

Women and Girls Initiative
Final Impact Report
Appendix 4

Women and Girls Monitoring
and Evaluation Framework:
2018

Appendix 4

Women and Girls Monitoring and Evaluation Framework: 2018

Desired Programme Outcomes:

- Increased provision of holistic, person-centred approaches for women and girls at risk
- A greater number of women and girls are supported through the provision of improved specialist support
- Increased role and voice for women and girls in co-producing services
- Better quality of evidence for what works in empowering women and girls

The purpose of the Learning and Impact services commission is to:

- Enable and empower local projects to evaluate their work and then use their learning in meaningful ways
- Identify cross-cutting findings and share these with WGI projects and across the sector so they are relevant and timely for use by different stakeholders

The evaluation objectives that will inform the learning and impact for WGI are:

1. Identify and describe what more holistic/person-centred approaches for women and girls looks like.
2. Describe and interpret how these approaches have increased and improved specialist support and what the intended outcomes are.
3. Understand what engages and enables the roles and voices of women and girls in co-producing services.
4. Evidence and interpret how many women and girls are supported in these different approaches.
5. Assess and enable quality local evidence to be generated and support improvements in how it is used.

Evaluation and Learning activities being delivered:

Workstream 1:

Progress reviews and mentoring (Aim 1: Provide support to WGI Grant-holders to assimilate findings from project evaluations)

Workstream 2:

Action Learning Sets and Masterclasses (Aim 2: Development of a Community of Knowledge for WGI Grant-holders)

Workstream 3:

Meta-analysis and thematic reports (Aim 3: Undertake Meta-analysis of WGI impact)

Workstream 4:

Capturing and sharing learning (Aim 4: Capture and Share Learning from WGI)

Page 3 onwards outlines each objective against learning and impact workstreams and activities, the questions to be considered through each activity, and then a suggestion of what data will be gathered and who by, in order to be able to meet the evaluation objectives. **This is a working document and is by no means complete or finished, but for discussion and ongoing work.**

Over the course of the WGI, it is hoped that we can test out responses to more detailed questions being asked such as 'What is an holistic approach?', clarifying further what this means for the work being undertaken by projects and how knowledge being gathered can inform and influence commissioners and other stakeholders.

Once the framework has been agreed as realistic and achievable, this can inform standardised information being collected by Grant officers as well as the ongoing activity by Learning and Impact partners.

Programme Outcome: Increased provision of holistic, person-centred approaches for women and girls at risk

Evaluation Objective	Activities and Work streams	Questions to be considered	Evaluation data: what will be gathered and how?	Evaluation methods at programme-wide level
<p>1. Identify and describe what more holistic/person-centred approaches for women and girls at risk looks like.</p>	<p>'Auditing', supporting, collating and analysing results from process and impact evaluations undertaken by projects (surveys; interviews; observations); WS1</p> <p>ALSs: WS2</p> <p>Thematic reports: WS4</p> <p>Case studies, with a focus on organisations working / aiming to work holistically: WS1; WS2; WS4</p>	<p>What is a holistic approach? How is it different from mainstream interventions? What difference does it make for women and girls? Does a service being women only matter to users and staff – why and how? What can be learned from looking across generic and BME specific services; domestic violence/sexual violence/integrated VAWG and wider women's services?</p>	<p>Examples of holistic working through case studies from projects – defining holistic work:</p> <p>a) at an individual level and b) at an organisational level.</p> <p>Question in Big Lottery Fund annual report template? E.g. How are you working holistically? Do you have any examples?</p> <p>Through learning gathered via individual project support and ALSs (meetings; workshops; facilitated activity)</p>	<p>Meta-analysis gathers and analyses qualitative data thematically from:</p> <p>Project reports to BLF; Progress reviews Action Learning Set on Holistic approaches; Action Learning Set for BAMER-focused organisations. Action Learning Set for Women's Centres Young Women's Action Learning Set Series or individual thematic reports explore these questions and what projects are learning about holistic working and why it is important.</p>

Programme Outcome: A greater number of women and girls are supported through the provision of improved specialist support

Evaluation Objective	Activities and Work streams	Questions to be considered	Evaluation data: what will be gathered and how?	Evaluation methods at programme-wide level
<p>2. Describe and interpret how these approaches have increased and improved specialist support and what the intended outcomes are.</p>	<p>Meta-analysis of monitoring data and impact data from projects: WS3</p> <p>Thematic content analysis of qualitative data to evaluate against expected outcomes / Theory of Change: WS3</p> <p>Case studies of improvements in access to and quality of specialist support: WS1; WS2; WS4</p>	<p>What baseline data can be used to develop understanding of increased provision as a result of WGI?</p> <p>Can projects track individual journeys through their provision, to inform case study evidence?</p>	<p>Progress reviews with each project involving:</p> <p>a) Review of funding applications/project plans b) Capturing information on outcomes being measured c) Activity updates d) Gathering data capturing mechanisms e) Project reports so far f) Gathering project-level theories of change where these are/have been developed</p> <p>Individual project evaluation reports and/or reports to Big Lottery Fund including information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any new activity begun since funding was granted • Any activity that has been sustained as a result of receiving funding • Outcomes achieved for individuals and projects • Any improvements implemented in services since grant funding • What has worked well and why • What have the challenges been and what has contributed to these • What has been learnt <p>Reports to summarise evidence demonstrating how projects know this information. Evidence to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers of women and girls benefiting from services • Average length of contact with clients • Summary of outcomes data captured • Case studies of individuals and the project's approaches to the work • What has changed (or been changed) and why 	<p>Meta-analysis in Year 1 to focus on gathering a baseline of programme-wide data, which can be used to track progress over subsequent years.</p> <p>First thematic report to summarise: What projects are doing and hope to achieve What the funding has meant so far to projects (in terms of client reach and engagement; service development; individual and organisational change)</p> <p>Later reports to summarise progress since projects started and against Theories of Change/ Project plans with quantitative and qualitative evidence (including case studies) to support findings.</p>

Programme Outcome: Increased role and voice for women and girls in co-producing services

Evaluation Objective	Activities and Work streams	Questions to be considered	Evaluation data: what will be gathered and how?	Evaluation methods at programme-wide level
3. Understand what engages and enables the roles and voices of women and girls in co-producing services	<p>Process evaluation brought together through thematic ALS and Msterclasses focused on co-production. Projects will be asked to report back on their learning about co-production, what has and hasn't worked and why: WS2</p> <p>Surveys – questions that relate to beneficiary voice and experience being used: WS1; WS4.</p> <p>Learning derived from direct involvement of beneficiaries of services in learning and impact services e.g. Msterclasses and conference: WS2</p> <p>Meta-analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, identifying what has worked, when and for whom: WS3.</p> <p>Case studies: WS1; WS2; WS4</p> <p>Learning shared through thematic reports, in conference and final report: WS4; WS2.</p>	<p>What does an empowerment approach mean? How is it implemented for different groups of women and girls? How do safety, freedom and voice feature? How are survivors involved in shaping services and wider social change work?</p> <p>How does co-production work? Are there more and less effective models/practices? Co-production at what stage?</p> <p>How far have women and girl's voices been amplified within specialist services and externally?</p>	<p>Progress reviews:</p> <p>Question on Co-production (giving baseline) – what people are doing and how it is going.</p> <p>Updates and information gathered through mentoring/one-to-one support.</p> <p>Reporting to Big Lottery Fund, or through external evaluations, on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How projects are defining co-production • What they are doing co-productively and what they are learning about it • What is working well in relation to co-production • If they are not co-producing activity, why have they decided not to / what are the barriers to co-production? <p>Increased knowledge and skill</p> <p>Co-production ALS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • embedding a co-productive approach to the ALS. • Capturing learning from projects of attempts at co-production. • Co-design of Msterclass on co-production <p>Msterclass on Co-production: which embeds co-production; shares case studies from projects.</p>	<p>Meta-analysis of;</p> <p>Progress reviews</p> <p>Reports to BLF – tracking changing responses over the years</p> <p>Co-production ALS</p> <p>Msterclass on Co-production</p> <p>A co-produced Thematic report, highlighting successes, challenges and the contexts which best support Co-production</p>

Programme Outcome: A greater number of women and girls are supported through the provision of improved specialist support

Evaluation Objective	Activities and Work streams	Questions to be considered	Evaluation data: what will be gathered and how?	Evaluation methods at programme-wide level
4. Evidence and interpret how many women and girls are supported in these different approaches.	<p>Collation and analysis of monitoring data from local projects' evaluations (surveys; attendance registers etc.), including demographic data: WS3.</p> <p>ALS exploring access to Women and Girl services, barriers and actions that work in what context: WS2</p> <p>Meta-analysis of quantitative and qualitative data: WS3</p>	<p>Does it matter whether projects are informed by gender analysis? Does it impact on effectiveness? Is there a difference between projects which have an explicit or implicit feminist perspective and those which do not?</p>	<p>Statistics reported to BLF and through external evaluations</p> <p>Qualitative reports to BLF and from external evaluators of what has worked and challenges experienced</p> <p>Learning shared in ALSs and Msterclasses (feminist approaches to work); conference; one-to-one support (developing Theories of change; reflective notes from meetings; comparison of different organisational/theoretical approaches)</p>	<p>Meta-analyses; thematic reports and annual synthesis reports bringing together:</p> <p>Project-level quantitative and qualitative data shared with BLF (in specific groupings as needed)</p> <p>Learning from ALSs</p> <p>Consultants reports on projects' learning and approaches to the work</p>

Programme Outcome: Better quality of evidence for what works in empowering women and girls

Evaluation Objective	Activities and Work streams	Questions to be considered	Evaluation data: what will be gathered and how?	Evaluation methods at programme-wide level
<p>5. Assess and enable quality local evidence to be generated and support improvements in how it is used.</p>	<p>Initial 'audit' of local M&E activity and data: WS1</p> <p>Development of programme resources and evaluation toolkits: WS1; WS2</p> <p>Mentoring for each project to support M&E of their activities: WS1</p> <p>ALS to bring together and interpret evidence: WS2</p> <p>Frequent thematic reports / briefings to enable iterative learning and influencing: WS3</p> <p>Msterclasses to support quality of M&E, use of findings to influence: WS2</p> <p>Conference to include sharing of M&E journeys, what has worked well and what hasn't for different projects in different contexts.: WS2; WS3</p> <p>Embedded M&E framework and resources for future use by the sector: WS1; WS3</p> <p>Monitoring of communications plan and outcomes relating to comms activity undertaken and it's reach to those with influence: WS3</p>	<p>What data is being gathered by projects?</p> <p>How are the 'Making a difference' and 'Outcome Measurement' tools working so far?</p> <p>What gaps do projects have in carrying out effective M&E for their project aims?</p> <p>What further tools could be developed to improve projects' ability to undertake M&E?</p>	<p>Baseline data from Progress reviews; project applications</p> <p>Feedback from projects on usefulness of resources and support: BLF satisfaction survey</p> <p>Changes made as a result of support (surveys on learning and impact services/at the end of ALSs and Msterclasses; BLF satisfaction survey)</p> <p>Reports from ALSs; Msterclasses and conference on learning</p> <p>Tracking the changes to this M&E framework, based on what is being gathered/ changes to data being gathered as a result of ongoing learning</p> <p>Ongoing development of communications plan</p> <p>Project reports to Big Lottery Fund on:</p> <p>Communications activities around projects – methods being used and how these relate to influence and building support;</p>	<p>Meta-analyses and thematic reports</p> <p>If appropriate undertaking meta-analyses of outcomes data reported</p> <p>Thematic/annual synthesis reports that collate:</p> <p>Tracking of learning between Years 1-5</p> <p>Reports of ongoing development of projects' learning, evaluation approaches and implementation of learning into future plans...?</p> <p>Contract reports to Big Lottery Fund</p>

How can projects answer these questions/ gather data through what they are already gathering, what can BLF gather from projects and what is realistic for us to do/support through the learning and impact services?