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Executive Summary

The MasterCard Foundation ("the Foundation" or "MCF") engaged FSG Social Impact Advisors to help design a new strategic learning and evaluation (SLE) system in order to standardize and guide the Foundation’s evaluation process. MCF has made significant progress in developing its SLE system, and this document serves as a guide and roadmap for completing and implementing the system.

Over the course of the last four months, the Foundation’s work has resulted in several notable achievements to building its SLE system, which include:

- Developing a new evaluation approach for the Foundation
- Refining the Microfinance program’s strategy
- Developing clear program-level outcomes maps and strategic evaluation questions
- Prioritizing specific indicators to track for next year and developing dashboards to communicate the most important information from each program clearly and quickly
- Creating a grantee reporting framework to standardize how grantees will report
- Conducting initial evaluation discussions with a few grantees to understand their evaluation approaches and how they and the Foundation can learn better together

In order to successfully complete and implement the system, the Foundation should conduct a number of key next steps in the future. Some of the nearer term, high priority next steps include:

- Engaging grantees to ensure alignment with new components of MCF’s SLE system, including outcomes, reporting expectations, and grantee capacity
- Developing the evaluation staffing plan and specifying roles and responsibilities
- Developing a five-year budget and annual budget for implementing the SLE System
- Planning and executing an annual learning retreat in November

The following document and appendices provide a full description of MCF’s evaluation achievements and detailed next steps for implementing the SLE system, including the level of urgency, timing, owners, resource requirements, and partner involvement.

This is an exciting time for the Foundation. After several years of grantmaking, MCF is now making a significant investment to ensure that it learns from its activities, adjusts its strategy appropriately, and holds itself accountable for its philanthropy. This document will help guide the Foundation along that path today and in the future. As the Foundation grows and its evaluation needs evolve, this document should also evolve in order to suit the needs of the organization.
I. Introduction

In May of 2010, The MasterCard Foundation engaged FSG Social Impact Advisors to a) facilitate a process to develop the Foundation's strategic learning and evaluation system and b) provide recommendations for how to start to implement such a system within the context of the organization.

Developing a SLE system presents an opportunity for MCF to integrate evaluation into its overall grantmaking strategy. This will also allow the Foundation to structure its approach to evaluation, identify opportunities to develop the evaluation capacity of staff, and determine how the organization will reflect and learn from its activities in order to improve its future efforts. In addition, this system will provide the necessary infrastructure to support the various learning and evaluation efforts that the staff conducts (For more details on the MCF’s state of evaluation and opportunities for the future, see the Phase I Memo in Appendix B).

This document is a result of interviews with staff, a review of key Foundation documents, several workshops with Foundation staff, select engagement with grantees, and insights gained from numerous working sessions with program staff. The main body of this document is structured into the following sections:

- **The Strategic Learning and Evaluation System** – Describes the components of a strategic learning and evaluation system and documents the achievements made by MCF to date in developing each component
- **The Strategic Evaluation Plan** – Provides a roadmap for the Foundation to follow in order to further develop its SLE system

In addition, there is an extensive, 56 page appendix which provides further detail on all of the achievements that the Foundation has made to date and additional detail to consider as MCF continues to develop and implement its SLE system.

This is a living document that should undergo continual refinement as the Foundation evolves its strategic focus and evaluation needs. Once the Foundation hires the Evaluation Director, this person should review this document and update it with her / his own perspective on how the Foundation should further develop the SLE system in discussion with the CEO and program directors. As the Foundation evolves over time and its evaluation needs change, this document should be revised or updated to suit the needs of the Foundation.

II. The Strategic Learning and Evaluation System

By developing a SLE system, the Foundation will have a proactive, integrated, learning-oriented, and responsive set of processes that will ultimately inform the various decision-making needs of the organization. This SLE system will ensure that all evaluations will be grounded in questions that matter and that the lessons learned can be meaningfully acted upon.

The SLE system framework, illustrated in Figure 1, is comprised of several interrelated and interdependent components that form a complex and unified whole.
These components work together to make evaluation a coordinated and efficient process throughout the entire organization. The rest of this chapter briefly describes each of these components and the achievements made during the engagement with FSG. The Strategic Evaluation Plan in the next chapter details the roadmap for developing the rest of the system.

A. Evaluation Approach
The evaluation approach reflects the values that the organization has for evaluation and communicates:

- What evaluation’s role is in organizational decision making
- Why evaluation is important
- How evaluation contributes to the future of the organization

Achievements to Date
Through discussions with all of the program staff and the CEO, the Foundation has developed the following approach to evaluation:

At The MasterCard Foundation, we will pursue a collaborative approach to evaluation, one which holds ourselves and our partners accountable for learning to inform our strategy, advance thought leadership, and accelerate impact.

MCF’s evaluation approach is guided by the following principles:

- Involve multiple stakeholders within and outside the Foundation, including our partners and those that we aim to serve (e.g., youth and microfinance clients);
- Encourage staff ownership and investment in these activities; and
- Incorporate lessons and initiate actions based on our findings

B. Strategic Framing
Implementing a successful SLE system is most effective when the organization has a clear strategy, articulated goals, and shared understanding of priority questions that need to be answered in order to understand what to measure, when, and how.

In addition to providing direction for program activities, strategies provide the basic framework for what the SLE system will try to understand and improve. Outcomes maps define the key
activities for the program, outputs (year one), short-term outcomes with corresponding indicators (years two to three), medium-term outcomes (years four to five), and long-term outcomes that will help indicate whether the program is effecting change and having impact on its overall goal. Program-level *strategic evaluation questions* define the critical hypotheses that each program hopes to better understand about its work. These questions serve as important strategic tools for measuring the extent to which and how the Foundation is meeting its strategic goals.

**Achievements to Date**

Based on previous work and new thinking in the last several months, the Foundation has established strategic plans, outcomes maps, and strategic evaluation questions for both program areas:

- The Youth Learning program further defined outcomes for its strategy and created an outcomes map and strategic evaluation questions to inform the strategy (See Appendix C-E for the Youth Learning strategic framework, outcomes map, and strategic evaluation questions).
- The Microfinance program refined its strategy to incorporate the program’s latest thinking and then created an outcomes map and strategic evaluation questions to inform the strategy (See Appendix C-E for the Microfinance strategic framework, outcomes map, and strategic evaluation questions).

The above achievements resulted from deep engagement and iteration by the program teams over several months during this project.

**C. Evaluation Activities**

The evaluation activities consist of the primary tasks that the Foundation must conduct, or commission others to conduct, in order to successfully learn from and evaluate its activities. These activities make up the core of the SLE system.

**Grantee reporting** provides a majority of the primary data that the Foundation will use to evaluate its activities and learn as an organization. This is a critical activity that must be coordinated carefully and collaboratively with each of the Foundation’s partners in order to ensure appropriate, reliable data. Another key activity is *conducting evaluations*, which requires answering questions such as what to evaluate, who should do the evaluation, and what type of evaluation to conduct. The Foundation’s *communications approach* is a key element in understanding how the Foundation will share its evaluation progress and results. Given the Foundation’s collaborative nature, sharing information with both internal (e.g., staff, Board) and external (e.g., partners, the media, other Foundations, youth) stakeholders in the optimal format will be critical to keeping these stakeholders informed. Finally, a foundation’s *learning activities* dictate how the organization will spend intentional time reflecting on evaluation results and incorporating lessons into its work. Whether structured in individual or group settings, weekly or annually, these activities are important to ensuring that the lessons from each evaluation are carefully considered and internalized by the foundation and its stakeholders.

**Achievements to Date**

**Grantee Reporting**

- The Foundation has developed a standard grantee reporting framework with three levels of intensity depending on the particular partner. This will allow MCF to standardize the
way that it collects data from grantees, allowing for more normalized reports and easier decisions around what grantees need to provide (See Appendix G for details).

- During the project, FSG conducted initial conversations with Youth Learning grantees to understand their learning and evaluation style, data collection capacity, and ability to report on outputs and outcomes from pieces of Youth Learning’s outcomes map:
  - Grantees commented that they were excited about the Foundation’s willingness to work with them on evaluation efforts.
  - When shown relevant portions of the YL outcomes map, grantees indicated to varying degrees an ability to deliver data against key outputs and outcomes (See Appendix I for a summary of these discussions).

### Conducting Evaluations
- The Foundation has developed a set of decision making criteria to determine whether evaluations should be conducted through grantee reporting, at the grantee/partner-level, or at the thematic/cluster-level (See Appendix J for details).

### Communications Approach
- Each program has prioritized certain outputs and outcomes to indicate its progress.
- Each program has developed dashboard templates for communicating those prioritized outputs and outcomes as well as other critical information for each program area (See Appendix F for details).
- MCF has identified a set of internal and external stakeholders that it wishes to communicate with and has created an initial set of approaches to share with them (See Appendix K for details).

### Learning Activities
- MCF has brainstormed potential learning opportunities in the calendar year, including an annual learning retreat and quarterly learning sessions dedicated to different themes.

## D. Infrastructure Needs
For a SLE system to work and be effectively integrated into how an organization accomplishes its goals, the system needs appropriate infrastructure across a number of areas. First and foremost, the system requires **leadership around learning and evaluation.** The CEO, CFO, Evaluation Director, and program directors must be the leaders of evaluation, i.e., they must model a spirit of inquiry, seek data-driven answers, and encourage program staff to do the same. The system also needs sufficient **human resources** (staff time and expertise) in order to successfully implement the system. In addition, **financial resources** are critical to ensuring that various evaluation activities are conducted adequately and that the Foundation has the systems and expertise to make use of evaluation results. Finally, a robust **knowledge management system** will allow the Foundation to track outcomes and lessons as well as organize results in a digestible way for all stakeholders.

### Achievements to Date

#### Leadership around Learning and Evaluation
- The Foundation has developed a set of activities that the CEO, CFO, Evaluation Director (ED), and program directors can do to provide the necessary leadership for learning and evaluation (See Appendix L for more details).

#### Human Resources
- Before the project began, the Foundation had already decided to hire an Evaluation Director to lead its efforts and is currently considering candidates.
- MCF has begun to clarify some of the evaluation activities that the Evaluation Director should lead.
Financial Resources
- MCF has discussed financial resource needs, particularly focusing on the need to model out a business plan once the rest of the system components are shaped and the ED comes on board.

Knowledge Management System
- The Foundation has discussed some potential characteristics and capabilities that it would like to see in a future knowledge management system.
- MCF has also engaged a 3rd party firm to help it identify the right platform for its needs.

III. The Strategic Evaluation Plan

The Strategic Evaluation Plan provides an initial roadmap to help the Foundation develop and implement a SLE system. While some of these next steps are clearly developed and articulated for the Foundation, some guidance is more general because the Foundation is not yet in a position to fully define the roadmap and because many of these pieces depend on the Evaluation Director’s input and perspective. This roadmap should continue to evolve as the Foundation builds out some pieces, determines future evaluation needs, and hires its Evaluation Director, who will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of this plan. The figure below provides a summary of which components of the system are completed, which have specific recommendations, and which have general recommendations.

Figure 2: Current Status of the Components of MCF’s SLE System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Components</th>
<th>Content in the Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed but Require Periodic Refinement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Evaluation Approach</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Strategies</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outcomes Maps</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strategic Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Strategic Framing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Grantee Reporting</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conducting Evaluations</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communications Approach</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Learning Activities</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Evaluation Activities</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Leadership around Learning and Evaluation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Human Resources</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Financial Resources</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Knowledge Management Systems</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Components with checks in two columns have some customized recommendations and some general recommendations.

Each section in this chapter includes the key next steps in order to further develop that component of the SLE system. At the end of each section, there is a table which summarizes the key activities and indicates the level of urgency, timing, owner(s) of the activity, approximate staff time required, and any recommended partner engagement. Appendix A contains a consolidated table for the entire Strategic Evaluation Plan for reference.
A. Evaluation Approach
The Foundation has developed its evaluation approach and now should ensure that it acts as a guide for directing MCF's evaluation efforts. In order to do so, next steps include:

A1 Communicate the evaluation approach to relevant stakeholders: Communicate the evaluation approach to the Board, management, staff, partners, and other relevant stakeholders. MCF should continually reinforce its importance by sharing it using a variety of strategies/formats, such as putting it in RFP’s for evaluations, sharing its themes in discussions with partners, and including it in evaluation documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Level of Urgency</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Approx. Staff Time</th>
<th>Partner Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Communicate the evaluation approach to relevant</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Immediately and ongoing</td>
<td>All MCF staff</td>
<td>Very limited</td>
<td>Share the approach with grantees and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Strategic Framing
With fully developed strategies, outcomes maps, and strategic evaluation questions for each program area, the Foundation is well positioned to frame its evaluation efforts around the questions that are critical to its effectiveness. In order to ensure the long-term relevance of the SLE system, the Foundation should:

B1 Continue to refine the program strategies: As the organization learns more about which elements of its strategies do and do not work, the Foundation should refine the strategies and update its documents appropriately.

B2 Continue to refine the outcomes maps: With each change to the program strategies, the Foundation should also make corresponding changes to its outcomes maps so that they remain aligned and the program strategy is clearly articulated from activity to long-term outcome.

B3 Continue to refine the strategic evaluation questions: As certain strategic evaluation questions are answered and as the strategy adapts accordingly, each program should consider what new strategic evaluation question it should pose to focus its future evaluation efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Level of Urgency</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Approx. Staff Time</th>
<th>Partner Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1 Continue to refine the program strategies</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Annually with particular emphasis</td>
<td>Program staff (directors</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Gather external expert input on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>around the annual learning retreat</td>
<td>and managers)</td>
<td></td>
<td>potential refinements to the strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Continue to refine the outcomes maps</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Annually with particular emphasis</td>
<td>Program staff</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Work with grantees to understand what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>around the annual learning retreat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>outputs and outcomes they can deliver on as the map evolves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Continue to refine the strategic evaluation</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Annually with particular emphasis</td>
<td>Program staff with ED</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Gather external expert input on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions</td>
<td></td>
<td>around the annual learning retreat</td>
<td>support</td>
<td></td>
<td>key questions MCF should answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Evaluation Activities

1. **Grantee Reporting**

Grantee reporting under this new SLE system involves an evolution of the type of engagement the Foundation has with its grantees. It will require up-front conversations with new grantees and ongoing discussions with existing grantees to explain the program’s strategy, outcomes map, and desired level of reporting from the grantee. The discussion will require the Foundation to probe on grantee capacity to deliver different data points and determine whether additional resources might be required to augment the grantees’ reporting capacity. Next steps include:

**C1.1 Align grantees to program outcomes maps:** Before MCF begins conversations with existing grantees, it first needs to align the goals of the grant to the MCF program outcome map. That way, MCF program staff will know what portion of the map to share with grantees, as well as what portion of the strategy (outputs and outcomes) they hope to inform through a particular investment. This will also help each program understand which parts of its outcomes map are currently not covered by existing grantees so that it can seek out additional partners to help achieve its strategy. For new grantees, this activity should happen during the proposal stage.

**C1.2 Engage in evaluation discussions with grantees:** As a next step, the Foundation should conduct discussions with its grantees (similar to the ones conducted by FSG) in order to share relevant portions of the outcomes map, understand the grantee’s culture around learning and evaluation, and begin to discuss the grantees’ capacity to deliver data on these metrics. This discussion would take place with new grantees as well during the proposal stage (See Appendix H for the discussion guide used by FSG).

**C1.3 Determine reporting requirements for grantees:** Next, MCF should determine its reporting requirements for each grantee according to the Foundation’s grantee reporting framework (See Appendix G for details). MCF should determine which reporting level applies based on a number of factors, including the grant’s age, value, level of innovation, and level of risk, as well as the grantee’s existing evaluation resources and infrastructure.

**C1.4 Determine grantee reporting capacity and needs:** Based on the discussions and the reporting requirements for the grantee, MCF should determine whether the grantee requires additional technical assistance around evaluation, in addition to program dollars, to increase the grantee’s ability to report on predetermined outcomes map data.

**C1.5 Begin to assess grantee outcomes against outcomes maps:** Every three months, each program should review grantee progress against its outcomes map and see how well the grantees are helping the program achieve its outcomes. This will also determine where the program might need additional grantees to fill specific “holes” in its strategy. This will allow MCF to build a rich pipeline of new potential relevant grantees.

**C1.6 Conduct monthly (at least), informal conversations with grantees around learning:** Program managers should continue having frequent, periodic conversations with grantees around lessons learned by the grantee and by the Foundation. This can also provide grantees the opportunity to provide any informal updates on programs but should remain focused mostly on reflection and learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Level of Urgency</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Approx. Staff Time</th>
<th>Partner Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1.1 Align grantees to program outcomes maps</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fall 2010 for existing grants; in proposal phase for new grants</td>
<td>Program staff</td>
<td>1.5 hrs per grantee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Conducting Evaluations
Conducting specific evaluations concerning individual grantees, clusters of grantees, or changes in a population or community require thinking through a number of options and trade-offs. An effective way to consistently align these decisions with the Foundation’s strategy and desired long-term outcomes would be to develop a structured approach for evaluation decision-making. In order the consider how to conduct evaluations, next steps include:

**C2.1 Prioritize strategic evaluation questions for each year:** Each program should prioritize a few strategic evaluation questions that it will aim to answer each year in order to focus its efforts. These questions can provide the structure of quarterly learning events for the Foundation (as noted in the learning activities section).

**C2.2 Determine the best level for conducting evaluations:** Once the Foundation knows what it wants to evaluate, it should consider how it will approach the evaluation. MCF can choose between using grantee reporting, a partner-specific evaluation, or a cluster / thematic evaluation. Evaluations will look across all components of (a set of) grantees to assess a number of factors, including whether inputs were provided as committed, whether grantees executed on the activities agreed upon, and what outputs, outcomes, and ultimate impacts have occurred in relation to this work. The Foundation has already determined criteria to help determine how it will consider each of these approaches, so it should follow these to guide its decision making (See Appendix J for more details).

**C2.3 Choose between conducting the evaluation internally or externally:** Once the level of evaluation has been decided, the Foundation should determine whether it will conduct the evaluation on its own or through a third party evaluator. Depending on the Foundation’s expertise, capacity, and resources available, it should determine whether to engage outside assistance, in which case it should send out an RFP. (See Appendix M for potential decision making criteria).

**C2.4 Select an evaluation design:** Next, the Foundation should determine the appropriate evaluation and data collection method. Choosing between randomized-controlled trials, quasi-experimental design, and non-experimental (or more qualitative) design is the critical question at this point. The Evaluation Director should help guide this decision. If the Foundation is engaging an external evaluator in this process as well, then that person / organization can help guide this decision (See Appendix N for a sample...
approach to assess which design is most appropriate for a research or evaluation study; See Appendix O for advantages and disadvantages of various data collection methods).

**C2.5 Design and execute targeted plans for evaluations:** Designing and conducting evaluations requires extensive work, from determining the specific data collection methodology to interpreting the results and recommending actions. For every evaluation that the Foundation will conduct either internally or through a third party evaluator, MCF should make sure to develop a targeted plan to help prepare and guide the evaluation (See Appendix P for an extensive description of a targeted plan for an evaluation).

**C2.6 Develop an Evaluation Advisory Committee:** Once the Evaluation Director is hired, the Foundation should consider creating an advisory board consisting of Board members, staff members, external experts, and youth to focus more closely on evaluation issues and design. This can be an important mechanism for ensuring that the Foundation is prioritizing the right questions and conducting its evaluation activities in a way that the field will take notice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Level of Urgency</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Approx. Staff Time</th>
<th>Partner Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2.1 Prioritize strategic evaluation questions for each year</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Once a year around the annual learning retreat</td>
<td>Program staff with ED support</td>
<td>4 hrs per program per year 2 months before the retreat</td>
<td>Engage with external experts to determine which questions might be important to the field in the next year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.2 Determine the best level for conducting evaluations</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>After the annual learning retreat and before every evaluation</td>
<td>ED, program staff</td>
<td>1 hr per evaluation</td>
<td>Potential to consult with other evaluation experts and Foundations to assess potential for joint evaluation efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.3 Choose between conducting the evaluation internally or externally</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>After the annual learning retreat and before every evaluation</td>
<td>ED, program staff</td>
<td>2 hrs per evaluation</td>
<td>Engage with third party evaluators as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.4 Select an evaluation design</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>After the annual learning retreat and before every evaluation</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>4 hrs per evaluation</td>
<td>Potential to consult with other evaluation experts in the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.5 Design and execute targeted plans for evaluations</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Before every evaluation</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Depends on the size and scale of the evaluation</td>
<td>Engage with third party evaluators as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.6 Develop an Evaluation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Shortly after Evaluation Director has started</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>20 hrs over 3 months</td>
<td>Regularly engage key advisory members to inform evaluation work, including key program stakeholders (e.g., youth) in the evaluation design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Communications Approach

Communicating the progress and results of evaluation efforts is an important step to ensure lessons are disseminated to all relevant stakeholders, both internal and external. The future VP of Communications will lead much of the external communications, and thus the full communications strategy will need to wait for this person to be hired, but there are certain things that the Foundation can do before then as well. In order to develop the communications approach, next steps include:
C3.1 Finalize and populate the program dashboards: Each program should customize the dashboard templates to their specific needs. They have already been updated to display each program’s prioritized indicators for 2011, but there may be some additional customization required depending on the particular audience (e.g., Board vs. the CEO vs. external stakeholders). The programs should begin to collect the relevant data wherever possible and populate the dashboards with them every quarter (See Appendix F for program dashboard templates).

C3.2 Refine and prioritize the Foundation’s communication approach: The Foundation has an initial set of approaches prioritized for its various stakeholders, but it should further refine it based on the expected evaluation needs for the coming year. In addition, the Foundation should prioritize a couple of evaluation approaches to use for the coming year based on identified needs (See Appendix K for the existing set of approaches).

C3.3 Develop a communications strategy: Once the Foundation hires its VP of Communications, it can develop a full communications strategy that details how it will approach each stakeholder, what resources are required, and a plan for implementing each solution and engaging each stakeholder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Level of Urgency</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Approx. Staff Time</th>
<th>Partner Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C3.1 Finalize and populate the program dashboards</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Quarterly, with particular emphasis before the annual learning retreat</td>
<td>Program staff</td>
<td>20 hrs per program per quarter (if done manually, less if IT system does it automatically)</td>
<td>Potential to engage grantees to clarify quarterly report of outputs/outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3.2 Refine and prioritize the Foundation’s communication approach</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>Program staff</td>
<td>4 hrs per program</td>
<td>Engage with external stakeholders to vet approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3.3 Develop a communications strategy</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>After MCF hires a VP of Comm.</td>
<td>VP of Comm.</td>
<td>40 hrs per month for two months</td>
<td>Engage with external experts and stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Learning Activities**
Setting aside dedicated time and space to learn is an essential part of internalizing the results of an organization’s evaluation activities. While it is often difficult to take time away from all of the other priorities, taking the time to honestly and openly reflect on successes, mistakes, and missed opportunities and then consider the relevant lessons will improve the Foundation’s effectiveness in its future work. The Foundation has identified two potential types of learning activities to facilitate intentional reflection throughout the year, but as the Evaluation Director comes on board, this person should help MCF determine what other types of learning activities it can use. In order to start this process of reflection, the Foundation should:

C4.1 Hold an annual learning retreat: The Foundation should hold an annual learning retreat in November to provide the time and space for Foundation staff to reflect on the year’s activities, consider lessons learned, and determine how to improve its work in the future. In order to spend adequate time to reflect, MCF should devote at least 2-3 days for this retreat and should allow all staff (and potentially some partners) to participate and help facilitate the retreat. During this retreat, the staff will not only reflect on the previous year’s activities, but it will also define the evaluation priorities for the coming year, including prioritizing the strategic evaluation questions it will try to answer. Coming out of this retreat, the Foundation should be able to begin deciding on the parameters for the upcoming year’s evaluations. The Foundation can consider using some of the key questions below to help structure or facilitate this learning process.
Key Questions for the Annual Learning Retreat

- What have been our biggest successes?
- What have been some of our mistakes or missed opportunities?
- What have we learned from our work this past year?
  - About our program strategies / areas?
  - About our grantees?
  - About ourselves?
- How should these lessons change the way we work as a foundation?
- What strategic evaluation questions and themes should be prioritized for the next year?
- What resources (financial, personnel and time) will be required for evaluation activities?
- Over what time period and in what formats should various learning and evaluation activities be conducted?

C4.2 Engage in quarterly learning events: MCF can also conduct quarterly learning events centered around specific strategic evaluation questions as determined in the annual learning retreat. These learning events can take various forms and include multiple internal and external stakeholders. There is potential to bring in grantees, other funders, Board members, or program stakeholders (e.g., youth or microfinance clients) in order to contribute to the learning. As such, the foundation can consider holding these events either at its headquarters or somewhere in the field. Each of these quarterly events should focus on answering a specific strategic evaluation questions, informed by evaluation results, grantee reporting, publications and lessons from the field, and other stakeholder experiences.

C4.3 Engage the Board in evaluation conversations: The Foundation should proactively share evaluation findings and lessons learned with Board members and also seek to build their evaluation knowledge and awareness. One way to do this is to share and discuss FSG's Trustee Evaluation Toolkit as a means for creating a “shared language” and a set of expectations among Board and staff (The Trustee Evaluation Toolkit is available on FSG's website and is included in the Foundation’s SLE system binders).

C4.4 Experiment with different group learning strategies: Once the Evaluation Director comes on board, this person can help shape the foundation’s learning culture and determine what activities work best. One way of doing this is to experiment with various learning activities and see what works for the staff. There are a number of potential learning strategies that the Foundation can experiment with, including:
  - Using **Appreciative Inquiry**\(^1\) to illuminate effective, successful, and motivating evaluation experiences
  - Holding **brown bag lunches** to present and discuss lessons from an evaluation or to discuss how lessons have been/can be successfully implemented into daily work
  - Facilitating **focus groups** with grantees and/or program stakeholders (e.g., youth and microfinance clients) in order to learn what approaches work for them

---

\(^1\) “Appreciative Inquiry” is a process that engages a group of people in searching for what a program, organization, situation, etc. looks like when it is at its best; when something is working and is providing new insights, excitement, and a future that is collectively desired. Within an evaluation context, Appreciative Inquiry can build on what is succeeding to further refine, develop, and adapt new learning, processes, and goals.
Planning **monthly program staff meetings** to reflect on, discuss, and learn about various evaluation topics.

Conducting **after action reviews** (AAR), which are structured reviews or debriefs for analyzing what happened, why it happened, and how it can be done better. These would be conducted after a grant’s completion and would typically involve the program staff and possibly the grantee. An AAR is distinct from a debrief in that it begins with a clear comparison of intended vs. actual results achieved.

After each evaluation has been completed, asking program staff a series of **learning questions** such as, what did we learn? What does it mean? What do we want to do with what we learned?

Engaging staff in responding to an **open-ended provocative question** that is relevant to a set of evaluation findings as a way to surface ideas and invite feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Level of Urgency</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Approx. Staff Time</th>
<th>Partner Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C4.1</strong> Hold an annual learning retreat</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Every November</td>
<td>ED and program staff</td>
<td>Prep: 2-3 days Retreat: 3 days Incorporating takeaways: 2 days</td>
<td>Potential to invite grantees or experts to attend part of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C4.2</strong> Engage in quarterly learning events</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Quarterly starting in 2011</td>
<td>ED and program staff</td>
<td>Prep: 2 days Event: 1 day Incorporating takeaways: 1 days</td>
<td>Potential to invite grantees or experts to attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C4.3</strong> Engage the Board in evaluation conversations</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Fall 2010 and quarterly</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>8 hrs per quarter</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C4.4</strong> Experiment with different group learning strategies</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>After the ED is hired</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>10 hrs per month</td>
<td>Potential to invite grantees or experts to attend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Infrastructure Needs**

1. **Leadership around Learning and Evaluation**

The Foundation’s leadership – the CEO, CFO, and program directors – has already indicated a strong interest in and commitment to establishing a positive and supportive culture around learning and evaluation. Sustaining this commitment through their words and actions will ensure that the evaluation system reaches its full potential. The Foundation has identified several leadership activities necessary to support learning and evaluation. While many of these activities are mentioned elsewhere in the plan, it is important to emphasize that the leaders within the organization must be the ones that model these activities and ensure that others follow. The CEO, CFO, Evaluation Director, and program directors are the main people who should be conducting these activities to set the tone for evaluation. In order to ensure that MCF has sufficient leadership for its SLE system, next steps include:

**D1.1 Communicate the importance of evaluation**: Leaders within the organization should continuously remind staff about the importance of learning and evaluation in their work. They should also be sure to celebrate successes and reinforce good practice by staff.

**D1.2 Create a learning environment within the organization**: Leaders must help create a culture of evaluation by creating systems and space that allow for staff to reflect and providing space for learning in the work day. Encouraging staff to celebrate successes as well as admit and reflect on mistakes will facilitate authentic evaluation.
D1.3 Provide the necessary resources and systems for effective evaluation: Leaders must also allocate sufficient resources to ensure that staff members are positioned to evaluate effectively and ensure that they understand their roles and responsibilities.

(See Appendix L for more details)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Level of Urgency</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Approx. Staff Time</th>
<th>Partner Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1.1 Communicate the importance of evaluation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Periodic</td>
<td>CEO, CFO, ED, and program directors</td>
<td>CEO: limited CFO: limited ED: limited Program directors: limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.2 Create a learning environment within the organization</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>After the ED comes on board and ongoing</td>
<td>CEO, CFO, ED, and program directors</td>
<td>CEO: limited CFO: limited ED: 8 hrs per month Program directors: 3 hrs per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.3 Provide the necessary resources and systems for effective evaluation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>After the ED comes on board and ongoing</td>
<td>CEO, CFO, ED, and program directors</td>
<td>CEO: 2 hrs per month at first CFO: 2 hrs per month at first ED: 30 hrs per month at first Program directors: 8 hrs per month at first</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Human Resources

The main priority for the Foundation from a human resources perspective is to hire an Evaluation Director, which MCF is already in the process of doing. Once this person is hired, there are a number of other human resource issues that the Foundation should address, led by the ED. In order to develop the Foundation’s evaluation human resources, next steps include:

D2.1 Develop an evaluation staffing plan: When the ED comes on board, she / he should work with the CEO, CFO, and program directors to develop a staffing plan for the organization’s long-term evaluation needs. Even with an ED, given the number of grants that the Foundation will soon manage, there will be insufficient staff to thoughtfully learn from and evaluate the tremendous breadth of programs that the Foundation is leading, so building up the appropriate staff will be paramount. One key question to consider is whether MCF should free up program manager capacity and train them to conduct the evaluation activities for their program or if MCF should hire dedicated evaluation staff that can work with program managers on these efforts. Either way, the Foundation should ensure that program managers have at least 10% of their capacity available for learning and evaluation and significantly more if they will be expected to lead significant evaluation activities.

D2.2 Determine staff roles and responsibilities for evaluation: In addition, MCF needs to determine the roles and responsibilities of those who will be involved in the various evaluation efforts (e.g., the Evaluation Director, program directors, program managers, partners, third party external evaluators). It must be explicit who will support what aspects of data collection, reporting, and other evaluation activities. For example, the ED’s role might be to coach and facilitate evaluation efforts while bringing consistency to the interactions between MCF and partners, and program directors might be responsible for making program-specific decisions.

D2.3 Revise the performance measurement system: As evaluation responsibilities become clear, MCF should also revise the Foundation’s performance measurement system to
promote accountability. Staff performance should include assessment of how well they are conducting the specific evaluation roles and responsibilities outlined.

**D2.4 Develop the evaluation capacity of staff:** MCF will also need to develop the evaluation capacity of the staff to ensure everyone has a baseline of evaluation knowledge and expertise. The Evaluation Director should hold discussions with staff to understand specific evaluation needs and design a training process to build the staff’s evaluation capacity over time. One suggestion might be to schedule periodic “reflection times” intended to determine what evaluation trainings/activities may be useful on an ongoing basis. The Evaluation Director could also hold monthly trainings for evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Level of Urgency</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Approx. Staff Time</th>
<th>Partner Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2.1 Develop an evaluation staffing plan</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>After ED is hired for one month</td>
<td>CEO and CFO approve plan; program directors and ED design plan</td>
<td>CEO: 3 hrs; CFO: 3 hrs; ED: 30 hrs; Program directors: 15 hrs</td>
<td>Potential to engage evaluation experts and other Foundations as needed for benchmarking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2.2 Determine staff roles and responsibilities for evaluation</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>After ED is hired for one month</td>
<td>CEO approves plan; program directors and ED design plan</td>
<td>CEO: 3 hrs; ED: 30 hrs; Program directors: 15 hrs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2.3 Revise the performance measurement system</strong></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>After roles and responsibilities established</td>
<td>CEO and CFO approve plan; program directors and ED design plan</td>
<td>CEO: 2 hrs; CFO: 2 hrs; ED: 10 hrs; Program directors: 5 hrs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2.4 Develop the evaluation capacity of the staff</strong></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>After ED is hired and monthly</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>15 hrs per month</td>
<td>Potential to engage evaluation experts for specific trainings or for case studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Financial Resources**
MCF will need to set aside adequate financial resources to support the Foundation’s evaluation activities and infrastructure. Typically, most foundations set aside around 10-15% of its annual program budget to support evaluation. However, building up certain elements of the SLE system may require additional up front investments beyond the 10-15%. In order to ensure adequate financial resources to support the SLE system, once the ED is hired, next steps include:

**D3.1 Benchmark foundation budgeting for evaluation:** The Foundation should contact five to seven peer organizations to understand how they source and allocate their financial resources for evaluation. Learning how other foundations budget for evaluation can help MCF understand what it can expect to spend, but it should not replace a detailed budgeting process.²

**D3.2 Develop a five year budget for implementing the SLE system:** MCF needs to develop a detailed five year budget for its SLE system. This budget must indicate both where resources will come from (central evaluation budget vs. program-specific budgets) and indicate how resources will be used. The budget should include funding for developing the system’s infrastructure (i.e., for evaluation training and a knowledge management system) and for facilitating evaluation activities. For grantee reporting, MCF can choose to help build the reporting capacity of grantees in order to provide

---
² Note, FSG does not have off-the-shelf details on foundation budgeting practices and conducting tailored benchmarking research of other foundations was not included in the defined scope of work for this project.
specific data. For conducting evaluations, the budget will depend on which questions, levels, and types of evaluation it chooses to pursue. For the communications approach, the number and type of stakeholders will affect the required funding, as well as types of communications media used. Finally, certain learning activities will require funding, particularly if MCF plans to bring in various stakeholders from different countries or hold large convenings.

**D3.3 Determine the annual evaluation budget:** Every year after the annual learning retreat, once the staff knows what evaluations it will prioritize and has a preliminary idea of how it will conduct the evaluations, MCF should develop an evaluation budget for the following year that will determine how it allocates its resources across various evaluation needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Level of Urgency</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Approx. Staff Time</th>
<th>Partner Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D3.1 Benchmark foundation budgeting for evaluation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>After the ED is hired</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>20 hrs for one month</td>
<td>Engage evaluation experts and other Foundations as needed for benchmarking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.2 Develop a five-year budget for implementing the SLE system</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>After the ED is hired and once SLE system components are better defined</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>30 hrs over 3 months</td>
<td>Potential to incorporate grantee reporting needs into budget proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.3 Determine the annual evaluation budget</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>After the annual learning retreat</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>15 hrs over 2 months</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See Appendix Q for a worksheet that structures basic budget allocation)

4. **Knowledge Management Systems**

Technology plays an important role in collecting, analyzing, aggregating, and using evaluation data. It is also instrumental for storing and disseminating information about an evaluation’s progress, findings, recommendations, and lessons learned. MCF’s current grants application, GIFTS, has limited capability to gather customized evaluation data, store lessons, analyze quantitative and qualitative data, and prepare useful reports on aggregated information. While it is very useful for financial information and can be customized to meet some basic knowledge management needs, the staff has expressed a desire to have capabilities beyond what GIFTS can provide. As MCF explores opportunities for ensuring technology is a supportive component of its evaluation infrastructure, it has identified several requirements for its knowledge management system. MCF should look for a system that can:

- Capture and store output and outcomes data across MCF’s outcomes maps; aggregate this information into Foundation-wide indicators; and produce reports and dashboards
- Prioritize 10-12 key indicators and analyze the key activities, inputs, outputs, and outcomes around them
- Analyze grantmaking across a variety of dimensions, including by program, objective, geography, year, etc.
- Capture qualitative and impact evaluation studies for each grant
- Provide customized websites where grantees can input their output and outcomes data and provide answers to key questions; this would then feed into the Foundation outcomes map system

In order to strengthen the knowledge management system, next steps include:
**D4.1 Review and refine the knowledge management system requirements:** The Foundation should review the list of system requirements that it has developed once the Evaluation Director is hired. The ED should help determine whether there is anything missing and then discuss these requirements with the third party firm that is helping it identify an appropriate knowledge management system.

**D4.2 Acquire and integrate the appropriate knowledge management system:** Once the Foundation decides which particular system that it wishes to use, it should acquire the system and then go through the process of transferring from the existing knowledge management process to the new system. This will require cataloguing all desired documents and transferring them into the new system in an easily accessible way. This will also require inputting the new program outcomes maps to form the structure for capturing outputs and outcomes, as well as designing dashboards in the system based on the PowerPoint templates provided in this engagement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Level of Urgency</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Approx. Staff Time</th>
<th>Partner Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D4.1 Review and refine the knowledge management system requirements</strong></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>After ED is hired</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>5 hrs</td>
<td>Review requirements with third party firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D4.2 Acquire and integrate the appropriate knowledge management system</strong></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Throughout 2011</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>20 hrs per month in 2011 (more early on)</td>
<td>Work closely with vendor to ensure integration with MCF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Detailed Timelines**

The following timelines consolidate the activities in the Strategic Evaluation Plan to show the sequencing and overlap. There are two different timelines included here, one to show the key activities required to develop the SLE system and another to show the sequence of typical evaluation events once the system is up and running. In addition, there is a revised grant management process showing how evaluation activities should be included in the process.
1. Development of the SLE System

Figure 3: Illustrative Timeline for Developing the SLE System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developing MCF's SLE System</th>
<th>2010 Q3</th>
<th>2010 Q4</th>
<th>2011 Q1</th>
<th>2011 Q2</th>
<th>2011 Q3</th>
<th>2011 Q4</th>
<th>2011 Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.1 Align grantees to program outcomes maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.2 Engage in evaluation discussions with grantees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.3 Determine reporting requirements for grantees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.4 Determine grantee reporting capacity and needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.5 Assess grantee outcomes against outcomes maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conducting Evaluations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.6 Develop an Evaluation Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3.1 Finalize and populate the program dashboards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3.2 Refine and prioritize the Foundation’s comm. approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3.3 Develop a communications strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.1 Hold an annual learning retreat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.2 Engage the Board in evaluation conversations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.4 Experiment with different learning strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership around Learning and Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.2 Create a learning environment within MCF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.3 Provide the necessary resources and systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.1 Develop an evaluation staffing plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.2 Determine staff roles and responsibilities for evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.3 Revise the performance measurement system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.4 Develop the evaluation capacity of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.1 Benchmark foundation budgeting for evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.2 Develop a five year budget for the SLE system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge Management Systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.1 Review and refine knowledge mgmt system requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.2 Acquire and integrate the appropriate system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hire ED
## 2. Annual SLE Activities

Figure 4: Illustrative Timeline for Annual SLE Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual SLE Activities</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Communicate the evaluation approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Framing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Continue to refine the program strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Continue to refine the outcomes maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Continue to refine the strategic evaluation questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grantee Reporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.5 Begin to assess grantee outcomes against outcomes maps (quarterly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.6 Conduct monthly, informal conversations with grantees around learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conducting Evaluations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.1 Prioritize strategic evaluation questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.2 Determine the best level for conducting evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.3 Choose between internal and external evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.4 Select an evaluation design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3.1 Finalize and populate the program dashboards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.1 Hold an annual learning retreat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.2 Engage in quarterly learning events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership around Learning and Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.1 Communicate the importance of evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.4 Develop the evaluation capacity of the staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.3 Determine the annual evaluation budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- indicates activity scheduled for the indicated month.

---
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3. **Grant Management Process**
Currently, MCF has a well-developed and structured grant process. For evaluation to be truly effective, it should be woven throughout that process, as opposed to concentrated at the end once the grant is over. As a result, FSG has slightly modified this process to indicate where the Foundation might incorporate evaluation into the process – from the beginning when MCF is having its initial conversations with prospective grantees and throughout the grantee relationship to track how grantee outputs and outcomes are aligning with the overall program outcomes map and desired strategic outcomes. See Appendix R for the revised grant management process.

4. **Conclusion**

The MasterCard Foundation is in an exciting position, with management and staff dedicated to developing a relevant, credible and useful system for learning and evaluation. While the development of such a system can be a lengthy process that requires dedicated resources and management support, the Foundation has demonstrated its desire to commit the necessary resources to inform its evaluation activities moving forward. Once the SLE system is in place, the Foundation can reap significant benefits by more systematically assessing its effectiveness and learning from its actions.

When designing and implementing an evaluation system, it is important to recognize that whatever system MCF implements, it will always be situated within a larger organizational context that is, and will be, influenced and affected by external forces. These forces may include expectations and requirements made by the Foundation’s Board members, constraints or needs of grantees, or changes in the landscape of youth learning and microfinance (including public policy, identification of effective tools and approaches, and shifts in focus of peer funders or other influencers). The system that is developed should not be static – it will need to shift and flex as its context and internal requirements change over time. Maintaining a “living and breathing” SLE system can mean engaging in periodic reviews to ensure that the system is evolving along with MCF’s needs.

We strongly believe that MCF is building a solid foundation for evaluation. Given the Foundation’s commitment to learning and evaluation, we are confident that the Board, management, and staff will continue to be committed to providing input and support as MCF moves forward with developing and implementing its SLE system.
### Appendix A: Consolidated Strategic Evaluation Plan Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Level of Urgency</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Approx. Staff Time</th>
<th>Partner Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1</strong> Communicate the evaluation approach to relevant stakeholders</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Immediately and ongoing</td>
<td>All MCF staff</td>
<td>Very limited</td>
<td>Share the approach with grantees and other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Framing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1</strong> Continue to refine the program strategies</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Annually with particular emphasis around the annual learning retreat</td>
<td>Program staff (directors and managers)</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Gather external expert input on potential refinements to the strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2</strong> Continue to refine the outcomes maps</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Annually with particular emphasis around the annual learning retreat</td>
<td>Program staff</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Work with grantees to understand what outputs and outcomes they can deliver on as the map evolves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B3</strong> Continue to refine the strategic evaluation questions</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Annually with particular emphasis around the annual learning retreat</td>
<td>Program staff with ED support</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Gather external expert input on the key questions MCF should answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1.1</strong> Align grantees to program outcomes maps</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fall 2010 for existing grants; in proposal phase for new grants</td>
<td>Program staff</td>
<td>1.5 hrs per grantee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1.2</strong> Engage in evaluation discussions with grantees</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fall 2010 for existing grants; in proposal phase for new grants</td>
<td>Program staff</td>
<td>2 hrs per grantee</td>
<td>Set up time with each current and future grantee to review outcomes maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1.3</strong> Determine reporting requirements for grantees</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fall 2010 for existing grants; in proposal phase for new grants</td>
<td>Program staff</td>
<td>1.5 hrs per grantee</td>
<td>Discuss reporting requirements with grantees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1.4</strong> Determine grantee reporting capacity and needs</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Periodic, particularly as the Foundation receives regular reports from grantees</td>
<td>Program staff</td>
<td>1-2 hrs per grantee per reporting cycle</td>
<td>Regularly discuss reporting successes and challenges with grantees and any need for technical assistance to augment capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1.5</strong> Begin to assess grantee outcomes against outcomes maps</td>
<td>Low (increasing priority over time)</td>
<td>Quarterly, particularly as the Foundation receives reports from grantees</td>
<td>Program Staff</td>
<td>2 hrs per grantee per quarter</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1.6</strong> Conduct monthly, informal conversations with grantees around learning</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Monthly, starting in Fall 2010</td>
<td>Program staff</td>
<td>1 hr per grantee per month</td>
<td>Set up regular time to speak with grantees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2.1</strong> Prioritize strategic evaluation questions for each year</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Once a year around the annual learning retreat</td>
<td>Program staff with ED support</td>
<td>4 hrs per program per year 2 months before the retreat</td>
<td>Engage with external experts to determine which questions might be important to the field in the next year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Activities</td>
<td>Level of Urgency</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Owner(s)</td>
<td>Approx. Staff Time</td>
<td>Partner Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.2 Determine the best level for conducting evaluations</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>After the annual learning retreat and before every evaluation</td>
<td>ED, program staff</td>
<td>1 hr per evaluation</td>
<td>Potential to consult with other evaluation experts and Foundations to assess potential for joint evaluation efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.3 Choose between conducting the evaluation internally or externally</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>After the annual learning retreat and before every evaluation</td>
<td>ED, program staff</td>
<td>2 hrs per evaluation</td>
<td>Engage with third party evaluators as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.4 Select an evaluation design</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>After the annual learning retreat and before every evaluation</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>4 hrs per evaluation</td>
<td>Potential to consult with other evaluation experts in the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.5 Design and execute targeted plans for evaluations</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Before every evaluation</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Depends on the size and scale of the evaluation</td>
<td>Engage with third party evaluators as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2.6 Develop an Evaluation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Shortly after Evaluation Director has started</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>20 hrs over 3 months</td>
<td>Regularly engage key advisory members to inform evaluation work, including key program stakeholders like youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3.1 Finalize and populate the program dashboards</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Quarterly, with particular emphasis before the annual learning retreat</td>
<td>Program staff</td>
<td>20 hrs per program per quarter (if done manually, less if IT system does it automatically)</td>
<td>Potential to engage grantees to clarify quarterly report of outputs/outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3.2 Refine and prioritize the Foundation’s communication approach</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>Program staff</td>
<td>4 hrs per program</td>
<td>Engage with external stakeholders to vet approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3.3 Develop a communications strategy</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>After MCF hires a VP of Comm.</td>
<td>VP of Comm.</td>
<td>40 hrs per month for two months</td>
<td>Engage with external experts and stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.1 Hold an annual learning retreat</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Every November</td>
<td>ED and program staff</td>
<td>Prep: 2-3 days Retreat: 3 days Incorporating takeaways: 2 days</td>
<td>Potential to invite grantees or experts to attend part of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.2 Engage in quarterly learning events</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Quarterly starting in 2011</td>
<td>ED and program staff</td>
<td>Prep: 2 days Event: 1 day Incorporating takeaways: 1 days</td>
<td>Potential to invite grantees or experts to attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.3 Engage the Board in evaluation conversations</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Fall 2010 and quarterly</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>8 hrs per quarter</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4.4 Experiment with different group learning strategies</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>After the ED is hired</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>10 hrs per month</td>
<td>Potential to invite grantees or experts to attend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Infrastructure Needs**

| D1.1 Communicate the importance of evaluation        | High             | Periodic                                    | CEO, CFO, ED, and program directors | CEO: limited CFO: limited ED: limited Program directors: limited | Emphasize evaluation with grantees and other stakeholders as well |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Level of Urgency</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Approx. Staff Time</th>
<th>Partner Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1.2</strong> Create a learning environment within the organization</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>After the ED comes on board and ongoing</td>
<td>CEO, CFO, ED, and program directors</td>
<td>CEO: limited</td>
<td>Invite grantees into learning events and dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFO: limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ED: 8 hrs per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program directors: 3 hrs per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1.3</strong> Provide the necessary resources and systems for effective evaluation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>After the ED comes on board and ongoing</td>
<td>CEO, CFO, ED, and program directors</td>
<td>CEO: 2 hrs per month at first</td>
<td>Potential to see what systems will effectively work with grantees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFO: 2 hrs per month at first</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ED: 30 hrs per month at first</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program directors: 8 hrs per month at first</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2.1</strong> Develop an evaluation staffing plan</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>After ED is hired for one month</td>
<td>CEO and CFO approve plan; program directors and ED design plan</td>
<td>CEO: 3 hrs</td>
<td>Potential to engage evaluation experts and other Foundations as needed for benchmarking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFO: 3 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ED: 30 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program directors: 15 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2.2</strong> Determine staff roles and responsibilities for evaluation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>After ED is hired for one month</td>
<td>CEO approves plan; program directors and ED design plan</td>
<td>CEO: 3 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFO: 3 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ED: 30 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program directors: 15 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2.3</strong> Revise the performance measurement system</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>After roles and responsibilities established</td>
<td>CEO and CFO approve plan; program directors and ED design plan</td>
<td>CEO: 2 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFO: 2 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ED: 10 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program directors: 5 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2.4</strong> Develop the evaluation capacity of the staff</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>After ED is hired and monthly</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>15 hrs per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3.1</strong> Benchmark foundation budgeting for evaluation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>After the ED is hired</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>20 hrs for one month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3.2</strong> Develop a five-year budget for implementing the SLE system</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>After the ED is hired and once SLE system components are better defined</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>30 hrs over 3 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3.3</strong> Determine the annual evaluation budget</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>After the annual learning retreat</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>15 hrs over 2 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D4.1</strong> Review and refine the knowledge management system requirements</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>After ED is hired</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>5 hrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D4.2</strong> Acquire and integrate the appropriate knowledge management system</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Throughout 2011</td>
<td>ED</td>
<td>20 hrs per month in 2011 (more early on)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix B: Phase I Memo

MEMORANDUM

To: The MasterCard Foundation
From: FSG
Date: June 9, 2010
Re: Phase I Internal Summary

In this memo, FSG highlights the key internal review findings, insights, and potential implications for the MasterCard Foundation’s Strategic Learning and Evaluation (SLE) strategy. This summary is based on interviews with ten staff members (see end of document for list of interviewees) and a comprehensive review of relevant internal documents such as grantee proposals, program strategies, and overall process maps.

Current State of Evaluation at the Foundation

Not surprisingly, given the Foundation’s age, the MasterCard Foundation (MCF) is at the very early stages of integrating evaluation into its overall grantmaking strategy — which in many ways is a true benefit as the Foundation is not entering into this strategic evaluation process encumbered by legacy systems.

MCF currently has no systematic process in place for evaluation. The current process maps articulate the grantmaking process in detail but do not integrate an explicit process for aligning proposal outcomes, indicators, and metrics with overall program goals, nor have they allotted time for integrating reflection and learning into the process or strategy. As one staff member commented, “To me, the weakness to date has been that evaluation was piecemeal. We need to look at it in more holistic way.” The proposals and quarterly reports for current grants include indicators that the grantee will track and often include some sort of outcomes map (with inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes), but the specific indicators vary quite a bit across grants making it difficult to aggregate outcomes across the portfolio. Staff articulated the need to evolve the conversation with grantees to include more systematic evaluation, commenting “Up until now, we have not put a specific structure in place to have an engaged dialog with our partners around M&E.”

Several staff members reflected how much of the current emphases on monitoring and evaluation is on the monitoring, rather than the evaluation, with one member saying “Mostly we are just monitoring so far in the form of quarterly reports” and that “In terms of reporting, a lot of the reporting to date has been driven by CRA requirements, not so much about learning and evaluation. We have a need to refocus and make sure it is core to our work.”

Finally, a majority of staff professed a low level of knowledge about evaluation, reinforcing the need for an SL&E system that is approachable, immediately usable, and not overly complex.

Aspirations for the Role of Evaluation at the Foundation

Despite the staff not having a strong background in evaluation, they collectively put forth a robust and consistent vision for the role that evaluation might play at the Foundation moving forward. For example:

- Evaluation should inform strategy by posing the right questions. Staff members believe that ultimately, evaluation should drive MCF’s strategy, saying, “When we have a
new program, we should know what the important questions are and then can ask our partner to answer them.”

- Evaluation should provide insights into program effectiveness and impact. Staff commented that evaluation will, “help us learn and see if programs are having impact.”
- Finally, evaluation should help create a learning culture at the Foundation so that staff can learn and determine how to improve future investments, especially in areas of innovation. One staff member commented, “Evaluation is absolutely critical to determine where you need to be focusing our future investments” and “our strategy and program design.”

Staff also outlined four groups of stakeholders to consider as stakeholders in evaluation efforts:

- **Foundation Staff:** MCF staff expressed a desire and need to continue to learn and improve through structured evaluation, saying “Evaluation is a management tool that helps us more effectively conduct our work.”
- **Foundation Board:** The staff recognized the importance of using evaluation as an accountability and communications tool with the Board to help them understand the strategy and the Foundation’s impact.
- **Grantee Partners:** Staff also indicated the importance of evaluation in providing information that is helpful to the Foundation and key partners, commenting, “Evaluation enables conversation with grantees, particularly around what is learned around financial services and youth learning.”
- **The Field:** Staff recognized the importance of evaluation not only in helping inform their own work, but also in helping to share lessons learned with several sets of stakeholders in the broader field:
  - Global institutions (e.g., the UN, the World Bank, bilateral)
  - Peers we work with (e.g., country governments, co-funders)
  - The media
  - Target populations (e.g., microfinance clients, youth)

### Challenges and Obstacles

Given the current nature of the portfolio, there are some inherent challenges for the Foundation with respect to designing and implementing an SL&E strategy. For instance, the strategies and outcomes for both the Microfinance and Youth Learning program areas are currently at a general level, and are not as explicit as they could be about the ties to outcomes different investments will produce. Current grant relationships are more focused on activities and outputs rather than an overarching relationship to the Foundation’s desired outcomes. In addition, there is a need to know the consistent questions the Foundation is trying to answer across the portfolio, as opposed to now, where the Foundation tries to determine this grant by grant. Since the learning agendas and indicators included in current grants do not have a common set of questions or indicators, overall learning is difficult.

Staff also have concerns about both internal and partner capacity for more extensive evaluation efforts. Grantees have varied capacity and capability to collect and report data. As one staff member commented, “It is important to think about how to not overburden the grantee but still get the specific information needed. There needs to be a good negotiation and conversation around this to set expectations at the outset instead of having fights later on when expectations are not met.” Staff also commented on the need to be more systematic in collecting consistent data, saying “Our partners vary quite a bit with how much data they can collect – BRAC has very sophisticated systems and can collect quite a deal of nuanced data while others have difficulty reporting on simple measures.”
Internally, there is no capacity to provide guidance or execute on evaluation efforts, nor is there time to reflect within each program area on lessons learned so that they may be applied to the strategy or shared with the field. Staff commented that knowledgeable evaluation staff would help with this effort, saying “We are missing internal leadership here in terms of evaluation and knowledge management; there is a desire to have rigorous evaluation, but there is no one who we can look to and help us determine how we do it.” Further, given the ramp-up in grants, overall capacity might need to be increased if each program’s staff is meant to participate in SL&E: “If we are talking about more extensive evaluation beyond just simple reporting, one person will not be able to do that for our future portfolio. We are going to have to do reporting, mid-term assessment, and final evaluation for around 50 active projects in two to three years.”

Finally, there is no system or culture in place to go beyond internal evaluation and instead actively share information more broadly and convene key stakeholders in the field. The staff believes that the Foundation must institutionalize a learning culture that allows time to assess program effectiveness and improve future grantmaking, saying “The Foundation will have to develop a learning culture, investing the necessary resources and time to reflect.” Staff recognize this will take addition resources: “As the Foundation expands, we need to have more formalized systems and processes that allow us to have systematic learning conversations so we can maintain and improve our culture around this” and that “We also need to have the right IT that supports this, but we need to figure out the front-end part before we become wedded to a system.”

Potential Implications

Given the desired role the staff has for evaluation at the Foundation, coupled with the current state, resources, and culture, the Foundation should be aware of several possible implications coming out of this SL&E strategy process:

1. This engagement will be the beginning of a likely multi-stage evolution of the Foundation’s approach to evaluation. The pace needs to match the staff’s ability to absorb, own, and execute the evaluation strategy, so mid-August will represent a strong initial step, not an end point. As one staff person commented, “It is better for us to have something [at the end of this engagement] that gets us halfway and that the Foundation buys into rather than have a plan that shows us how to get all the way but we are not ready to act on.”

2. As a result, there will be a need to sequence/stagger the implementation of the evaluation strategy so that the Foundation can match the required resources and culture to the aspired evaluation system and outcomes. “We need to determine as a team how we want to learn. This project should help us define what our evaluation and learning process is and how we can most valuably spend our time to evaluate and learn.”

3. The Foundation will also likely need to invest more time and resources in further refining each strategy so that it will ensure it is driving toward the desired outcomes. By defining the strategic narratives and outcomes maps, the staff may find they need to go back to the strategy and ensure the strategic goals align with the output from these evaluation working sessions and ultimately the SL&E strategy.
4. The MasterCard Foundation should also consider proactively adding new capacity to reinforce the SL&E efforts by potentially hiring a full-time director of evaluation to oversee the efforts, as well as additional staff so that both finance and program staff can begin to incorporate reflection and learning time into their workload.

5. Finally, the Foundation will likely need to invest time in continuing to engage and train the Board so that it can go beyond the numbers and outputs to understanding the more nuanced narrative around outcomes and influence on the field. A staff member commented, “From the Board’s perspective, impact equals numbers, so there is a real desire from them to say $X means Y people influenced. However, the real story is often more sophisticated than simple numbers because it is about human development.” While some progress has been made already, additional work is needed to ensure the Board continues to engage at the more complex, nuanced level of outcomes rather than outputs.

FSG will revisit this document towards the end of the engagement to ensure the SL&E strategy aligns with the staff’s vision for evaluation, and to reassess the potential implications laid out in the final section of this document.

**Interviewees**

FSG interviewed the following staff members to gain an initial perspective of the Foundation’s strategic learning and evaluation history, capabilities, aspirations, and challenges.

- Alpha Abebe
- Crystal Chan
- Kevin Dyck
- Deepali Khanna
- Meredith Lee
- Rewa Misra
- David Myhre
- Reeta Roy
- Jennifer Singer
- Charlene Wallace
- Peggy Woo
Appendix C: Program Strategies

Program Strategies

**Youth Learning**

*Youth Learning Program Goal*

Prepare youth to engage in the economy and lead change in their communities

*Focus Areas*

1. Enable continued learning
2. Facilitate connections to market
3. Support entrepreneurs

*Key Portfolio Themes*

1. Youth as active decision-makers and key influencers
2. Policy work influence on national development strategies
3. Informal and applied learning opportunities
4. Business role in making the workplace accessible to youth
5. Secondary school completion
6. Entrepreneurship models

*Program Priorities*

- Innovation
- Gender Equity
- Youth Engagement
- Peer-to-Peer Models
- Technology
- Monitoring & Evaluation

**Microfinance**

*Microfinance Program Goal*

Expand access to and increase the reach of microfinance to improve the quality of life for people of all ages in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA)

*Focus Areas and Strategies*

1. Scale proven business models in SSA
2. Experiment with scalable solutions for inclusive financial systems in SSA
3. Strengthen the global microfinance sector

- Replicate proven business models in new SSA geographies
- Catalyze youth-inclusion in financial systems
- Explore future scalable opportunities

- Increase institutional reach in existing geographies by:
  - Supporting expansion of Tier I institutions
  - Fortifying promising Tier II institutions that are poised to transform into Tier I institutions

*Guiding Principles*

- Scale
- Sustainability
- Sub-Saharan Africa
- Youth as the future

- Promote transparency
- Build human capital
- Develop financial capability of clients
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# Appendix D: Outcomes Maps

## Youth Learning Outcomes Map (1 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Themes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs (1 year)</th>
<th>ST Outcomes (1-2 years)</th>
<th>MT Outcomes (3-4 years)</th>
<th>LT Outcomes (5 Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Active Decision-Makers and Key Influencers | • Support community-based organizations serving youth  
• Encourage youth participation in local decision making bodies | • # of community-based organizations serving youth  
• # of youth participating in local decision making bodies | • Youth opinions are being considered in shaping youth strategies at the local level | | Youth of today have sustainable enterprises in the future |
| Policy Work Effect on Development Strategies | • Support youth involvement at national decision making bodies | • # of youth participating in national decision making bodies | • Youth opinions are being considered in shaping youth strategies at the national level | | |
| | • Fund youth learning platforms | • Youth learning platforms (e.g., “State of the World’s Youth” report, net) | • Platforms exist and are used for discussions with policymakers on national and regional poverty reduction | | |
| | • Encourage and support policy discussions among grantees | • # of grantees meetings or discussions related to policy review | • There are multiple and diverse conversations about policy regulations | | |
| Informal and Applied Learning Opportunities | | | | | |
| | • Support alternative education programs | • # of youth who attended alternative education programs | • Improved alternative education completion rates | | Youth of today are employed in a variety of safe jobs, are valued, and are fairly compensated in the future |
| | • Fund and support mentorship programs | • # of students with mentors | • Increasing youth participation in mentorships | | |
| | • Fund and support internship programs | • # of youth who complete internships | • Youth interns show enhanced meaningful workforce participation and/or entrepreneurship | | |
| | • Facilitate peer-to-peer training programs | • # of peer-to-peer trainers trained | • Effective and sustainable peer-to-peer strategy developed | | |
| | • Facilitate youth-employer networks | • # of networks with both youth and employers | • Connections to employers | | |
| | • Define “market-relevant skills” by region | • “Market-relevant skills” defined by region  
• # of youth trained in market-relevant skills  
• # of youth trained in leadership | • Youth trainees demonstrate increased market-relevant skills | | |
| | • Fund training programs in market-relevant skills and leadership | | | | |
| | • Fund entrepreneurship curriculum development | • Entrepreneurship curriculum successfully developed | • Entrepreneurship curriculum widely adopted and taught by others | | |
| | • Provide financial literacy training for youth | • # of youth who join and maintain membership in savings groups or receive credit for start-up capital | • Youth have increased decision-making over resources | | |
## Youth Learning Outcomes Map (2 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Themes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs (1 year)</th>
<th>ST Outcomes (1-2 years)</th>
<th>MT Outcomes (3-4 years)</th>
<th>LT Outcomes (5 Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4 | Business Role in Making Workplace Accessible to Youth | • Facilitate mentorship programs  
• Facilitate internship programs  
• Facilitate relationships between businesses and youth entrepreneurs | • # of mentors  
• # of organizations providing internship opportunities  
• # of relationships with private and public sector employers | • Increasing number of employers who offer mentorships and internships  
• Increasing number of jobs for youth | Individual / Household  
• Higher levels of education  
• Marketable skills (financial and technological literacy)  
• Access to safe / secure employment  
• Market knowledge  
• Access to mentors & social networks  
• Decision-making power and position to choose own economic future  
• Youth trainees show enhanced self confidence and community recognition as role models | Youth of today have sustainable enterprises in the future |
| 5 | Secondary School Completion | • Fund scholarship schemes for formal education | • # of youth supported to attend formal education | • Improved formal education completion rates  
• Improved academic performance  
• (differences by gender and urban vs. rural) | | Institution  
• Placement opportunities  
• Learning institutions that support entrepreneurship | Youth of today are employed in a variety of safe jobs, are valued, and are fairly compensated in the future |
| 6 | Entrepreneurship Models | • Review and evaluate existing models  
• Fund existing models for scale up  
• Fund new models for proof of concept | • # of models reviewed  
• # of models scaled up  
• # of new models tested for proof of concept | • Proven entrepreneurship models established | | System  
• Youth employment and entrepreneurship schemes strengthened  
• Informed government policy  
• Private sector values youth as workers  
• Market / economic development  
• Publications that show best practices for youth learning |
### Microfinance Outcomes Map (1 of 6)

**Replicate Proven Business Models in SSA & Scale Tier I Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs* (1 year)</th>
<th>ST Outcomes* (1-2 years)</th>
<th>MT Outcomes* (3-4 years)</th>
<th>LT Outcomes* (5+ Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replicate Proven Business Models in New SSA Geographies</td>
<td>• Fund MFIs to create new points of access for successfully replicated models</td>
<td>• # of new access points created by type&lt;br&gt;• # of new clients reached</td>
<td>• Increased number of clients in SSA have savings accounts, loans, or other financial products&lt;br&gt;• Decrease cost per client for MFI and the Foundation</td>
<td>• The establishment of new sustainable models in SSA further extends the reach of microfinance&lt;br&gt;• Learnings from replication successes and failures have been documented and disseminated, leading to new funding for effort&lt;br&gt;• Increase in funders supporting existing or new proven models for replication in SSA&lt;br&gt;• Further decrease transaction cost to client&lt;br&gt;• MFIs offer a diverse range of products and services through convenient delivery channels&lt;br&gt;• Increased client assets &amp; livelihood portfolio diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicate Proven Business Models in New SSA Geographies</td>
<td>• Document impact of new replicated program in SSA</td>
<td>• # of reports on key services / technical assistance required to apply proven approach in SSA&lt;br&gt;• # of reports on applicability of the model</td>
<td>• Sharing of replication best practices successes and challenges leads to greater interest in model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Expansion of Tier I Institutions*</td>
<td>• Support MFIs directly or through advisory services to expand existing services/product offerings</td>
<td>• # of new markets entered&lt;br&gt;• # of new products/services offered</td>
<td>• Increased capacity of MFIs to reach and serve more clients&lt;br&gt;• Increased number of new client accounts in new market segments&lt;br&gt;• Improved client satisfaction rate&lt;br&gt;• Increased tracking of PPI (or equivalent)</td>
<td>• Increased number of sustainable MFIs exist in SSA&lt;br&gt;• Increased penetration within selected geographies&lt;br&gt;• Decreased transaction costs to client&lt;br&gt;• MFIs have opened up new business models for reaching formerly un-reached sectors&lt;br&gt;• A model exists for leveraging scale economies&lt;br&gt;• Improved PPI indicators&lt;br&gt;• Increased client assets &amp; livelihood portfolio diversification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All output and outcomes data to be reported by age, gender, geography and poverty level.

Note that any Tier I or II institution receiving funding from MCF will be required to complete a set of financial measurements in order for the Foundation to assess risk and improvements over baseline.
### Microfinance Outcomes Map (2 of 6)

#### Fortifying Promising Tier II Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs* (1 year)</th>
<th>ST Outcomes* (1-2 years)</th>
<th>MT Outcomes* (3-4 years)</th>
<th>LT Outcomes* (5+ Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Commission research to appraise MFIs on key metrics/baseline on operational efficiency, governance, etc.</td>
<td>• # of MFIs appraised on key metrics</td>
<td>• Lower performing MFIs expressing interest in organizational change</td>
<td>• Increased number of talented leaders and managers are able to drive the growth of MFIs across SSA</td>
<td>• MFI clients in SSA are building, maintaining, and controlling household economic assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partner with group to match MFIs with advisory/technical training services to develop business plans</td>
<td>• # of MFIs matched with advisory/technical training services</td>
<td>• Organizational policies, plans and procedures changed to reflect technical recommendations</td>
<td>• Increased number of Tier II institutions are transforming into Tier I institutions</td>
<td>• MFI clients in SSA are investing in education, healthcare, and other QOL assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Give financial support for MFIs directly or through a TA provider to meet business plan objectives (assuming strong MFI business plan)</td>
<td>• # of MFIs funded for technical support</td>
<td>• Improvement of appraisal baseline scores in funded MFIs</td>
<td>• Improved PPI indicators</td>
<td>• MFI clients in SSA have improved capacity to cope with external socio-economic shocks and income volatility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All output and outcomes data to be reported by age, gender, geography and poverty level*

Note that any Tier I or II institution receiving funding from MCF will be required to complete a set of financial measurements in order for the Foundation to assess risk and improvements over baseline.
## Microfinance Outcomes Map (3 of 6)

**Experiment With Scalable Solutions for Inclusive Financial Systems in SSA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs* (1 year)</th>
<th>ST Outcomes* (1-2 years)</th>
<th>MT Outcomes* (3-4 Years)</th>
<th>LT Outcomes* (5+ Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission market research on youth segment's needs to develop products, services and optimum delivery channels</td>
<td># of market research reports commissioned and completed</td>
<td>Institutions are better informed about the type of products, marketing strategies, services, and delivery channels that lead to youth inclusion, and begin to focus on developing youth inclusive products and services</td>
<td>Increased number of youth in SSA having savings accounts, loans, or other financial products</td>
<td>MFI clients in SSA are building, maintaining, and controlling household economic assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission research to make the business case to key stakeholders about the value of youth inclusion</td>
<td># of market research reports commissioned and completed</td>
<td>Business case for youth inclusive financial systems is established and institutions begin to change their perceptions about the value of adding youth to their client base</td>
<td>Significantly increased in number of financial institutions perceive youth as viable clients and are able to serve youth better</td>
<td>MFI clients in SSA are investing in education, healthcare, and other QOL assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund MFIs to develop and roll out products and services</td>
<td># of new products and services developed and rolled out</td>
<td>Increased uptake of financial products and services created/adapted for youth</td>
<td>Increase number of MFIs that actively serve youth clients</td>
<td>MFI clients in SSA have improved capacity to cope with external socio-economic shocks and income volatility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund trainings and networking forums to create learning and partnership opportunities for youth-serving organizations and MF practitioners on youth-inclusive MF</td>
<td># of trainings, # of participants by organization type, level of participant satisfaction; # of partnerships developed; Volume of information available to sector</td>
<td>Lessons have been disseminated to a critical mass of organizations about key characteristics of client segments and potential products</td>
<td>Increased number of MFIs have partnered with YSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission documentation and dissemination of learnings and implications from experimental activities</td>
<td># of reports generated; # of reports distributed; # of convenings/meetings to discuss report results</td>
<td>More institutions and funders are aware of the potential for scale with youth inclusion in financial systems and are actively looking to increase/fund capacity to serve this segment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ST: Short-term; MT: Medium-term; LT: Long-term
## Microfinance Outcomes Map (4 of 6)

**Experiment With Scalable Solutions for Inclusive Financial Systems in SSA / Strengthen the Global Microfinance Sector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs* (1 year)</th>
<th>ST Outcomes* (1-2 years)</th>
<th>MT Outcomes* (3-4 years)</th>
<th>LT Outcomes* (5+ Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explore Future Scalable Opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Commission research and fund pilot testing on potential solutions that could significantly influence scale and begin initial testing</td>
<td>• Research that yields potential&lt;br&gt;• Foundation has strategies for initiatives with new segment</td>
<td>• Increased pipeline of new program partners identified and pilot testing of new solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promote Transparency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop core set of tools for social performance measurement and management and adapt tools to SSA context&lt;br&gt;• Fund training to MFIs and MFI networks on social performance measurement&lt;br&gt;• Fund facilitated forums for MFIs so they can share lessons on what is working/networking regarding social performance measurement</td>
<td>• # of networks trained&lt;br&gt;• # of MFIs trained&lt;br&gt;• # of MFIs applying SPM tools and reporting against them to MIX</td>
<td>• Increased availability of reports showing whether clients that are entering programs are relatively poor or not&lt;br&gt;• Increased availability of reports demonstrating whether clients are able to move up poverty levels over a period of time&lt;br&gt;• MFIs have better sense of client satisfaction with available products and services and what improvements are required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Outputs, ST Outcomes, MT Outcomes, and LT Outcomes are placeholders for actual outcomes and timelines.
## Microfinance Outcomes Map (5 of 6)

### Strengthen the Global Microfinance Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs* (1 year)</th>
<th>ST Outcomes* (1-2 years)</th>
<th>MT Outcomes* (3-4 years)</th>
<th>LT Outcomes* (5+ Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Build Human Capital | • Fund educational seminars and conferences to train microfinance practitioners  
                    • Provide scholarships to microfinance practitioners for training programs  
                    • Provide leadership development training, coaching and mentoring to emerging microfinance leaders in microfinance industry  
                    • Support women through funding leadership training | • # of trainings  
• # of participants  
• Degree of participant satisfaction  
• # of scholarships awarded | • Managers and leaders have increased skill set  
• Microfinance practitioners in the industry have increased confidence  
• Increased capacity and confidence of microfinance practitioners to do their jobs well  
• Increased organizational commitment to leadership development | • Scholarship recipients gaining a promotion  
• Increase of female leaders within the industry  
• Increased number of sound and reliable microfinance practitioners  
• Women within the microfinance industry are able to advance  
• Increased number of MFIs offering financial education services in conjunction with financial services | • The microfinance sector has a strong, capable, gender-balanced workforce that successfully attracts and retains clients |

| Develop Financial Capabilities of Clients | • Fund MFIs to work with clients to enable them to access information on diverse products and services (financial education)  
• Fund expansion of MFIs and other institutions in their delivery of financial education services  
• Commission research on best practices regarding scalable and effective financial programming | • # of trainings held  
• # of training participants (enrolled & completed)  
• % satisfaction in training  
• % improvement in pre-class baseline  
• # of research reports commissioned and completed | • Improved client financial knowledge and skills  
• Basic behavior around managing money improves (e.g. planning, saving, spending, borrowing, earning, investing, use of formal or informal financial institutions)  
• Personal and psychological characteristics (e.g. careful about spending money, confidence in making financial decisions, ability to plan ahead, more security about future) increase | • Clients are increasingly satisfied with the financial services they receive  
• Clients are managing household financial assets better to manage risk  
• Increased client assets & livelihood portfolio diversification | • MFI clients in SSA are building, maintaining, and controlling household economic assets  
• MFI clients in SSA are investing in education, healthcare, and other QOL assets  
• MFI clients in SSA have improved capacity to cope with external socio-economic shocks and income volatility |

*All output and outcomes data to be reported by age, gender, geography and poverty level  
Note that any Tier I or II institution receiving funding from MCF will be required to complete a set of financial measurements in order for the Foundation to assess risk and improvements over baseline
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs* (1 year)</th>
<th>ST Outcomes* (1-2 years)</th>
<th>MT Outcomes* (3-4 years)</th>
<th>LT Outcomes* (5+ Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other (Enhanced Livelihood)</td>
<td>• Fund linkages of the rural poor to markets and non-financial support services through trainings and livelihood development</td>
<td>• # of trainings</td>
<td>• Improved understanding of rural farmers and micro-entrepreneurs on enterprise development and market linkages</td>
<td>• Increased level of savings and assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• # of participants trained in livelihood development services</td>
<td>• Degree of participant satisfaction</td>
<td>• Increased uptake/accounts in specific products for target population</td>
<td>• Increased micro-enterprise profitability and sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Degree of participant satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased employment opportunities</td>
<td>• Increased client assets &amp; livelihood portfolio diversification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All output and outcomes data to be reported by age, gender, geography, and poverty level. Note that any Tier I or II institution receiving funding from MCF will be required to complete a set of financial measurements in order for the Foundation to assess risk and improvements over baseline.
Appendix E: Strategic Evaluation Questions

A critical step in developing a strategic learning and evaluation system for the Foundation is defining the strategic questions the organization is hoping to answer about its programs’ work. When crafted and implemented with care and thought about what information is needed and why, these questions serve as important strategic tools for measuring the extent to which, and how, the Foundation is meeting its strategic goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Learning Strategic Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent are youth active decision-makers and key influencers in their own societies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent does our grantees’ policy work with youth affect and contribute to national development strategies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent do informal and applied learning opportunities contribute to meaningful employment and connections to markets?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent, how, and why are businesses taking a proactive role in making the workplace accessible to youth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent does secondary school completion contribute to meaningful employment (either through entrepreneurship or working for an existing employer)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent do existing and new entrepreneurship models contribute to youth starting their own businesses or becoming employed at one?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Microfinance Strategic Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent can proven business models be replicated sustainably within SSA? What factors or determinants are key to a successful replication?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent does funding/technical support for Tier I and Tier II institutions lead to greater, and sustainable, client reach and financial performance of MFIs? Which type of support is most important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In what ways does supporting Tier I institutions differ from supporting Tier II institutions in terms of costs and other inputs, given a similar level of outreach to new clients?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent do youth-specific products and services lead to improved growth rates in outreach? To what extent are youth-specific product lines sustainable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent does including youth (either through conventional products or youth-specific products) contribute to the financial sustainability of MFIs overall?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What mix of microfinance programming (e.g., holistic, targeted), strategy and institutions best prepare youth to integrate with the market workforce?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How can financial services and non-financial services, such as business training and financial education, be offered sustainably and cost-effectively to ensure sustainable economic outcomes for a large number of clients, especially youth and women?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To what extent and in what ways does increased transparency contribute to improved client access (including scale and cost) and knowledge of financial services and institutions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To what extent and in what ways do well-designed and targeted financial services and programs lead to positive outcomes (e.g., decrease in poverty rates, increased quality of life)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Program Dashboards

Youth Learning Program Sample Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Timelines</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Example: All programs are on track with plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financials</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Example: Grantmaking for last year less than budgeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrics</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Example: All metrics at or above target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Milestones / Qualitative Metrics / Next Steps:
- Successfully organized Youth Learning Conference in ABC on XYZ, 2010
- YYY
- ZZZ

Activities:
- Major Highlights, examples:
  - Funded entrepreneurship curriculum development in XXX
  - Supported mentorship program with ABC Co. in YYY
  - Budget updates
  - Staff / office updates

Cumulative Grants Committed

New Grantees per Half

Prioritized Outputs (YTD 2011)

- Youth participating in local decision-making bodies
- Youth trained in market-relevant skills
- Youth supported to attend formal education
- Relationships with local private and public sector employers
- Youth and girls who gain jobs
- Youth and girls who start enterprises
The MasterCard Foundation’s Strategic Learning and Evaluation System

Youth Learning Program Sample Dashboard

Youth Reached by Region (YTD 2010)

Distribution of Youth Learning Grants by Grantee

-- All Data For Illustrative Purposes Only --

Comments and Lessons

- Youth Learning grants are spread across the globe, with a high density of giving in Sub-Saharan Africa.
- XX% of Youth Learning to the YY program area. The other ZZ% is distributed among various other program areas.
Microfinance Program Sample Dashboard

- All Data For Illustrative Purposes Only -

**Prioritized Outcomes**

1. **# of Training Participants (focused on client financial capabilities)**
   - Enrolled
   - Completed

2. **# MFIs Reporting Data to Publicly Available Platforms**
   - Reporting
   - Reporting Interest Rates

3. **Current % Portfolio At Risk**
   - Target

4. **Current % Financial Self Sufficiency**
   - Target

---

The MasterCard Foundation’s Strategic Learning and Evaluation System

September 10, 2010
Microfinance Program Sample Dashboard

Clients Reached by Region (YTD 2010)

- Rest of World
- Non-SSA
- SSA

Global Target 2010

Size of bubble corresponds to number of youth reached
Color of bubble reflects status:
- On-target
- Caution
- Off-target

Distribution of Microfinance Grants by Focus Area

- Proven Business Models
- Inclusive Financial Systems
- MF Sector

2010
2011
2012

Comments and Lessons

- Microfinance grants are spread across the globe, with a high density of giving in Sub-Saharan Africa
- XX% of Microfinance grants to the YY program area. The other ZZ% is distributed among various other areas
Appendix G: Grantee Reporting Framework

The Foundation has devised the grantee reporting framework below. Most grantees will fit into the “Standard” reporting requirements, but certain grantees may fit into the “Low Intensity” or “High Intensity” based on the following criteria:

- Age of grant
- Dollar value of grant
- Level of innovation
- Risk level/predictability of project/grantee
- Grantee’s level of evaluation infrastructure

Using these criteria, MCF can request three levels of reporting from its partners:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Reporting Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Intensity</td>
<td>• Quarterly financial / narrative report&lt;br&gt;• Detailed end of project report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>• Quarterly financial / narrative report&lt;br&gt;• Semi-annual report 2 page document including budget, budget narrative, and report on outputs and short-term outcome indicators&lt;br&gt;• Detailed annual report 5-10 page document including budget, budget narrative, outputs and short-term indicators, and narrative description of risks, opportunities, successes, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Intensity</td>
<td>• Quarterly financial / narrative report&lt;br&gt;• Detailed quarterly report in place of semi-annual report 5-10 page document including budget, budget narrative, outputs and short-term indicators, and narrative description of risks, opportunities, successes, etc.&lt;br&gt;• Detailed annual report In addition to the quarterly report, the annual report will include more detailed description of the program activities along with case studies and other details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intention is for “Standard” reporting to become the norm, while “High Intensity” will be require more effort for grantees that represent a large dollar value, are high profile, and/or are relatively innovative or risky. Some partners may start out at “High Intensity” during the early stages of the grant, but upon proving stability, can “graduate” to “Standard” reporting.
Appendix H: Grantee Discussion Guide

MCF Strategic Learning & Evaluation: Grantee Discussion Guide

Background

Thank you for taking time to speak with us. FSG has been engaged by the MasterCard Foundation to design its Strategic Learning and Evaluation (SLE) system. This system includes a comprehensive evaluation vision, outcomes map, evaluation questions, monitoring strategy, and recommended approaches to collecting and disseminating data to help the foundation learn about its impact and refine its Youth Learning strategy.

As a valued partner to the foundation’s Youth Learning program, your input is critical as we design this system so that we ensure it takes into consideration various grantees’ current monitoring and evaluation practices and capabilities. The foundation would like to ensure that the system is practical and useful not only to itself but also to its partners.

Below are some questions that we will use to guide our conversation. Thank you for your time!

Introduction/ General Questions

1. What is your current position and background?

2. What is the history of your organization's partnership with the foundation?

Organizational Learning and Evaluation

3. What has been your experience with learning and evaluation at your organization?

4. What are your organization’s key priorities with regard to evaluation (e.g., proving our model, showing scale and reach, unearthing key lessons for programs)

5. How does your organization use evaluation to make decisions and refine program design?

6. Please describe your organization’s capabilities with regard to collecting data on its programs?

7. What type of quantitative and qualitative data does your monitoring process collect? What types of methods or instruments do you use? (e.g., surveys, interviews)

Evaluation with the MasterCard Foundation

8. How involved and specific have conversations with the foundation been around monitoring and evaluation with respect to your grant?
9. How would you like the foundation to be working with you on evaluation, understanding that the foundation needs to receive certain information in order to inform its own knowledge and work?

10. Do you currently have any strong relationships with other funders with regard to evaluation? What might be some best practices that your organization and the foundation can draw from in order to work together to facilitate mutual learning and evaluation of the program?

Feedback on Potential Foundation Outputs and Short-Term Outcomes

11. To what extent would DOT be able to provide data around the following outputs and short-term outcomes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term Outcomes (1-2 years)</th>
<th>ST Outcome Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Support community-based organizations serving youth</td>
<td>• # of community-based organizations serving youth</td>
<td>• Youth opinions are being considered in shaping youth strategies</td>
<td>% increase in youth participation in local decision making bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage youth participation</td>
<td>• Youth participation in local decision making bodies</td>
<td>• % increase in youth membership amongst local bodies</td>
<td>% increase in youth membership amongst local bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fund and support internship programs</td>
<td>• # of youth who complete internships</td>
<td>• Youth interns show enhanced meaningful workforce participation and/or entrepreneurship</td>
<td>% increase in youth interns in formal/non formal sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Define “market-relevant skills” by region</td>
<td>• “Market-relevant skills” defined by region</td>
<td>• Youth trainees demonstrate increased market-relevant skills</td>
<td>% increase in youth entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fund training programs in market-relevant skills and leadership</td>
<td>• # of youth trained in market-relevant skills</td>
<td>• # of youth who get interviews, % increase in employer perception of skills</td>
<td>% increase in youth trained in market relevant skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fund entrepreneurship curriculum development and delivery</td>
<td>• Entrepreneurship curriculum developed</td>
<td>• % increase in youth who get market relevant jobs</td>
<td>% increase in use of entrepreneurship curricula</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

12. Would you like to offer any additional insights or thoughts with regard to your organization’s monitoring and evaluation efforts or your relationship with the foundation?

13. What advice would you have for the foundation as it refines its strategic learning and evaluation system?
Appendix I: Grantee Discussion Synthesis

Insights into Evaluation at the MasterCard Foundation
Synthesis of YL Grantee Discussions

This document synthesizes external perspectives from discussions with Grant Thomas and Kathy Duran from DOT as well as Chris Bradford from ALA.

Current Capacity for Evaluation

MCF grantees have varying capacity for monitoring and evaluation:

- DOT: They have robust M&E capabilities including a logic model and performance measurement framework for their economic programs in Africa which includes both quantitative and qualitative outputs and outcomes that are gender disaggregated
  - “We have a logic model which we use for our economic program in east Africa…and then a performance measurement framework that details what are our indicators, what are our targets, what is the baseline and who is responsible for collecting data.”
  - “At the output level, we are measuring people who are trained. At the immediate outcome level, we are looking at improved confidence, skills and knowledge. In terms of medium-term outcomes, we are tracking interns career mobility - what are they doing post internships, how have their skills improved, do they have the possibility to enter the job market or go back to school?”

- ALA: They are a young organization with limited M&E experience at this point; they are starting a long-term longitudinal study but have questions about how to make real-time adjustments to their approach
  - “We're a very young organization – I am heavily involved in the M&E work that we do, but we haven’t done a lot of it.”
  - “Ultimately we need to identify ways to learn and evaluate our programs while understanding we won’t have a full understanding of their impact for years. What are the appropriate interim metrics and what are the ways we collect them so we can evaluate whether our activities are working?”

Grantee Learning Culture

Similarly, grantees vary in their learning cultures as well:

- DOT: Learning is central to their organizational work and includes country-level sharing which gets disseminated to other countries as well as global management retreats with senior management and occasionally country directors
  - “[Our country offices] have semi-structured conversations with the team there around semi-annual reporting time. Those conversations get shared with the global team in Ottawa. So where we are finding some teams have had some experiences and lessons we try to share them as much as possible with other teams.”
  - “The other thing DOT has done is having management type retreat meetings and depending on timing, it may be senior management, or country directors.”

- ALA: Getting the program up and running has been the priority and now that things are more established, learning systems are starting to get institutionalized
  - “I don’t think our learning culture has been as strong as it needs to be. I think that when we look at the past two years, I see a whole lot of hustle, people working hard to get systems in place.”

47
“In 2010, we’ve started to build a learning culture. We’ve always relied on general survey data. Increasingly we have sought to bring people together for structured conversations about where we are going, what’s working, what’s going to be our priorities to get to our shared vision.”

Internal reporting
- DOT: Quarterly reports come in from country offices and weekly senior management calls include review of all country progress on key metrics and quality of programming
  - “We as an exec team meet by teleconference for about 2-2.5 hours every week where we review the performance of each program, including metrics and quality.”
- ALA: Reporting has centered around surveys with students and others in contact with them
  - “We have relied heavily on survey data on a wide range of attributes, including surveys with people who are coming into contact with our students.”

Working with MCF
Grantees have not had significant conversations with MCF to-date around evaluation
- “We haven’t gone beyond [basic discussions] with respect to designing M&E more fully with the Foundation.”
- “They have asked us repeatedly about M&E — how are you actually going to measure this? What I’ve really appreciated is they are willing to accept the answer: ‘I don’t really know but here are some ideas on what we think.’”

DOT can deliver on MCF’s outcomes map, but it is too soon to know about ALA’s ability to do so
- DOT can deliver on a significant portion of the subset of outputs and outcomes shown, but would need additional support to understand percent increase outcomes
  - “I see an 85% overlap with respect to what your table shows.” (note that FSG showed DOT a subset of outputs and outcomes from the YL outcomes map – see appendix)
  - “Percent increases suggest much broader baseline information which is something we would need additional support if we were to capture that.”
- It is unclear to what extent ALA will be able to deliver on MCF’s outcomes map at this point

Grantees express a desire for MCF to be partners more than funders
- “Obviously we much prefer to have a relationship that is collaborative and not simply a reporting relationship. We would welcome the foundation’s comments on our processes and opportunities to collaborate with them.”
- “One of the great things about MCF is that they are going to be exposed to things that are and aren’t working elsewhere. What we would really value is the sense of partnership and collaboration. I want [MCF] to feel comfortable calling me or the director and saying ‘what do you think about this; how do you think we can do this?’ I don’t want the relationship to revolve around 6 month reporting because a lot of things will be lost.”

While they are excited that MCF wishes to be collaborative in the process, there is concern that as the foundation’s portfolio expands, staff will not have the time to engage as deeply at the strategic level
"What I think they have done really well and what I think could be a differentiator for them, if they are a foundation that makes fewer but much bigger bets, they are going to have more ability to engage strategically with each of the organizations they work with."

“I have heard many foundation say they would like to be partners and collaborators, but when they get so busy with all of their grantees, they just revert to collecting reports.”

**Implications for MCF**

MCF should have these types of conversations with grantees themselves during the proposal phase

- Now that MCF has its own outcomes map, it should be proactive in discussing grantee capacity to provide data to inform parts of the outcomes map and answer relevant evaluation questions

For current grantees, MCF should have these types of discussions with remaining grantees and discuss how they can provide input on the Foundation outcomes map

- The Foundation should share with grantees what data it needs to collect (particularly the year one prioritized outputs) and determine which grantees can provide which data

MCF should institute regular learning conversations with grantees to share its lessons from the field and hear what the grantee is learning

- Grantees have a real hunger to engage with Foundation staff [and vice versa] beyond simple reporting
- Foundation staff should regularly check-in with grantees to discuss what the grantee is learning and what the Foundation is learning across its programs
Appendix J: Evaluation Level Definitions and Criteria

The Foundation can consider three levels of evaluation as defined below:

1. **Grantee Reporting**: Grantees will provide MCF with data on outputs and outcomes collected as part of the grantee’s M&E responsibilities (the foundation may choose to provide additional M&E funding to build the capacity of grantees to do this)

2. **Grantee / Partner-Level Evaluation**: MCF or a third party evaluator will take an in-depth look at a grantee in order to understand various aspects of the grantee’s work (beyond what it is reporting to MCF through its grant agreement)

3. **Thematic / Cluster-Level Evaluation**: MCF or a third party evaluator will look across several grantees with similar objectives or interventions to identify 1) level of efficiency, effectiveness, and/or scale in achieving the strategic goals and 2) lessons learned

MCF has identified this set of decision making criteria to determine whether evaluations should be conducted through grantee reporting, a grantee/partner-level, or a thematic/cluster-level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee Reporting</th>
<th>Grantee / Partner-Level Evaluation</th>
<th>Thematic / Cluster-Level Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• All grantees should report on select key indicators</td>
<td>• Grantees which illustrate findings that are worthy of sharing with the field (e.g., lessons learned from a particular type of innovation)</td>
<td>• Aspects of the foundation’s program strategy that require testing or validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outputs and outcomes that are most similar across grantees</td>
<td>• Grantees that are exceeding or not meeting the Foundation’s performance expectations</td>
<td>• Trends around thematic issues that the team wants to better understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fewer than 10 indicators per grantee in order to minimize the burden*</td>
<td>• Grantees operating in areas where there is a gap in knowledge in the field</td>
<td>• Themes that are of high strategic priority to the foundation or the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Narrative information relevant to grantees’ successes, challenges, observations, and needs from the Foundation</td>
<td>• Innovative programs that need to be rigorously evaluated before taking to scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In the event a grantee could report more outcomes data with additional capacity, MCF may choose to provide TA support if a the grantee made a compelling case</td>
<td>• Grantees in which MCF has significant investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that any Tier I or II institution receiving funding from MCF will be required to complete a set of financial measurements in order for the Foundation to assess risk and improvements over baseline
Appendix K: Initial MCF Communications Approaches

The Foundation has made an initial attempt to design how it will engage with various stakeholders. The figure below consolidates this into a chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial MCF Communications Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fewer Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other NGOs/Implementers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilaterals and Multilaterals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policymakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There are several different levels of dashboards: grantee, cluster, program
** YL expressed a desire to work collaboratively with youth and share lessons

Each approach requires a certain level of financial, personnel, and time resources. The Foundation should carefully consider how frequently it wants to use each approach to communicate with stakeholders. When the VP of Communications comes on board, this person should develop a full communications strategy and work with the Evaluation Director to determine how MCF will incorporate evaluation communications into that strategy.
## Appendix L: Key Activities for Leadership around Learning and Evaluation

The Foundation’s CEO, CFO, Evaluation Director, and program directors should conduct the following activities to promote leadership around learning and evaluation:

### Key Activities for Leadership around Learning and Evaluation

**Communicate the importance of evaluation**
- Communicate to both internal and external audiences that evaluation is a priority
- Demonstrate the value of evaluation by using evaluation findings to share lessons learned, determine next steps, and make decisions
- Celebrate success and publicize how an evaluation’s findings are being used to further the organization’s goals and overall health

**Create a learning environment within the organization**
- Engage in and encourage others to pursue evaluative thinking, making sure learning and evaluation is a regular item on the agenda
- Build systems that incorporate learning into the culture and create the space to reflect and learn as an organization
- Encourage the organization to celebrate successes and admit mistakes in order to create a constructive learning environment instead of a punitive one
- Use methodologies that support reflection (e.g., open space, appreciative inquiry)

**Provide the necessary resources and systems for effective evaluation**
- Provide resources (financial, time, personnel, capacity building) for designing and conducting quality evaluations
- Clearly articulate staff’s roles and responsibilities regarding how, when, and by whom evaluations are to be conducted and foster a sense of ownership
- Ensure performance management systems reinforce the organization’s commitment to evaluation and promote accountability
Appendix M: Internal vs. External Evaluation Criteria

The following chart outlines a number of criteria to consider when deciding whether an evaluation should be conducted by an internal or external evaluator. While some general guidance is provided to indicate how internal evaluations measure relative to external evaluations, the Foundation should assess the merits of each approach across each criteria for every evaluation it conducts. The way the Foundation weights each of these criteria for a given evaluation will go a long way in determining which approach is best.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Internal vs. External</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost-efficiency</td>
<td>Depends</td>
<td>Cost comparison calculation needed in each case (cost of external evaluator vs. internal resources required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Depends</td>
<td>Assessment of current availability of internal capacity and external evaluators needed in each case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of knowledge of program and operations</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Advantage for internal but external evaluators should invest time to understand this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of knowledge of context</td>
<td>Depends</td>
<td>Potential advantage for internal but external evaluators may have expertise in the particular topic or geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to collect information</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Advantage for external because of potential for sensitivities in some organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of evaluation expertise</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Advantage for external in most cases unless internal evaluators possess high expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived objectivity</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Advantage for external, especially for sensitive evaluations and specific audiences (“perceived” because no evaluator is ever completely objective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability for use of others’ funds</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Organizations receiving funding from other sources should consider the evaluation’s validity to funders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to criticize</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Advantage for external, though this is less of a factor in organizations with cultures encouraging critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of evaluation</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Advantage for internal as the evaluator understands the needs and culture of the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of attention to ethical issues</td>
<td>Depends</td>
<td>Assessment of the situation is needed in each case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability of evaluation to develop internal capacity</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Advantage for internal as the expertise the internal evaluator gains during the evaluation can support future evaluation efforts, though the organization can learn a lot from an external evaluator too</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from “A Fundamental Choice: Internal or External Evaluation?” by Melissa Conley-Tyler
Appendix N: Evaluation Design

Evaluation Designs Can be Classified by Asking Two Questions

Is random assignment used?

YES

Randomized or True Experiment Design

NO

Is there a control group or multiple measures?

YES

Quasi-Experiment Design

NO

Non-Experiment Design

Source: http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/desetypes.php

Choosing an Evaluation Design

Quasi-Experimental and Experimental Designs

**Pretest**
- Posttest
- Quasi-Experiment

**Characteristics**
- Both designs use a control group; experimental uses random assignment for the two groups
- Appropriate to use when:
  - It is critical to look at results for a control group
  - Some attrition (due to time difference between the two tests) will not cause major problems
  - Elimination of selection bias is critical (in the case of experimental)

**Advantages**
- Provides some control for the effects of history and maturation because of the use of a control group
- Provides evidence over time
- Measures attitudes, knowledge, and skills prior to the intervention
- Allows for comparison of pretest and posttest data

**Disadvantages**
- May require more resources because of repeated data collection efforts
- Changes may be the results of the repeated data collection (because of testing effects)
- May experience attrition or loss of people from the sample
- May have groups that are not similar because of unequal attrition
- May be difficult to obtain a “control” group

Non-Experimental Designs

**Non-Experimental**

**Characteristics**
- Does not have a control group; only conducts data on the group being studied
- Does not include multiple waves of data
- Appropriate for studying a phenomenon at one point in time
- Data use multiple data collection methods (e.g., interviews, surveys, observation, tests, social media)
- Sometimes called a “one-shot” or case study design

**Advantages**
- Includes data from multiple perspectives
- Can be cost-effective; reduces the costs and time needed for data collection, selecting a control group, and random assignment
- Rules out possible testing and instrumentation effects
- Often combines data from different sources

**Disadvantages**
- Since there is no pretest, does not provide baseline information
- Does not rule out the possibility that the condition existed prior to the intervention
- Results do not lead to scientific generalizability; difficult to replicate findings
- Need direct access to subjects

Source: [http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/desetypes.php](http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/desetypes.php)
Appendix O: Data Collection Methods

Data Collection Methods

Records and Documents

- **Records**: Participation rates, records of safety violations, overtime costs, student transcripts, accident rates, election records
- **Documents**: Grantee reports, training manuals, minutes of meetings, policies handbook, annual reports, diaries or journals, press releases
- **Existing Databases**: Census data, DOL data, organization websites

**Advantages**

+ Are easily collectable – don’t require participants to do anything different
+ Are unobtrusive measures and less likely to disrupt work
+ May provide data that focus on quantity or frequency
+ May provide a historical context
+ Are often cost-effective
+ Elicits information that cannot be collected from interviews or surveys
+ Increase perception of the data’s credibility
+ Require minimal training on how to collect data

**Disadvantages**

- Certain records, documents, and databases may be unavailable to the evaluator
- May not include a complete representation of event
- If there are many documents to review, can be time consuming
- Some complex databases may require sophisticated analysts
- The quality of writing in documents varies
- Sample may be limited or data may be too aggregated
- Missing data or records
Data Collection Methods

Observation

• **Full and Partial Participant**: Where observer is involved to some extent in the program, meeting, or discussion
• **Non-Participant**: Observer is not involved, for example in community meetings or public school settings
• Written notes, videos, drawings, photographs can be used by observer to gather both qualitative and quantitative data

**Advantages**

+ As long as access is provided to the observation site, the data are fairly easy to collect
+ As multiple observations are conducted at various times and locations, the evaluator is able to detect certain patterns of behavior across participants
+ Highlights discrepancies between fact and fiction
+ Increases understanding about the program’s context
+ Enables evaluators to see things that may routinely escape the consciousness of participants

**Disadvantages**

- Evaluator’s bias can interfere with the validity of the observation
- If using only one observer and making only one observation, data may simply be the result of that specific situation or time
- Conducting observations can be costly and time-consuming
- Observers need consistent training, not disadvantage per se, but important for success
Data Collection Methods

Surveys

- Attitude or Opinion Surveys
- Behavioral or Skill Surveys
- Employee Satisfaction or Organizational Climate Surveys
- Knowledge Surveys

Advantages

+ Easy to administer
+ Can cover a variety of topics in a brief amount of time
+ Helps to establish relationship with stakeholders
+ Many, particularly in U.S. and western Europe, are familiar with surveys
+ Easy to aggregate data and communicate results to stakeholders
+ Can be used to gather information from individuals who would be difficult to include in other data collection methods
+ Demonstrates interest in gathering feedback/information

Disadvantages

- Good surveys and questionnaires take time to develop
- The intent or meaning of questions may be interpreted differently by respondents
- Voluntary participation may result in biased findings
- Forced-response choices may not allow individuals to respond as they wish
- Open-ended questions produce data that require significant analysis time and resources
- Open-ended responses may vary in their length and quality
- Low response rate
Data Collection Methods

Interviews

- **Individual In-Person Interviews**: Interviews conducted in person on a one-on-one basis
- **Telephone Interviews**: Interviews conducted one-on-one or in groups while on the telephone
- **Focus Group Interviews**: Interviews conducted in groups of 5-10

**Advantages**

+ Can probe for details – ensures that participants are interpreting questions the way they were intended
+ Useful when gathering data from people for whom reading and writing may be difficult
+ Can uncover unexpected information
+ Can ensure greater participation
+ Compared to surveys, most respondents usually complete interviews
+ Group interaction during focus groups enrich depth and quality of data collected

**Disadvantages**

- Interviewees may not interpret questions in the same way
- Relatively expensive compared with a mail or online survey
- Require skilled and trained interviewers
- Can be hard to schedule; interviewees may also be resistant
- The interviewer's own biases can influence the process as well as the outcome of the interview
- With telephone interviews, the interviewer cannot see the interviewees to gauge their responses (nonverbal behavior)
## Data Collection Methods

### Tests

- **Paper**: A test typically taken in person and on a piece of paper
- **Simulation**: Exercises that test decision-making skills, or processes and procedures; sometimes with computers or other props
- **Computer-Based**: A method of administering tests in which the responses are electronically recorded, and/or assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardized Exams (Commercial)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standardized Exams (Commercial)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Can be adopted and implemented quickly</td>
<td>– Measures relatively superficial knowledge or learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Reduces or eliminates evaluator’s time in instrument development and grading</td>
<td>– Unlikely to match the specific goals and objectives of a program/institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Are scored objectively</td>
<td>– May be cost prohibitive to administer as pre- and post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Provides external validity</td>
<td>– More summative than formative (may be difficult to isolate what changes are needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Can make longitudinal comparisons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Can test large numbers of individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locally Developed Exams</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Can be tailored to match program objectives</td>
<td>– Complex and time consuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Can be used to develop locally meaningful norms</td>
<td>– Requires considerable leadership and coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Can obtain results more quickly</td>
<td>– May hinder curriculum change if exam needs to be revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Cheaper than commercial exams</td>
<td>– Results cannot be generalized beyond the program or institution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection Methods

Social Media

- **Blogs**: A Web site that contains an online personal journal with reflections, comments, and often hyperlinks provided by the writer
- **Wikis**: A Web site that allows users to add and update content on the site using their own Web browser
- **Twitter**: An instant messaging system that lets a person send brief text messages up to 140 characters in length to a list of followers
- **Mobile Devices**: Handheld, pocket-sized computing devices, typically having a display screen with touch input or a miniature keyboard

---

**Advantages**

+ Able to collect information from sources across vast geographies in a very short amount of time
+ Provide up-to-date current information
+ Can collect both qualitative and quantitative data
+ Can be updated in real time from several contributors simultaneously
+ Due to widespread popularity, require less training and able to involve general public in data collection
+ Relatively inexpensive

**Disadvantages**

- If data are collected from non-professionals, quality and accuracy of data may not be consistent
- Data may often be biased or incomplete depending on the source
- Often not best equipped to handle large amounts of data
- May only represent sample of population that is comfortable with technology
Appendix P: Targeted Plans for Evaluations

Every evaluation – whether it is of a grant, a cluster of grants, or an organization’s strategy, needs to be carefully thought out and planned; this is typically accomplished by developing a targeted evaluation plan. Depending on how many evaluations the organization wishes to conduct (as specified in the Strategic Evaluation Plan), each targeted evaluation plan spells out why, how, when, where, and with whom an evaluation of a specific program or activity will be implemented. The graphic below illustrates each phase of an evaluation process; what happens in each of these phases is fully described in a targeted evaluation plan.

The evaluation process often begins with developing a program or initiative strategy and outcomes map, which the Foundation has already done. The next phase is to focus the evaluation, and it is in this phase that the purpose of the evaluation is determined, stakeholders are identified, and key evaluation questions for this particular evaluation are developed. The following phases include choosing design and data collection methods (Phase 3); collecting data (Phase 4); analyzing and interpreting the data (Phase 5); and developing recommendations and action plans (Phase 6). Throughout an evaluation, efforts to communicate and report on the evaluation processes and findings should be purposeful and ongoing. And there should be continuous feedback to partners to help improve execution.

MCF has an opportunity to ensure that its evaluations can provide relevant, credible and useful findings, by developing evaluation plans that:

- Clearly state the purpose of the evaluation
- Address important questions
- Identify intended uses and users of the evaluation and how the findings will be considered
- Describe a set of data collection methods that will obtain valid and useful information
- Describe how the evaluation processes and findings will be communicated and reported to multiple stakeholders
- Establish a feasible and realistic timeline and budget

Whether commissioning an external evaluation study or designing an evaluation to be conducted by MCF staff, it is important to develop a targeted evaluation plan that frames and guides the evaluation to ensure that it will provide the most relevant, credible, and useful
information possible. The following are considered common elements of any evaluation plan, large or small:

1. **Program Strategy and Outcomes Map** - Visual representations of the program/initiative’s plan for achieving its goals and how the program or initiative is supposed to work/function.
2. **Background and Context of the Program** - Describes the background (history, context) of the program, process, product, or system that is being evaluated.
3. **Purpose of the Evaluation** - Describes the reason the evaluation is being conducted. It is useful to start the sentence with, “The purpose of this evaluation is to…”
4. **Stakeholders** - Describes who the stakeholders are for this evaluation and their role relative to that which is being evaluated. They are the intended users of the evaluation findings.
5. **Evaluation Key Questions** – Lists the questions the evaluation will seek to answer; these questions form the boundaries and scope of the evaluation effort. They are generally open-ended, and are fairly broad; they are not survey or interview questions.
6. **Data Collection Methods** - Describes each method of data collection, why these methods have been chosen, and how validity of the data will be ensured.
7. **Data Analysis** - Describes how the data will be analyzed once collected.
8. **Management Plans** - Describes who will assume various roles and responsibilities for designing and implementing the evaluation. These plans may also include timelines and required resources.
9. **Communicating and Reporting Plan** - Identifies who will receive communications about the evaluation as it progresses as well as who will receive the evaluation results, and in what format they will be provided. MCF will likely want to ensure that these communications:
   - Are representative of the evaluation’s progress and findings
   - Are tailored to the specific information needs of various stakeholders
   - Provide information on how the results will be used for program improvement, decision making, and future planning
   - Describe how the results are linked to the organization’s strategic plan
   - Provide information on how they can learn more about the evaluation
10. **Evaluation Budget** - Outlines a comprehensive budget for the evaluation. Though it is generally recommended that 10-15% of a program’s budget be allocated to evaluation activities, this will vary greatly depending on the size of the program/initiative being evaluated, how new or innovative it is, and the kinds of decisions to be made based on the evaluation findings.

Once the evaluation has been completed, MCF may want to focus on implementing action plans for how the findings will be used. This might include:

- Initiating a meeting with the evaluation’s stakeholders and others to review the evaluation’s recommendations. The group might talk about which recommendations need to be acted on sooner versus later, or which recommendations can be implemented without additional resources
- Inviting individuals and teams to act on various recommendations
- Developing a timeline for implementing each of the recommendations
- Establishing a process for reviewing the progress of implementing the recommendations
• Considering lessons learned from implementing the recommendations and any implications for improving MCF’s programs/initiatives and/or the evaluation process and system
• Ensuring that all staff members and those working on evaluation projects understand that professional evaluation practice is grounded in evaluation standards and principles as documented in The Program Evaluation Standards (see Appendix: E. The Program Evaluation Standards). When questions arise concerning the “right thing to do,” these standards and principles should be consulted and followed
Appendix Q: MCF Five Year Evaluation Budget Template

The Evaluation Director should develop a five year budget for evaluation for the Foundation.

**MCF Five Year Evaluation Budget Template**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Section</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grantee Reporting</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Evaluations</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Approach</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Activities</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership around Learning and Evaluation</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Management Systems</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
<td>$XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix R: Revised MCF Grant Management Process

Based on the steps required to incorporate the new grantee reporting standards, FSG has suggested additional steps in the Foundation’s grant management process to include evaluation activities in the process.
Align program outcome map with current grantees to assess where there are holes that need to be filled in the grantee pipeline.
1.2 Review Proposal Pipeline

During conversation, explain MCF’s approach to evaluation. Share relevant portions of outcomes map with the potential partner and ask that they explain at a high level in their concept paper how their program aligns with MCF’s goals and desired outputs and short-term outcomes.

Assess the level of alignment of the stated partner program goals with that of the Foundation. If it appears there is the potential for a good fit, then “yes”, if not, then “no”.

New Guidelines to include a request for a full evaluation outcomes/logic model for the program, including data collection details and TA requests.
1.3 Evaluate Proposals

Assess relative strength and fit of proposed partner logic model as it relates to the program outcomes map. Weigh benefits/opportunity costs of investing in this part of the program outcomes map versus other parts. Assess potential partner’s data gathering capacity and case for evaluation TA support (if relevant). Also determine which reporting requirements the partner would have to meet (standard, low intensity or high intensity).

Include in this conversation how the Foundation will work with the grantee on evaluation and data collection (this will help inform the reporting schedule). Communicate to the partner the reporting requirements.
Provide the Board with context as to how each proposed grant is aligned to a specific part of the outcomes map.
1.4b Prepare the Board Book – Mock Up and Final Version

- **Board Book Coordinator**
  - Duration: 2 days (15)
  - Prepare the Board Book Mock-Up
  - Duration: 2 days (16)
  - Circulate the Board Book Mock-Up with PSP, PD, SSP, CFO, CEO for Sign Off
  - Duration: 1 day (18)
  - Prepare the Board Book Mock-Up for Sign Off to Board Chair, Save the Board Mock-Up Book in the Governance Folder on the Server
  - Duration: 3 days (20)
  - Incorporate Final Changes, Format and Proof-Read the Board Book, Save the Final Board Book in the Governance Folder on the Server

- **Program Team**
  - Duration: 2 days (21)
  - Print and Assemble the Board Book and Distribute Among Directors and Team Members

- **CEO**
  - Duration: 1 day (17)
  - Sign Off on the Board Book Mock Up and Acknowledge BBC of Any Final Changes

- **Board Chair**
  - Duration: 5 days (19)
  - Review Final Mock-Up and Send Suggestions to BBC
1.5a Sign Contract with Partner - Single Payment Contract – Release of Funds (1 week)

- **Partner**
  - The package includes 1) cover letter, 2) executed page of the contract and 3) Schedule B
  - Forward Contract to Accounting for Wire Transfer Authorization

- **Finance Team (FFP)**
  - Duration: Day 22
  - Engage Accounting to Resolve Issues
  - S2 Process

- **Accounting**
  - Prepare Wire Transfer Authorization Package
  - Obtain CEO’s Signature and Send to the Board Chair
  - Send Wire Transfer Authorization to the Bank
  - Confirm Funds Have Been Withdrawn
  - Accounting provides a copy of the Wire Transfer and a Bank Statement that confirms that funds have been withdrawn

- **Board Chair**
  - Duration: 3 Days
  - Sign Wire Transfer Authorization and Send Back to MF by Courier

- **Bank**
  - Confirm with MF’s CFO Authorization for Funds Transfer
  - Transfer Funds to Partner

- **End**
### 1.5b Sign Contract with Partner - Multi-Payment Contract – Schedule C (4 weeks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forward Completed Schedule C, Quarterly Budget and Wire Transfer Template (if Required) to MF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send Signed Schedule C by Email or Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform Partner about Issues and Ask to Resend the Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finance Team</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-process 1.5, Step 01 For Year 1, Schedule C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Due Diligence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-process 1.5, Step 01 For Year 2 and Beyond If Payment is Due Next Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Due Diligence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Schedule C, Confirm Reporting Requirements with PPP, and Forward to Partner for Completion along with Wire Transfer (if Required) and Quarterly Budget Template</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Schedule C to the Program Team for Review, Forward Completed Wire Transfer Template to Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail the Originals to Partner and Ask to Sign and Return One Original by Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File and Link Schedule C to Dashboard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Team</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Validate if Schedule C is Consistent with the Original Proposal. If There are Changes to Reporting, Let the Program Team Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Provide Reporting Requirements for Schedule C to FFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Review data internally provided by grantee and learning question observations. Provide feedback to the grantee (if necessary) on output/outcomes data provided; incorporate data into dashboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Review data internally provided by grantee and learning question observations. Provide feedback to the grantee (if necessary) on output/outcomes data provided; incorporate data into dashboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Print Schedule C on MF Letterhead and Forward to CFO for Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Send Suggestions on Schedule C Adjustments to Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Analyze Quarterly Budget and Validate Against Contract and Schedule C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Review Signed Schedule C and Validate its Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Execution Complete and Valid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Print Schedule C on MF Letterhead and Forward to CFO for Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Receive signed Schedule C from CFO, Scan into PDF File and Email to Partner with Request to Print it Off, Sign and Return via Mail or Fax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This process is repeated for every payment of the contract. All exceptions must be approved by the CFO.
Assess the grantee's ability to provide data to date, and the potential to deliver more if given additional TA.
1.7 Close Projects

**Partner**
- Ask Partner to Provide Final Narrative Project Report and Related Learning Products as Part of Designation Requirements for the Last Year of the Projects.
- Remind Partner That They Need to Provide Final Narrative Project Report and Learning Products.
- Review and File Final Narrative Project Report and Learning Products.
- Write Project Evaluation, Discuss Lessons Learned with the Team, Submit Report into OffSite.

**Program Team**
- 30 days prior to contract expiration: Provide Final Narrative Report and Related Learning Products.
- 60 days prior to contract expiration: Ask Partner to Provide Final Narrative Project Report and Related Learning Products.
- 3rd Party Project Evaluation is Required only for Large Projects Over $5M.

**Finance Team**
- Assess the extent to which this grant helped to answer any key hypotheses that anchored the program strategy. Based on the result, make recommendations for strategy refinements (if relevant).

Specifically ask partners to reflect on any larger program strategic evaluation questions.