

Purpose

Developing a successful Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) plan is predicated on identifying the goals, strategies, activities, outputs, and outcomes (short-, medium-, and long-term) which are documented in a theory of change and logic model. To develop these tools, understanding stakeholders' experiences is critical. Stakeholders are those that are involved at different levels of "program" or organization, from leadership to on-the-ground implementers. Each level of stakeholders brings with them a different perspective and experience, which are needed in order to understand the full picture of how a program or organization operates. Assumptions of stakeholders' experiences, attitudes, and general understanding of goals and outcomes could severely affect the success of a program.

Background

Initially, focus groups were planned. However, in the very early discussions with Every Village, Edessa and Elite suggested a slightly different approach to more formalized focus groups. "Conversations" with the team seemed to fit more appropriately with this project, taking a more *informal* route to the same goal. The point of the exercise was to elicit information that would help build logic models and a theory of change, not to examine processes or evaluate procedures or implementation. Because "focus groups" tend to communicate *research and evaluation* and research and evaluation tend to make people feel like they are under examination, the idea was to remove any formality around the activity to alleviate nervousness and promote open and honest feedback. To these same ends, the questions were sent out beforehand to allow reflection and preparedness.

Conversations

Planning

In planning meetings on April 7, 2021, it was determined that there would be 3 levels or groups of "conversations" – one with Board Members, one with Every Village Headquarters staff in Houston, and one with Every Village Project Managers in South Sudan and Uganda. Andrew Brown informed Every Village staff that Edessa and Elite would be conducting some information gathering "conversations." On April 8, 2021, Andrew Brown emailed Board Members and Every Village Headquarter staff to set up an online conversation to be facilitated by Elite Research. The questions that would be discussed were sent at that point for participants to review and prepare.

Due to concerns of time and internet availability, it was determined that in-country Program staff would complete their responses via email directly to Elite Research. On April 15, 2021, Elite Research sent the preliminary questions to the in-country Director, Daniel Lual, for review and feedback, which was approved on his end April 16, 2021. It was also agreed that Daniel would send the email to Program Managers directly, but that their responses would go directly to Elite Research.

Data Collection

On April 13, 2021, Elite Research facilitated the first conversation with Every Village Headquarters staff in Houston, Texas. There were five Headquarters staff in the meeting, with Daniel Lual connected via WhatsApp through a computer. Each of the staff represented various functions of the organization: overall leadership, water and radio leadership, marketing and communications, community relations, and donor development. *Following this initial conversation, Elite Research and Edessa Research modified the questions for the Board Conversations.*

On April 19, 2021, Elite Research facilitated the second conversation with Every Village Board Members located mostly in Texas. Six board members were in attendance. One board member was not able to make the call, but asked to provide his feedback immediately afterwards. Elite Research called him directly and asked him the same questions that were discussed in the online meeting.

On April 26, 2021, Daniel Lual sent Every Village Project Managers in South Sudan and Uganda an email, *Understanding Every Village*, which included the questionnaire. Elite Research received four completed questionnaires.

Findings

The goal of these conversations was to identify the goals, strategies (activities), and outcomes that result from the work of Every Village – specifically through its Water, Radio, and People programs.

Talking Points	Main Points	Interesting Mentions
Goal	<p><u>Transformation</u> of every village in South Sudan by the spread of the gospel and community development (water and radio)</p> <p><u>Sustainability</u> – South Sudanese able to maintain the programs (financially and through leadership)</p> <p>Growing and thriving <u>nation for Christ</u> (nation-building for Christ)</p>	<p><i>Board member used the word “fully transition” for sustainability.</i></p> <p><i>Board members (most) were more focused on preaching the gospel.</i></p>
Strategies	<p>Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Drill wells, provide spare parts, facilitate maintenance and repairs ▪ Share financial cost <p>Radio</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build radio stations, employ on-air staff, distribute solar radios, supply equipment (computers, recorders, and solar power systems) ▪ Biblical programming <p>People (Training)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leadership workshops, conferences, on-job training ▪ Formal education, as necessary ▪ Pastoral training and pastoral networking (conferences) to ensure Biblical standards 	<p><i>PMs noted health and education community development programs; repeater towers. Board mentioned not knowing what their training is.</i></p> <p><i>PMs noted people program being ‘missionary’ oriented; HQ staff noted this element as most fluid and without definition; Board spoke of supporting local, indigenous staff and building them up (there were some conflicting opinions on whether missionaries should still be on the ground). Board also did not know what type or training is done for staff (they understood People program to include training of water and radio as well).</i></p>
Outcomes	<p>Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ to provide access to clean, safe water <p>Radio</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ to provide access to gospel <p>People</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ empowered, Biblically-sound SS leaders <p>Ultimately – changed people</p>	<p><i>HQ staff mentioned that donors have different expectation/idea of radio content than is delivered.</i></p> <p><i>PMs considered this “staff empowerment.”</i></p>
Beneficiaries	<p>Primary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In-country staff <p>Secondary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In-country, local churches ▪ Community members 	<p><i>PMs considered in-country staff the primary beneficiaries, while local churches and community members were secondary beneficiaries.</i></p> <p><i>One board member mentioned, “everyone in earshot” is beneficiary</i></p>
Assumptions	<p>Continued <u>infrastructure</u> work</p> <p>Continued <u>relationship building</u> with government and community leaders</p>	

	<u>Professionally and spiritually mature staff</u> Community desire and <u>willing to pay</u> for services	
External Factors	Financial support Geo-political stability Government partnership Stable supply chain for parts	

Findings mostly aligned with preliminary discussions with **Every Village's** **Andrew Brown** and **Brad Beless**. The conversations, however, highlighted some issues of differences in *how* staff and board members talk about the programs and goals, as well as a lack of definition around the People program. Most significantly was the importance the Board placed on the People program, as they understood it, and yet had very little information about it (no knowledge of the trainings given to staff, pastors, etc.). These incongruous understanding highlighted the need to formally define Every Villages' efforts in these areas *which is part of the process of developing logic models*.

The findings from all three data collection points were used to build out draft versions of Water, Radio, and People logic models, which then allowed for a roll up into a larger organizational logic model. The outcomes noted above were used as the starting points for the "long-term" outcomes, and subsequent group work helped parcel out the short and medium term outcomes leading up to the refinement of the long-term outcomes themselves (the outcomes chain).

Other

Although not part of the objectives of the in-country questionnaire, additional information came out that may or may not be of interest to **Every Village**. Some program managers expressed:

- Lack of comparable pay to work performed; radio staff work more
- Lack of sufficient number of staff; they need more people to run the programs
- Lack of sponsorship for training and capacity building; they desire more training
- Lack of health care or insurance cards; they wish to have more treatment options for them/family
- Lack of transport to run programs more smoothly; need car and motorbikes at each location
- Lack of in-country Head Office; need proper offices for their staff
- The need to conduct a hygiene program to accompany the Water aspect