**Sample Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan**

**for Recipients / Applicants to complete**

**Background**

A monitoring and evaluation plan (M&E plan) is designed by the implementer, and is a systematic and objective approach or process for monitoring project performance toward its objectives over time. In general, M&E plans should have a robust set of indicators that measure program progress and impact of the program activities. While it is not necessary to have indicators for every program activity, the indicators should measure the major program activities that will contribute to the advancement of the strategic objectives as laid out in the grant agreement.

Each M&E plan should contain specific output- and outcome-based indicators with baselines and targets, data source, and frequency of data collection. However, there is not a standard template for the M&E plan that each *(Insert Bureau or Office)* recipient must follow (e.g., each objective does not need to have 4 indicators with 2 of those indicators being outcome-focused). Grantees/applicants should design an M&E plan that is customized to the specifics of the program. *(Insert Bureau or Office)* recognizes that sometimes it may be difficult for recipients to design truly results-oriented M&E plans, but we encourage recipients to develop an M&E plan that is as comprehensive, ambitious and creative as possible.

The M&E plan is meant to detail how the outputs and outcomes of program activities will be measured quantitatively. Yet, sometimes the results and impact of a program are more easily conveyed qualitatively. Recipients can describe how program impact will be assessed qualitatively at the end of the M&E plan. *(Insert Bureau or Office)* encourages recipients to provide success stories and anecdotal or other qualitative evidence of program impact in the quarterly progress reports, as well as showing how well the program is meeting the targets set in the M&E plan.

Below is an example of a solid monitoring and evaluation plan.

## Sample Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

*(Insert Recipient Name)* will build the capacity of the judicial sector to ensure that the Democrastan citizens, especially detainees and those accused of crimes, are aware of and know how to defend their legal rights. This program has three strategic objectives: (1) to increase capacity of judicial police units, magistrates and court and prison clerks to protect the rights of detainees and prisoners; (2) to ensure that target communities, especially detainees and prisoners, are better informed about their legal rights; and (3) to build the capacity of civil society organizations (CSOs) to advocate for improvements in the legal rights’ protection framework. The project’s key activities include comprehensive training to judicial police units, magistrates to enhance their skills and knowledge on existing criminal procedure code provisions; management training to court and prison clerks to improve the implementation of the current prison case management system; and planning meetings with and mentorship of CSOs to mobilize and sensitize communities on the rights of prisoners and detainees as well as develop and implement an effective prison monitoring system.

**Strategic Objective 1:** To increase judicial police units, magistrates and court and prison clerks’ capacity to protect the rights of detainees and prisoners.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Indicator** | **Output/****Outcome** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Data Source** | **Data Disaggregation** | **Frequency** |
| Conduct training sessions for judicial police unit and magistrates on the rights of detainees and prisoners | Number of justice sector personnel that received USG training | Output | 0 | 100 police units and 40 magistrates trained | Program monitoring and reports | By region | Following training event |
| Percentage of unlawful detentions made | Outcome | Baseline from needs assessment | 20% decrease in unlawful detentions | Interviews with participants | By region | Final evaluation  |
| Number of bail requests granted  | Outcome | Baseline from needs assessment | At least 5 bail requests per magistrate granted above baseline | Interviews with participants | By institution | Final evaluation  |
| Hold office management training to court & prison clerks on how to best practices of office management | Number of courts and prison clerks trained | Output | 0 | 20 clerks trained | Program monitoring and reports | By sex and institution | Quarterly |
| Number of courts with improved case management | Output | 0 | 6 courts with improved case management | Program monitoring and reports | By region | Quarterly |
| Participants data entry skills | Outcome | Baseline from pre-test survey | 75% of participants show data entry skill improvements | Pre- and post-test surveys of participants | By types of data entry skills | Following training event |
| Level of knowledge on data management | Outcome | Baseline from pre-test survey | 85% of participants show knowledge increase on data management | Pre- and post-test surveys of participants |  | Following training event |
| Percentage of files available to public upon demand | Outcome | Baseline from needs assessment | 25% increase above baseline | Interviews from detainees, court clients and court staff |  | Final evaluation |

**Strategic Objective 2:** To ensure that target communities, especially detainees and prisoners, are better informed about their legal rights.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Indicator** | **Output/ Outcome** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Data Source** | **Data Disaggregation** | **Frequency** |
| Conduct training sessions for mayors and municipal council members on the rights of detainees and prisoners | Percentage of municipalities represented | Output | 0% | At least 95% 0f municipalities represented | Program monitoring and reports | By municipality | Quarterly |
| Knowledge of participants on legal rights issues | Outcome | Baseline from pre-test survey | 50% increase in knowledge from the baseline | Pre- and post-test surveys of participants  |  | Following training event |
| No. of awareness initiatives implemented successfully | Outcome | 0 initiatives | 6 successful initiatives implemented | Interviews with participating mayors and council members | By municipality | Final evaluation |
| Convene awareness strategic planning meeting | Quality+ of strategic plan developed | Outcome | 0% | 80% of plan elements rated as "high " by community leaders | Interviews with mayors, council members, and community members |  | Following meeting report |
| No. of recommendations implemented | Outcome | 0 | 65% of recommendations in the process of being implemented by the end of the project | Interviews with mayors, council members, and community members |  | Final evaluation |
| Train prison volunteers in criminal procedure | Participants’ knowledge on criminal procedures | Outcome | Baseline from pre-test survey | 50% increase in knowledge from the baseline | Pre- and post-test surveys of participants |  | Following training event |
| Ability to protect detainees | Outcome | 0% | 70% of participants use training to provide helpful information to detainees | Interviews with participants and detainees |  | Final Evaluation |

+ Individuals evaluate terms, such as quality, differently. While in this M&E plan, the term “quality” was not defined, it is important to explain how these terms will be defined and measured. But “quality” was included in this M&E plan to show one example of an outcome indicator.

**Strategic Objective 3:** To build the capacity of civil society organizations (CSOs) to advocate for improvements in the legal rights’ protection framework.

| **Activity** | **Indicator** | **Output/****Outcome** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Data Source** | **Data Disaggregation** | **Frequency** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Publish quarterly reports of prison data | Frequency of publication (# of reports published per quarter) | Output | 0 | 1 bulletin published every quarter | Program monitoring and reports |  | Quarterly |
| Publish penal code reform study | Quality+ of the study | Outcome | 0% | 70% of surveyed disseminationparticipants rate study quality as "high" | Survey of study dissemination participants |  | Following dissemination meetings |
| No. of study copies disseminated | Output | 0 copies | 500 copies distributed | Program monitoring and reports |  | Quarterly |
| Hold study dissemination meetings on penal code reform | Number of public advocacy campaigns on human rights  | Output | 0 meetings held | 10 dissemination meetings held | Program monitoring and reports | By municipality | Quarterly |
| Number of USG-assisted CSOs that engage in advocacy and watchdog functions\* | Output | 0 CSOs | 30 CSOs  | Program monitoring and reports | By municipality | Quarterly |
| Level of understanding about effective use of bail | Outcome | 0% | 70% of participants view the effective use of bail more favorably | Pre- and post-test surveys of participants |  | Following dissemination meetings |
| Bill presented to Parliament with study recommendations  | Outcome | 0 bill | 1 bill presented | Proposed bill |  | Final evaluation |
| Convenealternative sentencing conference | No. of final reports distributed | Output | 0 copies | 100 copies | Program monitoring and reports |  | Quarterly |
| Use of final report in drafting of bill | Outcome | 0 recommendations | 3 recommendations from report included in proposed bill | Proposed bill |  | Final evaluation |