ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

SCHOOL OF COMMERCE

DEPARTMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Assessing Monitoring and Evaluation practices in Talent Youth Association (TaYA): In the case of Get up Speak Out-GUSO Programme

By Meron Berhanu Adugna (REG NO: GSR/2611/13)

Advisor: Adane Atara (PhD)

June 2022

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS
SCHOOL OF COMMERCE
DEPARTMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT

ASSESSING MONITORING AND EVALUATION PRACTICES IN TALENT YOUTH ASSOCIATION (TAYA): IN THE CASE OF GET UP SPEAK OUT-GUSO PROGRAMME

A PROJECT REPORT SUBMITTED TO ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS, SCHOOL OF COMMERCE IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN PROJECT MANAGEMENT.

By Meron Berhanu Adugna (REG NO: GSR/2611/13)

Advisor: Adane Atara (PhD)

JUNE, 2022
ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

DECLARATION

I declare that this research with the title of "Assessing Monitoring and Evaluation practices in Talent Youth Association (TaYA): In the case of the Get up Speak Out-GUSO Programme" is my own original work and hasn't been submitted to any university. All resources used in this research are re appropriately referred to and given credit.

Declared by:	Signature	Date
Meron Berhanu Adugna		

Confirmed by:	Signature	Date
Adane Atara (PhD)		

CERTIFICATION

Assessing Monitoring and Evaluation practices in Talent Youth Association (TaYA): In the case of Get up Speak Out-GUSO Programme. A project work was submitted to Addis Ababa university school of commerce school of graduate studies, in partial fulfillment for the award of Master of arts degree in Project Management.

Approved by Board of examiners:

Advisor: Adane Atara (PhD)

Signature

____

Date

____

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

SCHOOL OF COMMERCE

PROGRAMME OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Assessing Monitoring and Evaluation practices in Talent Youth Association (TaYA): In the case of Get up Speak Out-GUSO Programme.

A project work submitted to Addis Ababa University College of Business and Economics School of Commerce in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Project Management.

By: Meron Berhanu Adugna

Approved by Board of examiners:

Advisor:	Signature	Date
Adane Atara (PhD)		
Internal Examiner	Signature	Date
Worku Mekonnen (PhD)		
External Examiner	Signature	Date
Biniam Berhie (PhD)		

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I most sincerely thank the almighty God, who gave me the strength and courage to be where I am now. I would like to thank my family and friends for all the support throughout this research. This project wouldn’t be a success if it wasn't for the TaYA team, I would like to express my deepest appreciation. I also would like to thank my Advisor Dr. Adane Atara who has been very cooperative and resourceful.

Table of contents

List of tables

ACRONYMES

ARH: Adolescent Reproductive Health
ASK: Access Service Knowledge
AYRH: Adolescent and youth Reproductive Health
CBOs: Community Based Organizations
CORHA: Consortium of Reproductive Health Associations
CSA: Central Statistical Agency
CSE: Comprehensive Sexuality Education
DEC: Development Expertise Center
ECHO: European Commission's Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department
EDHS: Ethiopian Demographic Health Survey
FGAE: Family Guidance Association of Ethiopia
FGDs: Focus Group Discussion
GBV: Gender based violence
GUSO: Get Up Speak Out
HIV/AIDS: Human Immunodeficiency Virus/ Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
IEC/BCC: Information, Education and Communication/ Behavior Change and Communication
IFRC: International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
ILO: International Labor Organization
IPPF: International Planned Parenthood Federation
KIT: Royal Tropical Institute
KPI: Key Performance Indicator
M&E: Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs: Millennium Development Goals
MoFA: (Dutch) Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MYP: Meaningful Youth Participation
NGOs: Non-Governmental Organizations
PMBOK: Project Management Body of Knowledge
PMEL: Program Monitoring Evaluation and Learning
PMI: Project Management Institute
SRH: Sexual and Reproductive Health
SRHR: Sexual and Reproductive Health and Right
TaYA: Talent Youth Association
ToC: Theory of Change
UFBR: Unite for Body Rights
UN: United Nations Development Programme
WHO: World health organization?
YNSD: Youth Network for Sustainable Development

Abstract

Monitoring and Evaluation practices are very essential to deliver the project/program based in the interest of all stakeholders. It is also important for effective and efficient implementation of the program. This study aims to assess the Practices in Talent Youth Association (TaYA): In the case of the Get up Speak Out-GUSO Programme. In this regard, the growth in number and size of local NGOs in Ethiopia has been growing in the past few years. which led to an increasing challenge about recognizing their accomplishments and viability of their performance? Because most NGOs. One-way associations can further develop adequacy of their project and program outcomes is by reinforcing their monitoring and evaluation frameworks. This study tried to assess the monitoring and evaluation practice on execution of Get up Speak Out-GUSO Program. Although project management practice has been improving and is showing good progress, the M&E practice has been largely low. This is why this study will assess the practice of a good monitoring and evaluation system t and its impact on the success of the GUSO Program. Adolescent sexual and reproductive health (SRH), problems are complex and multifactorial, thus requiring an empowering program for youth and women as an intervention. the pathway of changes, starting with the core problem followed by assumptions, key strategies, and outcomes with the long-term objective and finally the impact that the Ethiopian Activities were designed to increase adolescent SRH behaviors in five domains. The study takes the form of a descriptive design research design by using secondary data. It shows clearly how the M&E practices were implemented. It gave the researcher a clear image of the M&E practices, challenges, strength and weakness. The findings indicated that the GUSO program had a strong M&E practice and it highly contributed to its success even though it was challenged with Covid-19 and vague and overly ambitious goals at the planning stage of the PMEL Programme. Because of the good M&E practices the team was able to adjust their expectations and some output indicators to effectively monitor and evaluate the Programme. Which led the Programme to be successful despite the challenges faced. So anyone who came across this study can adopt their strong practice and put it to use in the projects or programmes they might implement.

Keywords: MDG, NGO, GUSO, SRH, M&E, PMEL, TaYA

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

The M&E process comprises those cycles expected to track, audit, and direct the advancement and execution of a project or a Programme; recognize if there will be changes required. Monitoring is gathering project execution information, creating execution assessment, and revealing and spreading execution data. Evaluating is contrasting actual execution and planned execution, investigating differences, surveying patterns to impact process upgrades, assessing potential improvements, and suggesting proper remedial activity on a case-by-case basis. The vital advantage of this Process Group is that project execution is estimated and broken down consistently or when exemption conditions happen to distinguish and address fluctuations from the project plan. Continuous monitoring provides advice and recommendations. This ensures the active participation of stakeholders in the Programme and helps to facilitate the sustainability of the Programme and the alliance. (PMBOK, 2017).

One can successfully set up a monitoring practice by having a clear objective, deliverables and key performance indicators. If we have a clear baseline data the results collected will give us accurate data of where the Programme is headed. This will let us form a mitigation strategy if there are issues or we can keep the best practices for the successful completion of the Programme.

On the other hand, evaluation is the comparison of the objectives and the KPIs set with the implementation of the Programme,

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system refers to all the indicators, tools, and processes that you will use to measure if a program has been implemented according to the plan (monitoring) and is having the desired result (evaluation). An M&E system is often described in a document called an M&E plan. The focus of M & E is to enhance the success of a Programme by creating a clear link between the Programme goals and objectives with its outcomes and impacts. M&E can help an organization to coordinate the Programme, identify and bridge capacity gaps, document and share accomplishments, provide advice and recommendations. This ensures the active participation of stakeholders in the program Programme and helps to facilitate the sustainability of the Programme etc. without M&E the project team or its stakeholders will not be able to know if the Programme they are running is failing or not. (Khandker, Koolwal and Samad, 2010)

These days most industries recognize the importance of discrete project cycles in contributing to larger strategies and success of Programme outcomes or impacts. As we all know there is lots of research and articles about project management practices, strategies, challenges and better approaches. The sexual reproductive health entitlement, information and education of SRH and youth-friendly SRH services of women and young people is less represented in project management literature. Even Though the Programme and project lifecycle are the way to improve the lives of children, youth and women in developing and undeveloped countries. Donor based programmes are usually carried out by one of the beneficiary governments under an agreement with the donor, or with the funding party partner", often a non-governmental organization (NGO) or a consulting contractor.

Donor funding for SRH, youth and women empowerment in Ethiopia has expanded in recent years. This led to a demand for a wide variety of project types, raising degrees of responsibility and performance among stakeholders and implementing parties, implying a growing requirement for better and efficient project management practices.

Responsibility is the means by which people and associations report to a project or Programme stakeholders and are considered liable for their activities (Edwards and Hulme 1994). M&E are an essential for any intervention, project, or Programme. (Frankel, N. and Gage, A. (2007)

1.2 Background of the organization

The Ethiopian Alliance for the Get Up Speak Out [GUSO] Programme is formed of Development Expertise Center (DEC), Family Guidance Association of Ethiopia (FGAE), Talent Youth Association (TaYA), and Youth Network for Sustainable Development (YNSD). The Alliance members have been working together through the previous UFBR & ASK Alliances and had the opportunity to engage together and knew each other very well. The ASK youth empowerment alliance, however, involved AMREF as the lead organization, which is still operating with some of the GUSO Alliance members through the DFID-Direct Aid project in North Shewa. DEC has joined the other ASK alliance members instead of AMREF on the GUSO Programme. However, this does not mean that the institutions did not have joint interventions before. DEC, being one of the institutions supported by the Netherlands, has been engaging with the ASK alliance members on common areas of interventions, such as the CSE initiative on curriculum issues among like-minded partners under the auspices of Consortium of Reproductive Health Associations [CORHA]. The GUSO Alliance members in Ethiopia view the joining of DEC as an additional catalyst, particularly on strengthening the hitherto efforts on CSE at grass-roots and national levels. More importantly, the periodic meetings among the Dutch grantees at the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands [EKN] have particularly served as an avenue of exchange and learning among partners. Thanks to the closer follow up and facilitation of the EKN, all of the GUSO Alliance members in Ethiopia have been engaging in the forum, whereby participants are given specific sessions to convey lessons and promising practices pursuant to their areas of expertise. Thus, the engagements in the previous alliances and the sub-grantees forum at the EKN can be mentioned as a key factor in setting a convenient benchmark for further alliance intervention, such as the GUSO Alliance.

Talent youth association (TaYA) is a local non-governmental organization founded in 2003 by people who were concerned with the challenges young people are facing and the consequences.

TaYA has particular focus on youth sexual reproductive health targeting young people who are in school, out of school and those in employment. which has been engaged in youth development programmes since its inception. With its new strategic plan, TaYA focuses on three thematic areas: adolescent and youth sexual reproductive health, youth economic empowerment, and promoting meaningful participation of young people in matters that affect their lives. Moreover, TaYA has been involved in African regional youth development activities, contributing not only to Ethiopian youth development, but also to African youth development endeavors especially in areas of youth participation, HIV/AIDS and SRH.

1.3 Statement of the problem

Project performance measurement is crucial in managing projects as it enables the project manager to establish challenges in budget and scope in time and devise proper mechanisms that address these challenges (Dissanayaka & Kumaraswamy, 2013). However, Turner and Muller (2015) observe that those that are involved in the project handling fail to take a proactive approach to overcoming the uncertainties. As a result of this, project delays and budget overruns are usually encountered due to an overlook of potential risk. Insufficient information and ineffective management of projects not only caused project cost overrun, completion delays but also termination before completion. In recent years, there has been an increase in M&E practice. This has opened up new opportunities to monitor and evaluate the performance of projects and programmes to get realistic data of implementations and outcomes. In monitoring and evaluation, a researcher seeks to discover the effects of a monitoring and evaluation practice on the GUSO Programme. Typically, this involves comparing the data collected and interviewing the Programme team and assessing the outcomes.

Despite the fact that monitoring and evaluation are seen as similar things, they are different. Monitoring is seen as a process that gives data and guarantees the utilization of such data by the board to survey Programme impact. It targets seeing if the expected goals/results have been met. Evaluation draws on the information and data created by the monitoring as an approach to examining the patterns in impacts and effect of the Programme. Now and again, it ought to be noticed that monitoring could uncover critical takeoff from the Programme assumptions, which might warrant the endeavor of an assessment to inspect the presumptions and premises on which the Programme configuration is based.
M&E are the processes of collecting and analyzing data to determine whether or not a project is meeting its intended goals. M&E is the process of identifying and understanding changes that occur during and after the implementation of a project. M&E are two important elements of project management. Monitoring is the collection of data in order to track and measure progress toward a defined set of goals.
To begin with, M&E is important for a PM to assess the Programme's success by comparing it to the planned outcomes. Next, M&E is important for funders who want to know if your NGO is a trustworthy partner. Developing a monitoring and evaluation practice culture in one's organization is very important. This will let us have a transparent partnership with donors, stakeholders and beneficiaries. Doers might also continue to support the NGO in other projects or programmes in the future.

M & E has increasingly been recognized as an essential tool for the management of the project. It has also conceded the need to improve on the performance of development funds given by donors. It calls for close consideration to information provision by the management to support project implementation. A complete feedback loop is important in designing new project initiatives. In addition, M & E also offers a provision for accountability in the course of the utilization of the development resources. A close scrutiny of review shows that despite the importance associated with adoption and implementation of effective M & E practices in the projects, very little attention has gone into questioning and investigating whether the practices result in project performance in donor funded projects. There are several valuable studies of and project performance concur monitoring and evaluation influence project performance. A few researchers have mentioned that few studies have been done on the monitoring and evaluation of project performance from the Kenyan chapter. These few studies did not widely focus on monitoring and evaluation as a major influence to the performance of projects (Kihuha, 2018).

1.4 Basic Research Questions

The following are the research questions:

1. What methods have been used for monitoring and evaluation in the case of Get up Speak Out-GUSO Programme?
2. What are the procedures used in the case of Get up Speak Out-GUSO Programme?
3. What are the main challenges faced while monitoring and evaluating in the case of Get up Speak Out-GUSO Programme?

1.5 Objectives of the Study

1.5.1 General objective of the study

The general objective of this study is to examine the practice of project monitoring and evaluation in the case of the Get up Speak Out-GUSO Programme.

1.5.2 Specific objective of the study

1. To assess monitoring and evaluation methods used in the case of Get up Speak Out-GUSO Programme.
2. Asses the procedures TaYA has for the GUSO Programme
3. Assessing the main challenges facing while monitoring and evaluating in the case of Get up Speak Out-GUSO Programme.

1.6 Significance of the study

This study will be helpful to demonstrate the monitoring and evaluation practices and its significance in managing a Programme. It will identify challenges faced during M&E with regard to a specific Programme. This study will be done by taking Talent Youth Associations experience in the case of Get up Speak Out-GUSO Programme. Although the study focuses on one NGO's practice, it is also believed that this study can be applicable to other NGOS that are involved in the same field. It is also hoped that the findings will be used by researchers to improve the literature on the subject. The research also intends to give a thorough examination of the many components of M&E practice. The objective of this study is to provide a comprehensive analysis of the various aspects of the humanitarian and environmental (M&E) field, including the design and implementation of projects, donors, and stakeholders. It will also identify the most effective solution that will be used by the Talent Youth Association.

1.7 Scope of the Study

The purpose of this study is to asses monitoring and evaluation practices for the GUSO Programme. By assessing M&E methods and procedures and challenges faced while the implemented the M&E. The study is only limited to one Programme i.e., Get up Speak Out-GUSO Programme. It is only based on the monitoring and evaluation practice of the Programme based on the Programme proposal, Programme outcome objective and baseline, midline and endline data. the study restricted itself to TaYA guidelines on monitoring and evaluation practices.

1.8 Limitation of the study

This research faced a number of challenges. To begin with the study is only based on one GUSO Programme and therefore other projects and programmes were not assessed. Which means the data and the sample didn't include other projects or programmes implemented in TaYA.

The findings of the study were limited to TaYA's institutional practice of M & E with correlation of GUSO Programme performance and less control of the many other confounders that may have directly influenced Programme performance. Literature review covered studies on varied organizations with different study designs. Study focused on one organization limiting findings to experience one organization and inference.

1.9 Organization of the Research Report

Chapter one of my study will present the background of the study, background of the company, background of the Programme, statement of the problem, research questions, research objectives, discuss the significance of the study and definitions of key terms that will be used in the research. The second chapter will assess different books, websites, articles, and any other sources significant to this research. It will provide different definitions, descriptions, evaluations, and critiques to provide an insight of what the researcher investigated to write the research paper. chapter three The research methodology in use for this research is Descriptive method. It will present an overall picture of the monitoring and evaluation practice for the GUSO Programme. It will present the background data like baseline study; classify the sequences, stages, challenges and achievements of the monitoring and evasion. chapter four: Data Presentation, Analysis and Discussion will be covered in chapter four Secondary data will be collected by reviewing documents like baseline data, MEL plan, guidelines, Programme outcomes, knowledge sharing document and different databases. The last chapter, chapter five will present Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation As the name indicates in this chapter the research will present a summary of findings, conclusions, limitations of the study and recommendations.

1.10 Definition of Terms and Concepts

- **Programme:** are groupings of linked projects and activities that are handled in a coordinated manner to have a bigger effect than if they were managed separately. Programs are often carried out through a centralized management system that coordinates groupings of projects in order to accomplish overall strategic objectives and advantages. (UNDP, 2009)
- **Monitoring –** is the continuous tracking of a project by way of collecting and analyzing data as the project progresses. It provides regular feedback that helps the organization track costs, personnel, and implementation time, and organizational development, economic and financial results to compare what was planned to the actual performance.
- **Evaluation –**is a specific activity that endeavors to survey efficiently and impartially progress towards and the accomplishment of a result. (UNDP, 2009)
- **Lessons learned –** are learning from experience that is applicable to a general situation rather than to a specific circumstance. it will be used to draw useful lessons and has make better and informed decisions on how to address some of the challenges encountered by the previous initiatives (UNDP, 2009)

- **Inputs:** The human and financial resources, physical equipment and operational policies that are the core components of the programmes and enable their implementation. (Frankel and Gage, 2007)
- **Outputs:** Are **e**vidence of Programme implementation. Outputs can include required deliverables, the number of activities, newly developed materials, new policies or procedures, observations of the Programme in use, numbers people involved, and other data that provide evidence of the implementation of activities in the Programme
- **Logical framework**: A dynamic planning and management tool that logically links the key elements of Programme and project design. It is the basis for M&E and hence kept under constant review. It is a tool that sets out the objectives of a project and how they will be measured. (Frankel and Gage, 2007)
- **Outcomes:** are associated with particular information, behaviors, or practices on the part of the intended audience that are obviously engaging the Programme can be reasonably expected to fluctuate throughout the short-to-intermediate term, contributing to a programme's targeted long-term aims. (Frankel and Gage, 2007)
- **Objectives:** the intended areas of action through which a project or Programme will attain its goals. Objectives are turned immediately into a list of tasks. Setting deadlines contributes to ensuring that goals are accomplished on time. (Frankel and Gage, 2007)
- **Indicators:** are measures used to demonstrate changes in certain conditions or results of an intervention.
- **Baseline data:** Data that describe the state of an issue to be addressed via the Programme or project. It will be used to decide the effects and accomplishments of an activity, and which serves as a critical reference for evaluation. (UNDP, 2022)

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

2 Introduction

This chapter contains a review of literature on Monitoring and Evaluation and its influence in performance of SRH programmes in a local NGO. It majors on the manner in which the idea of M&E has been integrated into the Programme management. The first section deals with theoretical literature review and it is followed by a discussion on empirical literature review.

2.1 Theoretical framework

2.1.1 Programme theory

Programme theory shows potential of the Programme to mend an issue by addressing the needs of a given beneficiaries. (Sethi and Philippines, 2012).

A Programme consists of a structure set up on a way to deploy resources and organize activities of the Programme to make sure that the supposed target population receives the intended quantity of intervention (Hosley, 2009).

The Programme theory could be a theory within the evaluation of programmes as it shows the capability of the Programme to attend to specific issues that require to be reviewed at interval projects. It adds more guidance on what areas have to be targeted throughout the M&E method (Donaldson, 2015).

2.1.2 Project monitoring

Project activities are monitored concurrently with their implementation to ensure that the project is on track and in line with the formulated plan. Tracking helps identify any deviations from the project plan and also initiates corrections during the course. When executing a project, its quality, time, cost and risk management must be considered to ensure that it is successfully implemented within the predefined resources and schedule.(Singh, 2017), According to (Herrero et al., 2012) integrating monitoring practices ensures that the project/Programme team should keep the planned activities on schedule, they should review and update the project plan and costs as necessary and they should review timelines and deliverables, which will help the project/Programme be implemented according to plan.

(UNDP, 2009) defines Monitoring as the continuous interaction by which partners acquire customary input on the progress made toward achieving their goals and objectives. More broadly, monitoring also includes tracking the policies and actions being taken by partners and non-partners and determining what new policies and actions need to be implemented and taken to ensure progress towards key outcomes.

(UNDP, 2009) stated these as the most common types of monitoring;

1. **Results monitoring:** tracks impacts and effects of a Programme. This is where monitoring assesses to decide whether the undertaking/Programme is on track towards its planned outcomes and whether there might be any unplanned effects (positive or negative).
2. **Activity Monitoring:** is used throughout the early phases of a project to track the usage of inputs and resources, as well as to examine how activities and outcomes are provided. It is typically performed in conjunction with compliance monitoring and adds to impact evaluation.
3. **Compliance monitoring:** guarantees compliance with donors' expectations and predicted results, supply and settlement requirements, nearby governmental rules and laws, and moral requirements.
4. **Context (situation) monitoring:** tracks the setting within which the project/Programme operates, particularly because it has an effect on known risks and assumptions, however also any sudden issues which will arise.
5. **Financial monitoring:** The main purpose of this monitoring is to live financial potency within a project. It tracks the planned expenditure used during a project as compared to the allotted budget and helps the project team to create methods to maximize outputs with lowest inputs. This is often conducted together with 'processes and 'compliance' monitoring and is crucial for irresponsibleness and coverage purposes.
6. **Organizational monitoring:** as the name indicates, examines institutional growth, communication, cooperation, sustainability, and capacity building inside an organization as well as with its partners and stakeholders in connection to project delivery.

2.1.3 Project Evaluation

Is a rigorous and impartial evaluation of both finished or ongoing projects and programmes to decide the quantity to which they're attaining said targets? Evaluations can observe many things, together with the project/Programme strategy, policy, topic, theme, region or organization. It can assist in decisions, enhance overall performance and reap deliberate results. (UNDP, 2009).

Evaluation is described as systematic studies to see if a Programme can achieve its meant results and impacts. Evaluation is performed to assess whether or not the envisaged goals and desires had been performed or not, and secondly, to check whether or not the fulfillment is due to the task interventions (Singh, Chandurkan, & Dutt, 2017).

It's far anticipated that the relevance and success of goals, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of a task may be decided by the usage of evaluation results. Besides, it should offer records that are credible and useful, permitting the incorporation of training discovered into the decision-making manner of each recipient and donors. (European Commission Civil Society Fund in Ethiopia, 2017)

2.1.4 Types of Evaluation

Based on (UNDP, 2009), these are the most common types of evaluation.

A. Based on timing of the evaluation;

1. **Ex-ante evaluation (Start-up evaluation)**: may be a progressive assessment of the seemingly future effects of recent initiatives associated with policies, programmes and strategies. It takes place before the implementation of a Programme.

2. **Mid-term evaluation:** it is undertaken mid-implementation of the initiative. It tends to boost performance, most frequently conducted throughout the implementation section of comes or programmes.
3. **Final or terminal evaluation:** they're done towards the end of the implementation of a Programme. It is done to determine the extent to which predicted results were realized. It's meant to supply information concerning the value of the Programme.
4. **Ex-post evaluation:** assessment of an initiative after it's been completed; typically performed after a specific period of time after completion. Its reason is to examine how effectively the initiative (Programme or project) served its aims, to evaluate sustainability of consequences and influences and to attract conclusions for related tasks for the future.

B. Based on who conducts the evaluation,

1. **Internal Evaluation:** is performed by people involved within the Programme/project, by the Programme implementation office or main finance of the Programme. (ILO, 2011)
2. **External Evaluation:** it's done by people from outside the Programme/project. Ex-post evaluations are often done by external evaluators. Donors often prefer external evaluators because it's believed that they will bring a spread of experience and knowledge that might not be available within the organization, and that they may have more independence and credibility than an inside evaluator. (ILO, 2011)
3. **Joint evaluations:** are evaluations carried out collectively by multiple agencies. The emphasis is not on participatory assessment and its methodologies for including stakeholder communities in the process, but rather on evaluations carried out together by more than one partner. It handles the growing portfolio of scheduled evaluation activity. (ILO, 2011)
4. **Participatory evaluations:** are conducted with the beneficiaries and other key stakeholders, and can be empowering, building their capacity, ownership and support. (IFRC,2011)

C. According to evaluation technicality or methodology

1. **Thematic evaluation:** evaluate certain features, concepts, and processes of technical work, and may also concentrate on specific areas, concerns, or methods. It enables technical programmes to investigate the efficacy and impact of certain methods in depth. These assessments might rely on lessons learnt at the project level and focus on issues that are important beyond the scope of the project. Because the assessment is focused on efficacy and impact, it is often utilized after the conclusion of programmes. (ILO, 2011)

2. **Cluster/sector evaluation:** focus on a set of related activities, projects or programmes, typically across sites and implemented by multiple organizations. (ILO, 2011)
3. **Impact evaluation:** the purpose is to examine the "positive and negative, long-term results caused by an intervention, directly or indirectly, planned or unforeseen." It answers to a rising desire among partners for more reliable effect measurement. It is generally distinguished by its conceptual and analytical focus on defining the form and amount of attribution that may be assigned to specific elements such as policies, programmes, or interventions. One of the most difficult aspects of this evaluation is distinguishing between what happened as a direct result of a given factor and what would have happened if that factor did not exist. (ILO, 2011)
4. **Real-time evaluations (RTEs)**: is an early-stage, timely, quick, and participatory peer assessment of a rapidly moving humanitarian operation (typically an emergency). Its goal is to assess the efficacy and impact of a particular response and ensure that its results serve as an immediate trigger for organizational and operational change. (Jamal and Crisp, 2014). The RTE approach, which has been characterized as an activity "taken out when a Programme is in full execution and nearly instantly feeds back its findings to the Programme for immediate application," might be regarded as a sort of process assessment during fast onset situations. (Walden, Scott and Lakeman, 2010).

2.1.5 The differences between monitoring and evaluation

M&E are clearly distinct but complementary activities. Monitoring is the process of collecting data on a regular basis in order to make informed judgments. Monitoring gives the facts to assess the current scenario and where it stands in relation to defined goals and objectives. It will help with identifying qualities and trends, keeping the Programme on track, and monitoring progress results. Monitoring provides data and facts about development in relation to objectives and results to managers and other stakeholders. It is descriptive and must recognize real or potential accomplishments and issues as soon as possible in order to inform decisions.

Evaluation gives data about why the Programme is or isn't accomplishing its objectives and targets. It could evaluate different regions like accomplishment of planned objectives, cost-proficiency, viability and influence. It addresses what caused the changes being monitored. how results are achieved or missed; and 'consistency and responsibility' questions, that is, did the guaranteed tasks really happen and as the Programme design. Evaluations are more scientific than monitoring, and try to resolve issues of causality. A bassline study is the start of evaluation. It is utilized to gauge the 'beginning or reference points of indicators of impact and effect (Soas, 2013)

2.1.6 Monitoring and evaluation plan

M&E plan is a document that aids in tracking and assessing the outcomes of interventions over the course of a programme's lifespan. It must be updated on a regular basis. While the specifics of each programme's M&E strategy will change, they must all follow a similar fundamental framework and have the same critical components. The plan will include certain papers that will be developed throughout the Programme development process, as well as a few that may be created during implementation. Elements such as the conceptual framework, theory of change, and adherence indicators, for example, may have previously been created with input from key stakeholders and/or the Programme funder. (How to develop a monitoring and evaluation plan | The Compass for SBC, n.d.)

It is essential to have an M&E plan with the project/Programme plan. It will assist Programme personnel determine how they may be going to gather information to follow up on indicators, how monitoring statistics might be analyzed, and the way the effects of data might be disseminated each to the donor and internally amongst staff for Programme improvement. M&E data on its own isn't always beneficial till a person places it to use. The M&E plan will assist ensure data collected to be used correctly to make changes as effective as viable and that allows you to document the effects by the end of the Programme. (How to develop a monitoring and evaluation plan| The Compass for SBC, n.d.)

The M & E scheme is crucial in enhancing project performance. Effective M&E implementation requires a well-done M&E plan. The plan would involve advocating for the necessity for M&E, assessing strategic data needs, building agreement and commitment among stakeholders, significantly of indicators and tools (WHO 2015)

Based on (Kelli et al., 2011), preparing an M&E plan calls for a proper knowledge of the project, inputs, processes, output and outcomes. And they referred to that the inputs required could consist of human assets with M&E technical ability and assets, authority and mandate to expand the M&E plan.

2.1.7 Monitoring and evaluation framework types

1. **Conceptual framework:** are diagrams that define and illustrate linkages between key organizational, human, and various aspects that will impact a Programme as well as the achievement of goals and objectives. They aid in deciding which elements will impact the Programme, but each of those aspects (underlying, cultural, economic, socio-political, and so on) may link to and influence the outcomes. They are not nice to the premise for monitoring and analytic operations, but they will assist establish the argument for Programme outcomes. (Monitoring and evaluation of initiatives on violence against women and girls, 2011)
    - **Theory of Change (TOC) -** It is an outline of ways a Programme is meant to achieve the preferred results. It describes ways and why a specific project or Programme will attain its meant results. It is a key underpinning of any impact assessment, given the cause-and-effect awareness of the studies. As one of the first steps with inside the evaluation layout, a theory of change can assist specify the questions. Theories of change depict a chain of activities that bring about outcomes; they discover the situations and assumptions wanted for the solution to take place.

      Working with the programme’s stakeholders to prepare a theory of change can make clear and enhance Programme design. The ideal time to prepare a theory of change for a Programme is at the starting of the planning process, while stakeholders are part of the planning of, goals, and the course to accomplishing the goals
2. **Results Frameworks** Results frameworks every so often known as strategic frameworks illustrate the direct relationships among the intermediate effects of tasks to the general objectives. They display the causal association among Programme goals and describe how every of the

intermediate effects/ outputs and effects pertains to and facilitate the success of every goal. Results frameworks do shape the idea for tracking and assessment sports on the goal level. (Monitoring and evaluation of initiatives on violence against women and girls, 2011)

3. **Logical Frameworks:** Logical frameworks lay out a linear, logical‖ interpretation of the connection among inputs, activities, outputs, results and impacts with reference to goals. Logical frameworks define the particular inputs that have to perform the activities/strategies to provide particular outputs a good way to bring about particular outcomes and impacts.it is used to shape the idea for monitoring and evaluation of the Programme.

   As clearly stated on (Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks (3 parts), 2010), Logic models are valuable tools for:

   - **Programme Planning and Development**
   - **Programme Management**
   - **Communication with stakeholders**

Log frames are diagrams that connect Programme inputs to processes, outputs, results, and impacts associated with a particular problem or circumstance. Logic models highlight the relationships between what resources the Programme needs to fulfill its goals, what the Programme will do, and what you want to do.
A sequence of "if, then" interactions link the logic model's components: Programme activities may be conducted when resources are accessible to the Programme; if Programme activities are effectively completed, specific outputs and results can be expected. (Gage and Dunn, 2009)
As a conceptual framework, the Logical Framework does not attempt to account for all elements that may impact the operation and outcomes of a Programme. Instead, the logic framework concentrates on the programme's inputs, activities, and consequences. This limited focus assists Programme administrators and monitoring and evaluation planners in clarifying the direct linkages between certain things of interest within a given Programme. (Monitoring and evaluation of initiatives on violence against women and girls, 2011)

2.1.8 Baseline and endline studies

Baseline study: is a study that describes the initial circumstances or suitable indicators prior to the start of a project/Programme, against which progress is measured or comparisons are made. It involves analyzing the prevailing situation in order to discover where to start a project. It is recommended that implementers carry out this survey before starting or implementing a Programme since these acts as a reference tool for use in all future activities

Endline study: is performed at the end of a project/Programme (typically as part of its final assessment) to compare to baseline conditions and measure change. It is used to discuss baseline and endline studies together because if a baseline study is undertaken, it is often followed by another comparable investigation later in the project/Programme (e.g., an endline study) for information comparison to see impact. An endline survey is conducted after the intended advantages of a Programme have been realized.

When outcomes at baseline and endpoint are compared, changes that happened throughout the intervention can be discovered.

Baseline and endline studies are not assessments in and of themselves, but they are an important component in assessing change. They help with project/Programme evaluation but they can also help with monitoring changes on longer-term projects/programmes. The benchmark data from a baseline is used for comparison later in the project/Programme and/or at the end to help verify what difference the project/Programme has made toward its objectives. This can be beneficial for measuring impact, which can be difficult. (IFRC, 2011)

2.1.9 Challenges in project evaluation

Developing nations developing their own M&E systems encounter issues that are both comparable and distinct from those faced by developed countries. The most basic prerequisite, demand for and ownership of such a system, may be more difficult to build in developing nations. A recent World Bank and African Development Bank research, for example, discovered that "...the fundamental impediment to effective M&E in Sub-Saharan Africa is a lack of demand." The lack of demand derives from a lack of a strong evaluation culture, which stems from a lack of performance focus in the public sector (Schacter, 2000). The following are some of the major challenges:

1. **Human Resource Capacity**

   According to (UNAIDS, 2008) it is necessary to possess dedicated and adequate numbers of M&E workers, it's essential for this staff to have the proper skills for the work. Moreover, M&E human capability building needs a large variety of activities, together with formal training, in-service training, mentorship and internships. Lastly, M&E capacity building ought to focus not only on the technical aspects of M&E, however additionally address skills in leadership, budget management, facilitation, supervision, support and communication. Therefore, by conducting capacity assessment and tackling capacity gaps we can implement a successful M & E with trained and fully capable staff.

2. **Insufficient Stakeholders' Involvement**

   Stakeholder participation is a vital issue to be thought of in analyzing factors that have an effect on the effectiveness of M&E. Knowing and understanding the needs of partners is important. This may affect the Programme in terms of funding, needs and what information is going to be needed by each stakeholder. An accurate stakeholder analysis has to be conducted. Neglecting relevant stakeholders in monitoring and evaluation could result in low ownership of results and reduce the likelihood that project implementers will incorporate results into decision-making processes. It can also lead to a lack of trust or even the relationship between beneficiaries, monitoring and assessment experts, government, donors, stakeholders and implementers in a bad place. (Mugambi & Kanda, 2013)

3. **Budget allocation for M&E**

   (TECS, 2013) states that Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requires proper and a well thought out budget allocation. To achieve their intended objective organizations need to allocate an adequate budget for M&E, but donors contrary to this while appraising and approving budgets tend to cut out the monitoring and evaluation component of the budget Therefore organizations will be forced either to quit their services or produce fake monitoring and Evaluation reports. Budgeting and resource distribution affects M&E and this is required to be planned well to ensure the monitoring and evaluation of the Programme is done properly (Mugambi & Kanda, 2013).

4. **Loose Monitoring and Evaluation planning**

   Based on (MLYAM, 2011). If the donor doesn't seem to be interested in the M&E organizations tend to ignore or do inadequate planning for M&E. This will lead to loss of data and the origination won't be able to tell if the Programme achieved its goals and objectives or not.

5. **Management Support**
   (WHO, 2015) also indicated that management support determines the success of monitoring and evaluation because it is the management who decides the resources required for the M&E, how the M&E undertaken, and for what purpose the result will be used.

6. **Lack of Integration**
   Monitoring and evaluation activities need to be integrated throughout the implementation of the project or Programme. Most impact indicators may not be collected appropriately. Some directorates want their activities to be more visible in the report. Lack of consistency in some data collected at the district level damages the whole system and outcome of M&E. if the monitoring and evaluation are not integrated the data collected will not be accurate. This will lead to inconsistent indicator analysis.

2.2 Empirical review

Indicators for M&E are crucial for evaluating the impact of programmes, policies, and interventions as well as tracking development of health outcomes, particularly in SRH. As a result, WHO/HRP contributes to the development of reporting standards that establish "how" to assess SRH outcomes and conducts research with partners to better understand how to collect, analyze, and interpret Reproductive and sexual health data. (WHO, 2014)

NGOs in Ethiopia are given a lot of donor funds to execute Sexual and Reproductive Health Projects. Not only does best practice include project monitoring for control, but project stakeholders also expect transparency, responsibility for resource usage, and communication. impact, effective project management, and organizational learning (to benefit future projects).

The study highlighted the monitoring and evaluation procedures used, as well as the problems encountered by NGOs conducting Sexual and Reproductive Health Projects in Addis Ababa. According to the study findings, the NGO's programmes were not successfully monitored and assessed. Furthermore, the same NGOs face major difficulties and limitations in project organization, baseline data gathering, and making available finances for M&E, as well as a lack of competence in the field.

M&E are new concepts related to other parts of project management practice among NGOs. As a result, they will require some training to carry it out. Most of those NGOs lack expertise and abilities in using the resources provided by the donors. Furthermore, because of frequent staff turnover, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) lose trained workers. This might be due to a lack of financial means to fully reward employees who seek higher compensation.
(Berhanu, 2011)

2.2.1 Baseline Survey on M&E and Project Performance

(Rogito, 2010) studied the influence of M&E on project implementation by taking the Youth Enterprise Development Fund Kenya as a case. The research aims were to establish how implementer M&E trainings affect youth project execution, how baseline surveys of M&E designs impact execution, and to identify mechanisms that might be used to improve youth project performance. Rogito discovered that baseline studies are hardly ever conducted. The study focused mostly on baseline surveys for youth initiatives, leaving other areas of the economy to be researched.
Action Aid (2008), for the following reasons: It is a beginning point for a project - Conducting a baseline study is an important and suggested technique to begin a project. A baseline acts as a standard for all subsequent operations, which project managers may turn to while making project management choices, based on its results: Setting priorities and planning - Baseline investigations are critical in determining project priorities. The findings of a baseline research might reveal which elements of a project require more attention than others.

2.2.2 Successful Monitoring and Evaluation

A successful Monitoring and evaluation are included into a project at the early phases of planning. It focuses on results that are related to the project's goals and objectives and assesses them thoroughly and objectively. It is used to inform the project's development and impacts its procedures and aims as it moves forward. Monitoring and evaluation success will be utilized to develop the project, promote your accomplishments and achievements, and boost the initiative's reputation in the local community. (Bates and Jones, 2012).

2.2.3 Why Monitor and Evaluate Programmes?

Based on (UNDP, 2009) Monitoring and evaluation may assist an organization in extracting useful information from previous and present operations to utilize as a foundation for Programme changes, realignments, and future planning. If the M & E report shows success, the practices can be improved and used for upcoming programmes.

(World bank 1997) M&E should be built in from the beginning, and used during all the implementation phases to assess: the extent to which the intended activities are carried out, the procedure used to attain the desired objectives, the progress achieved in reaching the desired outcomes and the project's impact on its beneficiaries.

(Adamchak et al., 2000) stated these reasons as to why evaluate programmes

- **Monitoring and evaluation show if and how youth programmes are working. -** Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) can inform us whether or not Programme actions are effective. Programme managers and donors want to be able to show outcomes, understand how their programmes function, and evaluate how the programmes connect with other events. This improves the discipline by creating a repository of lessons learned and best practices that can be used to develop ARH initiatives all around the world.
- **M&E can be used to strengthen programmes**. With sufficient data, you may compare sites, establish goals for strategic planning, assess training and supervision requirements, and solicit input from the target audience or Programme participants. You may prioritize resource allocation, enhance information for fund-raising, educate and encourage employees, advocate for the efficacy of your Programme method, and so on.
- **M&E results can help institutionalize programmes.** M&E findings may assist stakeholders and the community in understanding what the Programme is accomplishing, how effectively it is reaching its objectives, and whether key needs are impeding your progress. Sharing outcomes might assist the Programme in establishing or strengthening a network of persons and organizations with similar aims of working with youth.
- **M&E shapes the decisions of funding agencies and policymakers. M&E** outcomes are highly important to funding agencies and policymakers. They can make strategic decisions about how to spend money and demonstrate that the expenditure yields quality results. M&E results frequently indicate unmet needs or hurdles to Programme performance, which may be utilized to advocate for policy or legislative reforms.
- **M&E results strengthen your Programme institutionally.** M&E outcomes may assist stakeholders and the community in understanding what the Programme is doing, how effectively it is accomplishing its objectives, and whether progress can be improved. It may help secure social, financial, and political support, as well as assist your Programme in establishing or strengthening a network of persons and organizations with similar aims.

2.2.4 Limitations to M&E of SRH Programmes

Donors desire M&E tools that make it easier to track SRH interventions. However, the efficiency of these systems is limited by the lack of a supportive atmosphere or policy framework in the SRH sector. African countries have additional obstacles in incorporating globally agreed-upon indicators into national health data gathering frameworks. Another challenge in policy design is the lack of enough human and technological capability to administer the M&E system. This deficit includes flaws in data collection and analysis, a lack of indicators and benchmarks, and the near-absence of SRH management information systems in many nations.

An ideal M&E budget for SRH programmes is between 5% and 10% of the entire project expenditure. Many SRH programmes devote fewer resources; there are many competing priorities in the allocation of restricted resources, and Programme administrators frequently fail to prioritize M&E. As a result, the finances available are frequently insufficient to meet M&E objectives. This creates a gap at a time when funders seek to demonstrate how their assistance for organizations is delivering outcomes. In such circumstances, the better-funded Programme will have a better M&E compared to a Programme with budget constraints; however, donors' insistence on evidence-based decision-making, as well as increasing national and international efforts to provide and improve data-gathering, indicate that M&E will improve over time (Okonofua, 2014)

2.3 Conceptual framework

As shown in the table below, the following conceptual framework has been used according to literature review. Based on the empirical review M&E practices are directly related to Input, Process, Output, Outcome and Impact.

Table 1: Conceptual framework of the study

Assessment M&E practices at TAYA GUSO Programme				
Input	**Process**	**Output**	**Outcome**	**Impact**
Was there M&E Plan? Were there adequate resources, i.e., financial, human and material allotted for M&E activities?	Review capacity of M&E staff Review M&E data management and quality control Mechanism Review Programme Progress M&E	Review Programme reporting trends, i.e., timeliness and quality Review Programme supervision trends	Were the stakeholders actively involved in Programme supervision to follow up Programme progress against targets?	Was there baseline survey to facilitate Programme evaluation? Was there a mechanism to see whether the Programme achieved its objectives or not?

CHAPTER THREE

Research Methodology and design

3. Introduction

3.1 Research Methodology

For this study a descriptive research method is selected. Descriptive research is the research design research methodology that studies a phenomenon to discover information on its nature, cause, course, and effects. This will be used to explain the monitoring and evaluation practice implemented in the GUSO Programme and describes how the findings are arrived at. A descriptive research design in this study was key in describing the nature of the M&E systems and factors influencing their performance. The descriptive research is appropriate where the research tries to portray the attributes of specific groups, estimate the extent of individuals who have certain qualities and make forecasts (Cooper & Schindler, 2011). The design was additionally applicable since it portrays situations as they exist without manipulation of study constructs, which was the basis of this investigation (Kothari, 2004).

A descriptive research survey design provides an appropriate technique of collecting data in regards to the study variables on M&E practices. This design is preferred because it makes enough provision for protection against bias and maximizes reliability (Kothari 2012). The descriptive design is able to give more information concerning the variable in question as this study design is chosen where the research requires a description of a phenomena or an object.

Research methods used qualitatively. Qualitative methods will be conducted by sending a questionnaire to key personnel and team members that participated in the Programme. To ensure support or otherwise of facts and issues that are gathered. So, the research approach for this study is a mixed approach. The basis for selecting a mixed approach for this study is because the nature of the research problem required both primary and secondary data sets.

3.2 Data type and Source

3.2.1 Data collection method

The data collection procedures used in this study under the qualitative method is secondary resources. The student used a document and reports reviewing method to gather the necessary data. The student chose availability sampling or Convenience sampling technique. Availability sampling under non- probability sampling is a type of sampling where the first available primary data source will be used for the research without additional requirements. In other words, this sampling method involves getting participants wherever you can find them and typically wherever is convenient.

The main instrument that was used for collection of data was secondary data. Secondary data collection refers to gathering information that's already available. The data was previously collected, has undergone necessary statistical analysis and isn't owned by the researcher. This data is usually one that was collected from primary sources and later made available for everyone to access. In other words, secondary data is second-hand information that's collected by third parties. Secondary data is collected from the baseline data, midline data, endline data, Programme proposal, PMEL plan, Monitoring and evaluation reports and different Programme documents.

3.2.2 Data analysis

The information collected through the questionnaires formed part of the qualitative approach in the research as it explores in depth the research topic and ensures that the major details that are important to the whole study being conducted have been effectively studied. Since Secondary data is the main source for this research the M&E practices will be described in depth below to make it easy to understand for readers. Secondary data collection refers to gathering information that's already available. The data was previously collected, has undergone necessary statistical analysis and isn't owned by the researcher. This data is usually one that was collected from primary sources and later made available for everyone to access. In other words, secondary data is second-hand information that's collected by third parties. After completing the collecting the data relevant for this the data's are organized and structured with respect to the Programme timeline and Programme phase. In order to answer the research question these data's need to be analyzed. in a manner the correlation between Input, Process, Output, Outcome and Impact of the M&E practice. based on the analysis the findings will be presented in a narrative manner to give a deep insight.

3.3 Validity and Reliability

Validity is the applicability to which research findings can be realistic to the real world, beyond the controlled setting of the research. It is concerned with generalizability. Validity of research instruments has various sources of evidence as the requirement to build the case that the instrument measures accurately. Determining validity is similar to constructing an evidence- based argument. How a tool measures what it should. Evidence can be in content, response process, and relationships among variables. Reliability is the random error in measurement. Reliability outlines the accuracy of the instrument in question. Norland (1990) Describes consistency of data collection instruments to measure whatever it measures. To enhance reliability the researcher developed a data collection instrument based on study objective, problem statement and conceptual framework. The information that is collected in this manner is generally used only for research and statistical analysis. The researcher is not affiliated with any of the Programme alliances nor works for TaYA. Data will be collected using professional data collectors in order to avoid guiding interviewees to an answer. The collected data will be analyzed using a qualitative method to make sure results are truthful and will answer the research questions accurately.

3.4 Ethical Considerations

This research will be conducted based on the principles of ethical guidelines to avoid bias and misinformation. The analysis of data will be conducted in accordance with the policies of the university which govern the responsible use of data. The data gathered will be analyzed to determine the extent to which the monitoring and evaluation practice of the GUSO Programme was a success and to leave a learning document for future researchers. The study will be carried out in a way that respects the dignity of the research participants. The study will be done in a way that protects the privacy of TaYA, research participants and program stakeholders. The research will be conducted in a manner that respects the privacy of the research participants and stakeholders of the Programme.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Introduction

This chapter will present the study findings from analyzing the data gathered from both primary and secondary sources. The main objective of this study is to assess the Monitoring and Evaluation practices in Talent Youth Association (TaYA), mainly focusing on the Get up Speak Out-GUSO Programme.

4.1 Theory of change

The theory of change designed for the GUSO Alliance of Ethiopia is informed by the previous experiences from ASK and UFBR programmatic approaches. The GUSO Alliance program, it is understood that in order to achieve the long-term objective of the program, which is to empower young people especially girls and young women to realize their SRHR in societies that are positive towards young people's sexuality, the suggestion is that it is necessary to act across multiple levels of the model at the same time. Hence, through this approach, it is more likely to sustain prevention efforts over time than any single intervention. Hence, the model served as a theoretical background to structure the program thinking that young people are integral to the work of the Ethiopian Alliance. The drive in this regard is to create a space for the eventual empowerment of young people, which will be then instrumental for them to effectively engage in matters that affect their lives

4.2 Programme Outcomes areas, Outcome indicators, Outputs indicators and process questions

Table 2: Outcomes areas, Output indicators, Outcome indicators and Process questions

LONG-TERM OBJECTIVE: All young people are empowered to realize their SRHR in societies that have a positive attitude towards young people's sexuality		
Indicator: Positive change in sexual health; gender attitudes, empowerment, and self-esteem among young people in the Programme areas		
OUTCOME 1 STRONG AND SUSTAINABLE ALLIANCES		
Output indicators	**Outcome indicators**	**Process questions**
Number of people from the country alliances that have received training (by training/by participants/gender/age group/provider of training).	Country alliance is strengthened and more sustainable (internal strength/external recognition/financial sustainability).	● Describe 1-3 major trajectories/events that demonstrate how the alliance (increasingly) strengthens its position in the SRHR sector. ● Describe 1-3 important strategies implemented to strengthen the organizational and financial aspects of the alliance.
OUTCOME 2 YOUNG PEOPLE INCREASINGLY VOICE THEIR RIGHTS		
Output indicators	**Outcome indicators**	**Process questions**
● % Of youth representation in the SRHR alliance structures and decision-making processes. ● Number of collaborations among young people from different alliance-related organizations/networks that represent the youth constituency.	● Young people increasingly feel supported by adults in their organizations/the country alliance/partner organizations. ● Young people increasingly feel empowered to contribute to changes for the target group and in the socio-political environment.	● Describe 1 or 2 strategies that are in place to ensure a constant flow of young people trained and engaged in decision-making processes. ● Describe 1-3 important strategies implemented by the alliance to foster and strengthen youth movements/networks and/or help young people to organize themselves to work together. ● Describe 1 or 2 strategies that are in place to ensure a variety of young people, representing different groups, are involved and engaged.
OUTCOME 3 INCREASED UTILIZATION OF COMPREHENSIVE SRHR INFORMATION AND EDUCATION BY ALL PEOPLE		
Output indicators	**Outcome indicators**	**Process indicators**

• Number of educators trained. • Number of young people reached with (comprehensive) SRHR information and education.	• Increased % of young people who are reached with SRHR information and education from the GUSO Programme. • Increased % of young people who perceive the SRHR information and education as beneficial to them.	• The alliance has developed and implemented strategies to ensure the quality (content) of SRHR information and education. • The alliance has developed and implemented strategies to monitor high-quality implementation of SRHR information and education. • The alliance has developed and implemented strategies to ensure the sustainability of SRHR information and education delivery.
OUTCOME 4 INCREASED UTILIZATION OF HIGH-QUALITY SRH SERVICES THAT RESPOND TO THE NEEDS AND RIGHTS OF ALL YOUNG PEOPLE		
Output indicators	**Outcome indicators**	**Process indicators**
• Number of service providers who have been trained in YFS • Number of SRH services provided to young people.	• Increased % of young people (from the catchment area) who access high-quality SRH services, including modern contraception and safe abortion for young people. • Increased % of young people who use the referral system to access SRH services. • Decreased % of young people with an unmet need for SRH services.	• The alliance has developed and implemented strategies to improve the quality and inclusiveness of youth-friendly services. • The alliance has developed and implemented strategies to strengthen referral systems (SRHR education/information to SRHR services, and services to services).
OUTCOME 5 IMPROVED SOCIO-CULTURAL, POLITICAL AND LEGAL ENVIRONMENT FOR YOUNG PEOPLE'S SRHR		
Output indicators	**Outcome indicators**	**Process indicators**
• Number of people reached by campaigns and (social) media. • Number of people structurally involved in the implementation of the Programme at community level (for example youth groups, CBOs, peer educators).	• Progress towards high-quality implementation of (country-specific) SRHR policies and legislation. • Young people experience increased support from important stakeholders in accessing and using SRHR information and services.	• Describe the major processes and progress of your pathway of change in advocacy, including enabling and constraining factors. • The alliance has developed and implemented strategies to deal with opposition and to find allies.

4.3 M&E Plan and Learning

PMEL in GUSO will build on experiences from ASK and UFBR where methodologies for financial and Programme planning, monitoring and reporting have been captured in toolkits and systems. The newly adapted Essential Packages manual provides guidelines and inspiration for roadmaps and quality control. PMEL within GUSO serves purposes of accountability, learning (at multiple levels), informing decision making and steering (adapting) the program. PMEL will be organized around and oriented on both results and processes. To monitor progress, and measure realized results, indicators at outcome level are used, that will provide insights in the progress towards anticipated changes.

A combination of the more regular PMEL methodologies, Operational Research, the learning agenda, and an external evaluation will be used to measure progress and processes. GUSO will monitor processes within country specific programmes by means of milestones or process evaluations.

Process monitoring will be country specific, but is likely to focus on (amongst others) synergy between components of the program, assumptions within the TOC, innovative processes, and quality of implementation.

4.4 Objectives and indicators

Results of the GUSO Programme are formulated at the level of impact, long term objectives and five interrelated and mutually reinforcing outcomes. Throughout the Programme the GUSO partnership will monitor the progress of achieving results and the processes leading towards results. In the table below the five outcomes described in the GUSO TOC have been specified into a number of measurable objectives

Table 3: Outcomes Vs. measurable objective

Outcome	Measurable objectives[3]
Outcome 1: Strengthened and sustainable Country Alliances comprehensively address the SRHR of young people, including sensitive issues	Country alliances are better able to implement comprehensive SRHR programming because of strengthened thematic/technical and organisational capacities.
Outcome 2: Empowered young people increasingly voice their rights	Country Alliances have functional structures for meaningful involvement of youth in all aspects of programming; • for fostering youth SRHR movements, • for fair representation and regeneration of an active pool of young people and youth advocates • creates opportunities for increased responsibility and personal development, • and supports young people to be actors of change with their society.
	Young people are actors of change and increasingly influence positive change processes in SRHR in their society.
Outcome 3: Increased utilization of comprehensive SRHR information and education by all young people	Increased number of young people are reached through quality SRHR education and information channels.
	Country Alliances have set up sustainable structures for delivery of SRHR education and information, including referral to SRH services.
Outcome 4: Increased utilization of quality and youth-friendly SRHR services that respond to the needs and rights of all young people.	Increased accessibility of quality SRH services and contraception for young people.
	Increased satisfaction with SRH services by young people.
Outcome 5: Improved socio-cultural, political and legal environment for gender-sensitive, youth-friendly SRHR.	Increased acceptability for young people's rights to, and use of, SRHR education/information and services within communities (including care-givers/parents).
	Country alliances have contributed to positive SRHR policy and/or legislation changes.

4.5 Measuring Results

A sample of geographical areas will be selected, representative for all intervention strategies and partners within the country program, where results at the outcome level will be measured. For results in Outcome 1, qualitative and participative and process-oriented methodologies are more appropriate. For Results in outcome 2, an operational research trajectory is most suitable. Programmatic results for results in outcome areas 3, 4 and 5 can be measured through more regular PME methodologies, both qualitative and quantitative, and where appropriate, retrospectively. These findings will be complemented by operational research on the effects of the multi-components approach, programmatic assumptions and processes that supported or hindered implementation. To ensure good quality and independent data, we are exploring with research institutions from the onset of the Programme for baseline, mid-terms and end-line measurements.

• **Baselines:** For relevant outcome indicators, baseline measurements will be executed. The UFBR and ASK end-line evaluation data will be used as input for baselines for the GUSO Programme where outcomes correspond. It will be conducted prior to the beginning of the Programme. Because not all interventions will start at the beginning of the program, a number of baseline measurements might take place in due course of the program.

• **Mid-term:** Comparable to the baselines, mid-term evaluations will be executed for a selected number of outcome indicators. This selection will depend on the nature of the indicators and possible changes in the Programme.

• **End-lines (Final)**: In each country, the GUSO Programme will be evaluated. This evaluation will include an end-line measurement of outcome indicators.

• **Results at the level of the long-term objective:** These M&E are intended to research whether the programme's outcomes indeed contribute to the long-term objective. It will focus on changes at beneficiary level to improve the effectiveness of interventions on health and/or empowerment indicators, for example contraceptive use, self-efficacy, autonomy, unplanned pregnancies.

4.6 Monitoring progress and processes

The PMEL framework will include monitoring the following:

1. Progress towards results (context-specific milestones).
2. Assumptions of country-based theory of change, including the synergy between the different Programme components, and implementation processes.
3. Identified risks and relevance of the strategies
4. Quality of the implementation of interventions. Essential packages can be applied as guidelines/inspirations to monitor the quality; blended learning processes will promote adaptations of lessons learned through these processes.

4.7 Data collection methodologies

To ensure the quality of data collection, the following criteria must be met:

• Validity and reliability are secured by careful design of quality instruments and by triangulation (using different sources of verification for one indicator), quality data collection, entry and analysis.

• Usefulness is secured by developing the specific objectives of the baseline and end-line together with partner organizations and country alliances

• Objectivity and independence are secured by careful collection of information, and involvement of external consultants.

• Transparency is secured through description of processes in the ToR and the final reports

• Representativeness is secured by quality sampling procedures

A. **Regular monitoring**

Data collection methodologies will include the more regular monitoring methodologies, which track overall progress, targets, and ensure appropriate allocation of resources. Besides the regular monitoring, operational research and the learning agenda are is vital for collecting data of activities progress.

B. Operational Research

Operational Research in similar previous programs has proven very effective in informing (development and/or implementation) of interventions, defining and building common understanding of SRHR concepts, encouraging sharing and learning and promoting visibility by sharing and disseminating results. In addition, operational research has supported meaningful Youth Participation in the programmes. Based on these positive experiences, operational research will remain an important strategy within GUSO:

• To provide insights in the processes and explanatory factors of results, including synergetic processes and assumptions of change

• To gain better insights in different aspects of young people's SRHR for the development of strategies and interventions, including the use of targeted and contextualized interventions to address the needs of specific groups of young people. Too often it is assumed that young people are a homogenous group that will all benefit from the same intervention. However, this is not the case and we need to learn more about what young people need and how to address these needs in the most effective and efficient way

• To monitor implementation processes, particularly of new and innovative interventions

• To monitor progress towards outcome and output of selected indicators

• To compare effectiveness/efficiency of different intervention strategies

4.8 Learning agenda

Reflection, learning, steering and adaptation are integrated within the Programme cycle. Especially within alliances and consortia, sharing and learning are important to continuously address the added value and synergy of the investments of the different partners. Learning enables the consortium to generate in-depth insights on implementation, success factors and inhibiting factors and challenges, and to fine-tune programming. It will facilitate collaboration and harmonization, and the identification of possible new opportunities. Learning will be organized at the country and international level (between partners and members).

- Planning and reflection meetings will address: assessments on progress, checking assumptions and re-assessing relevance, monitoring of risks, assessing sustainability strategies, and need for adaptations in strategies and Programme planning. Likewise, at Dutch/UK level, annual planning and reflection meetings will be organized. The learning agenda will stimulate sharing the lessons learned of innovative approaches piloted, and of Operational Research findings.
- The Consortium will focus on one or two learning agenda topics that focus on partnership processes. Through the learning agenda the organizations will reflect on the added value of partner organizations, and on the partnership with the MoFA.
- In addition, the learning agenda. Another possible agenda theme is the ability of the Consortium to stimulate gender transformative thinking with intermediates and how this influences the quality and inclusiveness of the services provided.

4.9 Budget allocated for M&E

A fixed percentage of country budgets will be allocated for monitoring & evaluation, operational research and sharing and learning. The development of country specific PMEL frameworks will be discussed during the country workshops, further developed in the country, and included in the final country Programme that will be submitted for assessment and approval.

Table 4: PMEL budget

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
Ethiopie						
PMEL and OR	6.515	7.239	9.953	8.144	12.442	**44.293**
1. Alliance building	9.202	15.880	17.170	19.138	16.796	**78.186**
2. Empowering young people	12.270	21.174	22.893	25.517	22.395	**104.249**
3. SRHR information	18.405	31.760	34.339	38.275	33.593	**156.373**
4. SRHR services	12.270	21.174	22.893	25.517	22.395	**104.249**
5. SRHR enabling environment	9.202	15.880	17.170	19.138	16.796	**78.186**
sub total	**67.864**	**113.107**	**124.418**	**135.728**	**124.418**	**565.535**

4.10 Methodology for Monitoring

A. Planned impacts of GUSO Programme

The evaluation, jointly conducted by KIT and GUSO partners, focuses on measuring outcome indicators. The following generic indicators are measured as part of the performance.

1) Increased % of young people who are reached with SRHR information and education from the GUSO Programme
2) Increased % of young people who perceive the SRHR information and education as beneficial to them
3) Increased % of young people (from the catchment area) who access high-quality SRH services, including modern contraception and safe abortion for young people
4) Increased % of young people who use the referral system to access SRH services
5) Decreased % of young people with an unmet need for SRH services
6) Young people experience increased support from important stakeholders and gatekeepers in accessing and using SRHR information and services.

These indicators were gouged by a quantitative survey. KIT developed a generic questionnaire for the GUSO alliance. This was consequently modified in collaboration with the GUSO country alliance and research team to be specific to the Ethiopian context.

4.11 Method used to do the evaluation

The evaluation consists of two components:

PART A- EXTERNAL EVALUATION

1. Quantitative Performance Studies - to assess progress on indicators for Outcome 3, 4 and 5b, by collecting information from end-beneficiaries at base-, mid- and endline;
2. Mixed-Method Comparative Study to assess progress on indicators for Outcome 3, 4 and 5b and the long-term objective, by conducting a quantitative study among young people, and a qualitative study among key stakeholders. It was coordinated by the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT) and executed by KIT in collaboration with the in-country alliances.

PART B – INTERNAL PROCESS EVALUATION

The GUSO Consortium has coordinated the process evaluation on the remaining (process) Outcomes:

- Outcome 1 measurement (base- and endline, reflection workshops)
- Outcome 2 measurement (base- and endline, quantitative and FGDs)
- Outcome 5 measurement, with respect to indicator 5a, to evaluate progress towards the advocacy strategies (using the Outcome Harvesting Methodology)

4.12 Final Evaluation process

The final evaluation was conducted in the context of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. There were various measures taken to control the pandemic. The methodology for the youth centers and health facilities remained the same and relevant protective equipment and hygiene practices were followed during data collection. However, schools were closed. This affected the way that respondents were recruited for the endline study through schools, and this difference in recruitment method resulted in a reduced sample size at the end. Instead of reaching students who were already attending school (and were therefore already gathered in a place where they could be surveyed), the research team initially contacted students via details provided by teachers. This was necessitated by the closure of schools due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. They then proceeded to contact more students via snowballing based on these initial contacts. These contacted students were invited to travel to their school where they met research assistants and were surveyed in these school settings. Face to face interviews were therefore still able to proceed with minor adaptations including adherence to physical distancing and hygiene guidelines. Recruitment of participants through health centers was not directly affected by the pandemic.

4.13 Data quality assurance

Once a survey is completed, it is then uploaded to the KIT server. This allowed the KIT team to monitor the data real-time and point out any anomalies in sample size, composition or responses. Data quality was assured through the building in of skipping patterns and limitations for filling in certain values in the survey forms in the tablets.

4.14 Availability of trained staff

The principle of Meaningful Youth Participation (MYP) was embraced throughout the execution of the evaluation. Young research assistants were trained and involved in the data collection and analyses of Outcome. Measurement was coordinated by the Youth Country Coordinator and young researchers were involved in the design and execution.

Prior to data collection, the KIT team discussed the survey and changes that were made with the in-country team. Study sites and sample size were also discussed. After the survey was finalized, the KIT team familiarized the GUSO in-country team with the tablets. KIT provided tablets, infrastructure for the survey (incorporating the survey into a tablet-friendly format and the server needed to host the surveys) and the online tools such as guidelines and relevant instructions for the process. Considerations regarding the consent process and quality management of the data were discussed. Regular Skype calls were held and there was consistent communication via email during the data collection process

4.15 Results of M&E

To measure the baseline situation the team used a mixed-method approach. A more qualitative approach was used to study the situation around outcome areas 1, 2 and 5a, the outcome areas that monitor alliance processes. A quantitative approach was used to assess the baseline for outcome indicators 3 and 4 and 5b, the outcome areas that measure results on the level of the target group. This baseline data forms the basis for the Programme performance evaluation.

A. Annual M&E and results 2016 -2017

Table 5: M&E result of 2016

	OUTPUT INDICATOR	TARGET FOR 2016	REALISED 2016
OUTCOME AREA 1 Strong and sustainable alliances			
1a.	Number of people from the organisation that have received training from the country alliance	26	31

		ETH - partners		ETH-alliance	
	OUTPUT INDICATOR	TARGET FOR 2016	REALISED 2016	TARGET FOR 2016	REALISED 2016
OUTCOME AREA 2 Young people increasingly voice their rights					
2a.	% of youth representation in the [redacted] alliance and in the partner organisations structures and decision making processes	60%	48.5%	30%	18%
2b.	Number of collaborations among young people from different alliance related organisations/ networks that represent the youth constituency	n/a	n/a	26	15
OUTCOME AREA 3 Increased utilisation of comprehensive SRH[redacted] information and education by all people					
3a.	Number of educators trained	0	0	n/a	n/a
3b.	Number of young people reached with (comprehensive) SRH[redacted] information and education	0	0	n/a	n/a
Outcome AREA 4 Increased utilisation of high-quality SRH services that respond to the needs and rights of all young people					
4a.	Number of service providers who have been trained in YFS	34	33	n/a	n/a
4b.	Number of SRH services provided to young people	40.663	90.827	n/a	n/a
OUTCOME AREA 5 Improved socio-cultural, political and legal environment for young people's SRHR					
5a.	Number of people reached by campaigns and (social) media.	60	60	7.260	60
5b.	Number of people structurally involved in the implementation of the programme at community level	30	30	n/a	n/a

** On track = 20% range around the 2016 target set, behind = less than 80% achieved of the target, ahead = over 120% of the target achieved*

Source: GUSO annual report 2016

Summary of M&E results of 2016

- The GUSO Alliance was successful in 2016.
- The baseline survey for outcome 2, 3, 4 and 5b further allowed the GUSO alliance members to work as a strong alliance.

- The team was able to reach all the expected results, except for activities planned under the joint activities, which was a result of the budget delay.
- Some target areas could not be achieved, the target on 5a could not be achieved because of the local political situation we encountered. A number of activities were banned, social media movement was limited and mass education, community movement and related activities to this outcome area were subjected to a number of restrictions. Much was done with regards to laying the ground for the smooth project implementation for 2017.

B. Annual M&E results 2017-2018

Table 6: M&E result of 2017

OUTPUT INDICATOR		TARGETS 2016-2017	REALISED CUMULATIVE TO DATE	ON TRACK CUMULATIVE TO DATE VS TARGETS 2016-2017
OUTCOME AREA 1 Strong and sustainable alliances				
1a.	Number of people from the alliance (related) organisations that have received training from the country alliance	325	120	Behind
OUTCOME AREA 2 Young people increasingly voice their rights				
2a1.	% of young people (under 25) representation in the **partner** organisations' structures and decision making processes	30%	36%	On Track
2a2.	% of young adults (aged 25-30) representation in the **partner** organisations' structures and decision making processes		27%	*
2a1.	% of young people (under 25) representation in your **alliance** structures and decision making processes	30%	30%	On Track
2a2.	% of young adults (aged 25-30) representation in your **alliance** structures and decision making processes		22%	*
2b.	Number of collaborations among young people from different alliance related organisations/ networks that represent the youth constituency	26	0	Behind
OUTCOME AREA 3 Increased utilisation of comprehensive SRHR information and education by all people				
3a.	Number of educators trained	78	192	Ahead
3b1.	Number of young people reached with (comprehensive) SRHR education	1.720	1.073	Behind
3b2.	Number of young people reached with (comprehensive) SRHR information		193	*
OUTCOME AREA 4 Increased utilisation of high-quality SRH services that respond to the needs and rights of by all young people				
4a.	Number of service providers who have been trained in YFS	190	138	Behind
4b.1	Number of direct SRH services provided to young people	44.000	44.133	On Track
4b.2	Number of indirect SRH services provided to young people		104.699	*
4b.3	Number of condoms provided directly to young people	n/a	72.456	*
4b.4	Number of condoms provided indirectly to young people	n/a	51.276	*
OUTCOME AREA 5 Improved socio-cultural, political and legal environment for young people's SRHR				
5a.	Number of people reached by campaigns and (social) media.	7.260	43.993	Ahead
5b.	Number of people structurally involved in the implementation of the programme at community level (for example young people groups, CBOs, peer educators)	91	163	Ahead

n/a= not applicable, no targets set.

*no justification on programme progress can be made since no targets were set (2a2 & 4b2, 4b3 and 4b4) or in the case of 3b2 it is difficult to compare the achievements of redefined indicator on SRHR information with the former indicator 3b.

Source - GUSO annual report 2017

Summary of M&E results of 2017

- The 2017 target was not met. The set target by the alliance was too high and ambitious.
- Indicator 2b is behind schedule because of a misunderstanding of the definition of the indicator.
- Due to the change in the definition of indicator 3b2, 4a and outcome area 5. was only able to deliver general SRH information that contributed for.
- For the implementation of activities under outcome area 5 in 2017, challenges were faced due to the state of emergency that took place for about 10 months,

C. Annual M&E results 2018-2019

Table 7: M&E result of 2018

	OUTPUT INDICATOR	TARGETS 2018	REALISED 2018	ON TRACK REALISED 2018 VS TARGETS 2018	CUMULATIVE TO DATE	5 year targets**
OUTCOME AREA 1 Strong and sustainable alliances						
1a.	Number of people from the alliance (related) organisations that have received training from the country alliance	114	185	Ahead	305	NA
OUTCOME AREA 2 Young people increasingly voice their rights						
2a1.	% of young people (under 25) representation in the **partner** organisations' structures and decision making processes	18%	28%	Ahead	NA	NA
2a2.	% of young adults (aged 25-30) representation in the **partner** organisations' structures and decision making processes	*	29%	*	NA	NA
2b.	Number of collaborations among young people from different alliance related organisations/ networks that represent the youth constituency	4	13	Ahead	13	NA
OUTCOME AREA 3 Increased utilisation of comprehensive SRHR information and education by all people						
3a.	Number of educators trained	114	209	Ahead	401	NA
3b1.	Number of young people reached with (comprehensive) SRHR education	1.780	2.144	Ahead	3217	NA
3b2.	Number of young people reached with (comprehensive) SRHR information	300	322	On Track	515	NA
OUTCOME AREA 4 Increased utilisation of high-quality SRH services that respond to the needs and rights of by all young people						
4a.	Number of service providers who have been trained in YFS	150	173	Ahead	311	NA
4b.1	Number of direct SRH services provided to young people	27.484	36.108	Ahead	80241	NA
4b.2	Number of indirect SRH services provided to young people	35.715	49.725	Ahead	154424	NA
4b.3	Number of condoms provided directly to young people	*	47.513	*	119969	NA
4b.4	Number of condoms provided indirectly to young people	*	17.740	*	69016	NA
OUTCOME AREA 5 Improved socio-cultural, political and legal environment for young people's SRHR						
5a.	Number of people reached by campaigns and (social) media.	19.060	153.539	Ahead	197532	NA
5b.	Number of people structurally involved in the implementation of the programme at community level (for example young people groups, CBOs, peer educators)	100	97	On Track	260	NA

Source - GUSO annual report 2018

Summary of M&E results of 2018

This year the GUSO program is on track on each of the indicators and a bit more ahead on 5a.

D. Midterm evaluation

Even with challenges faced at the beginning the Programme showed a remarkable outcome of GUSO TOC. Moreover, it showed promising results towards the long-term objective to empower young people to realize their SRHR.

- Outcome 1, Although most coalitions' financial scopes do not extend beyond the term of the program, they all stated a desire to continue working within the alliance following GUSO.
- Outcome 2, It was also said that more may be done to guarantee that young participation extends beyond implementation and advocacy and includes (financial) planning as well as monitoring and evaluation.
- Outcome 3- The qualitative assessment shows that the GUSO Programme is having a positive impact on young people's knowledge about sexual and reproductive health.
- Outcome 4. It clearly illustrates the need to better link demand (Outcome 3) and supply (Outcome 4) under the multi-component approach.
- Outcome 5 showed a development on evidence-based advocacy strategy but the targeted outcome has not been met.

E. Annual M&E results 2019-2020

Table 8: M&E result of 2019

	OUTPUT INDICATOR	TOTAL TARGETS 2019	TOTAL REALISED 2019	AHEAD/ON TRACK/BEHIND	CUMULATIVE REALISED	5 YEAR TARGETS
TOTAL						
OUTCOME AREA 1 Strong and sustainable alliances						
1a.	Number of people from the alliance (related) organisations that have received training from the country alliance	100	217	Ahead	522	N/A
OUTCOME AREA 2 Young people increasingly voice their rights						
2a1.	% of young people (under 25) representation in the **partner** organisations' structures and decision making processes	26%	36%	Ahead	36%	N/A
2a2.	% of young adults (aged 25-30) representation in the **partner** organisations' structures and decision making processes	*	29%	*	29%	N/A
2b.	Number of collaborations among young people from different alliance related organisations/ networks that represent the youth constituency	7	36	Ahead	49	N/A
OUTCOME AREA 3 Increased utilisation of comprehensive SRHR information and education by all people						
3a.	Number of educators trained	90	94	On track	495	N/A
3b1.	Number of young people reached with (comprehensive) SRHR education	3.080	3.740	Ahead	6.957	N/A
3b2.	Number of young people reached with (comprehensive) SRHR information	1.270	1.363	On track	1.878	N/A
OUTCOME AREA 4 Increased utilisation of high-quality SRH services that respond to the needs and rights of by all young people						
4a.	Number of service providers who have been trained in YFS	145	266	Ahead	577	N/A
4b.1	Number of direct SRH services provided to young people	27.942	104.542	Ahead	184.783	N/A
4b.2	Number of indirect SRH services provided to young people	*	154.693	*	309.117	N/A
4b.3	Number of condoms provided directly to young people	*	101.520	*	221.489	N/A
4b.4	Number of condoms provided indirectly to young people	*	41.580	*	110.596	N/A
OUTCOME AREA 5 Improved socio-cultural, political and legal environment for young people's SRHR						
5a.	Number of people reached by campaigns and (social) media.	40.880	244.859	Ahead	442.391	N/A
5b.	Number of people structurally involved in the implementation of the programme at community level (for example young people groups, CBOs, peer educators)	96	189	Ahead	449	N/A

Source - GUSO annual report 2019

Summary of M&E results of 2019

M&E results of 2019 shows a promising result, all outcomes are head or on track.

4.16. Challenges of the M&E practice

- It is not possible to draw conclusions about changes at the district level because the sampling method and some indicators do not allow this.
- even though the M&E conducted for each indicator shows a work well done.
- The program structure was a bit different from normal program structure, M&E and planning approach was a bit complicated.
- Some on the indicators are difficult to measure and understand

- Lack of expertise of program staff
- This M&E was conducted in the context of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and related restrictions. In the study area, these restrictions meant that schools and youth centers were closed at points throughout the year, and it was not possible for many GUSO and other community activities to take place. In addition, this may have resulted in recall bias on the part of endline respondents who were involved with GUSO, as respondents were less recently actively engaged in GUSO activities compared to the midline. COVID19 may therefore confound some of the outcomes and findings. The pandemic also resulted in a reduced sample size compared to base- and midline as the closure of schools affected the way that respondents were recruited to the endline

4.17 Strength of the M&E practice

When asked what the strength of the M&E practice are, the respondents mentioned the main strengths of the M&E practices stated as follows;

- Its regularity and openness to flexibility.
- Youth centered M&E practice
- Regular M&E with partners and stakeholders present and regular reporting
- It gives input on how to better achieve the outcomes going forward
- It's regularity and openness and flexibility
- It is well planned and conducted according to the plan

4.18 Weakness of the M&E practice

For the question the weakness of the M&E practice the following answers are given;

- Difficulty in measuring some indicators
- Poor feedback loop and collaboration between the alliance
- Budget didn’t arrive in the first year of the program to begin the program on time.
- There was no a specific person assigned to conduct M&E for the specific Programme

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, conclusion and recommendation

5.1 Summary of Findings

TaYA has a written guideline for M&E, conducted a needs assessment/Baseline survey while planning the program, gives M&E training to M&E staffs, stakeholders are involved in the planning of M&E, regularly analyze results of M&E, manages use the outcomes for decision making and planning, lessons learned are applied for future programs and that the program was successful. TaYA has a separate budget for M&E practices throughout the Programme. M&E plan and Schedule for M&E activities are included in the Programme plan document. This will allow them to measure how far they have come with the Programme objectives. M&E training is given for most of the team and data collectors this will increase efficiency and reliability of data collection and analysis. We also can see that all stakeholders are part of the Programme M&E; this will increase accountability within the alliance and better use of M&E findings in the Programme. Regarding the details of the M&E practices like planning, budget and schedule there seems to be a little bit of knowledge gap on team members that are not in top management or directly participate in the M&E. As we can see from the procedures, depending on the phase of the Programme M&E will be conducted internally, externally or in joint. This increased transparency between stakeholders and held them responsible for their actions.

It is also noted that some indicators are not easy to understand or measure. All staff members are not adequately trained, and due to different reasons including Covid-19 the program didn't adhere to the planned M&E practice guideline.

To collect data for both M&E community interview and meeting, document review, questionnaire, checklist, focus group discussion, action plan, KPI, reports, stakeholder discussions and field visits are used. To collect these data's Survey monkey, Google form and excel are used as tools. M&E reports of the program were being timely and accurately submitted to the top or delegated management body of the organization, the Programme regularly monitored and evaluated throughout its lifetime and the management took appropriate and timely corrective measures in response to the feedback given based on the M&E findings. Other local NGOs can learn from this Programme how regular monitoring, registering lessons learned and using M&E findings to the betterment of the project contributed to the Programme success.

The budget is monitored monthly, quarterly and annually. every two years and at the end of the program. The M&E started behind schedule because of a misunderstanding of the definition of the indicator which has affected the planning and budget allocation process for activities contributing to the target set. The team also set unrealistic and overambitious goals for This indicator is the planning phase.

5.2 Recommendation

- Regular, easy to use templates, but flexible M&E is necessary for changing environments.
- Engaging young people in the M&E structure for a youth focused program is essential.
- Having clear and not complicated M &E procedures.
- Allocating M&E staff specific to one Programme especially for programmes that take a long period of time like GUSO instead of sharing personnel across programmes.
- Create regular and easy to use templates, but flexible M&E is necessary for changing environments.
- Better collaboration and feedback loop process with alliances when conducting M&E
- All Programme team members should have the basic know-how of the M&E plan, schedule and how it will be conducted and used for decision making.
- Regular follow-up on and proper execution of action plans should be given emphasis in any similar activities in the future
- Set indicators for youth participation in social accountability and monitor them as per the plan. Even though annually and bi-annually M&E are conducted as per the plan an equal attention should be given to the rest of the M&E practices.
- Ensure follow-up by having a monthly report that summarizes what has been improved based on designed action plans
- Donors should allocate a budget for impact evaluations to be conducted 3-5 years after the end of This will give an insight on the long-term sustainability of a programmer.
- The planned indicator measurement was too high and ambitious because there was no clear understanding of the indicator.

5.3Conclusion

The M&E documents provide insight into several indicators directly connected to the GUSO Programme. The data derived from the evaluation might not be able to prove considerable positive changes for all indicators, as a result of limited coverage by GUSO, as a result of other interventions implemented in control areas, spill-over effects of the interventions introduced in the intervention area, or the sampling method by clusters. Furthermore, contextual changes such as economic conditions, elections, poor harvest, conservatism, etc. could have had an effect on the intervention and control areas. Although the Programme lifespan was five years, there was only three years between the base- and end lines.

Finally, this study was conducted in the context of the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic which affected the implementation of the Programme in its final year. Although respondents were asked to reflect on the time before the pandemic, the pandemic could have had an impact on the results.

While the reports provided insight into several indicators directly connected to the GUSO Programme, it is not possible from the performance studies to draw conclusions about changes at the district level, as the sampling method does not allow this. In these four contexts, a qualitative component could have created deeper insight into the findings. The evaluation design was determined by the budget available. Two mixed method studies (the comparative studies) were prioritized, with the remaining budget then allocated for performance studies. There were some changes in the overall composition of the sample at the endline compared to baseline and midline.

The data and findings show some positive outcomes or consolidated gains since midline on the lives of young people, even in the challenging current context. To maintain the program's and outcomes' sustainability, as well as to limit the pandemic's setbacks, the Alliance should prioritize reaching out to young people with mental health and SRHR-related support. The role of peer educators and health workers in providing SRH services and information has improved over time. This should be built upon in order to encourage young people to continue to take action to exercise their SRHR.

References

- *Action Aid, (2008) "Accountability, Learning and Planning System (with notes to accompany ALPS)," Retrieved December 12.*
- *Adamchak, S., Bond, K., Maclaren, L., Magnani, R. and Nelson, K., 2000. A guide to monitoring and evaluating adolescent reproductive health programmes.*
- *Bates, G. and Jones, L. (2012) Monitoring and evaluation: a guide for community projects. Centre for Public Health, Faculty of Health and Applied Social Sciences. Liverpool, United Kingdom.*
- *Birhanu, T., 2011. Monitoring and Evaluation of CORHA-based NGOS implementing sexual and reproductive health projects in Addis Ababa: Practices and Challenges.*
- *Cooper, D., & Schindler, P. S. (2011). Business research methods (8th end). New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.*
- *Donaldson, 2015. Theory in evaluation: Reducing confusion and encouraging debate, Claremont Graduate University, USA*
- *Ethiopia Mini Demographic and Health Survey (2014) Central Statistical Agency, Available at: https://www.statsethiopia.gov.et/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Ethiopia-Demographic-Health-Survey-Report-2014.pdf (Accessed: May 25, 2022).*
- *Frankel, N. and Gage, A. (2007) M&E Fundamentals: A Self-Guided Mini Course. U.S. Agency for Inter.*
- *Gage, A. and Dunn, M., 2009. Monitoring and evaluating gender-based violence prevention and mitigation programmes. US Agency for International Development, MEASURE Evaluation, Interagency Gender Working Group, Washington DC.*
- *Guide on Measuring Decent Jobs for Youth – Monitoring, evaluation and learning in labor market programmes.*
- *Herrero, O. et al. (2012) "Toxicological evaluation of three contaminants of emerging concern by use of the Allium cepa test," Mutation research, 743(1–2), pp. 20–24. Doi: 10.1016/j.mrgentox.2011.12.028.*
- *How to develop a monitoring and evaluation plan| The Compass for SBC, (no date) Thecompassforsbc.org. Available at: https://thecompassforsbc.org/how-to-guides/how-develop-monitoring-and-evaluation-plan (Accessed: June 1, 2022).*
- *IFRC (2011). Planning and Evaluation Department (PED) of the IFRC Secretariat, (2011). Programme Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Guide, Switzerland, Web site: www.ifrc.org*
- *International Labor Organization (2011) ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations.*
- *Jamal, A. and Crisp, J., 2002. Real-time humanitarian evaluations: Some frequently asked questions. UNHCR.*
- *Kalali, N. S., Anvari, M. R. A., Pour Ezzat, A. A., & Dastjerdi, D. K. (2011). Why does strategic plans implementation fail? A study in the health service sector of Iran. African Journal of Business Management, 5(23), 9831–9837. https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM11.430*
- *Khandker, S. R., Koolwal, G. B. and Samad, H. (2010) Handbook on impact evaluation: Quantitative methods and practices. Washington, D.C., DC: World Bank Publications. Doi: 10.1596/978-0-8213-8028-4*
- *Kothari, C. R. (2004). Research methodology: methods and techniques (2nded.). New Delhi. New Age International (P) Limited.*
- *Kusek, J. Z. and Rist, R. C. (2012) Ten steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation system: A handbook for development practitioners. 2nd ed. Washington, D.C., DC: World Bank Publications.*
- *MacKay, K. R. and Keith, R. M. (2007) How to build M& E systems to support better government. Washington, D.C., DC: World Bank Publications. Doi: 10.1596/978-0-8213-7191-6.*

- *Measuring and monitoring indicators (no date) Who.int. Available at: https://www.who.int/teams/sexual-and-reproductive-health-and-research-(srh)/areas-of-work/measuring-and-monitoring-indicators (Accessed: June 5, 2022).*
- *Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks (3 parts) (no date a) Endvawnow.org. Available at: https://www.endvawnow.org/en/articles/335-monitoring-and-evaluation-frameworks-3-parts.html (Accessed: June 5, 2022).*
- *Monitoring and evaluation of initiatives on violence against women and girls (2011) Endvawnow.org. Available at: http://www.endvawnow.org/uploads/browser/files/me_asset_english_nov_2011__final.pdf (Accessed: June 1, 2022).*
- *National strategy and action plan on harmful traditional practices (HTPs) against women and children in Ethiopia federal democratic republic of Ethiopia ministry of women, children and youth affairs (MoWCYA) (no date) Africanchildforum.org. Available at: http://www.africanchildforum.org/clr/policy%20per%20country/2018%20Update/Ethiopia/ethiopia_htp_2013_en.pdf (Accessed: May 25, 2022).*
- *Nuguti, E. O. (2015) PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION; INTRODUCTION AND THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK APPROACH. Kenya: Ekon Publishers.*
- *OECD (2002) Evaluation and aid effectiveness no. 6 – glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management (in English, French and Spanish). OECD.*
- *Okonofua, F. (ed.) (2014) Confronting the challenge of reproductive health in Africa: A textbook for students and development practitioners. Brown Walker Press.*
- *Project Management Institute (2017) A guide to the project management body of knowledge (PMBOK guide) – sixth edition ND Gile practice guide (English). Project Management Institute.*
- *Rossi, P. H. (2012). Evaluating with sense: The Theory Driven Approach. Evaluation Review*
- *Schwindt (2015). Hand book on project management and scheduling*
- *Seith, S. and Philippines I. (2012, December). Evaluation and Theory of change. Presented at workshop on randomized evaluation to improve financial capability innovation for poverty action (IPA)*
- *Shaw, G. (1995) "The performance measurement, management, and appraisal sourcebook," U. S. A.*
- *Singh, K. (2017) A practitioners' manual on monitoring and evaluation of development projects. Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.*
- *Soas, ©. (2013) Unit Ten: Monitoring and Evaluation, Fao.org. Available at: https://www.fao.org/3/au767e/au767e.pdf (Accessed: June 5, 2022).*
- *United Nations Development Programme (ed.) (2009) Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results. New York, NY: United Nations.*
- *Walden, V. M., Scott, I. and Lakeman, J. (2010) "Snapshots in time: using real- time evaluations in humanitarian emergencies," Disaster prevention and management, 19(3), pp. 283–290. Doi: 10.1108/09653561011052466.*
- *World Health Organization, 2014. Annual technical report: 2013: department of reproductive health and research, including UNDP/UNFPA/WHO/World Bank Special Programme of Research Training in Human Reproduction (HRP) (No. WHO/RHR/14.01). World Health Organization.*
- *World Health Organization. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Geneva: World Health Organization; 2015 (N.d.). WHO.INT. Retrieved June 1, 2022, from https://www.who.int/hiv/strategic/me/en/*