Tools for Designing and Conducting Social and Behavior Change Evaluations

About USAID Advancing Nutrition

USAID Advancing Nutrition is the Agency's flagship multi-sectoral nutrition project, led by JSI Research & Training Institute, Inc. (JSI), and a diverse group of experienced partners. Launched in September 2018, USAID Advancing Nutrition implements nutrition interventions across sectors and disciplines for USAID and its partners. The project's multi-sectoral approach draws together global nutrition experience to design, implement, and evaluate programs that address the root causes of malnutrition. Committed to using a systems approach, USAID Advancing Nutrition strives to sustain positive outcomes by building local capacity, supporting behavior change, and strengthening the enabling environment to save lives, improve health, build resilience, increase economic productivity, and advance development.

Disclaimer

Recommended Citation

Photo Credit: Karen Kasmauski/MCSP. Nurse Jeidy gives a cooking demonstration to Graciela Mendez Escalante, who is with her baby Maribel Perez in Guatemala.

USAID Advancing Nutrition

JSI Research & Training Institute, Inc.

2733 Crystal Drive

4th Floor

Arlington, VA 22202

Phone: 703–528–7474

Email: info@advancingnutrition.org

Web: advancingnutrition.org

Contents

Acronyms

ANC   antenatal care

ASF   animal source food

IYCF   infant and young child feeding

IP   implementing partner

JSI   John Snow Research & Training Institute, Inc.

MDD   minimum dietary diversity

MEL   monitoring evaluation and learning

RFP   request for proposal

SBC   social and behavior change

SOP   standard operating procedures

SOW   statement of work

USAID   United States Agency for International Development

WRA   women of reproductive age

Introduction

Social and behavior change (SBC) is a key component of effective multi-sectoral nutrition activities. High-quality evaluations of SBC components are essential to identifying what went well, what could have been done differently, and how to improve future program design. The tools included here accompany *Evaluating Social and Behavior Change Components of Nutrition Activities: A Design Guide for USAID Staff* and *Measuring Social and Behavior Change in Nutrition Programs: A Guide for Evaluators.* They provide additional support on topics such as how to develop an evaluation statement of work (SOW) and how to determine the most appropriate respondent(s) for a given activity. The table below provides an overview of each tool.

Overview			
Tool	**Description**	**Audience**	**Corresponding SBC Evaluations Guidance**
Sample Evaluation Statement of Work (SOW) for Nutrition Social and Behavior Change (SBC)	Outlines a sample evaluation SOW for an evaluation team lead and adds annotations on why USAID evaluation designers should include specific information and where they can find it. Includes sample text that USAID staff can adapt and include in their SOWs.	USAID	Designing
Illustrative Question Support Case Study	Describes how USAID evaluation designers can identify, build, and refine relevant evaluation questions and select methods to measure nutrition social and behavior change through a case study.	USAID	Designing
Choosing Respondents	Supports evaluation teams to determine the most appropriate respondent(s) considering the behavior(s) being encouraged and evaluated in light of common evaluation constraints.	Implementing partners (IPs)	Conducting

Tools 1 and 2: Sample Evaluation Statements of Work and Illustrative Questions

These tools show how to develop an evaluation statement of work (SOW) and evaluation questions to guide evaluation design. Tool 1 provides a framework for drafting an SOW. Each section of the framework outlines considerations to support SBC adaptations and includes sample language that USAID staff can adapt to reflect the specifics of the evaluation being proposed. Tool 2 consists of three illustrative nutrition SBC activity examples and related evaluation questions.

These tools accompany the guide *Evaluating Social and Behavior Change Components of Nutrition Activities: A Design Guide for USAID Staff*, which helps USAID staff 1) plan an evaluation (including suggestions for relevant program documents and how to select evaluation team leaders), 2) identify evaluation objectives, and 3) build a statement of work for an evaluation team seeking to review an activity that uses SBC to improve multi-sectoral nutrition outcomes.

Tool 1: Sample Evaluation SOW: Integrating SBC into Evaluations

Purpose and Use of the Evaluation

The purpose and use of the evaluation section(s) of the SOW includes a summary of the goals and desired outcomes from the evaluation. In this section, it is important for you (i.e., designers) to describe desired SBC outcomes as they are appropriate to the evaluation. Those outcomes would be copied from the results framework or other program design documents. SBC outcomes often include an increase in nutrition behaviors (e.g., the number of women (or infants) breastfeeding, the number of children consuming a diverse diet, etc.).

Sample Language

The purpose of this [Insert Evaluation Type: Performance, Process, Cost-Effectiveness or Sustainability] evaluation is to examine the [Activity Name]'s implementation to date, including [depending on evaluation question selected: how well the SBC components of the Activity's work plan are being implemented; the quality of the SBC processes used; whether expected results are occurring or are likely to occur; etc.]. [Insert: Activity Name] is being implemented by [Insert Implementing Organizations] with funding from [Insert Bureau funding the evaluation]. The findings and programmatic aspects of recommendations from the evaluation will provide feedback to [Insert Implementing Organization] and its partners to—

- highlight areas of success

- identify shortages in inputs, processes, output, and outcomes

- adapt implementation for [reference to time remaining in activity implementation or future activities] and potential opportunities for scale-up.

Activity Background

A. Problem, Region of Focus, Theory of Change, and Interventions

This section of the SOW frames the programmatic context and explains how the activity will address known challenges and the changes that are expected as a result of addressing the challenges. In evaluations of SBC in nutrition activities, this section includes prioritized behaviors, factors, and activities. Use the theory of change (or results framework) and the SBC strategy documents to extract information that helps the potential evaluation team understand these critical components of SBC and how they relate to the problem and theory of change. These components will also determine which stakeholders you need to engage to plan for the evaluation. Consider whether SBC is an active component of one or multiple activity outcomes. (Subsections A and B can be combined, as appropriate).

Sample Language (can be provided in written form or as a graphic):

This activity is seeking to address the problem of *[XXX]* and achieve the goal of *[XXX]*. The desired outcomes of this activity are *[XXX]*, the sub-outcomes are *[XXX]*, and the strategies implemented to achieve these outcomes are [XXX; there can be SBC in one outcome or strategy or in all outcomes or strategies]. The socio-ecological model level guiding the activity's implementation is the following: Departmental/National Level (national-level policies, frameworks, networks); Community Level

---

(community-wide activities); Interpersonal (dealing with relationships with family, coworkers, community members, and peers); Individual (interventions aimed at reaching individuals).

Example: Minimum dietary diversity (MDD) in children 6-23 months

This activity is seeking to address the problem of insufficient animal source food consumption among children 12-23 months in Rwanda. The desired outcomes of this activity are to increase the number of children between 12-23 months of age who receive food from five or more food groups in the previous 24 hours. The strategies implemented to achieve this outcome are developing materials and guidance to increase the agency and skills of caregivers to preserve food for children and implementing hands-on-practice through peer support groups for caregivers. The socio-ecological model level guiding the activity's implementation are the following: community, interpersonal, and individual.

B. Results and Indicator Framework

The activity's monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) plan will contain key information on the current indicators that the program is monitoring, such as definitions, data sources, data reporting frequency, and relevant targets. It helps evaluators understand the program's outputs, outcomes, impact, and data availability. If deemed necessary, work with the implementing partner to determine if any relevant SBC indicators are being used. Consider flagging them for the evaluation team, to increase the likelihood of use.

C. Activity History

Outline the history of the activity to date, including the design and awarding process, start-up, and implementation. Include details on the SBC components of the activity wherever appropriate, as the rate at which behaviors change is affected by the point-in time and length of implementation.

Evaluation Design

A. Questions

The evaluation questions are based on the desired evaluation type and results framework or theory of change, and guide the design and methodology for the full evaluation activity. They can be listed as primary and sub-questions. Consider the following guidelines to determine the number of **SBC-focused evaluation questions** that you should include in the SOW.

- One SBC question if the evaluation is part of a larger multi-sectoral nutrition activity

- Three to four SBC questions for the evaluation of an activity focused on social and behavior change

Overall, the evaluation questions should align with the activity's impact pathway, results framework or theory of change, be focused on the activity's identified priority behavior(s), and be feasible given the evaluation design. After you have determined the evaluation questions, revisit the activity's nutrition SBC monitoring indicators to see if any need to be added or revised based on and for the scope and type of evaluation designed. Refer to the USAID Advancing Nutrition Evaluation Planning Tool for USAID Nutrition Programs and Evaluating SBC Components of Nutrition Activities: A Design Guide for USAID Staff.

Table 1: Illustrative Nutrition SBC Evaluation Questions from Evaluating SBC Components of Nutrition Activities: A Design Guide for USAID Staff

Type of Evaluation Illustrative	Overarching Question to Keep in Mind	Nutrition SBC Evaluation Questions
Performance or Outcome Conducted during and/or after activity implementation, or only after activity implementation.	• Did the activity achieve its intended behavior change outcome? Alternatively, to what degree did the activity achieve its intended outcomes?	1. To what degree did the activity achieve its intended behavior change outcomes in households? 2. What youth behaviors changed in the focused districts that could be due to the SBC approaches? 3. What behaviors did the participating households change that could be due to the caregivers' participation in the activity's Care Group? 4. To what degree have the global complementary feeding behaviors been adopted?
Process Evaluation Conducted during activity implementation	• Is the activity being implemented as originally planned? • Is the activity making any adaptations during implementation? • How well are the activity's processes working? • How can processes be improved?	1. To what extent has the activity's SBC strategy been implemented? 2. To what extent was the activity implemented following the causal pathways between behaviors, factors, influencers, and activities? 3. To what extent is the activity monitoring prioritized factors and behavior changes? 4. To what degree were the activity's SBC processes focused on the identified prioritized behaviors? 5. To what extent were the formative research findings used to guide SBC activity design and implementation? 6. What role did audience segmentation play in the success

Type of Evaluation Illustrative	Overarching Question to Keep in Mind	Nutrition SBC Evaluation Questions
		or shortcomings of the SBC approach(es)? 7. To what extent were the activity's approaches accessible in the identified districts? 8. To what extent did the activity affect factors? What factors appear to promote or deter the prioritized behavior changes?
Impact Evaluation Conducted during activity implementation (pre-post measurements)	• To what extent is the behavior change a result of the activity?	1. What impact did the activity's training package have on household dietary diversity? 2. What impact did the activity's approaches have on the uptake of the prioritized small doable actions to increase complementary feeding? 3. What impact did the activity's behavior change messaging have on the activity participants' knowledge, attitudes, and practices related to the prioritized behaviors?
Cost-Effectiveness Evaluation Conducted before, during, and/ or after activity implementation	• Which activity approach is more cost-effective? • What were the activity costs and behavior change outcomes before and after the implementation of the activity, compared with those of other similar activities? • What would be the cost of scaling up the activity?	1. What was the cost per person reached with the activity's Care Group? 2. What would be the cost of expanding the activity's infant and young child feeding (IYCF) counseling approaches to nearby districts? 3. Was the activity cost-effective in increasing the prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding in infants under 6 months?
Sustainability Evaluation Conducted at the end of an activity or after an	Activity Sustainability: • Will or has the activity continue(d) after external funding has ended?	1. After the activity ended, did the activity's intended behavior change continue in households?

Type of Evaluation Illustrative	Overarching Question to Keep in Mind	Nutrition SBC Evaluation Questions
activity has ended (e.g., two or five years later)	Sustained Outcomes: • Will the activity outcomes be maintained without activity inputs? • Were the activity outcomes maintained?	a. To what degree is the intended behavior change still occurring? 2. Did the Care Groups continue after the activity ended? a. What is the quality of the continuing Care Groups?

B. Methodology (including data analysis)

The scope of an evaluation of activities using SBC depends on various factors, including budget allocated to the evaluation, size of the SBC work relative to the other elements of the activity, time allocated to the evaluation, and availability of needed data. Together, the purpose and scope of the evaluation will help determine the most appropriate evaluation design.

Sample Language for a Request for Proposal (RFP)

The contractor/evaluation team will be responsible for developing an evaluation strategy and methodologies that include a mix of qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis. Most importantly, the selection of the methodology should be aligned with the evaluation type and evaluation questions listed above. The offeror should speak directly to the SBC-specific evaluation objectives and questions in the RFP. The offeror should also demonstrate understanding of the activity's prioritized behaviors, factors and the activities being used to address and influence them. The offeror should present an evaluation questions matrix showing the source of data, method of data collection, and data analysis methods for each of the evaluation questions. The winning offeror/evaluation team will have available for their analysis (including any analysis or interpretation needed for SBC data) a variety of program implementation documents and reports, as well as interviews with project staff and stakeholders. Methodology strengths and weaknesses should be identified and discussed, as well as measures taken to address those weaknesses.

C. Key Documents for Review; Key Stakeholders to Be Consulted

Identify activity documents that outline the impact pathways chosen to improve the prioritized behavior, e.g., SBC strategies or communication plans, behavior pathways, and reports from formative research. (See annex 7 in Evaluating Social and Behavior Change Components of Nutrition Activities: A Design Guide for USAID Staff for a list of possible SBC documents to include).

USAID staff should consult external and internal stakeholders when drafting an SOW for the evaluation of a nutrition SBC program.

- **External stakeholders** are people who are not directly participating in a program's implementation activities, but may have a vested interest in the program's achievements. Stakeholders could include government/ministry officials, national working groups, or other subject matter experts.

- **Internal stakeholders** are people who are directly responsible for or are contributing to the program's implementation activities (including implementing partners). Implementing partners may be consulted to understand the perspectives of an array of internal stakeholders. Especially for process evaluations, consider consulting these groups: activity's SBC team, MEL team, finance teams, senior management, and USAID staff, etc.

D. Evaluation Schedule/Timeline

1. **Activity Design/Start-Up:** Determine scope and design of the evaluation; build possible evaluation questions.

2. **Early Activity Implementation:** Select midterm evaluation team; collect baseline data.

3. **Refinement of Evaluation Question:** Refine evaluation question(s); select evaluation team; conduct midterm evaluation; disseminate findings.

4. **Activity Closeout:** Refine evaluation question(s); conduct final evaluation; disseminate findings.

E. Evaluation Team Requirements

At least one member of the team should be well-versed in SBC, particularly in SBC for nutrition. The [Defining Social and Behavior Change Competencies for Multi-Sectoral Nutrition](#) tool offers a list of competencies that USAID staff can include in the evaluation SOW.

F. Selection Criteria

Selection criteria, or evaluation criteria/factors, should include considerations for evaluating SBC components. To support this, include a rubric outlining the different components of the proposal to be evaluated and incorporate a point-based evaluation of those criteria. The points-based rubric ideally would include 5-10 points for "approach to evaluating SBC components."

Tool 2: Case Studies for Identifying Evaluation Questions and Appropriate Methodologies

For any activity evaluation, the evaluation questions guide the evaluation design. Based on the desired evaluation purpose, USAID staff seeking to plan an evaluation can identify what they are most interested in knowing and learning about an activity. Evaluations are carried out through a variety of methods, depending on the specific evaluation questions and the type of evaluation (table 1).

USAID activities use social and behavior change (SBC) to improve nutrition outcomes. In large, complex nutrition activities, SBC may be the focus of one outcome, or it may be used as an underpinning strategy to achieve several outcomes. Understanding how SBC is positioned in the nutrition activity and which behaviors (specific actions that are practiced by a specific person at a specific time) are being promoted, to whom, and how is the first step in planning for an evaluation. Those responsible for developing the evaluation should determine its purpose, scope, design, and key questions at the beginning of activity implementation.

Table 1: Types of Evaluation Methods

Type of Evaluation	Overarching Question(s) to Keep in Mind
Performance or Outcome Conducted during and/or after activity implementation, or only after activity implementation	Did the activity achieve its intended behavior change outcomes? Alternatively, to what degree did the activity achieve its intended behavior change for each behavioral outcome?
Process Evaluation Conducted during activity implementation	• Is the activity being implemented as originally planned? • Is the activity making any adaptations during implementation? • How well are the activity's processes working? • How can processes be improved?
Impact Evaluation Conducted during activity implementation (pre-post measurements)	• To what extent is the intended behavior change a result of the activity?
Cost-Effectiveness Evaluation Conducted before, during, and/or after activity implementation	• Which activity approach is more cost-effective? • What were the activity costs and behavior change outcomes before and after the implementation of the activity, compared with those of other similar activities? • What would be the cost of scaling up the activity?
Sustainability Evaluation Conducted at the end of an activity or after an activity has ended (e.g., two or five years later)	Activity Sustainability: • Will or has the activity continue(d) after external funding has ended?

Type of Evaluation	Overarching Question(s) to Keep in Mind
	Sustained Outcomes: • Will the activity outcomes be maintained without activity inputs? • Were the activity outcomes maintained?

Below we present three brief illustrative activity examples with descriptions of their overall objectives, main areas of focus, and illustrative reasons an evaluation is needed. Also included is guidance for identifying evaluation questions based on the type of evaluation needed.

Illustrative Activity #1

The overall goal of this activity is to improve the nutritional status of children by improving minimum dietary diversity in children 6-23 months. The activity has prioritized the behavior of caregivers feeding diverse foods, such as animal source foods and fruits and vegetables, in meals and snacks during the day to children 6-23 months. We are interested in learning 1) if the activity is on track to achieve its expected results (increasing minimum diet diversity (MDD) and 2) if the activity is effectively addressing relevant factors that contribute to children achieving MDD.

Table 2. Questions: Illustrative Activity #1

Proposed Outcomes/Behavior Changes	Activity Strategies	Type of Evaluation Needed	Illustrative Evaluation Questions
Increasing MDD in children 6-23 months through the prioritized behavior of caregivers offering children 6-23 months diverse, nutrient-rich foods in meals and snacks during the day	• Developing materials and guidance to increase the agency and skills caregivers to preserve food for children • Implementing hands-on-practice through peer support groups for caregivers	Performance evaluation	1. To what extent has the activity increased minimum dietary diversity among children 6-23 months of age? 2. To what degree has the activity increased access to diverse nutrient rich foods year round? a. To what extent has the activity addressed factors that have an impact on MDD? Are there factors that the activity is not addressing that are impeding the improvement of MDD? 3. Has the priority behavior changed that could be contributed to the caregivers participating in the peer group sessions?

Illustrative Activity #2

The overall goal of this activity is to improve the nutritional status of children under two years of age by focusing on improving caregivers' behaviors related to preparing and feeding food hygienically. The activity has prioritized the behaviors of caregivers using water from an improved source for cooking and caregivers washing their hands and the child's hands with soap prior to eating. We are interested in learning if the activity improved caregivers' behaviors related to preparing and feeding food hygienically. We also want to know if the activity increased the accessibility of improved water sources in the community and caregivers' understanding of the need for hygienic hand washing and food preparation practices.

Table 3. Questions: Illustrative Activity #2

Proposed Outcomes/Behavior Changes	Activity Strategies	Type of Evaluation Needed	Illustrative Evaluation Questions

Improving access to improved water sources and hygiene products in the community and shifting caregiver norms of hygienic hand washing and food preparation practices	• Supporting community initiatives
	
	• Strengthening the capacity of health providers
	
	• Provide reminders/improved handwashing facilities with caregivers to improve hygiene
		Impact evaluation	I. What impact has the activity had on preparing and feeding food hygienically?
			
			  a. What impact has the activity had on increasing the accessibility of improved water sources?
			
			  b. What impact has the activity had on shifting caregivers' norms of hygienic hand washing and food preparation practices?

Illustrative Activity #3

The overall goal of this activity is to improve the nutritional status of women of reproductive age (WRA) by focusing on improving women's dietary diversity. The activity has prioritized the behavior of women limiting highly processed, non-nutrient-rich foods and sugary drinks. We are interested in learning 1) if the activity is being implemented as originally planned, 2) what progress the activity has made toward its goal(s), 3) what approaches the activity implemented that were successful, 4) what challenges the activity faced, and 5) what processes/approaches can be improved for the activity to effectively achieve its goals.

Table 4. Questions: Illustrative Activity #3

Proposed Outcomes/Behavior Changes	Activity Strategies	Type of Evaluation Needed	Illustrative Evaluation Questions
Improving the dietary diversity of WRA through the prioritized behavior of women	• Supporting private sector engagement	Process evaluation	I. To what extent was the activity implemented following the causal pathways among

Proposed Outcomes/Behavior Changes	Activity Strategies	Type of Evaluation Needed	Illustrative Evaluation Questions

limiting highly processed, non–nutrient-rich foods and sugary drinks	• Strengthening the capacity of health service providers
	
	• Supporting local policymakers to enact and enforce social protection measures
	
	• Implementing a targeted multimedia campaign and leveraging existing community networks
	
	• Implementing women's groups
			behaviors, factors, influencers, and activities?
			
			2. To what degrees were the activity's strategies focused on the identified prioritized behavior?
			
			3. To what extent has the activity affected the minimum dietary diversity of WRA?
			
			   a. What processes/approaches have been successful?
			
			   b. What challenges has the activity faced in improving the minimum dietary diversity of WRA?

Tool 3: How to Choose Respondents and Other Sources of Data

Purpose of This Tool

This tool, which accompanies the guide [Measuring Social and Behavior Change in Nutrition Programs: A Guide for Evaluators,](#) helps evaluation teams determine the most appropriate respondent(s) for a given activity, taking into consideration the evaluation questions, common evaluation constraints, and behaviors being promoted. Although caregivers and pregnant and lactating women are often the focus of SBC activities, it is important to note that they should not be the only option when determining respondents, due to the influence that other people and systems have on their behavior.

Four Considerations

1. Full Range of Possible Respondents in SBC Programming

In a perfect evaluation scenario with no constraints, SBC evaluators would include people from each of the following categories in their respondent groups, as guided by the evaluation question:

- **Actor*** - Person practicing the behavior.

- **Influencers*** - An influencer is a person who inspires or guides the action of others. The influencer drives the actor's likelihood to perform behaviors effectively. Respondents could include other household members, peers, community members/leaders, service providers, community health workers/volunteers, market vendors, farmers, etc.

- **Internal Stakeholders -** People who are directly responsible for or contributing to a program's implementation activities.

  — Especially for process evaluations, consider these groups: the activity's SBC team, MEL team, finance teams, senior management, and USAID staff, etc.

- **External Stakeholders** - People not directly a part of a program's implementation activities, but may have a vested interest in the program's achievements. Respondents could include government/ministry officials, national working groups, or other subject matter experts.

*Within the primary and supporting actor respondent groups, it may be appropriate to sample from groups of people with similar characteristics.

SBC programs may use a process called **segmentation** to segment participants or audiences (actors) by similar needs, values, attitudes, or characteristics. As you consider which actors to include in the evaluation, be sure to understand how the programmers have used segments to inform your choice. Representation from one segment may be a more appropriate respondent group than from another segment. If there are available resources, consider reviewing multiple segments.

2. Understanding of Relevant Nutrition Behaviors and Which Respondents Are Most Appropriate

Use the SBC materials available to you to determine which behaviors are being promoted <u>and</u> should be included in the evaluation. The figure below outlines two tiers of possible respondents. The tiers help mitigate constraints that may be faced in step 3. Note that the respondents included here are illustrative and not conclusive. [Behavioral data shows that they are commonly represented globally.](#) Links to the

behavior profiles are included below. Use them alongside program documents to ensure that you have selected the right respondents for the context.

Figure 1. Possible Respondents

Tier 1 Possible Respondents (Best):

Includes the **actor, influencers**, and suggestions for observations (as appropriate). The combination of these three sources of data will allow the evaluation team to triangulate the information received and increase data validity and reliability.

Tier 2 Possible Respondents (Better):

Includes the **actor**, who will often self-report. To triangulate self-reported data, include one additional source, as possible.

Common Prioritized Behavior		Tier 1 Respondents	Tier 2 Respondents
	Pregnant women complete a full course of quality antenatal care	Pregnant woman, health service provider, patient record review, observation of ANC visits	Pregnant women AND patient record review
	Mothers initiate breastfeeding within one hour after delivery	Mother (via observation at time of delivery) AND caregivers (via survey), obstetrician, review obstetrician SOP	Caregiver AND observation
	Mothers breastfeed exclusively for 6 months after birth	Mother (via survey), mother (via observation), father, and grandmother	Mother AND grandmother
	Caregivers feed children 6-23 months one animal source food (ASF) daily	Caregivers, ASF producers, household members, and market observations	Caregiver AND household member
	Caregivers regularly seek information about childrens' growth	Caregivers/community health workers/health care providers, patient record review	Caregiver AND community health worker

3. Evaluation Questions

Table 2. Evaluation Questions

Type of Evaluation	Overarching Question to Keep in Mind	Key Respondents*
Performance or Outcome Conducted during and/or after activity implementation, or only after activity implementation	• Did the activity achieve its intended behavior change outcome? Alternatively, to what degree did the activity achieve its intended outcomes?	• Actors • influencer • Community members (even if not a part of the program)
Process Evaluation Conducted during activity implementation	• Is the activity being implemented as originally planned? • Is the activity making any adaptations during implementation? • How well are the activity's processes working? • How can processes be improved?	• Internal stakeholders • External stakeholders
Impact Evaluation Conducted during activity implementation (pre-post measurements)	• To what extent is the behavior change a result of the activity?	• Actors • Influencer • Community members (even if not a part of the program)
Cost-Effectiveness Evaluation Conducted before, during, and/or after activity implementation	• Which activity approach is more cost-effective? • What were the activity costs and behavior change outcomes before and after the implementation of the activity, compared with those of other similar activities? • What would be the cost of scaling up the activity?	• Internal stakeholders • External stakeholders
Sustainability Evaluation Conducted at the end of an activity or after an activity has ended (e.g., two or five years later)	Activity Sustainability: • Will or has the activity continue(d) after external funding has ended? Sustained Outcomes: • Will the activity outcomes be maintained without	• Actors • Influencer • Community members (even if not a part of the

Type of Evaluation	Overarching Question to Keep in Mind	Key Respondents*
	activity inputs? • Were the activity outcomes maintained?	program)

*These respondents should be included among others.

4. Evaluation Constraints

- **Resources** (time, funds, staff):

  — <u>If</u> evaluation resources (time, staff, or budget) are limited, <u>then</u> evaluators should prioritize the actor and a small sample of influencers.

  — If the activity has not intentionally identified influencers, include a small sample of internal stakeholders.

  — Consider how developing questions tailored to each respondent group might take extra time, money, and work hours. What is the cost of including them in the evaluation?

- **Bias** (impact of the evaluation on behavior; impact of the team composition on the findings; impact of the design (with cost constraints) on the findings)

- **Cultural sensitivity** (gender, religious sensitivity):

  — When selecting respondents, evaluators should consider power inequities among women, men, girls, and boys at the highest and lowest levels, including policies and programs, as described in the Gender Equality Continuum Tool (PRB 2017).

  — Foster critical examination of inequalities and gender roles, and how those may affect or have affected behavior.

  — Promote the relative position of women, girls, and marginalized groups, including transforming underlying social structures, policies, and social norms (USAID Advancing Nutrition 2022).

USAID Advancing Nutrition is the Agency's flagship multi-sectoral nutrition project, addressing the root causes of malnutrition to save lives and enhance long-term health and development.