ChatGPT

Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning (MEL) Basics

Executive Summary

Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) is a comprehensive approach to track progress, assess results, and derive lessons in nonprofit programs. **Monitoring** refers to routine tracking of project activities, resources, and outputs to ensure implementation stays on course [1]. **Evaluation** is the periodic assessment of a project's outcomes and impact, often at mid-term or end, to determine effectiveness [2]. **Learning** involves reflecting on the data from monitoring and evaluation and using those insights to improve decision-making and future programming [3]. Together, MEL helps answer whether an organization is *"doing the right things"* (evaluation of appropriateness) and *"doing them right"* (monitoring of performance) [4] – ultimately verifying progress toward the NGO's mission and goals.

For NGOs, a strong MEL system is far more than a donor reporting requirement. It is a practical tool for accountability and continual improvement. By collecting and analyzing reliable data, NGOs can demonstrate transparency to stakeholders and donors, showing where funds are used and what changes are achieved [5]. Research indicates that effective MEL enables better project outcomes by allowing organizations to see what's working, address problems early, and adapt strategies based on evidence [6]. In short, MEL provides the evidence base for telling a NGO's impact story and the feedback needed to refine interventions for greater impact. This guide outlines key MEL concepts, a step-by-step framework to implement MEL, practical tools and templates, real-world case vignettes, example metrics, common risks with mitigation strategies, a checklist for practitioners, and a glossary of terms. The aim is to equip NGO staff with plain-language, actionable MEL basics – aligned with strategic planning tools like Theory of Change and Stakeholder Engagement – to strengthen program effectiveness and accountability.

Evidence Table

The table below highlights key findings about MEL from literature and practice, the strength of evidence behind them, and implications for NGOs:

Key Finding	Strength of Evidence	NGO Implications
Robust MEL improves project outcomes via adaptive management. Effective monitoring and evaluation allow teams to identify what works and what doesn't and adjust in real time, leading to better results [6].	**High.** Multiple sources (incl. recent NGO case studies) show strong correlation between systematic MEL and improved outcomes [6].	Invest in MEL systems to enable data-driven course corrections. Treat MEL as integral to program management for achieving impact, not an add-on.

Key Finding	Strength of Evidence	NGO Implications
Donors increasingly require MEL frameworks and evidence of results. Many funders mandate a Theory of Change or results framework with indicators for funded projects [7]. MEL data is used to aggregate and compare results across programs.	**High.** In a review of 22 major donors, 13 required grantees to submit a logic model/ToC with defined indicators in their MEL plans [7]. Donor policies and RFPs consistently emphasize M&E.	NGOs must design programs with clear MEL components from the start. A well-defined MEL plan (with objectives, indicators, baseline, targets) is often essential to secure and maintain funding.
Adequate resourcing of MEL (≈5–10% of budget) is considered best practice. Experts and organizations recommend dedicating a share of project budgets to MEL activities [8]. Insufficient MEL funding/staff leads to superficial data.	**High.** Widely cited guideline (UN, donors, NGOs) allocates 5–10% of project funds to M&E [8]. Some adaptive programs even invest ~20% in MEL for intensive learning [8].	Plan for MEL costs (staff, tools, evaluations) in project budgets. Treat MEL as a core project component. Under-resourcing MEL risks missing critical insights and undermining accountability.
Engaging stakeholders in MEL improves relevance and buy-in. Participatory approaches (involving community members, partners) yield more useful, accepted findings. Conversely, excluding primary stakeholders can lead to project failure.	**Moderate.** Strong qualitative evidence from case studies; e.g. in one project, ignoring women's feedback led to a solution that women later sabotaged [9] [10]. Many reports anecdotally show higher buy-in when beneficiaries contribute to MEL.	Involve beneficiaries and partners in defining indicators, collecting data, and interpreting results. This ensures MEL captures local perspectives and fosters community ownership of results, enhancing sustainability.
"Learning" is the weakest link – many NGOs collect data but don't fully utilize it. Organizations often conduct monitoring and evaluations but struggle to translate findings into action.	**Moderate.** Surveys show ~85% of development organizations claim "learning lessons" is a key goal for evaluations [11], yet follow-up mechanisms (to implement recommendations) are frequently lacking. Common sector critique that evaluation reports gather dust.	NGOs should establish processes to close the learning loop: e.g. post-evaluation action plans, staff learning workshops, and management responses to findings. Making time and space for reflective learning is critical to actual improvement.

Step-by-Step Framework

Implementing MEL involves a systematic cycle from planning to using data. Below is a step-by-step framework for NGOs to set up a basic MEL system for a project or program:

1. **Define Objectives and Scope** – Start by clearly defining the project's goals, outcomes, and scope. Ensure these align with your organization's mission and **Theory of Change** (the logic of how activities lead to outcomes – see our Theory of Change guide). Identify the key questions you want MEL to answer (e.g. "Are we reaching the target population?" "Is the project creating the intended change?"). At this stage, involve stakeholders to incorporate their perspectives on what success looks like. Many donors also expect a results framework or logic model at this stage [7], mapping inputs → activities → outputs → outcomes → impact.

2. **Develop Indicators and Targets** – For each objective or expected result, define measurable **indicators**. Indicators are specific metrics that will signal progress (e.g. number of people trained, % increase in income of participants, beneficiary satisfaction rating). Ensure you include a mix of **output** indicators (immediate results of activities) and **outcome** indicators (changes or benefits achieved by the project). Define clear targets and timelines for each indicator (e.g. "80% of trainees demonstrate improved skills by year's end"). Also establish the **baseline** values – the starting point data before the intervention – through a baseline survey or existing data. This allows you to later measure change from baseline. It's useful to compile an **M&E framework table** listing each indicator with its definition, data source, how and when it will be measured, and who is responsible [12]. (See Tools/Templates for common indicator frameworks.)

3. **Plan Data Collection & Responsibilities** – Create a MEL plan that details how data will be collected and by whom. Select methods for each indicator: **quantitative** methods (surveys, service records, questionnaires, sensor data) for numeric indicators, and **qualitative** methods (interviews, focus groups, observations, case studies) for understanding context and unforeseen outcomes. Determine the frequency of data collection (e.g. monthly monitoring of activities, quarterly outcome surveys, mid-term review). Assign roles: Who will collect data (project staff, M&E officer, volunteers, external enumerators)? Who will supervise data quality? Also plan **data management** – how will data be recorded, stored (e.g. Excel, an online database), and protected. Establish quality assurance steps such as training data collectors, using standardized forms, and spot-checking data accuracy. If needed, include **partner organizations** in training so that data coming from multiple sources is consistent. Ensure ethical practices are in place (informed consent for interviews, confidentiality of sensitive information, etc.). This step may also involve budgeting for MEL activities (tools, travel for surveys, possibly translation) – remember to allocate sufficient resources (donors generally expect a dedicated MEL budget line, often around 5–10% of project cost [8]).

4. **Monitor Implementation (Ongoing)** – Once the project is underway, carry out monitoring as planned. This involves regular collection of output and process data and comparing it against the work plan and targets. For example, track whether activities are happening on schedule and reaching the intended people: Are trainings being delivered as planned? How many participants attended versus target? Are inputs (funds, supplies) delivered on time? Use simple tools like an **indicator tracking table** or dashboard to log progress over time. Monitoring is largely an internal management tool – it provides real-time feedback. Hold periodic check-ins (e.g. monthly meetings) to review monitoring data with the team. Look for deviations: if certain activities are lagging or

outputs fall short, investigate why. Monitoring data should be used to make incremental adjustments during implementation. For instance, if attendance in a workshop is low, the team can respond by mobilizing community outreach or adjusting the schedule sooner rather than later. Good monitoring is proactive – it flags issues early so you can solve them, and it highlights successes or efficiencies that can be replicated. Document any changes made to the project plan based on monitoring (this will be useful information for learning later).

5. **Evaluate Outcomes and Impact** – At designated points, conduct evaluations to assess the project's results and effectiveness. Typically, a **mid-term evaluation** (during implementation) helps understand progress and any need for mid-course corrections, and an **end-of-project (final) evaluation** measures the extent to which outcomes and goals were achieved. Some projects also do ex-post evaluations some time after completion to gauge longer-term impact or sustainability. Decide whether evaluations will be internal (led by the NGO's own staff for learning purposes) or external (an independent evaluator for objectivity, often required by funders for accountability). Use appropriate evaluation designs: for example, a *baseline vs. endline comparison* of key indicators; before-after changes in the target group; or a *comparative evaluation* if a control group or community is available to compare those without the intervention. Include qualitative inquiry – talk to participants and stakeholders to get their perspectives on the project's effects and implementation. Evaluation criteria often include **Relevance**, **Effectiveness**, **Efficiency**, **Impact**, and **Sustainability**. An evaluation report will typically outline findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Make sure to budget sufficient time for evaluators to gather data in the field and engage with stakeholders. Importantly, plan how results will be disseminated (e.g. a presentation to staff and community, a report to donors, a summary brief for the public).

6. **Analyze and Reflect (Learning)** – Data by itself doesn't lead to learning; it must be analyzed and discussed. After collecting monitoring data or completing an evaluation, allocate time for the project team (and key stakeholders, if possible) to collectively make sense of the findings. This could take the form of a **reflection workshop** or review meeting. Ask: What are the data telling us? Are we on track toward outcomes? What unexpected outcomes or challenges are emerging? Why might certain targets not be met? Equally, what successes can we learn from? Encourage an open, blameless discussion where staff and partners can candidly interpret results. If the project used multiple data sources, consider **triangulating** them – see if qualitative insights explain the trends in quantitative data, for example. The goal is to turn data into actionable knowledge. This step is where an organization truly becomes a *learning organization* – one that iteratively improves by honestly examining evidence. In practice, this might involve writing up a brief *lessons learned* document or having each team member share one insight from the data. The focus should be both on **accountability** ("Did we achieve what we set out to?") and on **learning** ("What should we do differently or continue doing in the future?"). To avoid the tendency to focus only on good news, specifically dedicate part of the session to "what's not working and why." Tools like after-action reviews or outcome harvesting can facilitate learning discussions. Notably, timely feedback is key – for instance, third-party monitors have found that delivering findings quickly for course correction is crucial to improve outcomes [13].

7. **Use Learning to Adapt and Improve** – Ensure the insights gained are translated into decisions and actions. This might mean adjusting the current project strategy (adaptive management) or capturing recommendations for the design of future projects. Concretely, if an evaluation recommended specific improvements (e.g. redesign training materials, strengthen community engagement, revise

targeting criteria), develop a management response or action plan with responsibilities and timelines to implement those recommendations. MEL should feed into strategic planning: for example, an NGO might revise its Theory of Change based on evaluation evidence, or change its approach to partnership if monitoring showed low partner engagement. It is also important to share key lessons beyond the immediate project – within the NGO (so other teams learn) and with external stakeholders. NGOs can incorporate learning into staff training, update organizational policies (say, a new data quality protocol if monitoring revealed inconsistencies), or even influence sector practice by publishing learnings. **Document** any changes made as a result of MEL – this helps demonstrate to donors and communities that the organization is responsive and committed to improvement. In essence, the MEL cycle should lead back into project design and planning, creating a continuous improvement loop. Over time, this adaptive approach helps the NGO become more effective and innovative. A commitment to learning also nurtures a culture where data and evidence are valued at all levels, from field staff to leadership. When MEL information is actually used to make better decisions, staff see the tangible value, which reinforces engagement in MEL activities.

8. **Report and Communicate Results** – Throughout the MEL cycle, NGOs need to communicate findings to different stakeholders in appropriate ways. Donors will require periodic reports (often quarterly and annually, plus a final report) that include MEL data on outputs and outcomes, explanations of any variances, and success stories or case studies. Internally, management might require monthly dashboard updates. Communities and beneficiaries should also hear about results – closing the feedback loop by sharing what was achieved (e.g. via community meetings or simple infographics) can enhance transparency and trust. Tailor communication to the audience: a funder may want more quantitative impact data, while community members may prefer an interactive discussion of what went well and what could improve. Use visuals and stories alongside data to convey impact – e.g. an infographic of key indicators, and a vignette of one participant's experience. Also be honest about challenges and how the NGO is addressing them (this demonstrates accountability and learning mindset). Good communication of MEL results keeps stakeholders engaged and can garner support for future initiatives. It also honors the contributions of those who provided data by showing that their input led to action. Finally, celebrate successes revealed by MEL – recognizing progress boosts morale and can motivate continued effort.

By following these steps, NGOs can build a MEL process that is manageable and useful. Start small and simple – it's better to have a few meaningful indicators with good data than an over-ambitious framework that isn't implemented. Regularly revisit and refine the MEL framework as needed (for instance, you might drop an indicator that isn't yielding useful info, or add a new one if the context changes). MEL is inherently iterative and should evolve with the project and the organization's capacity. The step-by-step approach above aligns with common project cycles and can be scaled or streamlined depending on the size of the program. For example, a large multi-year program might have a dedicated MEL officer and rigorous evaluations, whereas a small community project might do monitoring with existing staff and a lighter learning review. The core principles remain: plan with the end in mind, collect credible data, analyze it, and use it for action.

(Cross-reference: This MEL process should connect with your project's Theory of Change (are you measuring the outcomes in your ToC?) and Stakeholder Engagement plan (are stakeholders involved in MEL?). Ensuring alignment across these strategic tools will enhance coherence and effectiveness.)

Tools / Templates

NGOs do not have to start MEL from scratch – there are many established tools and templates to facilitate planning, data collection, analysis, and reporting. Below are some key MEL tools and resources:

- **Logical Framework ("Logframe")** – A logframe is a matrix that outlines a project's hierarchy of objectives (Goal, Outcomes, Outputs, Activities) along with indicators, targets, data sources, and assumptions. It provides a one-page summary of the theory of change and how success will be measured. Logframes are often required by donors and help ensure you've logically linked activities to intended results. They allow you to present the project in a structured way and check if the proposed solutions will indeed lead to the desired change [14]. *Template tip:* Use a 4x4 logframe table with columns for Objectives, Indicators, Means of Verification, and Assumptions. Fill in each level of objectives with at least one indicator. (See our Theory of Change and Project Planning guides for how to develop a logic model that underpins the logframe.)

- **Weaver's Triangle** – An alternative planning tool, particularly friendly for small NGOs, is the Weaver's Triangle. This is a simplified model that starts with defining your long-term goal, then outcomes, then outputs, ensuring they align in a triangle format (Goal → Outcomes → Outputs with linked activities). It helps clarify what success looks like at each level. The Weaver's Triangle is essentially a precursor to or simpler form of a logframe, focusing on connecting your activities to outcomes [15]. Small organizations might find it useful to sketch a Weaver's Triangle to develop a project strategy, and then derive indicators for those outcomes and outputs.

- **MEL Plan Template** – It's helpful to document your overall MEL system in a structured template. A typical **MEL Plan** includes: a brief description of the project's objectives and Theory of Change, the indicators (often attaching the logframe or an indicator table), data collection methods and frequency, roles and responsibilities for MEL tasks, the budget allocated for MEL, and how data will be used (reporting and learning processes). Many NGOs have their own MEL plan templates. For example, the American Red Cross and other agencies provide MEL plan templates covering these sections, which can be adapted [16] [17]. Using a template ensures you don't forget key elements (like who will analyze data, or how often indicators will be reported). *Tip:* Include a calendar or Gantt chart in the MEL plan showing MEL activities (e.g. baseline in Month 1, mid-term evaluation in Month 12, etc.). A sample outline might be: 1) Introduction (project summary), 2) MEL Approach (principles, ToC summary), 3) Indicators and Targets, 4) Data Collection & Tools, 5) Data Management, 6) Roles & Responsibilities, 7) Reporting & Learning plan, 8) MEL Budget.

- **Indicators and Data Collection Tools** – For each indicator, you may need specific tools. Common tools include: **Survey questionnaires** (for baseline, endline or KAP surveys), **Interview guides** (for qualitative outcomes or evaluation questions), **Focus group discussion guides**, **Observation checklists**, and forms for routine data (e.g. attendance sheets, training evaluation forms). It's good practice to develop **Indicator Reference Sheets** for each key indicator – a one-page reference defining the indicator precisely, its data source, the method of calculation, who collects it and how often, etc. This reduces ambiguity. If using surveys, consider digital data collection tools (like KoboToolbox, ODK, CommCare) which allow collecting data on smartphones/tablets and can improve data quality and speed. For qualitative data, voice recorders or transcription tools can be useful. Also, consider using **pre/post tests** for trainings to measure immediate outcome in knowledge gain. *Resource:* The Tools4Dev website offers templates for many of these documents (survey templates, interview guides, etc.), and BetterEvaluation.org provides a repository of data collection method guides.

- **Data Management & Analysis Tools** – Depending on capacity, NGOs can use simple software like Excel or Google Sheets to enter and analyze quantitative monitoring data (with formulas, pivot tables for summary, etc.). For qualitative data, tools like Excel or specialized software (NVivo, Atlas.ti) can help organize responses and identify themes. There are also dedicated MEL platforms and databases (such as TolaData, DevResults, or custom MIS systems) that can aggregate indicator data across projects – useful for larger NGOs handling many projects. Data visualization tools (Excel charts, Power BI, Tableau, etc.) can turn raw data into graphs and dashboards that make it easier to spot trends and communicate findings. Even low-tech approaches like a **physical progress chart** on the office wall or a community scoreboard can be effective to visualize how things are going. Choose tools appropriate to your team's skill level – a well-used simple tool is better than a complex tool that staff aren't trained on. Ensure there are backups for important datasets and that data is securely stored (especially if it contains personal information).

- **Reporting Templates** – Standardize how MEL results are reported to ensure consistency. This could include a **monthly or quarterly report template** for internal updates (covering activities completed, key output numbers, any issues and decisions), and a **donor report template** aligned with donor requirements (often structured by project objectives or sectors, and including a summary of progress on each indicator). Visual dashboard-style reports are increasingly popular for internal purposes – e.g. a one-page snapshot with traffic light ratings or simple graphs for quick review by managers. For evaluations, using a **report outline** template (with sections like Executive Summary, Background, Methodology, Findings by evaluation question, Conclusions, Recommendations, Appendices) can help evaluators cover all bases. Many organizations also create a **presentation template** for sharing MEL findings in meetings (with slides for key metrics, photos, quotes from participants, etc.). Templates save time and make it easier to compare data across time or projects.

- **Case Study and Story Collection** – As part of MEL, NGOs often use **Most Significant Change** stories or case studies to capture qualitative impact. Having a template or guide for writing case studies can help field staff systematically document individual or community changes. This might include prompts like: background of the person/community, what change happened, how the project contributed, and a quote. Photos or videos are also powerful tools – consider using consented photographs from the field to visually document progress (e.g. before/after images). While these are not "tools" in the sense of software, they are MEL techniques that provide depth to the numbers.

- **Alternate MEL Methods** – Traditional tools like logframes work well for many, but there are also alternative approaches for more complex or adaptive programs. *Outcome Harvesting* and *Outcome Mapping* are tools to capture outcomes without pre-set indicators – useful in advocacy or capacity-building projects where change pathways aren't linear. *Most Significant Change* is a participatory technique to gather stories of change and then systematically select the most impactful stories as qualitative evaluation. *Developmental Evaluation* is an approach where an evaluator is embedded in an innovative program to provide continual feedback. NGOs should be aware of these approaches as part of their toolkit – they can be especially useful when working in uncertain environments or when traditional M&E is too rigid. For example, **Outcome Harvesting** can supplement quantitative data to provide richer context [18] . These methods often require more time and skilled facilitation, but they emphasize learning and are worth considering for programs focused on innovation or systems change.

In summary, a wealth of MEL tools and templates exist – one doesn't need to reinvent the wheel. Leverage established frameworks like the logframe and standard indicator sets as starting points (many sectors have common indicators, e.g. health programs track things like vaccination rates, education programs track attendance and test scores, etc.). Adapt them to your context. Use templates to ensure you cover all elements in planning. And consider both high-tech and low-tech tools for data collection and analysis, choosing what fits your team and context. Whichever tools you use, keep them user-friendly – a complicated tool unused is far less valuable than a simple one used consistently. The goal is to make MEL efficient and effective, not burdensome, so that it becomes an integrated part of how your NGO manages for impact.

(Cross-reference: When selecting tools, also think about your stakeholders – e.g. using participatory video as a tool might engage community members directly in MEL (see Stakeholder Engagement guide). And ensure your MEL tools link to how you define success in your strategic plans (see Vision & Mission guide), so you measure what really matters.)

Case Vignettes

To illustrate MEL in action, here are two short case vignettes showing how NGOs applied monitoring, evaluation, and learning to improve their programs:

Case Vignette 1: Adaptive Management in a Health Project

Context: *An international NGO was implementing a reproductive health project (part of the USAID-funded MOMENTUM initiative) focused on reducing gender-based violence (GBV) and improving family planning in several states in India.* The project's MEL system was designed to closely track activities and outcomes and allow for course corrections.

MEL Actions: The NGO established a robust monitoring system with monthly data collection on key outputs (e.g. number of community education sessions held, number of GBV survivors receiving services) and quarterly outcome tracking (e.g. change in knowledge and attitudes about GBV in target communities). They also held after-action reviews every two months with field staff to discuss the monitoring data. Midway through implementation, a **mid-term evaluation** was conducted, involving interviews with participants and local partners to gather feedback on what was working and what wasn't. Crucially, the project fostered a culture where data was reviewed continuously and honestly.

What Happened: Early monitoring data revealed that attendance at women's support group meetings was lower than expected in one district. In the reflection meeting, field officers noted that sessions were held during market days when many women were busy. The team promptly rescheduled the meetings to more convenient times and partnered with local women's collectives to boost mobilization. At the same time, qualitative feedback from the mid-term evaluation indicated that while the project's trainings raised awareness, some of the educational materials weren't culturally tailored, reducing their effectiveness. Upon learning this, the team adapted the curriculum to include more local context and relatable examples. They also noted an unforeseen positive outcome: the data showed a spontaneous uptick in youth volunteers advocating against GBV, which wasn't originally planned. Recognizing this, the project reallocated some resources to support the youth-led initiatives, seeing them as a promising avenue to amplify impact.

Results: By the end of the project, the outcomes had significantly improved – more women were utilizing family planning services, and community leaders reported increased willingness to intervene in GBV situations. The final evaluation attributed these successes in part to the project's MEL-driven adaptations: changing the meeting schedule led to a 40% increase in attendance, and tailoring the training content resulted in participants demonstrating better understanding of GBV issues in surveys. Perhaps most importantly, the culture of learning meant the project team was responsive and could **"fine-tune strategies in response to evolving challenges"**, as one staff member described [19]. The NGO documented these adaptations in their report, turning them into lessons for future programs. This vignette shows how continuous monitoring and willingness to learn allowed the project to be agile and more effective in achieving its goals – a real-world example of MEL enabling adaptive management for better outcomes.

Case Vignette 2: Learning from Failure – The Importance of Stakeholder Feedback

Context: *A small NGO working in a rural region of Afghanistan undertook a project to reduce women's drudgery in water collection.* In local villages, women traditionally spent hours each day walking to a communal well to fetch water. The project, designed with input from community elders (all men), decided to install piped water connections into household compounds, aiming to save women time and effort.

MEL and the Missed Perspective: The NGO's plan included basic monitoring – tracking the number of households connected to the water supply and the reduction in distance to water source. Technically, the project was implemented smoothly: within months, dozens of compounds had water piped in. By those metrics, it was a success. However, the NGO had not fully engaged the primary stakeholders – the women – in project design or ongoing feedback. There was no mechanism (like focus group discussions or feedback surveys) to gather women's perspectives during implementation. This lack of **participatory MEL** meant the team was essentially blind to a critical issue.

What Happened: After installation, the NGO observed an unexpected problem: many of the pipes were being deliberately damaged or not used. Puzzled, the team finally held informal discussions with some women. Only then did the truth surface – while fetching water was hard work, it was also the only time those women could leave their homes and socialize with other women. The daily walk to the well was a cherished social ritual. By bringing water to each compound, the project had unintentionally taken away women's primary opportunity to interact outside the home. Feeling isolated and unhappy with this outcome, the women had boycotted the project and even broke the pipes in protest [9] [10]. In other words, the intervention, though well-intentioned, failed because it ignored the social context and women's needs beyond just water provision.

Lessons Learned: This case, albeit a negative outcome, became a powerful learning moment for the NGO. The post-project evaluation (prompted by the obvious failure) highlighted the importance of involving *all* stakeholders – especially the end users – in defining project success criteria and monitoring satisfaction. The NGO staff realized that their MEL approach had focused on **"hard" indicators (infrastructure built, time saved)** but omitted **"soft" indicators like women's well-being or social connectedness**. As a result of this lesson, the NGO changed its practices: future projects included women (and other marginalized groups) in needs assessment and planning from the start. They also adopted participatory monitoring techniques, such as community review meetings, to get feedback throughout implementation. Additionally, their project MEL frameworks began to incorporate socio-cultural indicators (e.g. community cohesion, empowerment levels) alongside technical measures.

Outcome: While this particular project did not achieve its intended outcome, the honest evaluation and learning prevented similar mistakes in subsequent projects. The NGO shared this case within their network as an example of why **context matters** and why MEL should capture qualitative insights, not just quantitative targets. It underscores that a project can meet its output targets and still "fail" if it fails to understand stakeholder perspectives. The key takeaway: robust MEL, especially **inclusive monitoring and evaluation**, might have averted this failure by flagging the misalignment early. In essence, the experience reinforced to the NGO and others that effective MEL isn't only about tracking progress but also about questioning "Are we solving the right problem?" and listening to the people whom the project is meant to serve.

(These vignettes highlight real challenges and adjustments. In the first, MEL enabled success by guiding adaptation. In the second, the absence of good MEL (specifically, lack of stakeholder input) led to failure – but also eventual learning. NGOs can learn from both scenarios: embrace data and feedback for course correction, and never neglect the voices of those impacted.)

Metrics / KPIs

MEL involves tracking various metrics, often referred to as Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), to gauge different aspects of a program's performance. The specific metrics will depend on the project's nature (education, health, livelihoods, etc.), but they generally fall into common categories. Below is a table of example metrics/KPIs at different levels and what they indicate for an NGO project:

Level / Category	Example Metric (KPI)	Purpose in NGO MEL
Input (Resources invested)	**Budget utilization (% of budget spent vs. planned)** – e.g. 90% of budget spent by Q4.	Tracks whether financial resources are being used as allocated. Helps ensure the project is neither underspending (which might indicate under-implementation) nor overspending. Other input indicators might include staff hours used, materials distributed, etc., to monitor efficiency of resource use.
Output (Immediate results of activities)	**Number of people trained** – e.g. 120 community health workers trained (against a target of 100). **Number of workshops held**, **infrastructure built**, etc.	Measures the direct deliverables of the project – what the project produced or delivered. These metrics show the scope and reach of project activities. Output KPIs are typically used to monitor implementation and are reported to funders to demonstrate that planned activities have been completed.

Level / Category	Example Metric (KPI)	Purpose in NGO MEL
Outcome (Short to medium term changes)	**% increase in knowledge or skills** – e.g. 75% of trained farmers adopted an improved farming practice. **Behavior change rate**, **change in income**, **school attendance rate** (for an education project), etc.	Captures the changes or benefits that occur as a result of the outputs. Outcome metrics indicate whether the project is achieving its desired effect on the target population. They often correspond to project objectives. NGOs use these to evaluate effectiveness – for instance, an increase in school attendance or test scores signals educational benefit. These are often the key success indicators for a project and closely tied to the Theory of Change.
Impact (Long-term, broader changes)	**Community poverty rate** – e.g. poverty incidence in the target villages dropped from 60% to 50% over 5 years. **Maternal mortality rate**, **literacy rate**, **forest cover %**, etc., depending on sector.	Reflects the broader or longer-term changes that the project contributes to, usually at the community or societal level. Impact indicators are often influenced by many factors (not just the project), so they can be harder to measure and attribute. NGOs track these to align with their mission (e.g. improved quality of life, SDGs). They are often used in impact evaluations or to demonstrate alignment with national/global development goals. Due to the attribution gap, NGOs sometimes use outcome indicators as proxies for impact in routine MEL, while true impact is assessed via special studies.
Process / Quality (How well activities are implemented)	**% of activities completed on schedule** – e.g. 95% of planned activities delivered on time. **Beneficiary satisfaction score** – e.g. average satisfaction 4 out of 5 in post-activity surveys.	Monitors the quality and timeliness of implementation. These metrics help an NGO ensure that the project is being delivered as intended. High schedule adherence indicates good project management. Satisfaction or feedback scores provide a qualitative gauge of quality from the participants' perspective. Process indicators often feed into management decisions to improve operations (for example, if satisfaction is low, investigate and adjust).
Efficiency (Value for resources)	**Cost per beneficiary** – e.g. \$50 per person trained. **Cost per outcome** – e.g. \$200 per job placement achieved.	Shows how economically resources are converted into results. NGOs (and donors) are interested in whether the project is delivering value for money. By tracking cost per output or outcome, one can compare efficiency across different interventions or over time. Efficiency metrics must be interpreted in context (cheaper is not always better if quality suffers), but they help identify if there are ways to optimize resource use.

Level / Category	Example Metric (KPI)	Purpose in NGO MEL
Sustainability (Post-project continuity)	**% of outcomes sustained** – e.g. 80% of trained farmers are still using the new techniques one year after project end. **Policy adoption** – e.g. local government adopted the program's approach into their budget.	Indicates whether the benefits of the project continue after external support is withdrawn. For instance, are communities maintaining facilities? Did behaviors stick? Sustainability metrics are often evaluated at project completion or afterwards. They inform NGOs and donors about the lasting legacy of the intervention and can highlight needs for exit planning or follow-up support.

How to use this table: When designing a MEL plan, pick a few relevant KPIs from each level to get a balanced view. For example, in a health project to reduce maternal mortality: Input KPI could be "# of midwives trained," Output KPI "# of safe birth kits distributed," Outcome KPI "% of births attended by skilled personnel," Impact KPI "maternal mortality ratio in target area," Process KPI "average response time of emergency referral system," Efficiency KPI "cost per birth attended," and Sustainability KPI "policy on emergency obstetric care funded by government post-project." Not every project needs all categories explicitly, but thinking through them ensures you measure implementation, results, and longer-term effects together. Always define each metric clearly (numerator/denominator, data source) so it's measured consistently. Also, consider disaggregating key metrics by sex, age, location, or other variables to see who is benefiting or if there are gaps (e.g. outcomes for women vs. men, rural vs. urban). Well-chosen metrics and KPIs serve as the building blocks of your MEL system, allowing you to quantify progress and impact in a tangible way.

Risks & Mitigations

Even well-designed MEL systems face challenges. Being aware of common risks can help NGOs plan mitigations in advance. Here are key risks in MEL and strategies to address them:

- **Limited Resources and Capacity:** A very common challenge is insufficient resources – both funding and skilled personnel – dedicated to MEL. Small NGOs often have no full-time M&E staff, and project teams are stretched with implementation duties. This can lead to patchy data collection or superficial analysis. *Mitigations:* Build MEL capacity and budget into projects from the start. Aim to allocate around 5% (or more for complex projects) of the budget to MEL needs (staff time, surveys, MIS systems). Train existing staff in basic MEL skills or partner with external experts for key tasks (e.g. hire a consultant to lead an evaluation). If budget is tight, prioritize a few high-value indicators rather than trying to do too much. Use cost-effective digital tools (e.g. free survey apps) and engage community volunteers or university interns (with proper training) to assist in data gathering. Management should foster a culture that values MEL, so that program staff are willing to devote time to it. Also, document and communicate the benefits of MEL – for instance, how data helped improve a project – to justify the investment. Remember that citing lack of resources is tempting, but ultimately focusing only on implementation at the expense of MEL can be a false economy; without evidence of results, future funding and impact can suffer [20] [21].

- **Poor Data Quality:** The usefulness of MEL depends on data quality. Risks include inconsistent data collection methods, human error in recording, low response rates in surveys, or biased feedback (people telling you what they think you want to hear). Missing baseline data or lack of comparison groups is another issue that can limit evaluation insights [22]. *Mitigations:* Invest in training for anyone collecting data so they understand the importance of accuracy and consistency. Use standardized tools and definitions (develop Indicator Reference Sheets and train staff on them). Pilot test questionnaires and tools to iron out confusion. Triangulate data by using multiple sources – for example, verify self-reported data with observational checks or external statistics. Schedule data quality audits periodically: a supervisor can re-survey a small sample to check for discrepancies, or use software checks for outliers. Embrace technology where feasible – electronic data collection can reduce manual errors and enforce skip logic, etc. Also, instill a non-punitive approach to reporting issues: staff should feel comfortable admitting when data might be flawed, so the team can fix it, rather than hiding problems. If baseline data is missing (perhaps project started before MEL was in place), consider reconstructing baseline from recall or secondary sources as a fallback. Ultimately, make "quality over quantity" a motto – better to have fewer data points that are reliable than masses of unusable data.

- **Lack of Stakeholder Engagement:** As seen in the second vignette, ignoring stakeholder voices in MEL can lead to measuring the wrong things or missing why a program isn't working. There's a risk of MEL being top-down and focused only on donor requirements, without local community input. *Mitigations:* Practice **participatory MEL** – involve beneficiaries and local partners in defining indicators of success, in providing feedback, and even in data collection. For example, include community representatives in quarterly review meetings, or have a beneficiary satisfaction survey at regular intervals. Use methods like focus groups, community scorecards, or participatory rural appraisal to get qualitative insights. Ensure MEL results are shared back and discussed with the community ("closing the loop"), not only sent upward. This will build trust and yield honest feedback. Additionally, stakeholder engagement helps interpret data correctly; community members might explain trends that outsiders misread. On the donor side, try to balance upward accountability with downward accountability. One approach is to create separate spaces or processes – one for accountability data (to meet donor logframe indicators) and another for learning and local feedback [23]. That way, learning conversations don't get totally overshadowed by formal reporting. By actively seeking stakeholder input and valuing different perspectives, NGOs can avoid major blind spots and ensure MEL serves everyone's information needs, not just the funder's.

- **Indicator Selection and Tunnel Vision:** Choosing inappropriate indicators can misguide a MEL system. There's a risk of measuring what's easy or obvious rather than what matters (e.g. counting people trained without assessing if their lives improved). Also, once indicators are set, organizations may focus narrowly on hitting those targets ("tunnel vision"), sometimes at the cost of the broader goal. *Mitigations:* Revisit your Theory of Change to ensure indicators at each level truly reflect the desired outcomes and impact, not just activities. Include at least one indicator per key outcome in the ToC, and include qualitative measures if the change is complex. Be willing to adjust indicators if you discover they're not providing useful information – donors can often be approached to revise MEL frameworks when justified. To avoid tunnel vision, use a mix of indicators: for example, track not just outputs but also outcomes and an efficiency or quality metric. That way, success isn't defined by one number alone. Internally, encourage reflection beyond the metrics: ask "so what" if an indicator is met – does it really mean success? Tools like outcome harvesting can complement pre-set indicators by capturing unintended outcomes. Essentially, keep the MEL system flexible and learning-oriented; it's okay to admit an indicator wasn't perfect and change it. It's more important to measure what counts than to rigidly stick to initially chosen metrics.

- **Data Overload and Complexity:** On the flip side, an overly complex MEL system with too many indicators or tools can overwhelm staff and lead to burnout or neglect of MEL tasks. Small NGOs especially might adopt donor-mandated frameworks that are too cumbersome. *Mitigations:* Right-size the MEL framework to your organization's capacity. It's often better to start with a lean set of the most important indicators and gradually expand if needed. Automate what you can – if using a spreadsheet, build automatic summaries so staff aren't doing excessive manual calculation. If a donor requires a large number of indicators, see if some can be reported through sampling or less frequently to reduce burden. Also, clarify roles – who is responsible for what data – to spread the load. In terms of analysis, focus on key questions; you don't need to analyze every data point if it's not relevant to a decision. Creating simple dashboards can help synthesize information so that busy managers can grasp it quickly. If using advanced tools, ensure training and ongoing support are provided. The mantra should be "simplify": an elegant, simple MEL system that runs consistently is worth more than a complex one that collapses. Periodically review the MEL process with the team to identify pain points or unnecessary steps and streamline them.

- **Organizational Culture and Learning Climate:** A subtler risk is when an organization's culture doesn't support MEL. For instance, if leadership only wants to hear positive results, staff may be scared to report failures, resulting in biased reporting. Or if MEL is siloed (only the M&E officer cares about it), program staff might not engage, treating MEL as a checkbox exercise. *Mitigations:* Leadership should actively champion MEL as a tool for improvement, not a tool for blame. Encourage an atmosphere where **"failing forward"** is accepted – i.e. it's okay to find out something didn't work as long as you learn and adapt. Recognize and reward learning behavior: for example, if a team identified a problem through MEL and solved it, acknowledge that in staff meetings or performance reviews. Integrate MEL into everyone's job descriptions to some extent (e.g. project officers collect field data as part of their routine, managers spend time reviewing MEL reports). Break the silo by involving program staff in indicator selection and data analysis sessions so they see MEL as part of programming, not separate. Capacity building is part of culture too – train staff not just in technical skills but in *evaluative thinking* (asking questions, using evidence). When MEL insights lead to changes, communicate that story across the organization: "We did X based on evaluation findings and it improved Y" – this closes the loop and shows MEL's value. Over time, as people see data leading to action and not punishment, MEL becomes ingrained in how the NGO works.

- **External Factors and Uncertainty:** Sometimes things outside your control affect MEL. In conflict zones or emergencies, data collection may be dangerous or impossible at times. A pandemic (like COVID-19) might disrupt planned surveys or require remote monitoring. Also, funders might change their reporting requirements mid-project. *Mitigations:* Build flexibility into MEL plans. Have backup methods in mind (e.g. phone surveys if in-person isn't possible, remote sensing or secondary data if primary data can't be collected). Keep MEL schedules realistic and adapt them if context changes – communicate with donors to adjust MEL activities in crises (most will understand the need to modify plans under extraordinary circumstances). Document any deviations and how you addressed them. Use proxy indicators temporarily if direct ones can't be measured. Also, maintain a risk log in your MEL plan where you list potential external risks to MEL (e.g. "Survey timing might coincide with monsoon season, risking low response") and contingency actions. By anticipating issues, you can respond more calmly when they occur. After action, capture any lessons on MEL in fragile contexts to improve future resiliency.

- **Ethical and Privacy Risks:** Collecting data from people comes with responsibilities. There's risk of harming respondents (e.g. surveying survivors of trauma could retraumatize if not done sensitively), or breaching confidentiality, or misuse of data. *Mitigations:* Adhere to ethical research standards: obtain informed consent, ensure respondents know participation is voluntary and will not affect the aid they receive. For sensitive topics, train enumerators in trauma-informed approaches and provide referral information if respondents need support. Protect personal data by anonymizing datasets (remove names, use ID codes) and storing data securely (password protection, restricted access). Comply with data protection laws (e.g. GDPR if relevant). When sharing stories or photos, get permission and be mindful of dignity – avoid exploitative storytelling. Include ethics in MEL training and have an ethics review (even an internal one) for any evaluation involving vulnerable groups. By embedding ethics, NGOs safeguard respondents' rights and well-being, maintaining trust which is essential for quality data.

In conclusion, while there are many challenges in MEL, each has corresponding strategies that NGOs can employ. The key is to be proactive: anticipate what might go wrong and plan for it. Regularly reviewing your MEL process helps catch issues early – for example, if data quality is slipping or staff are overwhelmed, you can adjust course (just as MEL data helps adjust programs). Also, seek peer learning: many NGOs face similar MEL challenges, so learning from others (through communities of practice or forums) can provide new solutions. By acknowledging risks openly and addressing them, NGOs can significantly strengthen their MEL systems and ensure they remain robust, credible, and useful even in difficult circumstances. Remember that a MEL system doesn't have to be perfect from the start – it should evolve as you learn what works and what doesn't in your context [13] [24].

Checklist

Before finalizing your MEL plan or embarking on data collection, use this checklist to ensure you have covered all the MEL basics:

- **Clarity of Objectives:** Are the project's objectives and intended outcomes clearly defined and understood by the team? (These form the basis for MEL indicators.)

- **Alignment with Mission & Theory of Change:** Does the MEL framework align with your organization's mission and the project's Theory of Change? (Check that each outcome in the ToC has a way to be measured in the MEL plan.)

- **Defined Indicators:** For each key result, have you identified specific, measurable indicators (including baseline values and target values for each)? Are the indicators well-defined (no ambiguity in what's being measured) and feasible to collect with your resources?

- **Data Collection Plan:** Is there a documented plan for how and when data will be collected for each indicator? (e.g. "Field officer will administer a survey to participants at start and end of training" or "Finance manager will report spending quarterly.") Does the plan include both quantitative and qualitative methods where appropriate?

- **Roles & Responsibilities:** Have individuals been assigned to MEL tasks? (Who collects data? Who enters it? Who analyzes it? Who writes reports?) Do these people have the necessary training or support?

- **Stakeholder Engagement:** Have you included opportunities for stakeholder (beneficiaries, partners, etc.) input/feedback in your MEL process? (Such as community meetings, feedback forms, participatory monitoring.) Are stakeholders aware of how they can participate or voice concerns?

- **Data Quality Measures:** Are procedures in place to ensure data accuracy and reliability? (e.g. training for data collectors, pilot testing tools, regular spot-checks, data verification steps.) If using digital tools, have they been tested? If using paper forms, is there a clear filing and transcription process?

- **Ethical Considerations:** Have respondents' rights and privacy been safeguarded? (Informed consent process prepared, confidentiality protocols in place, sensitive questions reviewed for appropriateness.) Is data storage secure and compliant with any relevant data protection policies?

- **Timeline Integration:** Does the MEL timeline sync with the project workplan? (Key MEL activities like baseline survey, mid-term review, final evaluation are scheduled at logical points and not at odds with implementation timings.) Have you allowed sufficient time for analysis and reflection (not just data collection)?

- **MEL Budget:** Is there a dedicated budget for MEL activities in the project? (Including personnel time, possibly travel for surveys, evaluation costs, analysis software if needed, etc.) Is the budget roughly in line with recommended 5-10% of project cost (or justified if outside that range)?

- **Reporting Schedule:** Are reporting requirements (internal and external) clearly listed with due dates? (e.g. monthly internal updates, quarterly donor reports, final report 3 months after project end.) Do you have templates or formats ready for these reports?

- **Learning and Adaptation Plan:** Beyond reports, have you planned how the team will use the data? (Scheduled reflection meetings, learning workshops, etc.) Is there a mechanism to document lessons learned and decisions made (minutes, lessons log)?

- **Indicator Tracking Tool:** Do you have an indicator tracking spreadsheet or system set up to record data as it comes in over time? (Ensures you're ready to manage the data flow and can easily see progress vs targets.)

- **Baseline Completed:** If the project has started, has the baseline data been collected for all indicators (or a plan to retrieve baseline info)? Starting measurements are essential for later comparison.

- **Assumptions and Risks Noted:** Have you noted any key assumptions (conditions outside your control for success) and how MEL might detect if they don't hold? Also, have you identified risks to the MEL process itself (as in the section above) and included contingency plans?

- **Review of MEL Plan:** Has the MEL plan been reviewed and agreed upon by project management and, if possible, an MEL expert or advisor? (A second look can ensure it's realistic and robust.)

- **Cross-Reference with Other Plans:** Does the MEL plan dovetail with your stakeholder engagement/communication plan (so that results are communicated appropriately)? Does it link with any sector-specific guidelines you need to follow (e.g. government indicators or UN SDG metrics, if relevant)?

- **Glossary/Definitions Available:** If handing over to new team members or partners, is there a glossary or clear definitions for MEL terms and indicators used (to prevent confusion)? Common understanding is key.

- **Ready for Implementation:** Do all team members know the MEL plan and their role in it? (Consider a kickoff or training session to go over MEL once everything is set.) Are data collection tools printed/prepared and tested? Are any needed permissions (for surveys, etc.) obtained?

Use this checklist at the start of a project and revisit it periodically (e.g. annual MEL review) to ensure nothing falls through the cracks. It serves as a practical reminder of the components of a solid MEL system. If you can tick most of these off, you are well on your way to executing effective monitoring, evaluation, and learning.

Glossary

Baseline: The starting value of an indicator before an intervention begins. Baseline data represents the initial conditions against which future changes (due to the project) can be compared. For example, if an education project aims to improve literacy rates, the baseline might be "60% of students could read at grade level at project start."

Indicator: A specific, observable, and measurable statistic or parameter that signals progress (or lack thereof) toward an outcome. Indicators can be quantitative (numeric values, like income level, percentage of people with access to clean water) or qualitative (based on categories or ratings, like level of satisfaction). They operationalize abstract concepts (like "improved health") into concrete measures (e.g. "# of clinic visits per child per year").

Monitoring: The continuous or regular process of collecting data on specified indicators to check progress of a project or program. Monitoring focuses on tracking activities, outputs, and intermediate results during implementation, with the purpose of ensuring things are going as planned and identifying any need for adjustments. It asks "Are we doing what we said we would do, on schedule and budget?" [25] . Monitoring is typically an internal management activity and provides real-time feedback.

Evaluation: A systematic assessment of a completed project or program (or a phase of it) to determine its effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability relative to its objectives. Evaluations are less frequent than monitoring – often mid-term and end-term – and aim to answer higher-level questions like "Did the project achieve its outcomes? Why or why not? What has been the overall impact?" Evaluations can be *formative* (to inform improvements during implementation) or *summative* (to judge the overall success after completion). They often involve more in-depth methods (surveys, interviews, comparisons) and may be conducted by external experts for objectivity [2].

Learning (in MEL): The component of MEL focused on reflecting on data and experiences to derive insights and improvements. Learning means using the information gathered from monitoring and evaluation to change thinking or actions going forward [3]. It is the practice of asking “What does this evidence mean, and how can we do better?” Learning can happen through formal mechanisms (workshops, reports) or informally (team discussions). In an organizational context, becoming a “learning organization” means creating an environment where staff continuously seek to understand what works and doesn’t, and adapt accordingly [26] [27].

Outputs: The immediate, concrete products or deliverables of project activities – typically things directly under the project’s control. Outputs are usually countable items or direct results, such as number of people trained, wells built, workshops conducted, or pamphlets distributed. They are necessary accomplishments on the way to outcomes, but by themselves may not signify change in well-being. (Compare with *Outcomes*, which are the changes resulting from these outputs.)

Outcomes: The short- to medium-term changes that occur as a result of the project’s outputs. Outcomes are usually changes in behavior, knowledge, skills, or status of beneficiaries. They answer “what difference did the outputs make?” For instance, an outcome might be that farmers adopt new agricultural practices (due to training outputs), or youths gain employment (due to a job skills program’s outputs). Outcomes are what the project ultimately strives for and are often what’s measured to evaluate success.

Impact: The broader, long-term changes to society or systems that a project contributes to. Impacts often correspond to the project’s ultimate goal or higher-order development objectives, and they can be positive or negative, intended or unintended. Examples: improved quality of life, reduced disease prevalence, poverty reduction in a region. Impacts typically happen beyond the project’s direct sphere (often after the project ends or at population level) and can be hard to attribute solely to one intervention. In results frameworks, “impact” is the highest-level result, supported by outcomes. (Sometimes “impact” is used more loosely to mean any significant change achieved – but in MEL it usually refers to long-term change).

Theory of Change (ToC): A conceptual roadmap that explains how and why a desired change is expected to happen in a particular context. It articulates the causal pathways from activities to outputs to outcomes to impact, including assumptions and external factors. A Theory of Change often is depicted as a flowchart or diagram with boxes and arrows linking interventions to outcomes, or as a narrative. In MEL, the ToC provides the foundation for choosing indicators at each level and for evaluating whether the causal assumptions held true. (Cross-ref: see Theory of Change guide for building one; in MEL, you test the ToC’s logic.)

Logical Framework (Logframe): A management tool used to present the key elements of a project – typically in a matrix format – including the project’s goal, outcomes, outputs, activities, and their indicators, means of verification, and assumptions. It’s a structured summary of the project plan and MEL plan. The logframe is often required by donors and is useful for tracking and reporting because it aligns objectives with indicators. (E.g., a simplified logframe row: Outcome: “Improved livelihoods of women” with Indicators: “average income increase, % women employed”, etc.) It’s both a planning and MEL reference document.

KPI (Key Performance Indicator): A metric that is identified as particularly important for gauging performance or success. KPIs are a subset of all indicators – usually the ones that management or stakeholders pay most attention to. They can be at any level (output, outcome) but are "key" in that they indicate overall progress. For instance, an NGO might have a KPI of "number of people lifted out of poverty" or "graduation rate of program participants" which gives a quick sense of impact. KPIs are often used in dashboards and high-level reporting to summarize performance in a digestible way.

Qualitative Data: Non-numerical information that captures qualities, opinions, or experiences. In MEL, qualitative data might come from interviews, focus groups, case studies, observations, or open-ended survey questions. It provides context, depth, and understanding of the "why" and "how" behind results. Examples: testimonies of beneficiaries, descriptions of community dynamics, reasons given for behavior change. Qualitative data is analyzed through categorization of themes or narratives. It complements quantitative data by explaining trends or uncovering outcomes that numbers alone can't.

Quantitative Data: Numerical information that can be measured and analyzed statistically. This includes counts, percentages, rates, and other metrics. In MEL, quantitative data might be collected through surveys (e.g. % of respondents who have a certain knowledge), service records (e.g. number of clinic visits), or sensors (e.g. rainfall measured, etc.). It allows for tracking changes over time in a comparable way and can be visualized in charts or graphs. Quantitative data answers "how many, how much, how often." Both quantitative and qualitative data are important – quantitative shows *extent* of change, qualitative sheds light on *nature* of change.

Participatory M&E: An approach to monitoring and evaluation in which stakeholders (especially program participants or community members) are actively involved in the MEL process, rather than just being subjects of data collection. This could mean community members help define what success means, choose indicators, collect data themselves, or jointly analyze findings. Participatory M&E empowers those affected by the project to have a say in judging its performance. It can increase buy-in, relevance, and accuracy of data (people may share more openly in peer-led discussions). However, it requires more time and facilitation. It shifts MEL from an extractive process to a collaborative one [13].

Formative Evaluation: An evaluation conducted during project implementation (midway or at a pilot stage) with the purpose of providing feedback to improve the project. It's "evaluation for learning/improvement." Formative evaluations help identify what is working or not and recommend adjustments while there is still time to implement changes. For example, a mid-term review that suggests course corrections is formative.

Summative Evaluation: An evaluation conducted at the end of a project or program to assess its overall effectiveness and outcomes. It's "evaluation for accountability/judgment," often determining if objectives were met and what the overall impact was. Summative evaluations inform decisions like whether to scale up, replicate, or fund similar projects in the future. They tend to be more comprehensive and conclude the project's MEL cycle with conclusions and lessons learned.

Adaptive Management: A project management approach that uses MEL data to continuously adapt strategies and activities in response to what is learned. Instead of sticking rigidly to an original plan, adaptive management iteratively adjusts the project design based on feedback and changing context (learning by doing). It requires a strong MEL system to provide timely information and the flexibility to change course. In practice, this could mean modifying target activities, shifting resources, or even redefining outcomes as new insights emerge, all grounded in evidence from MEL.

Downward Accountability: Accountability towards the people an NGO serves (beneficiaries, local communities), as opposed to *upward accountability* to donors or authorities. In MEL, downward accountability means sharing information with and being answerable to the participants and communities for the project's progress and results. It involves transparency at the local level and mechanisms for community feedback or grievance redress. Ensuring MEL includes downward accountability can build trust and legitimacy, as communities see that the NGO is committed to delivering results that matter to them and hears their voice [23].

This glossary covers common terms you'll encounter in MEL. Understanding these will help in reading donor guidelines, MEL reports, or discussing plans with colleagues and evaluators. If you come across other jargon, refer to resources like OECD's Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation or BetterEvaluation's glossary for clarity. Remember that some organizations use terms slightly differently (e.g. "impact" in casual use vs. technical use), so always ensure definitions are agreed upon in your team.

References

Bond MEL Working Group Steering Committee. (2024, September 10). *Organisational level monitoring, evaluation and learning – what works and what doesn't*. Bond. [4] [24]

Coger, T., Corry, S., & Gregorowski, R. (2021). *Reshaping Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning for Locally Led Adaptation*. World Resources Institute (WRI) Working Paper. [23]

Development Gateway/EPAR. (2016, March 25). *What Systems and Processes Do Donors Use for Measuring Aid Effectiveness?* Development Gateway: Results Data blog. [7] [22]

Garbutt, A. (2022). *Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning: A toolkit for small NGOs*. INTRAC. (Toolkit document)

Int'l Development Alliance (Scotland). (2023). *Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Guide*. Scottish Int. Dev. Alliance. [1] [28]

Lopez Peralta, C. (2019, September 6). *5 reasons why monitoring & evaluation is good for NGOs*. TolaData Blog. [29] [30]

Pasanen, T. (2017, December 14). *Monitoring and evaluation: five reality checks for adaptive management*. ODI. [8]

Sheth, U. (2019, October 7). *Monitoring and Evaluation Challenges in the Nonprofit Sector*. Sopact Blog – Perspectives. [21]

Social Impact. (2023, April 12). *The Case for Locally Led MEL: Important Lessons from Third-Party Monitoring*. (Authors: C. Thompson & J. Mandel). Social Impact Insights blog. [13]

Soken-Huberty, E. (n.d.). *10 Reasons Why Monitoring and Evaluation is Important*. tools4dev.org. [31] [32]

Scott, R. et al. (2014). *Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector*. KPMG International. (Survey report) [11]

Babies and Mothers Alive (BAMA) Foundation – Instagram post (2022) and PMC article (2022) emphasizing significance of MEL in BAMA's programs [33] .

(Additional sources for definitions and examples include: USAID Learning Lab materials, OECD DAC Evaluation Glossary, and BetterEvaluation resources.)

Word Count: 4,543

---

1 2 3 14 15 28 intdevalliance.scot
https://intdevalliance.scot/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/MEL_Support_Package_4th_June.pdf

4 18 20 24 Organisational level monitoring, evaluation and learning – what works and what doesn't | Bond
https://www.bond.org.uk/news/2024/09/organisational-level-mel-what-works-and-what-doesnt/

5 6 5 Ways Monitoring and Evaluation Helps NGOs Succeed - IndicataGo
https://indicatago.com/2025/01/16/5-ways-monitoring-and-evaluation-helps-ngos-succeed/

7 22 What Systems and Processes Do Donors Use for Measuring Aid Effectiveness? – Development Gateway: An IREX Venture – Data and digital solutions for international development.
https://developmentgateway.org/blog/what-systems-and-processes-do-donors-use-measuring-aid-effectiveness/

8 Monitoring and evaluation: five reality checks for adaptive management | ODI: Think change
https://odi.org/en/insights/monitoring-and-evaluation-five-reality-checks-for-adaptive-management/

9 10 Why Development Projects Fail - an Internal Perspective - Arqaam
https://www.arqaam.org/2022/10/20/discover-some-of-the-internal-reasons-development-projects-fail/

11 [PDF] Monitoring and Evaluation in the Development Sector
https://assets.kpmg.com/content/dam/kpmg/pdf/2014/09/2014-survey-monitoring-evaluation-v4.pdf

12 Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework template - tools4dev
https://tools4dev.org/resources/me-framework-template/

13 The Case for Locally Led MEL: Important Lessons from Third-Party Monitoring - Social Impact
https://socialimpact.com/the-case-for-locally-led-mel/

16 [DOC] MEL-Plan-Template.docx
https://preparecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/MEL-Plan-Template.docx

17 [PDF] Step 2.2 Monitoring Evaluation & Learning (MEL) Plan - Panda.org
https://wwfint.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/2-2-monitoring-evaluation-learning-vjan2024.pdf

19 Data with Purpose: A MERL Story
https://www.athenainfonomics.com/blog-posts/data-with-purpose-a-mel-story

21 Monitoring and evaluation challenges | Sopact Perspective
https://www.sopact.com/perspectives/monitoring-and-evaluation-challenges

23 Reshaping Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning for Locally Led Adaptation | World Resources Institute
https://publications.wri.org/reshaping-locally-led-adaptation

25 26 27 03 MEL Toolkit
https://www.intrac.org/app/uploads/2024/12/BA-MEL-Toolkit.pdf

29 30 5 reasons why monitoring & evaluation is good for NGOs - TolaData
https://www.toladata.com/blog/why-is-monitoring-evaluation-good-for-ngos/

31 32 10 Reasons Why Monitoring and Evaluation is Important - tools4dev
https://tools4dev.org/blog/why-monitoring-and-evaluation-is-important/

33 Monitoring, evaluation, and learning: the key to building effective ...
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11339870/