

AET EVALUATIONS: SURVEY OF MISSIONS

Nikki
Kernaghan

MISSION SURVEYS

- Cambodia
- Egypt
- Guinea
- Senegal
- Tanzania
- At least one large AET project, usually centrally funded
- Using FTF indicators + custom indicators
- Developed own M&E plans

OBSERVATIONS

- No communication with other projects in country or within the mission in developing M&E plans
- No gap analyses
- Most projects use external evaluators for mid and final evaluations but not use pre and post tests or collect baseline data
- Missions do not seem to have internal evaluation expertise

USING FTF INDICATORS

- Too general/generic to be of much use for AET evaluations
- Too output focused (# of people trained, etc.)
- Projects don't last long enough to use FTF impact indicators
- In FTF framework, no way to report on the narrative analysis and qualitative data being collected by projects
- Few, if any, indicators of change are being used

AET EVALUATION ISSUES

- No approved mechanism for tracking and reporting institutional change
- No mechanism for tracking private sector engagement
- Long term measurement and tracking not a component of these projects
 - Can't measure impact on participants
 - Can't measure employment or private sector involvement
 - Can't measure government and institutional policy changes
 - Local stakeholders do not have the resources to do this work

THOUGHTS GOING FORWARD ON EVALUATION IN GENERAL

- Need better communication between projects to share effective evaluation methodologies and best practices, as well as share AET results
- Need to develop local capacity to conduct project evaluation, including training for local institutions
- Additional training of Mission staff in project evaluation to enable them to provide greater input into the development and implementation of evaluation activities, to recommend best practices for evaluation and align data collection with FtF indicators more effectively
- Need to integrate long-term tracking and outcome evaluation into project design to determine sustained project impacts

THOUGHTS ON AET EVALUATIONS SPECIFICALLY

- AET indicators must be developed and widely shared that can be used beyond the outputs measures
- US universities can be a resource (as can other organizations like AAU, RUFORUM, etc.) to assist tertiary education institutions develop evaluation strategies

AET INDICATORS: BACKGROUND STUDY

**Jessica
Childers
Nikki
Kernaghan**

SUMMARY

- **List of indicators currently in use by USAID and World Bank**
 - USAID – project level usually, often customized beyond FTF standard indicators
 - World Bank – country level, using available national datasets
- **Supports with quantitative data the mission survey results**
 - Almost all AET indicators are output indicators
 - Higher level indicators require access to reliable baseline data which is often lacking in other countries
 - Custom indicators are typically developed at the project level and used for project monitoring but are not sustainable
- **Highlights the need to give meaningful attention to M&E plans, including taking into consideration data needs, availability, and sustainability.**