



**HUMANITARIAN INNOVATION FUND
GBV M&E Challenge Final Report**

- Please try not to exceed 8 pages (Arial, 12pts) excluding attachments -

Organisation Name	Queen's University (Canada)
--------------------------	-----------------------------

Project Title	Feasibility and Value of Using SenseMaker® to Improve Monitoring and Evaluation for Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Programs and Services
Partner(s)	ABAAD Resource Centre for Gender Equality International Rescue Committee Lebanon Queen's University UNFPA Lebanon
Problem Addressed / Theme	Provision of more timely and more nuanced M&E data on SGBV programs/services
Location	Lebanon
Start Date	October 1, 2017
End Date	October 31, 2018

Total Funding	Total HIF and other contributions to this project
Total Spent	49,143

Innovation Stage	Development
Type of Innovation	M&E tool
Project Impact Summary	Despite several challenges, SenseMaker® provided unique insights into perceptions about SGBV services and its mixed methods approach provided a more comprehensive understanding of women and girls'

	<p>experiences accessing programs. We conclude that SenseMaker® is feasible and could have added-value as an M&E tool for SGBV programs. More specifically, in acute humanitarian settings where the environment is rapidly changing and prompt data is required for responsive decision-making, SenseMaker® would offer a unique ability to capture rich data about the experiences of women and girls. As an M&E tool SenseMaker® is better suited for women and girls with literacy skills and technological literacy to complete the survey independently. However, to successfully implement SenseMaker® as an M&E tool, financial and human resource support would have to be available, managers and front-line staff would be to be committed to its use, and SenseMaker® would have to be thoughtfully integrated into existing M&E activities. Finally, if SenseMaker® were to be implemented as a M&E tool for gender-based violence programs, it would be most cost-effective to do through a consortium of service providers since the associated costs would then be shared across the organizations.</p>
--	---

ACTIVITIES AND ACHIEVEMENTS

1. What are the Outcome statements you aimed to make at the end of the HIF grant and what have you tried to achieve within this period?

- Novel ideas for improvement of SGBV programs and services were generated from nuanced insights obtained by a SenseMaker® M&E tool.
- It is feasible to use SenseMaker® as an innovative M&E instrument complimenting existing M&E approaches in a humanitarian setting.

2. Describe all the activities carried out. *Please attach the workplan or log frame used.*

- MOU signed between Queen’s University and UNFPA Lebanon and program funds transferred from Queen’s to UNFPA
- Hosted workshop in Beirut with approximately 35 different stakeholders from 10 different international and local organizations offering SGBV programs and services around the country
- Introduction to the project with overview of objectives
- SenseMaker® explained to stakeholders and questions / concerns addressed to secure buy-in



- Collaboratively developed a SenseMaker® M&E survey over the course of a day
- Survey was translated from English to Arabic and back translated to check for accuracy
- Survey was programmed into SenseMaker®
- Survey questions were tested with approximately 35 participants and refinements were made based on the pilot
- SenseMaker® data collected by 6 partnering SGBV service providers in Lebanon from end of May to 3rd week of August
- Data analysed
- Hosted closing workshop in Beirut with approximate 25 stakeholders from 8 partnering organizations
- Project report written and due to be released end of first week of December
- Peer review publication being drafted with goal of submission to a peer review journal before end of December
- An abstract on the project has been prepared for the SVRI conference.

3. If you have made changes or amendments to the planned activities and objectives that have not been detailed in an *Agreement Amendment Form*, please list them in Appendix 1 below and explain why these have not been communicated.

We had originally stated our intent to test the feasibility of different routes of SenseMaker® data collection particularly aimed at gathering data from women and girls in the community who were not accessing program/services (posters/brochures containing an online link to the survey or an interviewer who visited different communities and invited women/girls to complete a facilitated survey). However, in further discussion at the opening workshop this did not seem feasible for a variety reasons:

- There was concern that accessing the internet to complete the survey could put women/girls at risk for violence in their homes as this had been the experience of one of the partnering organizations.
- Literacy levels (both reading and technological literacy) were relatively low among the population attending services and this would have likely made it difficult for women/girls to complete the survey independently.
- Financial concern that the budget did not have enough funds to do this aspect in an ethical way (i.e. hiring an interviewer to physically collect stories in the community)

4. Has the project demonstrated the success of the innovation or idea?

Please explain further:

- The innovation was successful in identifying nuanced insights about programs/services that were previously unrecognized by service providers.



- The innovation was less successful in making M&E data collection more efficient since limited literacy skills (beneficiaries) required that the surveys be facilitated by a staff member, which was time-consuming.
- The project was successful in identifying that more acute emergencies (when the environment is rapidly changing and when prompt data is required for responsive decision-making) would likely benefit more from this innovation as opposed to a more protract emergency like the Syrian crisis when programs are already well established and the need for data is less urgent.

APPROACH

5. Describe the approach, project design or methodology you used to achieve the planned objectives. How would you say it was successful?

Our project design involved reviewing strengths and limitations of current M&E approaches, collaboratively creating a SenseMaker M&E survey, a 3-month data collection period, and then review of the collected data as well as the data collection process to decide on the two outcomes highlighted in question 1. Overall, we feel that the approach was appropriate for the project.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION, LEARNING AND ETHICS

The HIF sees M&E as a critical component of a successful innovation pathway. M&E represents a powerful advocacy tool, likely to accelerate the adoption of solutions and widen people's awareness.

6. How did you monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of your activities during the grant period?

The main monitoring took place during the 3 months of data collection during which time uploaded data was reviewed regularly and feedback was provided to service providers. During that time, team members familiar with the technology were available to respond to questions or concerns. The main evaluation took place at the closing workshop where the whole process was reviewed together (creating survey, collecting data, reviewing data, making program changes as a result, etc.).

7. What evidence have you been able to gather with regards to the innovation performance and the intended impact?

The collected evidence is really testimonials and shared experienced of the 6 participating service providers who collected SenseMaker M&E data for 3 months. Additionally we have data from 198 self-interpreted stories according to service providers did reveal new insights about their services.

8. What have you learned about your innovation during the grant period and how have you incorporated these learnings?

- SenseMaker did provide previously unrecognized insights about SGBV programs/services.
- Use of SenseMaker was not more efficient in this setting since almost all surveys had to be facilitated by a staff member due to limited literacy skills.
- Use of SenseMaker as an M&E tool would be more valuable earlier in the acute phase of humanitarian crisis when data is needed more quickly for prompt decision making, program design, etc.
- Based on this experience, we believe that the next logical step will be to pilot test use of SenseMaker as an M&E tool in a more acute emergency setting.

9. What are the relevant indicators and quality criteria for the innovation performance?

- Service providers learning previously unappreciated insights about their SGBV programs that could be used to improve services for beneficiaries.
- Service providers indicating that the M&E innovation allowed them to collect data more efficiently.

10. What is the innovation’s potential impact and how did you evaluate this?

The innovation’s potential impact is to provide more insightful and more nuanced M&E data to improve SGBV programs/services and to do so more efficiently in humanitarian settings. Program/service adaptations made on the basis of the SenseMaker data (and which would not have otherwise been made) will be taken as the project having made an impact. With the data just becoming available in the past two months, it is too soon to know if this will happen.

11. Please describe any ethical considerations arising from the project and how they have been addressed.

Our team decided that it was not ethical to collect data from women/girls in the community who were not accessing programs/services because of concern that accessing the internet to complete the survey might put them at risk for violence in their homes. Therefore, this aspect of the project was never implemented.

CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS

12. Please list the three most significant challenges and barriers faced during the project and describe how they affected the planned activities and results.

Challenge/Barrier	Impact of Challenge/Barrier
-------------------	-----------------------------

1. UNFPA was to take the lead in coordinating project activities in Lebanon. Point person at UNFPA changed 3 times in the life course of the project

Each time there was a change over the new person had to be briefed and required time to become familiar with the project, where we were, what needed to be done. This delayed our actual data collection by several months

2. The project timeframe of 12 months was insufficient for what we had planned to do.

With additional time, we would have included dedicated training for the SenseMaker facilitators, a longer data collection period to reach our desired sample size of 300, and more complete analysis and dissemination would have been possible within the life course of the project. As is, we are releasing the report and publishing a peer review article after the project end date.

3. It proved challenging for the local service providers to get women/girls to participate in the survey for the following reasons: low literacy skills required that almost all surveys had to be facilitated by a staff member, some women/girls simply said no, and some programs were several months in duration which meant that there was only one group of women/girls served within our 3-month data collection period (i.e. once they had completed the survey, there was no one else to approach unless we waited until the new group started several months later).

Despite a really great effort by all the participating organizations it was not possible to reach our sample size of 300 within the data collection period. Additional time would have been needed.

13. Please indicate what steps were taken to address these challenges and barriers, and whether the solutions were effective. Please provide as much data and evidence as possible

Solution

1. Each time the UNFPA lead changed both the academic team and other local participating organizations briefed the new individual, reviewed the survey with her, discussed the logistics of SenseMaker data collection, etc.

Effective?

This was ultimately effectively in allowing the project to move forward but it required time in an already tight project

<p>2. We worked as efficiently as possible to collect, analyse and disseminate the results.</p>	<p>timeline. Effective in that we finished on time but it did compromise a little because we did not reach out desired sample size.</p>
<p>3. We encouraged partnering service providers to continue with data collection, provided them with updates on how many surveys had been completed, and explored whether there were other program/services that could be included in the M&E project.</p>	<p>Probably effective in increasing the sample size from what it otherwise would have been but not reaching the target.</p>

LOCAL ENGAGEMENT

14. What is the impact of the project on field-affected communities or any affected populations directly affected by the project?

- Some new insights were raised about SGBV programs/services (i.e. who was accessing or not accessing them, that the needs of adolescents are different, needs of older women likely different, reasons why women/girls accessed programs/services, etc.). Hopefully this knowledge will be useful in informing programs/services moving forward to better meet the needs of affected women/girls.
- Some service providers believed that use of SenseMaker (opportunity to tell your story using technology) was empowering for women/girls and stated that they would include technology training for women/girls in the future. Since comfort with technology is important for so many aspects of daily life in this era, this seemed like an unanticipated positive impact.

15. How and at which stage of the project have connections and engagement with local actors been considered and implemented? (E.g. civil actors, local NGOs, public stakeholders). This can be in terms of problem identification, problem solving, or both.

There was communication with the local service providers throughout the entire project but when the local lead for this communication was not available (at times when the UNFPA point person was transitioning), things seems to breakdown. The most fulfilling engagement was at the opening and closing



workshops when the entire team spent two days together with all energies focused on this project. These were the highlights!

PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATION

16. Have there been any significant changes in your partnerships, including new partnerships? If yes, what are the changes, and the impact on the project?

Four of the SGBV service providers who had originally intended to partner on data collection ultimately felt that they did not have the human resources to participate (Danish Rescue Committee, INTERSOS, Makzoumi and CONCERN).

17. How do you see this partnership(s) evolving and moving forward? Are there plans to continue your partnership(s), either while continuing this innovation or on other projects?

Since the SGBV sector in Lebanon implemented a joint M&E toolkit about 1 year prior to our data collection and ultimately felt that it was too late to take up SenseMaker as an M&E tool given the time and resources that had been invested in this other M&E toolkit, there probably won't be further collaboration on SenseMaker for M&E. However, there seems to be interest in future collaboration more broadly in Lebanon and certainly other areas of mutual interest like child marriage that will likely be explored. Early discussions are ongoing about next steps for the collaboration.

RISK MANAGEMENT

18. Please describe the top risks the project faced. How did you work to mitigate them?

The top risk faced by this project was lack of local leadership and poor coordination at times of transition for the UNFPA lead. During these brief periods, it sometimes seemed unlikely that we would succeed in fully implementing the project. However, patience, persistence and communication seem to have paid off in ultimately allowing project activities to move ahead.

NEXT STEPS

19. How has the project been shared with others during the reporting period (e.g. events, publications, media, and informal interactions)?

- Two project blogs were posted on ERLHA's website
 - A 20-page project report was written and is pending publication next week.
-
-



- Another blog has been drafted with a plan to post it to coincide with the release of the report.
- A peer review publication on the data was drafted with plan for journal submission in the next month
- Abstract about the project was drafted for SVRI conference and is pending submission.

20. How are you planning to support the next steps of the project, idea or innovation? What would be the key challenges or actions you would need to consider? Can it be replicated, carried forward or scaled up? Or is there need for further research?

Please explain further

The next steps will be: a) to identify a more acute emergency in which to pilot SenseMaker as an M&E tool for SGBV programs/services (ex. perhaps Rohingya crisis); b) partner with local service providers to understand current M&E approaches and how SenseMaker could fill existing gaps; c) secure funding for the next phase; and d) conduct a similar feasibility project incorporating lessons learned from the current work.

Suggestion/issue	1	2	3
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX 1. WORKPLAN CHANGES

If you would like to make significant changes to your project, then you **must** have submitted an *Agreement Amendment Form* to HIF for discussion before these changes are undertaken.

If there are changes that have **already** occurred in your project workplan that you do not think will require an Agreement Amendment form, then please record them in the table below. These are changes that will impact the results, milestones or objectives you set out in your original workplan, but do not affect the location, methodology or evidence-building and do not change any budget chapters by more than 15%.

*If there are **no changes** to your project workplan since your application, OR if you have included all changes in an Agreement Amendment form, you do not need to fill in this section.*

Please use Table 1 for completed changes Please copy in all of the principal results, milestones or actions from your original proposal that you wish to change; then record in the next column the changes. Please note it is important that you provide a description of the possible affects these changes will make.

Table 1: Completed changes			
Original results or activities	Changed results or activities	Why the changes were necessary	Expected or observed effects of the change
We had originally intended to test the feasibility of different routes of SenseMaker® data collection particularly aimed	We did not implement this project activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was concern that accessing the internet to complete the survey could put women/girls at risk for violence in their homes as this had been the experience of one of the partnering organizations. 	We do not have data from women/girls who are not accessing programs/services and therefore cannot comment on their prior, potentially negative experiences with programs, on perceptions in the community about SGBV programs/services or about the



<p>at gathering data from women/girls in the community who were not accessing program/services (posters/brochures containing an online link to the survey or an interviewer who visited different communities and invited women/girls to complete a facilitated survey.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Literacy levels (both reading and technological literacy) were relatively low among the population attending services and this would have likely made it difficult for women/girls to complete the survey independently.• Financial concern that the budget did not have enough funds to do this activity in an ethical way (i.e. hiring an interviewer to physically collect stories in the community)	<p>decisions of women/girls to not seek SGBV services.</p>