

# Project's Monitoring & Evaluation rubric 'Enhancing CBCF in Indonesia' [FST/2015/040]

Digby Race, Project Leader  
updated 27<sup>th</sup> July 2021

## Overview

The primary purpose of developing a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) rubric of the project's performance is to enable the project team to have a clear and simple method for gauging the achievement of project's operations and outcomes. This M&E rubric is designed to be a streamlined 'report card' that assesses the project's key variables that comprise the internal operations and external outcomes of the project. The M&E approach adopted for this project was to select key variables that could be readily measured and reported using a 5-point scale, with the report card colour-coded for both 'dashboards' – internal operations and external outcomes. The M&E rubric is designed to have each key variable measured and reported every six months, primarily so deficiencies can be easily identified and promptly addressed. The measures for each variable can also be reported as a 'time series', so progress of achievement over time of each variable can be reported (i.e. the project had ten reporting periods during 5 years).

The project leader (PL) has identified six key variables that relate to the 'internal operations' of the project (Part 1 of the project's M&E rubric), which can also be considered as project inputs to achieve the desired 'external outcomes' (Part 2 of the M&E rubric). The project's M&E rubric is designed to be a streamlined process for the project team (primary target audience) to readily track its performance and easily identify where adjustments or enhancements should be made. The project's M&E rubric is also designed to complement the established processes and reports required by ACIAR to assess the project's performance (e.g. Annual Reports, Mid-Term Review, End of Project Review).

Every six months, the PL makes an assessment of the project's key variables based on his working knowledge of the project, communication with key members of the project team, and what activities and outputs are reported by the project team (e.g. as noted in the Annual Report). Importantly, the project's M&E rubric does not require any additional data or information to be collected, beyond what the project team already does as part of the normal reporting requirements. Also, the M&E rubric is not intended to report precise variations in performance within a single variable, between variables, or over time – it is designed to allow the project team to have an in-depth discussion about the relative performance of each key variable. Each variable is an aggregate of activities, processes and resources that contribute to a key component of the project. The scoring of some variables is against the standard expected to be achieved at the conclusion of the project (e.g. improved knowledge and skills of stakeholders), while other variables are scored according to the standard expected throughout the project (e.g. clear processes for acquittals and reporting). The PL updates the project's M&E rubric prior to discussion among the project team (usually without external stakeholders), with team discussions often held in association with large project meetings (e.g. project's annual meeting). After an in-depth discussion of the PL's assessment of each key variable, a rating informed by the group discussion is confirmed for each variable and noted in the M&E rubric. The group discussion is deliberately intended not to focus on specific errors or failure, but to be constructive

among the project team about how the project team can achieve a higher rating in the next period for each variable.

The M&E rubric has already demonstrated its value in the first 18 months of the project’s life by encouraging the project team to critically assess its own performance, rather than default to and rely on M&E processes managed by ACIAR or partner organisations. It has also developed a stronger understanding of the concept of ‘project logic’ (i.e. the linkage between plans, inputs, activities, outputs, partnerships, processes and outcomes). As expected, there is a ‘lag’ (delay) in the performance of the ‘external outcomes’ as these are highly dependent on the performance of ‘internal operations’, with any deficiency in the key variables of the ‘internal operations’ directly constraining the performance of ‘achieved outcomes’.

The 5-point scale and colour coding is presented below:

rating: 1 = **very low**, 2 = **low**, 3 = **moderate**, 4 = **high**, 5 = **very high**

### Part 1: Internal operations

1. **Administration** = timely contracts with partners, timely payments to partners, clear processes for acquittals and reporting;
2. **Work plans** = clearly drafted, discussed and understood by all participants, work plans sufficiently informative to guide activities, work plans reviewed and updated);
3. **Reporting** = clear and regular communication with project team, regular formal and informal communication of activities and performance with ACIAR, reporting is informative and timely));
4. **Budget** = adequate for activities, timely transfer to partners, funds formally acquitted, funds managed appropriately by partners;
5. **Stakeholder links** = priority stakeholders identified, mutually-beneficial links with stakeholders, regular and timely engagement with stakeholders;
6. **Activities** = appropriately designed and implemented, effective activities, timely.

### M&E dashboard of ‘internal operations’

Jul. 2021	5	5	5	5	3	3
Jan. 2021	5	4	4	4	3	3
Jul. 2020	5	4	4	4	2	3
Dec. 2019	5	4	4	4	3	4
Jul. 2019	5	4	4	4	3	4
Dec. 2018	5	4	4	4	3	4
Jun. 2018	5	4	4	4	3	4
Dec. 2017	5	4	3	3	3	4
Jun. 2017	4	3	3	3	2	3
Dec. 2016	3	3	3	3	2	3
<b>Variable</b>	<b>Administration</b>	<b>Work plans</b>	<b>Reporting</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Stake. links</b>	<b>Activities</b>

## Part 2: External outcomes

1. **Team capability** = members have acquired relevant knowledge and skills, improved capacity to undertake research role, enhanced research capability of partner teams;
2. **Science** = is of high-quality, recognised of international value, relevant to national and provincial agencies, informative for private sector partners, timely delivery of key findings, shared with research peers;
3. **Communication** = two-way with partners, informative for partners, regular communication, information trusted by stakeholders (credible);
4. **Knowledge and skills of stakeholders** = increased level of understanding and capacity by partners, improved understanding of CBCF by stakeholders, relevant to enhancing CBCF by investors, increasing spread within target communities;
5. **Relationships between stakeholders** = increased awareness of potential partners, increased engagement with key partners, project team viewed by stakeholders as making an important contribution;
6. **Farm-based forest management** = enhanced quality, greater precision of silviculture, greater efficiency in management, more profitable management;
7. **Empowerment of rural women** = women's farming groups engaged, greater knowledge and skills acquired by women involved in CBCF, women forging stronger links with private sector.

### M&E dashboard of 'external outcomes'

Jul. 2021	4	4	4	4	3	3	4
Jan. 2021	4	4	3	4	3	3	4
Jul. 2020	4	4	3	4	2	3	4
Dec. 2019	4	3	4	4	3	3	4
Jul. 2019	4	3	4	3	3	3	3
Dec. 2018	4	3	4	3	3	3	3
Jun. 2018	4	3	4	3	3	3	3
Dec. 2017	4	3	4	3	3	2	2
Jun. 2017	3	2	3	2	2	2	2
Dec. 2016	3	2	3	2	2	2	2
<b>Variable</b>	<b>Capability</b>	<b>Science</b>	<b>Comm.</b>	<b>Know. &amp; skills</b>	<b>Relations.</b>	<b>Forest mgt.</b>	<b>Emp. women</b>

## Project M&E rubric

Data analysis July 2021

