important reason is external – to provide donors with accurate data for them to make their policy and operational decisions. They too need accurate information about what to emphasize in their development portfolio, and to identify ways they can assist you in getting more yield on the investment they are making.

Monitoring impact brings sunlight into our programs. Both the implementing agency and the donor can see the results being obtained or not being obtained along the way. The light should shine on results, not on inputs – it’s not the numbers of graduate degrees you are producing but the changes those individuals will introduce, primarily in their institutions when they return, that we want. Trainees also need to know their role in improving performance in their institution. If their institution or department is dysfunctional when they return, their dream of making a difference with their new knowledge and attitudes will hit a major roadblock – and they may be unprepared to navigate the institutional challenges they face.
How and when do we monitor results?

- Establish your database – include input and impact data
- Use a variety of tools to set up your impact monitoring at the beginning
- Employ those tools frequently along the way
- Gather data, analyze & synthesize into findings, & make recommendations to decision-makers
- Monitor throughout training – and begin post-training monitoring approx. 6 months after return to country
Most of this is standard monitoring --- establish a database, use tools along the way to measure change, gather data, analyze the information, synthesize it to use in decision-making or to send to donors, etc. Simple tools can help track training in progress. Post-training monitoring is typically done 6 or 9 months after the person returns.

What is important here is to integrate “institutional impact or performance indicators” into the mix, not just to monitor training progress. For example, one could include leadership as an indicator – measuring the extent the student is acquiring leadership skills that can, when applied back home, have an effect on institutional performance. Or tracking whether the student is learning to work on teams – for research, teaching, etc. Since many graduate students end up teaching, measuring their acquisition of active learning methods helps equip them to make changes in teaching styles once back at the institution.

Let's take a look at the interventions we use to increase institutional capacity or performance ---- first, what is “capacity building”
Building Institutional Capacity

- Aims to increase performance at an institution, whereas individual training increases an individual’s KSA (Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes)
- Employs both training and non-training interventions
- Uses different measurement tools to track performance increases at the organizational level (a department, unit, division or the whole institution)
Commentary
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How does training differ from institutional capacity building?

While training focuses on the individual – building the person’s knowledge, skills and modifying their attitudes (behavior), it is but one method to build capacity at the institutional level. Look at this table that compares the two, taken from USAID’s Human and Institutional Capacity Development guidebook:
## Comparing Individual Training with Institutional Capacity Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAINING</th>
<th>HICD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on <em>only one</em> performance factor - skills and knowledge</td>
<td>Focuses on <em>all five</em> performance factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An event</td>
<td>A process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up with individual performers</td>
<td>Continuous measurement process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on learner needs</td>
<td>Based on organizational needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated by individual performance</td>
<td>Evaluated by Organizational Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on 1 or few individuals</td>
<td>Focus on <em>systems</em> approach to improve organizational performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single type of intervention (training)</td>
<td>Multiple types of interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on project commitment</td>
<td>Based on organizational commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training needs assessment</td>
<td>Performance assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds capacity of individual</td>
<td>Builds capacity of organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results-oriented at participant level</td>
<td>Results-oriented at organizational level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be ad hoc</td>
<td>Must be systematic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The performance factors mentioned under HICD are those which affect an organization’s ability to meet its objectives and performance targets (if it has any): 1) job expectations; 2) Performance feedback; 3) Work environment & tools available; 4) motivation 5) equity and 6) skills and knowledge.

Training (on the left) is a performance solution that targets mainly those factors related to No. 6 above – increasing KSA – knowledge, skills & attitudes.

You can see how the other characteristics of training and HICD (which essentially means “institutional capacity building”) compare.

Notice the one on the left “single type of intervention” – training is the principal way individuals learn, whereas it is but one intervention in building institutional capacity. Other interventions include strategic planning (which might be facilitated), space management, IT improvements, physical infrastructure changes – all of which can profoundly affect an organization’s performance, and are not training.
For programs focusing on the individual

- identify host institutions and require that students maintain regular communication with deans, dept heads, peers
- develop career paths that link student to institutional gaps back home
- build networks among students that can help drive Institutional changes
This slide shows some examples of actions that you can take in addition to the things you are already doing to monitor training. You may already be doing these – but there are many others to consider that can be part of your training program. Their cost is minimal – and their impact on a student’s institution can be considerable.
For programs focusing on institutions

- Supplement out-of-country degree training with management training tailored to address the Institution’s performance gaps

- Go beyond training – look at internal communications, space use, infrastructure or equipment needs
This slide shows some examples of actions that you can take in addition to the things you are already doing to monitor training. You may already be doing these – but there are many others to consider that can be part of your training program. Their cost is minimal – and their impact on a student’s institution can be considerable.
To Recap

Evaluating Your Program’s Results:
How do you know if your work is having an impact?

✓ Training by Type and by Focus
✓ Monitoring results – why it’s important and how to do it
✓ Building institutional capacity – how it differs from training alone
✓ Linking Training to institutional need – some examples how to do it
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We’ve proposed some ideas on improving the way we manage training to help improve institutional and individual performance in developing country institutions. What are your experiences? What tools have you found useful?
Anne-Claire Hervy  
achervy@aplu.org

Andrew Gilboy  
agchange@agchange.com

To Join the Knowledge Network:  
Knowledge Network on Long-Term Technical and Leadership Training  
http://agrilinks.org/groups