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Executive Summary

EvalPartners developed EvalAgenda 2020 (Agenda 2020) through a 15 month international and collaborative process. The vision is that by 2020 “Evaluation has become so embedded in good governance that no policy maker or manager will imagine excluding evaluation from the decision making process.” EvalPartners launched the EvalYouth network with assigned regional leaders of the network along with the 23 YEEs who attended the Global Evaluation Forum in Kathmandu.

EvalYouth split into three different voluntary task forces, to address the mechanisms expected to enable Agenda 2020: 1) enabling environment for evaluation, 2) enhancing institutional capacities, 3) increasing individuals’ capacities for evaluation, and 4) interlinking among these three dimensions. Task Force II focused on developing an international Mentoring Program in order to build individual capacities and supports the growth of the other three dimensions. Task Force I focused on promoting YEEs in VOPE leadership and Task Force III focused on organization of EvalYouth conferences.

In alignment with the EvalYouth strategic agenda for 2016 – 2018, Task Force II’s international Mentoring Program was conceptualized, planned, and implemented between 2016 and 2018. As programming reached the end of its pilot phase in May 2018, Task Force II sought a utilization-focused evaluation that provided data to support recommendations going forward.

The utilization-focused evaluation included a launch meeting, presentation to discuss findings, and a review of the report with an Evaluation Advisory Group composed of Task Force II leaders, members and volunteers. The evaluator conducted Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with two EvalYouth Leaders (one representing EvalPartners and the other EvalYouth), and eight Task Force II members; 22 semi-structured interviews with a randomly selected, stratified group of mentees and mentors; and a post-program satisfaction survey with 77 respondents out of the original 102 participants. The evaluator did a review of data and documents supplied by the Task Force II, including: program materials, curriculum materials (online learning platform), and an evaluation skills and knowledge pre and post survey.

From a high-level perspective, for a pilot phase the Program was successful. In two years, an enthusiastic group of volunteers planned and implemented a Mentoring Program that was broadly:

- **Relevant** to the needs of the international evaluation community. It was built to mechanize a collective evaluation vision, Agenda 2020, and developed using a needs assessment and environmental scan to develop a program. A total of 850 people applied for the program, of whom roughly 750 wanted to be Mentees.

---

- **Efficient** for a pilot phase. Its leadership style allowed members to plan and adapt to challenges as they arose while staying within a low-cost budget of $15,000.

- **Effective** at implementing a Program that addressed most key expected outcomes. For example, 93% (n=75) of participants thought it worthwhile to participate at least once, and increased Mentees’ evaluation capacities and confidence to pursue a career in evaluation.

- **Impacts and Sustainability** need more time before being best assessed. There were nascent indicators of macro and micro level impacts. The program has built up some sustainability: it will continue (at least for two years with now 100 pairs) and the concept of a mentoring program for YEEs is being spread to VOPES.

There were some areas for improvement:

- The Program had a dropout rate of 53% (n=102) of mentees and mentors, with no clear plan of action for how to address this issue except initially selecting more than 50 pairs assuming some mentoring would withdraw for any reason. The dropout rate may seem high at first glance, but less so when one considers the context in which the Program operated. It had two core components: 1) an online curriculum, which guided interactions between Mentor-Mentee pairs. 2) None of the mentors were paid for their time, and the Program is international and virtual. Mentees participated for free. When asked by the evaluator about the reason(s) why they dropped out, participants always referenced personal factors that are external to the Program.

- While generally satisfied with the Program, only 43% (n=39), of surveyed Mentees were satisfied with their mentoring experience. Unfortunately, no Mentees who dropped out participated in the interviews. However, a theme across the mentor and mentee interviews (n=20) was that participants expressed disappointment when expectations (sometimes related to a lack of clarity of what programming entailed) were not met.²

- More could be done to connect participants to further build their professional networks. While participants whose mentor or mentee did not drop out on entry gained at least one connection, few interviewees reported to gain more than that one connection.

**Recommendations** for moving forward focus on a few key concepts:

- As the Program transitions from a pilot phase to a routine phase, it will enter a complex stage of operations. This means some activities will become routine, and some activities will need to be tweaked and alternative solutions need to be tested. The recommendation is to take time to write down and plan routines that can be easily replicated, and to test alternative solutions areas where improvement is needed (addressing dropout rates, increasing connections amongst mentors) rather than put in a routine programming. This evaluation report can support such process with its findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.

---

2 There were a total of 22 interviewees. As this was a theme identified across the interviews, and not the response to a direct question, it is reported here as a number rather than a percentage.
• Incorporate relationship management theories that focus on increasing intrinsic motivation rather than extrinsic motivations to reduce dropout rates and systemizing notification that people dropped out of this voluntary and free program. Examples for implementation tweaks include: after participants have applied and been identified as eligible ask them to reconfirm they want to participate in the program before creating mentor-mentee pairs. Personalize and clarify communications by identifying a person (not a generic email address) as a touch point from the beginning of the program, and provide a way for participants to notify the Program if they leave early. Ask alumni if they would be willing to mentor; re-pair mentees and mentors whose first pair partner dropped out, and, at the very least, connect mentees who have no mentor so they can review the curriculum together (potentially asking an unpaired mentor to mentor more than one).

• Generally, clarify what is possible within this Program for all participants. Celebrate and elevate the importance of gaining knowledge about evaluation, increasing soft skills, connections, and gaining a mentor. Expand on the importance of a holistic view of evaluator capacities, which in addition to technical skills can include reflective skills, management skills, inter-personal skills, and environmental contextual skills. Be clear, this is not a Masters level research analysis class. Some mentees may gain hands-on experiences working with their mentors on projects, but there is much to learn and gain whether or not they receive that opportunity. Enhance the onboarding process by providing additional support for struggling mentors to become acquainted with the online learning platform and an orientation reviewing the roles, responsibility and most importantly frame realistic gains.

• Keep track of and utilize alumni as much as possible to reduce Task Force II’s work load. For example, a few participants suggested creating an alumni network to whom Task Force II could reach out to whenever extra support was needed. Keeping track of alumni further allows Task Force II to follow the impact of building the individual capacity of evaluators on the lives of the individuals and the communities and institutions they work in.

• Continue to expand and engage national and regional VOPES in the concept of mentorship and build collaborative not competitive tracks. Even if there are no dropouts, graduating 100 mentor and Mentee pairs could never compare to having local VOPES internationally replicate the Program.

• Finally, looking across all the recommendations consider time and volunteer effort. The Program is successful in large part because of time dedicated of Task Force II volunteers. Adopt strategies that are possible, and feasible given the time volunteers have available. For example, involve more volunteers and have a clean scope of work for each.
Introduction

Background to the Final Evaluation of the Mentoring Program

Birth of EvalYouth

In September 2014, EvalPartners began a fifteen-month internationally collaborative process to develop the Global Evaluation Agenda 2016 -2020 (Agenda 2020). The Millennial Development Goals period was ending, and the international development world had begun to focus on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Among the many lessons that the international development community learned, two particularly resonated with EvalPartners: (1) leave no one behind and (2) increase the use of data for decision making.

Agenda 2020 envisions that “Evaluation has become so embedded in good governance that no policy maker or manager will imagine excluding evaluation from the decision-making process.” Four essential dimensions were identified as the mechanisms to create this change: 1) enabling environment for evaluation, 2) enhancing institutional capacities, 3) increasing individual capacities for evaluation, and 4) interlinking among these three dimensions.

EvalYouth (EY) was launched at EvalPartner’s 2015 Global Evaluation Forum (GEF) in Kathmandu, Nepal. Its aim is to promote Young and Emerging Evaluators (YEE), including women, to become competent, experienced and well-networked professionals who contribute to evaluation capacity at national, regional and international levels. The key justifications for the prioritization of youth were that the skill for international evaluators is shallow, and demand exceeds supply; young evaluators are underrepresented in many Voluntary Organizations for Professional Evaluators (VOPEs); and finally, that historically young people are underrepresented in the evaluation process and their inclusion is required for the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Twenty-three YEEs who played an active role to help shape Agenda 2020 represented EvalYouth at the forum from the following regions: Africa, Asia, Europe/Eurasia, Latin America, Middle East (MENA), and United States / Canada / Australia. During sessions and activities at GEF, EvalYouth’s 2016-2018 priorities and implementation strategies were established for this

---

4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
7 EvalYouth. (2016). EvalYouth Concept Note: A global network to promote engagement, innovation, and exchange among young and emerging evaluators and youth and young people. Montrosse-Moorehead, B., Gervais, M. & Bitar, K.
new global network. Three task forces (TF) were developed, with a representative on each task force.  

**Development of the International Mentoring Program**

Task Force II (TF2) was tasked with the design of a mentoring program for YEEs in order to achieve Agenda 2020 priority of increasing the individual capacities of evaluators (number three in the list above).  

In alignment with the EvalYouth strategic agenda for 2016 – 2018, Task Force II’s Mentoring Program was conceptualized, planned, and developed between 2016 and 2018. Eighteen energetic YEEs from five global regions volunteered to build the Program. The Program used a needs assessment/environmental scan to identify its strategy, developed a concept note which was submitted to EvalPartners, and then the Program moved forward with recruitment and program implementation. The timeline below shows the external and internal key actions between 2012 and 2018 that led to the launch of EvalYouth and the International Mentoring Program’s pilot phase.

---


9 Ibid.

10 Ibid.
Recruitment and Participation

Mentors and mentees selected from the original 850 applicants were organized in 50 pairs. Criteria for matching pairs included:

- Field of interest,
- Professional interest (health, education, agriculture, international development, public policy, etc.),
- Country of residency,
- Region of work and evaluation interests.\(^{11}\)

In total, 102 mentors and mentees participated in the Program. At the time this evaluation took place, 41 participants had completed the Program, almost evenly split between mentees and mentors.

Mentoring Program Structure

The Mentoring Program provided structured content based on training materials to ensure progress of mentoring, and based on the advice gained from the environmental scan. The Program was drafted by the Task Force II team, a consultant developed the final product, and the EvalYouth leadership reviewed the final curriculum. These were loaded on to an online Learning Management System, hereto called “Moodle.” The Moodle contained six modules:

- **Module 1:** Exploring mentor and mentee experience and an assessment of mentee capacity.
- **Module 2:** Introducing main concepts and principles of monitoring and evaluation principles.
- **Modulo 3:** Evaluation ecosystem: actors, opportunities, skills and methods.
- **Module 4:** Developing professional plans.
- **Module 5:** Developing a one-year timeframe (after the mentoring action plan).
- **Module 6:** Discussing the resources and ideas provided by the mentor and way forward.

The modules were released monthly, and included videos, exercises, reflective questions, and resources such as links and reports.

Evaluation of the Program

As the pilot phase came to an end in mid-May 2018, EvalYouth Task Force II wanted a utilization-focused final evaluation to harvest lessons learned and use findings to improve programming. EvalYouth Task Force II expects to use findings to tweak, refine, and scale programming by the end of 2018.

Evaluation Team

EvalYouth’s Task Force II team hired Natalie De Sole from Rooted-Growth, a third-party evaluation organization, to assess key findings between Mid-June to Mid-July 2018. With ten years as an evaluator, Natalie was familiar with both in-person and online mentoring programs, and had studied stakeholder engagement. She came with an international perspective as a dual citizen of the United States and Italy who grew up in Sub-Saharan Africa until age 14, and had conducted evaluations in both the United States and Sub-Saharan Africa.

Methodology

Approach

This evaluation embraced the utilization-focused evaluation approach developed by Patton and truncated the elaborate process to meet this evaluation’s timeline and scope. The EvalYouth Task Force II leaders’ essential role as the Evaluation Advisory Group (EAG) linked the intended users and the evaluation, and enabled the necessary dialogue to ensure evaluation activities consider the utility and actual use of findings. The evaluation findings and recommendations will inform the design of the post-pilot phase of the Program.

The EAG attended a launch where key information needs and the evaluation’s purpose were articulated. As a result of the meeting, Key Evaluation Questions were identified. These questions informed the development of instruments, the analysis, and the final report.

The EAG was provided the opportunity to review the evaluation design, and all tools used. The EAG attended a webinar of the findings and reviewed the draft report before it was finalized.

Design

This evaluation was in accordance with the OECD/DAC criteria and standards, guidelines, principles of evaluation put together by the United Nations Evaluation Group and OECD/DAC. The evaluation was conducted using mixed-methods in order to capture both quantitative and qualitative data. Findings were triangulated to validate conclusions.

Key Evaluation Questions

1. To what extent were mentees and mentors satisfied with the EvalYouth Program?
   a. What intervention components added greatest value and what improvements could be made?

2. How well did the Program support the growth of YEEs evaluation capacity?

3. To what extent did the Program increase the confidence of YEEs to pursue a career in evaluation?

4. How well do participants understand how to improve their skills currently and build a career path going forward.

Data generated through the evaluation was analyzed using an Evaluation Matrix. A focus was placed on participants’ greatest areas of growth and program implementation strengths and challenges.

Desk Review

A desk review was undertaken based on all relevant program documents provided by EvalYouth Task Force II. This included the program design concept notes, learning modules, lessons-learned document, outputs survey and meeting minutes from the two mentors/mentees meetings provided by the Task Force’s leadership team. These documents were used to inform the development of the data collection instruments in the report.

Data Collection

In total, 31 interviews were conducted and 77 satisfaction surveys completed over the over ten days allotted for data collection.

Broad targets were met for each type of data collection, although the evaluation expanded the number of interviews in an attempt to gain more proportional representation across the different criteria for selection (reviewed below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Total Invited</th>
<th>Target Response</th>
<th>Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interviews</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Depth Interviews</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews were conducted through online technology such as Skype or WhatsApp. This included both Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and in-depth semi-structured interviews.

Key informant interviews (KII)

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) were conducted with two EvalYouth leaders and eight Task Force II members. They were selected, with the support of the EAG, based on their knowledge and experience related to efficiency, impact, and sustainability. These KIIIs used the EvalYouth leader’s elevated vantage point to gain a bird’s-eye view of the Program.

In-depth semi-structured interviews

In-depth semi-structured interviews took were conducted with 10 mentors and 12 mentees. The target response of 16 interviews was exceeded with 22 completed. These program participant perceptions provided insights into all aspects of the evaluation criteria, including the program’s relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Mentors served in the unique role of being both implementers and participants, while mentees were the target
beneficiaries. The evaluator initially created a stratified randomized sample of mentors and mentees based on the criteria listed below. Interviewees were invited to participate twice. The evaluator extended additional invitations to include more participants who had dropped out of the Program or were from the United States /Canada/Australia. The criteria for selection included:

- Gender, with a special consideration given to female mentors and mentees
- Region
- Whether they continued in the Program or dropped out of the Program

The table below shows the distribution of the 22 participant interviewees by region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Mentors (n=10)</th>
<th>Mentees (n=12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>• Uganda, Public sector</td>
<td>• Ghana, Private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Zambia, Private sector</td>
<td>• Nigeria, Private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uganda, Non-governmental organization</td>
<td>• Uganda, Non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kenya, Non-governmental organization</td>
<td>• Kenya, Non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>• Pakistan, Non-governmental organization</td>
<td>• Afghanistan, Private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>• Netherlands, Consultancy</td>
<td>• Pakistan, International organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe/Europe</td>
<td>• Mexico, Academia</td>
<td>• Italy, Consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chile, Consultancy</td>
<td>• Portugal, Consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Guatemala, International organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America*</td>
<td>• Jordan, International organization</td>
<td>• Uruguay, Public sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Brazil, Non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mena (Middle East)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Egypt, Non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Jordan, Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States / Canada / Australia*</td>
<td>• United States, International organization</td>
<td>• Jordan, Consultancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Regions where one of the interviewees had dropped out

The questionnaires for both KII and participants asked both quantitative and qualitative questions, adding to the mixed-methods methodology. While quantitative data can be used to demonstrate scale and scope, it is also a powerful method to illuminate perspectives in a quick snapshot. Quantitative questions, aligned with the Key Evaluation Questions, were used to frame conceptual areas in the questionnaire and were validated by the rich qualitative questions. Quantitative questions asked participants to rate their experiences on a scale, while qualitative questions probed deeply and appreciatively to understand the what, why, when, who, and how questions. The quantitative findings offer a quick comparison of differences among interviewee responses and show ratings by concept area. Qualitative question probes
were refined throughout the data collection process to ensure the fullest version of participants’ experiences shone through.

All participants were informed fully about the aims and purpose of the evaluation and the reasons they had been invited to participate. It was made clear that participation was not required for further/on-going support and that they could withdraw from the process at any point.

Names of participants were anonymized and their responses to questions were kept confidential. EvalYouth Task Force II leaders supported the identification of interviewees, and provided a larger than necessary list of participants from which the evaluator selected invitees into the study. This method was used to increase the likelihood of confidentiality and candour. Notes taken during the interviews and recordings provided backup.

**Satisfaction Survey**

A short satisfaction survey was distributed to all mentors and mentees through Google Forms. The target response rate of 75% was met, with 76% of participants responding. The satisfaction survey explored participants’ experience with the Program and whether they would recommend the evaluation to others.

**Incentives**

Two forms of incentives were provided to encourage participants to provide data:

- Interviewees were entered into a raffle for an Amazon gift card of $20, which was provided to two interviewees.
- Survey respondents were entered into a raffle for an Amazon gift card of $10, which was provided to one survey respondent.

**Limitations**

The evaluation faced two limitations. First, none of the dropouts who participated in the interviews were mentees despite efforts to talk with one to two of them. The dropout cohort was oversampled: a total of 14 of the 44 invited interviewees had dropped out of the Program, and another two had partially completed it. The second limitation was the time and scope of the evaluation. The evaluator had 22 working days to complete the entire study, and only 5 days for both the analysis and the write-up of results. Given more time, a suggested amount being 10 days, the evaluator could have analysed findings more deeply.

**How to Read Findings**

Two types of findings reported herein. Quantitative questions help understand the number and scale of a finding and can illuminate similar perceptions. Qualitative questions help understand respondents’ thoughts and opinions about a concept. Even if the same probes are used (i.e.
follow-up with the same set of options) respondents may choose to answer questions quite differently. This report also reviews how many people brought up a concept, which allows the readers to see which concepts, themes, or findings resonated most commonly amongst interviewees. The purpose of including “n” is to show prevalence of a concept more accurately than the generic phrases of many, some and few.

Responses to qualitative questions are distinguished between questions answered by individuals who supported the development and implementation of the Program (EvalYouth Leadership, and the Task Force II team), and individuals who participated in the Program (mentees and mentors). As such this report differentiates the two groups of respondents by adding color (see the box).

Summary of Findings

The report is ordered by the Evaluation Criteria set out by the OECD/DAC. The table below reviews major findings, ordered by the evaluation criteria and Evaluation Question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Was the Program design relevant to the mentoring needs of young and emerging evaluators?</td>
<td>The international Mentoring Program was relevant. Conceived as a strategy to support the pursuit of the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals, and aligned with EvalAgenda 2020, this Program was carefully planned and validated through a needs assessment and enthusiastic international response. For example, a total of 850 people applied for the Program, of whom roughly 750 wanted to be Mentees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Is the Program cost-effective and time-efficient?</td>
<td>The Program was efficient. Within the two year 2016 to 2018 EvalYouth strategy timeframe, the Program grew from an idea into a piloted program, run completely by volunteers. Although there were growing pains, the Program adapted to problems as they arose and developed creative solutions while staying within a low-cost budget of $15,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Were participants satisfied with the program?</td>
<td>Generally, both mentors and mentees were satisfied with the Program overall. A total of 93% of participants thought it worthwhile to participate at least once. Net Promoter Score analysis shows that 35% of survey respondents will actively recommend the Program to their acquaintances. Generally, participants appreciated the quality of experience and the Program’s general purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did Moodle LMS improve the experience of mentoring and mentees?  
The Moodle provided a structure and backbone for the Program which participants appreciate. A majority, 59%, found it easy to use, but those who struggled with its usability really struggled. There was no clear preference for one type of content over another, preference related to knowledge and skill needed or interests.

Did the program build the capacity of mentees?  
As a whole, participants perceived Mentee’s increased their capacity across all concept areas measured. Greatest areas of growth related to understanding the Eco-System and career paths, technical skills, reflection skills, and interpersonal skills. Basic principles of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) had the least growth followed by evaluation methods.

Are mentees’ confident of their ability to plan towards a career in evaluation and connection with professional networks?  
The Program’s capstone project, Modules 4 through 6, and the guidance of mentors increased mentees’ confidence towards a career in evaluation. Connecting mentees to mentors provided a stepping stone towards professional networks, and sometimes opened doors. The program could do more to facilitate networks amongst participants and the report provides recommendations.

Has the program improved commitment of mentors?  
Most mentors, 71%, were satisfied with their experience. Time was the biggest barrier they faced, and most would mentor again. While mentors did not feel they needed more guidance, less than half, 43%, of mentees were satisfied with their mentoring experience. This finding likely relates to mentees regard for their mentors, as over 50% of mentees were satisfied with all other components of the Mentoring Program.\(^{13}\)

Impact  
To what extent has the program contributed to providing the evaluation community with professional evaluators?  
The Program’s long-term impacts are unknown. However, there are indicators that a virtual international Mentoring Program can have great impacts on the evaluation community on both the macro-level and micro-level.

Has there been any unintended consequences (positive or negative)?  
There were no consequential unintended consequences.

Sustainability  
How effectively has the program considered long-term impact and sustainability?  
The Program has made inroads towards building sustained capacity within EvalYouth. It offers a model for the development of other YEE mentoring programs. It is too early to tell if the program will build a sustained capacity for mentees or mentors.

---

\(^{13}\)Aside from the mentoring experience, all other components of the Mentoring Program were rated as satisfactory by over 50% of mentees who completed the satisfaction survey. The percentage of mentees who reported to be satisfied for other components of the Mentoring Program included: 67% of mentees were satisfied with the program generally, 64% of mentees were satisfied with the Moodle’s curriculum, 53% of mentees were satisfied with the Moodle’s ease of use,
Relevance

The international Mentoring Program was relevant. Born as a strategy to support the pursuit of the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals, and aligned with the Global Evaluation Agenda 2020, this program was carefully planned and validated through a needs assessment and enthusiastic international response. Further, with the mission to “leave no one behind” the program carefully considered the diversity of participants.

The Mentoring Program was developed with the aim of building the capacities of individual YEEs globally (n=7). Task Force II members explained that YEEs need support for the professionalization of their skills, especially those living in the Global South (n=2). Free mentorship democratizes evaluation expertise, personalizes learning, and provides mechanisms to connect people in the field, share expertise and social capital (n=3).

Evidence from documents and interviews supports the relevance of and need for a mentoring program for the international evaluation community, as follows:

- The Program was developed to support EvalPartner’s Agenda 2020 vision that “Evaluation has become so embedded in good governance that no policy maker or manager will imagine excluding evaluation from the decision-making process.” The program was designed to support the ability of individual evaluators to build their skills going forward, thereby directly addressing one of the four key EvalPartner dimensions mechanizing Agenda 2020, specifically having evaluators with strong “individual capacities for evaluation.” Further, improving the individual capacities of evaluators across the globe is theoretically linked to support the other three key mechanizations of Agenda 2020: 1) enabling environment for evaluation, 2) institutional capacities, and naturally supports the final mechanization, the interlinking among the 3 dimensions.¹⁴
- 850 people applied, roughly 100 mentors and 750 mentees (n=1). This response surprised EvalYouth’s Task Force II and leadership (n=4) who expected roughly 100 applicants.
- More than 50% of the mentee applications came from Africa (n=3), showing a great need for a free evaluation mentoring program in the Global South.
- A global needs assessment interpreted in six different languages identified a high level of need for mentoring globally.¹⁵ Findings from the 339 survey respondents are shown in the graphic below.

---

¹⁵ EvalYouth. (2016). EvalYouth Mentoring Program Survey Infographic: exploratory research on opportunities and the needs of Young and Emerging Evaluators.
91% of respondents identified unmet mentoring needs of YEEs in their countries.

90% of respondents characterized the need for an evaluation mentoring program as a high or very high priority.

56% of respondents did not know of any mentoring programs for YEEs in their country of residence.

An environmental scan confirmed the program would not duplicate existing evaluation mentoring programs. The scan included discussions with Canadian Evaluation Society and European Evaluation Society who had developed and run mentoring programs before, and with YEEs who participated generally in mentoring program.

Mentees (n=12) explained their primary reasons for applying included a desire for evaluation knowledge and skills, practical experience, and expansion of their international networks amongst evaluators.

Further, Task Force II embraced EvalPartner’s lesson learned from the pursuit of the Millennial Development Goals to “leave no one behind,” and carefully considered diversity as part of the criteria for participation (n=6). Criteria included:

- Representation from six different regions (Table to the right of mentor and mentee pairs)
- Gender: 51 males, 50 females, 1 self-identified as queer
- Mentees: fewer than 5 years of experience, work on at least one evaluation, aged under 35 years old
- Mentors: more than 5 years of experience and a primary job in M&E
- Sectors: nonprofits, government, academia
- Specialization: health, education, agriculture, international development, public policy
- Motivation of their role, what they thought they would gain

These criteria resulted in 50 mentor-mentee pairs, which, to the extent possible, were matched according to country, region, sector, and thematic interest. However, the number of participants was insufficient to match all mentors and mentees by country or, in one case, by region.

---

Lessons Learned
All indicators show that the Mentoring Program was relevant. Interviewees representing EvalYouth leadership and Task Force II members thought that the intentional approach used to validate the need and develop the design of the Program ensured its relevance (n=6). EvalPartners’ intensive efforts to develop Agenda 2020 (reviewed in Birth of EvalYouth) also enhanced the relevance. Further, the Program was intentionally developed to not overlap with opportunities offered by local country VOPES, by being international and virtual (n=1). The needs assessment identified that mentees would be willing to pay to participate in a mentoring program, but because it is free the Program is intentionally affordable for those living with less economic wealth. The fact that over 50% of applicants were from Africa, the least economically region, is in itself, a great success.

Considerations
As the Program becomes more established and scales up, it will likely face many questions about its structural frame and scope that may affect its relevance. It is important that the Program remain conscious of the needs of the evaluation community, and does not go beyond its intended purpose. For example, during the interviews one EvalYouth leader questioned whether the program should be targeting only YEEs (under the age of 35), and not emerging evaluators generally. Yet, the program’s focus is under EvalYouth, and EvalYouth’s programmatic mission is to support young and emerging evaluators. A common reason for failure in nonprofits is a drift away from their mission, often to appeal to donors more competitively. The high response rate of applicants, with roughly 750 mentees, indicates there are many potential YEE mentees who wish for mentorship. It therefore makes sense for the Program to keep the criteria that supported mentees be under the age of 35. On the flip side, interviewed mentors and mentees (n=5) wished the pairs had been located in the same country to facilitate face-to-face and hands-on experience. The needs assessment identified many developing countries currently lacking in-country mentoring options. Hence, it would make sense for one criterion for pairing be residence in the same country when possible. However, if local VOPes grow their own mentoring opportunities, the Program may adapt to changed circumstances by providing a unique, unduplicated, opportunities for cross-cultural exchanges focused on how evaluation works in different national contexts. One of the main gains reported by four of the ten interviewed mentors was an understanding of how evaluation works in a different country (n=4). In future years, it may make sense to intentionally revise the pairing protocols so that they are cross-national, perhaps within the same region.

Recommendations

Below are a few recommendations for evaluation to support continual growth:

- **Reassess relevance:** The Program must not assume that international mentoring needs will remain the same over time. Many foundations in the United States re-evaluate their strategic vision every five years, and start gathering data to reconsider their strategy every three years.\textsuperscript{19} Data collection for strategic revisioning can be planned when there is structural change or major decision-making. For example, the Program could conduct a needs assessment at least once during the leadership of each chairperson who rotate every two years. Other important changes, potentially external, could also indicate the need for reassessing the strategic vision. Due to time and resources intensity, it is not recommended that a needs assessment be conducted annually, rather, at a minimum, once every five years.

- **Determine ways that enhancing individual capacities supports the other aspects of Agenda 2020:** Going forward, now that pilot phase is completed, the Program needs to think about how the Program relevantly supports the larger Agenda 2020 goals. How can increasing individual capacities link to enhancing institutional capacities and enabling environments for evaluation. This linkage between EvalYouth’s efforts and the larger Agenda 2020 should be messaged and could become a specific goal that is followed up by current participants (especially mentors) or alumni. This could be a topic for an interactive discussion piece online through the Moodle, or through a Go-to-Meeting chat. The more EvalYouth messages this and seeks ways to harvest lessons and challenges or examples of success, the more it can validate the Program’s relevance as 2020 approaches.

\textsuperscript{19} This is based on the evaluator’s personal experience working on the evaluations for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Lumina Foundation, The Foundation Center, and the Colorado Health Foundation, and hearing it is an operational norm.
Efficiency

The Program was efficient. Within the two year 2016 to 2018 EvalYouth strategy timeframe, the Program grew from an idea into a piloted program, run completely by volunteers. Although there were growing pains, the Program adapted to problems as they arose and developed creative solutions.

Ultimately, EvalYouth Leadership and Task Force II staff perceived that the pilot process was highly efficient because it developed a program out of a concept in two years through the work of volunteers (n=5). As one EvalYouth leader explained:

“Management is entirely satisfied with EvalYouth’s Mentoring Program. In a record time [they] set it up, and had several successful activities... this requires adaptive management and efficiencies.”

Efficiency in a pilot phase of any program is different from efficiency of a well-established program, as the Harvard business school professor Amy Edmonson points out. An efficient use of time for experimental and novel concepts is reflected in the ability of a team to congregate and adapt to lessons learned while implementing.20 In contrast, a well-established program may expect more linear and routine timeframes and outputs. Therefore, efficiency here reflects whether the program effectively planned an implementation strategy, adapted to challenges as they arose, and implemented outputs.

The program carefully thought through the steps needed to accomplish its purpose and used evidence to develop its decisions (n=3). Documented evidence for this includes:

- Use of a needs assessment and an environmental scan
- Concept note for the evaluation
- Internal bi-weekly meetings (on average)

The Mentoring Program operated on a small budget totaling $15,000.21 An EvalPartner leader reported that the program would likely have cost four times more if a nonprofit consultant had been hired. Reasons for this successfully low budget include:

- Task Force II comprised a group of international volunteers, and the budget excluded any amount for administrative overhead.22
- Task Force II used their own social capital and knowledge, including networks, social media platforms, and VOPES to engage the international evaluation community in the survey, to recruit participants, and to provide resources for programming (n=3).
- The online learning platform (the Moodle) does not require funds to be continually hosted on the site, and is managed for free by Task Force II volunteers (n=2).

---

21 EvalYouth. (2016). EvalYouth Concept Note: A global network to promote engagement, innovation, and exchange among young and emerging evaluators and youth and young people. Montrosse-Moorehead, B., Gervais, M. & Bitar, K.
• Mentors volunteered to participate, with no remuneration
• The amount budgeted for specialized skills, including the curriculum and video consultant, was low (n=2).

Task Force II was a highly vibrant and committed group of volunteers, with seven core members constantly engaging in the work, and a larger group supporting efforts over time (n=3). Task Force II’s flexible and collaborative management structure allowed implementation plans to adapt in the face of challenges (n=2). For example, during recruitment, when the number of recruited participants far exceeded the number expected, a Task Force II member organized 25 volunteers to sort through the applicants and help refine the criteria for involvement (n=1). Two interviewees agreed the Task Force II used an inclusive, if round about, method resulting in the final success, “it all worked out in the end.”

There are two areas where Task Force II could have more efficiently dealt with challenges that arose: mentor and mentee dropouts and communications.

The number of dropouts during the pilot phase of the Mentoring Program surpassed expectations. Multiple Task Force II members expressed surprise at the dropout rate (n=4). One Task Force II member had expected a 10% drop out rate, yet by the end the rate was closer to half of the original 102 participants. While some dropped out late in the Program, others left immediately after being accepted into the Program. When faced with this challenge, Task Force II did not have a plan in place to replace mentors for mentees (n=1). Three of the twelve mentees interviewed had been paired with a mentor who dropped out, and only one of them received a replacement mentor. Two of these mentees followed the modules and completed the program despite the lack of a mentor for the majority of the time, but expressed disappointment, having expected a more supported process.

Efficient communication between Task Force II members and participants was an ongoing, evolving, issue (n=4). An unresolved question relates to whether it is more efficient and effective to centralize all communication or to allow regional leads to be an added source of communication. One Task Force II member reported communication was the most consuming issue in relation to working with participants.

A total of 67% (n=72) of respondents to a satisfaction survey thought EvalYouth administrators were easy to communicate with. Task Force II members themselves were split on what is most effective form of communication. Some believed regional communication made the program more effective (n=3), as it built a connection between mentors and mentees, reduced the work load so each...
volunteer only had to communicate with 20 participants, and allowed for contextual knowledge of the opportunities and limitations in each region. Other Task Force II members \( (n=2) \) saw the benefit of centralizing communication as it increased the opportunity for quality control. A few interviews with mentors and mentees indicated a desire from participants for regional communication \( (n=3) \). For example, in response to problems that arose, one mentor described only directly emailing her friend who was the regional lead. In another instance, a mentee never reached out to the central EvalYouth email about the fact his mentor dropped out because he felt uncomfortable doing so.

**Lessons Learned**

The Program was effective in its pilot phase, as within the strategic plan’s two-year window Task Force II turned an idea into a program and adaptively managed challenges. Task Force II managed to retain a large, committed Task Force II membership \( (n=3) \). This is likely enabled by the flexible nature of the group that allowed members time to focus on other work when needed and return to be a core member \( (n=1) \). Members appreciated each other \( (n=8) \), seeing others as thoughtful, productive, and “brilliant.” Along the way, Task Force II members learned ways to improve their operations. Task Force II learned the importance of developing clear criteria before selecting participants \( (n=3) \). Task Force II learned that it must be prepared to expect a large level of interest, and has developed a process to manage a larger number of volunteers to sort through applicants \( (n=1) \). Task Force II learned it is not feasible for one member to answer all communications \( (n=1) \). Task Force II can take note of more realistic timelines for what it takes to recruit, select, and launch the Program, now that the Program has been implemented once. All of these can be systematized into routine actions.

Task Force II members need to recognize the likelihood of a high dropout rate since the key implementers (i.e. the mentors) are not paid at all, the community is virtual, and participants receive a free service (i.e. mentees) is not surprising. It is not comparable to a mentoring program where mentors are part of a physical community or receive funds. It is not comparable to a program where mentees pay, like a university. However, there are practices that increase the effectiveness of a program operating under similar conditions, as discussed in the recommendations below.

**Considerations**

Going forward, the definition of effectiveness will change. The Program and leadership of the Program should transition from a completely learning frame to a complex frame, and eventually head towards an execution frame.\(^2\) The Program will scale up in its next year, only its second year of programming. As such, some practices may be routine and require replication (like reusing the templates announcing the program), whereas others require alternative strategies need to be tested. In complex operations, programming needs to focus on considering what is known and what unknown risks may be faced as the Program scales up. Leadership will be

called on to proactively plan for how to deal with issues as they arrive. As a frame of mind, it is important that issues as arise, Task Force II tests alternative strategies rather than implement routine and mandated structures without reviewing their effectiveness.

Recommendations

Below are recommendations and alternative strategies to test as the Program transitions into a complex frame:

- **Identify replicable processes and set up routine actions**: As the Program transitions, ensure that everything that was successful and replicable is recorded, and written into a simple template that allow replication going forward. Examples include:
  - A list of VOPEs and all social networks used to announce the program
  - Template of the announcement
  - Final criteria for selecting eligibility and pairing of the partners

- **Continue to allow flexibility in Task Force II membership**: The two-year commitment of many Task Force II volunteers, with seven highly involved, is a triumph. A national evaluation of Social Networks found that voluntary based networks which produced significant outputs or products were successful because the intense activity was time-bound, usually closer to the duration of one to three months. Keeping the time-bound principle in mind, as tasks become more routine the Program may ask Task Force II volunteers to take on heavier loads for short periods of time, and then allow life, work, school be prioritized over the two years.

- **Implement relationship management strategies to reduce dropout rates**: Dropout rates were undesirably high at 53%. The explanation for this includes several factors: 1) the community is virtual, reducing the feeling of connection, 2) the program is free meaning the only cost for dropping out is of an opportunity lost, and 3) it is truly a voluntary position for mentors. Over the years, researchers managing longitudinal panels have studied means to reduce the dropout rates for groups that voluntarily engage in a program. The key theory is prioritizing intrinsic motivations over extrinsic. Below are key lessons for how the Program could incorporate those strategies into their program:

---


28 The evaluator used this theory to implement a virtual teacher panel whose retention rate in first year was over 90%, and over 50% had participated in at least two mini-studies. The cohort was smaller, only 100 people on entry. In comparison, she shared experiences with a large project developing a panel locally in Denver. They were headed towards trying to sign on over a 1000 participants, but hadn’t managed to get even 20 panelists to answer or get involved in a single study.

29 An example of how external factors are different from external motivation came up in this evaluation. EvalYouth decided not provide a $100 incentive for participants who met face-to-face, but rather reprogrammed that line item to support communication. Eight interviewed participants were asked if $100 would have facilitated face-to-face experiences. All wanted to meet face-to-face, and explained the finances only would make a difference if the mentor and mentee pair lived in the same

---
o **Double opt-in entry after deeming eligibility**: After applicants are deemed eligible but not yet paired into a mentee-mentor relationship, require participants to confirm that they are certain they want to participate in the program and repeat all expectations of participants. This will weed out participants who applied but have not reflected on their availability. It also will reduce the likelihood that participants drop out immediately after acceptance.

o **Set clear expectations**: Be very clear about the criteria, time involved in participating, and the workload. Be sure to repeat these expectations at all onboarding stages: in the application, at the Double Opt-In time, and when the program begins.

o **Provide a person for participants to contact**: Identify a contact person for each participant, not a generic email address, but a name with an email address, and Skype or WhatsApp contact information. This may increase the participant’s feeling that their needs could be addressed, and builds the sense of a relationship with the program.

o **Personalize communication**: Personalize communication to show that EvalYouth cares about participants, building the concept of a relationship. For example, all formal communications should include the participants’ names. To make it less cumbersome, use free mail merge options like the ‘Not Another Mail Merge’ addition on Google sheets.

o **Provide a clear method for participants to leave**: If mentors or mentees decide to leave, make it clear how they should do so. This will increase the likelihood that if one member of a pair departs the other will not. Newly freed Mentors can be methodically paired with any mentees whose mentors dropped out.

- **Create clear communication structures**: A relationship management framework prioritizes clarity and caring for communications. If the Program hires an individual as a communicator, then the Program should centralize communications. If, however, the Program is run by volunteers, then it should decentralize communication by region. It reduces the workload and increases a sense of connection. Using a clearly organized hierarchical form of communication could also reduce the workload. EvalYouth could send general communications centrally, and decentralize follow-up communications.

- **Expect dropouts and systematize a way to deal with them**: Expect dropouts to be high for a voluntary, free program, run virtually and prepare to systematically deal with the problem. Ask alumni if they would be willing to mentor, re-pair mentees and mentors whose first pair partner dropped out, and, at the very least, connect mentees with no mentor to review the curriculum together (potentially asking an unpaired mentor to mentor more than one).
Effectiveness

The Program effectively increased all expected outcomes amongst participants. Satisfaction rates were high, even though 47% of survey respondents did not complete the Program. A Net Promoter Score analysis shows 35% of participants will actively recommend the Program to acquaintances. Greatest areas for growth related to increasing mentees’ professional networks, and increasing mentees’ satisfaction with their mentoring experience.

As a result of participation, the Program expected to affect the following outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>Mentees</th>
<th>Mentors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Satisfaction with the Program generally</td>
<td>• Increased evaluation capacity of mentees</td>
<td>• Increased commitment and satisfaction of mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Satisfaction with the Moodle as an aid to improve the mentoring experience</td>
<td>• Increased connection with professional networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased confidence to navigate a career in evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each outcome is reviewed in sub-sections below.

Satisfaction with the Program

Participants were satisfied with the Program overall; participants appreciated the quality of experience and the program’s general purpose.

Post-program satisfaction survey results from 77 out of the original 102 participants accepted into the program demonstrate that overall participants were satisfied with the program. Thirty-one of these survey respondents did not complete the program.

Findings found participants were satisfied:

- 73% (n=77) survey responders reported to be satisfied or very satisfied with the program overall. Satisfaction rates were slightly higher for mentors than mentees: 76% (n=38) of mentors were satisfied and 67% (n=39) of mentees were satisfied.

Other components indicating satisfaction were also high.

- 93% (n=75) survey responders reported it was worthwhile to participate in the program at least once.
• 82% (n=74) survey responders reported they would participate in EvalYouth’s International Mentoring program again.
• 82% (n=74) of survey respondents reported they trusted EvalYouth as a reputable organization.
• 78% (n=74) of survey respondents reported the program created a welcoming environment.
• 67% (n=72) of respondents to a satisfaction survey thought EvalYouth was easy to communicate with.

Satisfaction rates for free programs are hard to interpret as social desirability may affect the results, as participants will more likely express appreciation out of gratitude rather than true value. As such, the questionnaire included a net promoter score question: “How likely are you to recommend this program?” Extensive behavioral research has identified the level of response required that will result in a participant actually recommending the program. On a scale of 1-10, where 1 means not likely and 10 means very likely, the literature defines the ratings as follows: a 9 or 10 means the participant will actively recommend the program, a 7 or 8 means the participant enjoyed the program, and a 1 to 6 rating means the participant is dissatisfied with the program. Net Promoter score results (n=77) below show that 35% of survey respondents were active promoters, 39% were neutral promoters, and 21% were detractors.

---
Interviews with mentors and mentees provided examples of reasons participants were generally satisfied with the program (n=20).

Gained knowledge and skills (n=6)

“It changed me, I really developed in terms of my technical skills... I would recommend it to myself another time.”

Motivates you to continue developing your M&E skills and follow an M&E career (n=5)

“The career development plan made me commit to writing my (evaluation tools) manual, otherwise I would only focus on finishing my PhD.”

Access to resources (n=4)

“I now have a vast amount of resources (downloaded documents and articles) to gain knowledge from”

Program fills a mentoring gap for M&E (n=4)

“In our country, we lack mentors... this is a good opportunity for anyone interested in international development”

Of the 22 interviewed participants, only two mentees expressed dissatisfaction with the Program overall. One mentee felt the Program’s lack of practical hands-on lessons made it not worth her time. The other mentee felt the program’s content was elemental and would not recommend it to anyone with experience.

Satisfaction with Moodle

The Moodle provided a structure and backbone for the course which participants appreciated. A majority found it easy to use, but those who struggle with its usability really struggle. There was no clear preference for one type of content over another, preference related to knowledge and skill needed or interests.

A total of 65% (n=77) of survey respondents reported they were satisfied with the content of Moodle. Satisfaction rates of the Moodle’s content was comparably the same between mentors and mentees: 66% (n=38) of mentors were satisfied and 64% (n=39) of mentees were satisfied.
Interviewees enjoyed the interactive nature and variety of forms of engagement, including the videos, publications, links (n=7). The format’s organization and easy-to-follow nature facilitated the usefulness of the content (n=3). The availability of instructions and guidelines centralized, expectations, resources, and upload assignments was valuable (n=3). The quality of the Moodle improved over time, as participants requested more materials during the time of the program, and afterwards modules included more links and resources (n=1).

Twelve mentors and mentees provided feedback on their favorite and least favorite components of the Moodle, listed in the table above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Most Favorite (n=11)</th>
<th>Least Favorite (n=1)</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module 1</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>√ Liked thinking about mentoring√ Too elemental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 2</td>
<td>√√√</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>√ Reviewed standards and principle√ Too elemental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 3</td>
<td>√√√√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√ Stakeholder engagement, participatory methods, environmental contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 4</td>
<td>√√√√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√ Developing a plan of action to improve skills and gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 5</td>
<td>√√√√√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√ Developing a plan of action to improve skills and gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 59% (n=73) of survey respondents reported that the Moodle’s technology was easy to use. There was a slight difference between mentors and mentees: 57% (n=35) of mentors through it was easy to use, and 53% (n=38) of mentees thought it was easy to use.

Interviewees gave absolutely dichotomous responses about the usability of the Moodle. Either they said it was usable, friendly, easy to navigate and learn (n=15). Otherwise the platform was perceived to be very tricky, hard to use, or troublesome every time used (n=4). In one case a mentor never used the platform, and asked her mentee to send assignments and reflections directly to her. All who struggled in the interviews with the Moodle platform were mentors.
A few suggestions were made to improve the Moodle:

- Provide deeper, more layered, content \( (n=7) \). Suggestions for layering included providing levels (i.e. very beginner, intermediate, advanced) or sorting by sector of work.
- Increase the content of practical, real life, examples \( (n=5) \). For example, share case studies, examples of tools, steps for analysis.
- Increase the level of interaction on the Moodle \( (n=3) \). Experiences would be further enhanced by allowing participants to share their thoughts and resources on the Moodle.
- Provide more training on how to use the Moodle \( (n=3) \).
- Make the Moodle more navigable by giving each mentor a home page to store and access their own mentees information \( (n=1) \).

During Task Force II’s meeting with mentors in February it was recommended that Task Force II provide more instruction, such as using a video, on how to use the Moodle. Alternatively, it was suggested that another platform, such as Amanda, be used because it is a more user-friendly, interactive, platform.

| Increased evaluation capacity of mentees | As a whole, participants increased their capacity across all concept areas measured. Greatest areas of growth related to understanding the Eco-System and career paths, technical skills, reflection skills, and interpersonal skills. Basic principles of monitoring and Evaluation had the least growth followed by evaluation methods. |

Mentees were surveyed before and after the Program to assess their knowledge and skills. Items were rated from scores of 1 to 6, where 1 meant not true and 6 meant very true. Less than half of the participants who completed the pre survey completed the post survey (46 compared to 16). Findings provide an initial baseline of change scores, which will be further validated with data in future years.

The table below shows the average change per category and identifies the areas of greatest growth:

- 1.66 change score for knowledge of the evaluation eco-system (Module 3)
- 1.58 change score for awareness and knowledge of how to pursue a career in evaluation (Modules 4, 5, 6)
- 1.44 change score for self-assessment (Module 1, and reflective skills generally)
- 1.42 change score for evaluation methods (Module 3)
- 1.19 change score for M&E basics (Module 2)
### Eco-System: Average Pre: 2.92, Average Post: 4.57, Average Change: 1.66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Score Mean (N=46)</th>
<th>Post-Score Mean (N=16)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understands the evaluation ecosystem</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the map of stakeholders in evaluation</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the different sectors where evaluation is used</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examines the organizational context of the evaluation</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzes the political considerations relevant to the evaluation</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies the interests of relevant stakeholders</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Career: Average Pre: 3.13, Average Post: 4.71, Average Change: 1.58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Score Mean (N=46)</th>
<th>Post-Score Mean (N=16)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the type of job within the evaluation field which is most appealing to his/her interests</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the different type of jobs an evaluator can do</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the next steps he/she wants to pursue in the evaluation field</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursues professional development in relevant content areas</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursues professional development in evaluation</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds professional relationships to enhance evaluation practice</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Self-Assessment: Average Pre: 2.91, Average Post: 4.34, Average Change: 1.44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Score Mean (N=46)</th>
<th>Post-Score Mean (N=16)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware of self as an evaluator (knowledge, skills, dispositions)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflects on personal evaluation practice (competencies and areas for growth)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Methods: Average Pre: 2.94, Average Post: 4.36, Average Change: 1.42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Score Mean (N=46)</th>
<th>Post-Score Mean (N=16)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serves the information needs of intended users</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about technology tools for evaluation</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses validity of data</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes strengths and limitations of the evaluation</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about quantitative methods for evaluation</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends to issues of evaluation use</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses reliability of data</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about mixed methods for evaluation</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about qualitative methods for evaluation</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviews with mentors and mentees delved into participants’ perceptions about the growth of mentees’ capacities as evaluators as a result of participating in this Program.

A total of 81% (n=21)\(^{32}\) of interviewed participants perceived that either their own or their mentee’s capacity as evaluator grew as result of participating in the Program. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means minimum and 5 means maximum, mentors and mentees rated their mentee (if a mentor) or their own (if a mentee) capacity as an evaluator before or at entry into the program and after the program. The icon array to the right shows that the mode changed from a “2” before the Program, to a “4” after the Program.

To complement the review of knowledge and skills gathered through the pre and posts test, capacities were categorized in terms of expectations set by the Canadian Evaluation Society and overlap with the new guide ratified by the American Evaluation Association. These capacities include technical skills, interpersonal skills, reflective skills, management skills, and environmental context (eco-system) skills.

\(^{32}\) One interviewee preferred not to quantify the growth, and as such the chart on the right only contains a total of responses from 20 interviewees.
Interviewees provided the following examples of gained capacities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Technical Skills (n=12)          | • Resources, articles and links, provided interviewees with knowledge about new skills, types of analytical approaches, a deeper understanding of the spectrum of M&E methods and approaches.  
• Mentors provided mentees implementing evaluations at their jobs advice, shared resources, and reviewed their plans. |
| Interpersonal Skills (n=6)       | • Resources and mentors taught mentees how to deal with stakeholders, gather input, and influence others to better use evaluation results  
• Mentors and the international nature of the program increased Mentees networking skills, and cross-cultural networking opportunities.  
• Mentors encouragement helped build confidence of mentees to share their authentic personality, instead of being constantly rigid, academic, and technical. |
| Reflection Skills (n=6)          | • Mentors supported mentees to think critically about their evaluation experiences, approaches, and consider ways to improve their current practices. |
| Management Skills (n=3)          | • Mentees gained better understanding of evaluation processes and feel better prepared to plan and budget for evaluations.  
• A mentee’s deeper confidence and knowledge of M&E resulted in his taking on a leadership role to build the evaluation capacity at his organization. |
| Environmental Context (Eco-System) (n=2) | • Eco-System module supported mentees knowledge of international organizational contexts and systems.  
• Mentor-mentee discussions led to a better understanding of the impact of context on evaluation. |

A total of four mentees and mentors initially perceived no change in their own or the mentee’s evaluation capacity as a result of the program. However, when the interviewer explained that the concept of capacities expands beyond technical skills, opinions changed. Three of the four interviewees described types of capacities gained, including reflective skills, interpersonal skills, and environmental context (eco-system) skills.

Participants wanted more opportunities to gain practical experiences with evaluation (n=6). Some wanted the opportunity to see all the steps of an evaluation from A to Z. Others wanted hands-on samples or steps explaining for practical skills like making a survey or conducting qualitative analysis.
Increased confidence towards a career in evaluation

A total of 90\% (n=19) of interviewed mentors and mentees believed that mentees had gained confidence in their ability to successfully navigate towards a career in evaluation. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means minimum and 5 means maximum, mentors and mentees rated their mentee (if a mentor) or their own (if a mentee) confidence to navigate towards a career in evaluation before the Program (or right at entry) and after the Program. The icon array to the right shows the mode changed from a “2” before the Program to a “4” after the Program.\(^3\)

The Program’s capstone activity of building a career development plan was considered “useful” by 95\% (n=19) of the interviewed participants who completed the Program.

Mentees gained an understanding of which skills to achieve long-term career goals, specific steps to take, and ways to build their desired career (n=10). The final Modules also provided guidance and direction to complete this task. Both mentees interviewed whose mentors had dropped out viewed this activity as useful despite the lack of a mentor. Mentors helped their mentees think through the steps (n=4) and in some cases helped the mentee revise the plan multiple times. One mentor explained the value of this activity:

“It was a very clear activity that leads to personal development and technical skills”

Mentees were confident they would continue towards their career development plan goals after the Program (n=10). They provided examples of signing up for classes, joining local Voluntary Organizational Professional Groups (VOPES), attending conferences, seeking more literature, and finding more voluntary or paid evaluation experiences.

\(^3\) The frequency of findings for this question was of interest to a Task Force II member. For before the Program, mentees reported ratings were: six reported “2,” four reported “3,” and one reported “4.” After the Program, mentees reported ratings were: ten reported “4” and one reported “5.” Before the Program, mentors reported ratings of their mentees were: one reported “1,” two reported “2,” three reported “3,” one reported “4” and one reported “5.” After the Program, mentors reported ratings of their mentee’s were: one reported “3,” two reported “4,” and five reported “5.”
A total of 90% \((n=12)\) of mentees reported that their professional networks increased as a result of participating in the Program. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means minimum and 5 means maximum, mentors only were asked to rate the breadth of their professional evaluation networks before the Program (or right at entry) and after the Program. The icon array to the right shows the mode changed from a “1” or “2” before the program to a “3” after the Program.

The connection to a mentor built a strong tie for some interviewees \((n=7)\), and in some cases mentors helped mentees further expand their networks \((n=4)\). One aspect of gaining networks was an increased understanding of the types of networks and opportunities for professional development that support further professionalization. For example:

- Increased knowledge of the evaluation field, other organizations
- Becoming active members at their local VOPES
- Understanding the importance of conferences, seminars, and professional groups
- Expanding one’s networks to think about the international evaluation community

One mentee provided an exceptional example of what one can accomplish with a focus on the task of building international networks. His mentor dropped out of the Program early, and so he focused on developing professional networks. Using every opportunity to learn about different organizations, sharing on EvalYouth’s groups discussions, and looking for other early-career professionals, he substantially grew his network from 80 LinkedIn contacts to 600.

Mentees expressed disappointment that the Program did not put more emphasis on building connections amongst mentees \((n=7)\).

Suggestions were provided on ways the Program could better increase opportunities for participants to build professional networks:

- Provide more programatically-planned opportunities for participants to meet \((n=5)\), such as planning a few days to support online discussions amongst participants, creating a requirement in the modules for participants to interact, or creating a challenge to meet as many other mentees over X amount of time.
• Collaborate with regional or country VOPES to help participants become more involved and build local connections (n=4).
• Switch mentors and mentees within one module, so participants get exposed to more people (n=1).

| Increased commitment of mentors | Mentors were satisfied with their experience, time was the biggest barrier they faced, and most would mentor again. While mentors did not feel they needed more guidance, less than half (43%) of mentees were satisfied with their mentoring experience. |

A total of 71% (n=38) of mentor survey respondents were satisfied with their mentoring experiences. Interestingly, nine of the mentors who reported to be satisfied with the Program did not complete the Program.

A total of 90% (n=10) of interviewed mentors were confident they would be a mentor again. One was less certain, stating she would want more time to learn how to use the Moodle if she were to repeat the experience.

Eight interviewed mentors felt EvalYouth’s team supported their efforts to be an effective mentor. They appreciated the Program’s flexibility and free reign, the guidance provided by the Moodle, and initial guidelines and instructions. One satisfied mentor noted that while she liked the freedom to interpret how a mentor and mentee worked through the Moodle, it required a higher level of mentoring skills. The mentor who felt unsupported wished for more guidelines and deadlines. One mentor dropped out immediately after being accepted into the Program and was unable to provide a perspective on this experience.

None of the interviewed mentors had the opportunity to meet their mentee face-to-face, as they lived in different countries. Mentors placed an emphasis on talking to their mentees via WhatsApp, Skype, or Google Hangouts and used email as follow up mechanism (n=5). One mentor used Google Drive to share and review information in a central location. While discussion-based meetings were the desired primary form of communication, emails were viewed as an essential form of communication by a mentor who often collected data in areas with little broadband connectivity.

Coordinating meetings across time zones and lack of time were the two greatest challenges for mentors (n=5). Mentors noted it takes considerable time to get to know each other, build trust, and understand the skills of a mentee (n=2). This is especially true because evaluation is a very complex subject, and it can be hard to assess what does a mentee really needs to learn.
Mentors who dropped out reported having significant life changes and not having the time to complete the Program, such as moving to a new country (n=2). Mentors shared what they gained from participating in this Program:

- Mentors liked the mentees they were matched with (n=4), because they worked in a similar sector, used a similar evaluation approach, or just liked their personality.
- Mentors appreciated the opportunity to give back, and watch their Mentees’ growth (n=4).
- Mentors learned how different environmental contexts can affect evaluation processes and Mentee’s evaluation opportunities (n=4).
- Mentors increased their awareness of their own mentoring skills (n=3), which built their understanding of the evaluation capacity building process.
- Mentors were exposed to new methods, technologies, and theories, or were reminded of the basics (n=3).
- Mentors built networks with other Program participants (n=2).

Mentors provided a few suggestions of ways to improve the effectiveness of mentors. Mentors wanted more support and opportunities to provide mentees with practical experiences (n=5). Mentors wanted more online discussion and more half-way time to discuss and share their experiences (n=3). Things that could be shared included tricks and tips for mentors, and what mentors learn from mentees. Mentors wanted more accountability for their work, particularly schedules, deadlines, and online submittals (n=4). A mentor wished for a more formal orientation to introduce mentors and mentees to the Program and to each other. One interviewed mentee expressed a similar thought.

When asked if the length of the Program should be shorter, extended, or the same, mentors had diverse opinions. Two mentors suggested six months is a great length of time, three mentors thought the Program should be a yearlong, and one mentor believed that the Program should only be three months long.

While mentor’s experiences were relatively positive, feedback from mentees indicates the Program may need to do more to support the mentoring experience. Only 43% (n=39) of mentee survey respondents were satisfied with their mentoring experience. Twelve respondents who reported ‘neutral,’ ‘dissatisfied,’ or ‘very dissatisfied’ did not complete the Program. Unfortunately, none of the mentees who dropped out scheduled an interview, despite
being purposely over sampled. The Considerations section reviews potential reasons for this finding.

Lessons Learned

As a whole, the Program was effectively implemented. As the table to the right shows, almost all expected outcomes were achieved. The greatest areas for improvement are building mentee connections and improving mentee’s satisfaction with their Mentoring experience.

What these findings show are twofold:

1) Participants who stayed in the Program grew. The areas of greatest growth for mentees related to understanding how to navigate a career, understanding the environmental ecosystem, and increased evaluation capacities. Areas of greatest growth for mentors related to being able to give back and share knowledge, gaining a connection with a young evaluator, and a cross-cultural exchange of how evaluations exist in different environments.

2) Satisfaction, generally, does not mean people will not drop out. For example, 93% (n=75) of satisfaction survey respondents reported it was worthwhile to do the Program once even though a large percentage had dropped out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Satisfied participants generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Satisfaction with the Moodle as an aid to improve the mentoring experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Increased evaluation capacity of mentees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Increased mentee’s confidence to pursue a career in evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Some mentee’s connections with professional networks were built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Increased mentee’s confidence to navigate a career in evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Increased commitment and satisfaction of mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✗ Less than half of mentees were satisfied with their mentoring experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considerations

Messaging is one way the Program could increase satisfaction with the mentoring experience. A general theme across the interviews (n=20) was that when mentors or mentees expressed dissatisfaction it related to a disconnect between expectations and the reality of the Program. For example:

- Being part of a cohort was expected to build an online community and connections, but most left only knowing their mentor or mentee (n=6).
- Advertising that the Program would increase mentee’s knowledge or skills, was expected by those dissatisfied to mean they would gain hands-on knowledge or skills (n=6).
- Mentors desired more systematic check-ins and accountability from EvalYouth (n=5).
• Having an online platform was expected to be accessible, and a few mentors truly struggled to access the Moodle’s content (N=4).
• Surprise that mentors dropped out or did not communicate for months with the mentee (n=4).

Having finished the pilot phase, the Program can more accurately market and qualify to participants what is and is not part of the Program.

There are aspects of the mentoring experience which Program Task Force II has little control over: access and quality of the mentor-mentee experience. One issue noted by interviewees was the ability for mentor-mentees pairs to access each other, especially when pairs live in different time zones, major life changes occur, or limited bandwidth increases communication troubles. Quality of mentor-mentee experiences is an area for further review, and potentially a concept for the Program to track going forward.

Recommendations

The following recommendation could be tested by the Program is in its second year:

• **Clearly, and repeatedly, frame realistic gains for participation:** This Program is an online, virtual, international mentoring program. The Program should not create high expectations for experiences or outcomes that are unlikely, such as actual participation in an evaluation. Suggestions for possible ways to do this include:

  o **Frame expected gains that focus on capacities, soft skills, networks, and mentors:** Research in Malaysia\(^{34}\) and South Africa\(^{35}\) on successful careers found that core components of success, beyond hands-on experience, corresponding to core elements of the Program: career capital that includes soft skills,\(^{36}\) networks\(^{37}\) and mentors.\(^{38}\)

  The Program should communicate more clearly that it will build these three important assets. Rather than simply stating participants will gain skills and knowledge, frame it as increased

  “75% of getting and maintaining a job successfully is supported by individual’s generic/soft skills… only 25% accounts for hard skills or technical knowledge”

  (Malhi, 2009)

---


knowledge of the evaluation field, and increased identification of skills needed, and increased knowledge of ways to grow professionally. Some of the most disappointed interviews expected this Program to essentially be a Masters level program focused on analytical and practical skill development. It is not, and cannot, be that.

- **Emphasize the importance of all types of evaluation capacities**: None of the interviewees initially considered capacities beyond technical skills. The evaluator had to expand, for all, to see if the other important skills were key gains. This evaluation used CES’s capacities that includes reflection, inter-personal, management, and eco-system. Reflection, especially, appears to be a key mechanism of growth in this Program that does not appear to be verbalized adequately as an important gain. Research has found soft skills are a must for career success.³⁹

- **Repeat, repeat, repeat**: The Program provided excellent documentation of roles and expectations for mentors and mentees. Onboarding is a highly important stage for setting participants on a good track. Multiple participants requested an orientation at the outset during and a follow-up mid-way through the Program. An orientation would be an easy way to set the tone, provide clear expectations and also build a sense of community.

- **Provide targeted, additional, support for any participant, especially Mentors, to use the Moodle**: While some suggested changing the Moodle platform, this evaluation indicates usage issues are pretty dichotomous. All interviewees who had issues were Mentors, some self-admitted to struggling with technology generally. It is suggested that Task Force II provide three check-ins to provide technological support: the beginning, mid-way, and at the end when final products expect to be loaded.

- **Provide some categorization of content by experience**: It was clear from the interviews that mentee skills were vastly different. One mentee was right out of college and had one evaluation experience, and another mentee competes internationally for evaluation contracts and has completed his Master’s degree. While interviews suggest mentees and mentors were effectively paired by experience level, the content of the Moodle could be more organized so those with more or less experience know which materials to focus on.

- **Experiment with non-time intensive ways for participants to build connections**: There are many ways to build an online community, but the first step for all is to build a sense of trust and get responses online.⁴⁰ The Program has limited resources, and time, making it hard for Task Force II staff to use the normal methods which include: taking the time to ask excellent questions, provide encouragement (cheer, thumbs up, write “great question/response”) for all who respond, probe deeper, follow up, remove any

---


⁴⁰ One evaluation informed the activities reported in the book, Taking College Seriously: Pedagogy Matters! by Gail Mellow, Diana Woolis, Marisa Klages-Bombich, and Susan Restler. Chapter 4, Scaffolding the Community provides insights. The other evaluation was of an online teacher program whose findings were never published.
very negative comments. Trust and hierarchy may be an issue as an interviewee noted it can be hard for a mentee to answer or discuss a question, because they do not want to overstep an experienced mentor. Even the mentee who grew his LinkedIn account from 80 to 600 members targeted other mentees and other evaluators with similar levels of experience on other EvalPartner chats, not mentors. Below are some potential ways to experiment with that could build connections or trust:

- Create subgroups for mentor and mentees, reducing the power difference between groups
- Have mentees set connection goals with their mentors in their first month, as some interviewed mentees wanted to have had a good online conversation with at least one or two other mentees compared to others who want to increase their LinkedIn profile number.

The other consideration is perhaps, rather than an online community which takes time and resources, provide some structures to break the ice:

- Both mentees and mentors interviewed suggested increasing dialogues amongst mentors or mentees. For example, sharing lessons learned, experiences, thoughts about an evaluation method, or theme. To reduce the time intensity for EvalYouth this may be an opportunity to rotate EvalYouth alumni to host a discussion or ask current participants to rotate and volunteer to facilitate (not lead) the discussion.
- The business world’s informational interviewing process provides an easy format for how to develop networks, one option is to providing an article and make it a bonus activity as a skillset that can support evaluators careers going forward.

- **Provide a few more systematic group check-ins with mentors:** A few mentors (n=4) noted it may be helpful to provide more systematic, group, check-ins where they could share tips for working with mentees, resources, and make them more accountability of their efforts with mentees. It is not recommended by the evaluator to implement deadlines focused on the mentors, because it goes against the theory to prioritize intrinsic instead of extrinsic motivations.

Due to time and scope, this project was unable to identify what specifically needs to change within the mentoring experience. The report will not provide a recommendation on how to engage mentors. Mentors generally appeared satisfied with their experience and in the qualitative interviews it was clear that those who participated felt sufficiently supported by the Program. However, it will be noted mentoring in itself is a skill. The National Research Mentoring Program in the United States focuses on supporting mentors in research to improve their skills as mentors.

---

41 Theories of growth online usually move from a level of trust/comfort to express oneself to sharing resources or an experience to critical thinking to reports of trying out someone else’s critical thought or activity.

42 This is based on the evaluator’s personal experience. In her final year of graduate school, the evaluator conducted 10 information interviews on how to do informational interviews with people in the business, foundation, and public policy world, and then conducted 30 evaluation-job related informational interviews. The process led to her getting an unadvertised job that lasted for five years during the height of the Great Recession in the US and in the economically depressed city of Detroit. She used a similar method to get a job in Denver, though lucked out and converted one informational interview into a job.
Impact:

*The Program’s long-term impacts are yet known. However, there are indicators that a virtual International Mentoring Program can have great impacts on the evaluation community on both the macro-level and micro-level.*

In accordance with Agenda 2020’s vision, the Task Force II team developed a mentoring program to increase the professionalization and number of capable evaluators. In total, 102 mentors and mentees participated in the Program. At the time this evaluation took place, 41 participants had completed the Program, almost evenly split between mentees and mentors.

It is tricky to assess a Program’s impact in a pilot phase when the evaluation takes place right at the end of programming. This section therefore captures available evidence of any nascent impacts revealed through data collection towards increased professionalization and the number of capable evaluators.

Task Force II interviewees and EvalYouth leaders perceived the International Mentoring Program impacted the evaluation community on a macro-level. As the icon array shows, Task Force II interviewees and EvalYouth leaders \((n=9)\) believed the Program positively contributed towards achieving the 2020 Agenda.

Interviewees provided evidence for this positive rating:

EvalYouth’s international Mentoring Program provides a mechanism to build a cadre of well-trained evaluators, and capacity building is one of the three pillars of the 2020 Agenda \((n=5)\). Mentoring provides an individualized approach that builds reflective and critical thinking skills, that takes one out of the classroom:

*"The thing we know about evaluation is that classes, books, aren’t enough. The opportunity to learn and critically reflect is what really helps you think about what it takes to apply and practice"*

EvalYouth and Task Force II built awareness for the importance of YEEs and what a group of YEEs can accomplish \((n=3)\). Activities completed by Task Force II have been substantial, and results such as the fact that 850 evaluators applied built a consciousness of the Program. Implementation may need further crafting and tweaking, but much was done and accomplished \((n=1)\). EvalYouth’s global efforts have influenced many local EvalYouth local chapters in a short time \((n=1)\).
The international Mentoring Program increases the number of evaluators who contribute to evaluations in their own country \((n=2)\) and thus democratizes evaluation. As one EvalYouth leader explained, there are few opportunities for increasing one’s evaluation skills outside the US context.

The Program took intentional steps to build the interest of local VOPES in the development of the Program \((n=5)\), although more could be done. This provided a model for local VOPES, and some have expressed an interest in developing their own programs \((n=2)\). The trick is to ensure that mentoring programs do not become duplicative \((n=1)\).

Some mentees and mentors provided examples of micro-scale impacts of the Program. These case studies provide examples of the tremendous effect the Program had on the lives of a few YEEs.

| Increased knowledge resulted in better job opportunities \((n=1)\) | The mentee joined the International Mentoring Program with only one year of experience in monitoring and evaluation. He devoured the Program’s resources which taught him basic steps to conduct an evaluation, like developing an evaluation framework. He started to implement better metrics to track the work in his office, which he believes is the reason metrics for his own work Program improved. His masters’ thesis content was inspired by the video on impact evaluations. He got a new job with better pay during the course of the Mentoring Program, and he was better able to answer interview questions because of lessons learned related to evaluation frameworks and how to manage an M&E office. |
| Networks for new job opportunities \((n=1)\) | One mentee was able to increase his evaluation network from 80 to 600 LinkedIn connections. He is using this network to pursue job international opportunities that he did not know about previously. |
| Increased pursuit of an evaluation career \((n=1)\) | As a result of the career development plan, and with her mentor’s guidance, one mentee applied for and received a fellowship to pursue a Master’s degree in monitoring and evaluation. She will attend the university in the fall. In the meantime, with the encouragement of her mentor, she has submitted a proposal for a presentation to a continental conference for the first time and joined her local VOPE. |

**Lessons Learned**

Findings show that on a micro-level the Program can have vast impact for those with strong initiative and drive, and clear focus for what they want. Findings also show that the Program has potential macro-level implications to address Agenda 2020. However, the lack of longitudinal data makes it hard to understand what has and has not been impacted.
Considerations
Going forward, the Program should take an interest in evaluating its own impact on participants, whether or not they finished. For those completed the Program, after a year, how would they reflect on their experience? For any dropouts, were the parts completed beneficial? Were there unexpected gains?

Recommendation

- **Create mechanisms to track when people dropout:** Currently, the Task Force II members do not know at what point or time in the Program someone left. This is an important data point to track for future assessment of impact, and to support implementation (as reviewed in the recommendation on efficiency to provide a mechanism for signaling someone is dropping out).

- **Engage alumni going forward:** Alumni will provide a basis to determine long-term impacts, especially for keeping track of how to contribute to the Agenda 2020 goals. Consider ways to re-engage, and vitalize alumni. For example: asking them to volunteer for new cohorts, sending a short survey annually to track where they are and what they are doing in relation to sustainable development (making it broader than the evaluation field), and engaging them in future evaluations.
Sustainability

The Program has made inroads towards building sustained capacity within EvalYouth, and modeling the Program so other YEE mentoring programs are developed. It is too early to tell if the Program will build a sustained capacity for mentees or mentors.

In its pilot year the expectation of the Program was to focus on development, articulating a plan for longer term and broader implementation. The Program successfully completed its first year, and has secured funding for its second year of operation (n=2). However, the funding is not permanent nor secured over a long period. EvalPartners itself has only secured funding for the next two years (n=1).

The decision to invest time, resources, and funding into any project is based on the expectation that projects will leave a lasting legacy. Sustainability can be defined in many ways. Patricia Rogers and Bob Williams, Australian and international leaders in evaluation methodologies and systems thinking, identified three core concepts to consider: the sustained capacity within an organization, the sustained idea or service model, and the sustained capacity within beneficiaries.43

| Sustained capacity of the organization: Partial evidence | There is evidence that there will be sustained capacity within Task Force II to continue this Mentoring Program for at least the next year. All Task Force II interviewed members (n=8) expressed pride and joy at participating as a volunteer, and the expectation they will continue to volunteer for this Program. One noted that structural policies at EvalYouth will change the dynamics of the group, as co-chairs will be expected to step down, however currently dedicated Task Force II participants are ready to step up to leadership positions. EvalYouth’s management is currently committed to consider this a program that will be continued (n=1). The infrastructure of the Program was developed to be low budget, such as the lack of cost for maintaining the Moodle platform. Currently this Program relies on funding from EvalYouth, and long term funding is not secured. While the Program exists on a low budget, it is resource intensive. |
| Sustained idea or service model: Nascent evidence | There is some evidence that the idea of a mentoring program aimed at YEEs will be sustained. Some EvalYouth global members also lead their local VOPES and are transferring the ideas locally (n=3). EvalYouth engaged local VOPES, to some extent, in the development of the Program and in the recruitment of participants for the Program. Some |

VOPES have expressed an interest in developing their own YEE mentoring programs \( (n=3) \). EvalYouth’s leadership recommends further development of networks and interconnectivity with VOPES as a priority for the future \( (n=1) \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustained capacity within beneficiaries: Too early to tell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is too early to tell whether the capacities individual gained will be sustained. The initial findings show that participants perceived an increase in their evaluation capacities (as reviewed in the effectiveness section).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lessons Learned & Considerations**

The Program successfully has developed ways to model the development and assessment of a mentoring program, and even translate surveys and curriculum into different languages. The Program has funding ensured for a second year, and then it is unsure of its financial future. Further, the Program intends to scale, before having perfected its initial model into a routine set of processes. As the Program goes forward, and its future funding remains uncertain, continue to build towards opportunities for sustainability of the idea or concept, in addition to sustaining the Program and capacity within beneficiaries.

**Recommendations**

Going forward, the following are some recommendations to test out:

- **Seek to reduce the resource intensity of volunteers over the longer term:** This report has identified a host of ways to improve implementation. Creating those changes may be resource intense. As the Program moves forward, consider what is viable given the time and scope of volunteers. The second year will probably continue to be resource intense since, as reported in Effectiveness, it is a “complex” stage. It will not be the most efficient year. When the Program reaches a routine stage (if it continues in year three), it will be possible to reduce resource intensity.

- **Consider ways to increase funding:** Consider “hot topics” in the evaluation world and find innovative ways to build those into the Program’s content in order to obtain funding from diverse sources \( (n=1) \). For example, current “hot topics” include impact investing, youth employment, youth in political engagement \( (n=1) \).

- **Continue to share with VOPES:** VOPES are an essential way for YEE mentorship to grow. EvalLeader suggested looking for ways to use alumni networks to offload the resource intensiveness of the Program \( (n=1) \). As the alumni base grows, could the Program provide more opportunities for connecting, especially within region or country?

- **Implementation, Implementation:** Continue to enhance and tweak implementation to improve the experience of beneficiaries \( (n=8) \).
## Appendices

### Appendix A: Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Sub-Questions</th>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>Was the Program design relevant to the mentoring needs of young and emerging evaluators?</td>
<td>To what extent did the Program’s components address unmet needs identified in mentoring survey?</td>
<td>Desk review: Review of mentoring survey and modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Were modules appropriate to maximize learning?</td>
<td>Data collection: Interviews with mentees and mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do the YEEs feel that they can handle M&amp;E responsibilities confidently now?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were coverage and participant diversity appropriate?</td>
<td>Did the Program consider the diversity of participants in terms gender, region, language, level of education, evaluation experience?</td>
<td>Desk review: Review of program participants list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data collection: Interviews with Task Force II Leadership and members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Is the Program cost-effective and time-efficient?</td>
<td>Were there better alternatives to the programmatic approaches for a lower cost?</td>
<td>Data collection: Interviews with Task Force II Leadership and members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have the resources been allocated strategically?</td>
<td>Satisfaction Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have the outputs been delivered in a timely manner?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How efficiently was communication between participants?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Did the Program build the capacity of mentees?</td>
<td>Do program participants perceive improvement in knowledge and skills?</td>
<td>Desk review: Review of pre and post assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did modules enhance the mentees learning experience?</td>
<td>Data collection: Interviews with mentors and mentees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How well did mentors support the development of mentees?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What components of the Program were most effective at building mentees’ capacity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What components of the Program were</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are mentees successful in their plan towards an evaluation career and connection with professional networks?</td>
<td>Do mentees feel connected with professional networks and skilled evaluators? To what extent did mentees improve their ability to build career in evaluation?</td>
<td>Desk review: Review of pre and post assessments Data collection: Interviews with mentors and mentees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the Program improved commitment of mentors?</td>
<td>What motivated mentors to participate in the Program? Are mentors satisfied with their experience in EvalYouth Mentoring Program? What did mentors gain by participating in the Program? Will mentors continue being mentors in upcoming phases?</td>
<td>Data Collection: Satisfaction survey Data collection: Interviews with mentors and mentees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Moodle LMS improve the experience of mentoring and mentees</td>
<td>Is Moodle interactive and user-friendly? Is Moodle a platform that program participants would like to use? What are suggestions for improvement?</td>
<td>Data Collection Interviews with mentors and mentees Satisfaction survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Has the Program positively contributed to achieving objectives of global evaluation agenda 2020? What is the impact on the program participants?</td>
<td>Desk review: Review of outputs survey Review of global evaluation agenda 2020 Data collection: Interviews with mentors and mentees Interviews with Task Force II and members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has there been any unintended consequences (positive or negative)?</td>
<td>Did the Program result in any regional mentoring initiatives? Did the Program have any negative consequences?</td>
<td>Data collection: Interviews with mentors and mentees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on program participants and/or evaluation community?</td>
<td>Interviews with Task Force II and members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>How effectively has the Program considered long-term impact and sustainability?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has the capacity of program participants improved in accordance with their career goals and job requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did the Program build national/regional capacity to continue running mentoring programs and training initiatives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has the Program built networks that would eventually sustain the Program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data collection: Interviews with program participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with Task Force II and members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Qualitative Consent and Questionnaires

Introduction and consent for all qualitative questionnaires

Hello ____,

Thank you for taking the time to talk with me today. I’m Natalie De Sole from Rooted-Growth, a third-party conducting organization hired by EvalYouth’s Task Force II International Mentoring Program to conduct this evaluation. EvalYouth piloted their mentoring program this past year and they wish to learn about participants’ experiences and outcomes in order to learn how to best run the Program in their second year of programming.

As an interviewee you should know that your responses will remain confidential, meaning your responses will not be attributed to your name or position in the report. Further, the EvalYouth staff do not know which program participants were invited and confirmed to participate in this study. Findings will be triangulated with other data sources and reported to EvalYouth for internal improvements and monitoring of outcomes. EvalYouth looks forward to your honest opinion about your experiences with the Program.

This interview should take no longer than sixty minutes. We would like to record your answers to ensure the accuracy of my notes. May I have your permission to record? Thank you.

Do you have any questions for me before we get started?

Interview questions for mentees and mentors

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>To help me understand your answers and perspectives, please introduce yourself and tell me why you got involved with EvalYouth’s International Mentoring Program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. | On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being none / little and 5 being maximum / very good: how satisfied were you with your mentoring experience?  
   • What went well and what challenges did you experience?  
   • EvalYouth is considering different programmatic options, what do think is the is the optimal length of time for a mentor and mentee program?  
   • What types of communication did you use with your mentor /mentee? If EvalYouth removed face-to-face options a criteria mentoring pairs, what advice would you give them to ensure continued connectivity? |
3. On the same scale as above, on a scale of 1 to 5, how well did EvalYouth’s Moodle system disseminate information?
   - What were aspects of the Moodle programming content did you enjoy the most and least? Was there anything missing?
   - Did the modules cover enough material? Would it be helpful to have a deep drive into a specific area?
   - Do you have any other suggestions for improvement?

4. **Mentors only:** How well did you feel EvalYouth supported you to be an effective mentor?
   - What did they do to support you?
   - What more could they have done to support you?

5. What were your top three positive changes, i.e. the most significant outcomes, you experienced by participating in this Program?

6. Were there any negative outcomes or challenges that arose because you participated in this Program? How did you deal with those negative outcomes / challenges?

7. Was there anything that surprised you about the project or something you did not expect to happen?

8. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being none / little and 5 being most / maximum. How would you rate:
   1) Before participating in EvalYouth’s International Mentoring Program: your (or your mentee’s) confidence in your (their) ability to successfully navigate a career as an evaluator?
   2) And at the end of the Program?

   Please explain any differences between your (or your mentee’s) confidence now and then.
   - Were there particular aspects of the Program that supported your (or your mentee’s) increased confidence? (a probes: a Moodle session, resources, mentor’s guidance, increased network)
   - Were there aspects of the Program that could have better increased your (or your mentee’s) confidence?
   - (mentees only) How do you plan to retain your confidence going forward?

9. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being none / little and 5 being most / maximum. How would you rate:
   1) Before participating in EvalYouth’s International Mentoring Program: your (or your mentee’s) capacity as an evaluator?
   2) And at the end of the Program.

   Please explain any differences between your (or your mentee’s) capacity as an evaluator now and then.
   - What types of capacities did you (or your mentee) gain? (probes: technical skills, interpersonal skills, reflective skills, management skills, understanding the environmental context)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10. **Mentees only:**
   - What elements of the Program best supported growth? (probes: mentor / moodle / networks / TF2)
   - Were there capacities you had hoped your mentee gained, but didn’t?
   - (mentee’s only) How confident are you in your ability to continue to increase your skills going forward?

| 10. **Mentees only:**
   - On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being none / little and 5 being most / maximum. How would you rate:
     1) Before participating in EvalYouth’s International Mentoring Program: the breadth of your evaluation network with professional evaluators.
     2) And at the end of the Program.
   - Please explain any differences between your (or your mentee’s) evaluation networks now and then.
     - What type of networks did you gain? (probes: connections to peers, knowledge of mentors, knowledge of institutional leaders or organizations to follow, connection at EvalYouth)
     - Were there aspects of the Program that supported the development of networks?
     - Could the Program have better supported the development of networks? If so, how?

11. **How useful was the final output to create a career development plan? Would you recommend any other type of output as more important as the final capstone to participating in the Program?**

12. **Mentors only:** Would you be a mentor again? (get a yes or no answer). Why or why not?

13. **Mentees only:** Would you recommend this to a friend? (get a yes or no answer). Why or why not?

14. **When you think of your participation in EvalYouth, was it worth the time and effort to participate? Why or why not?**

15. **Is there anything else you think it would be important for me to know about your experience?**

Thank you for participating in this evaluation!
**Interview questions for EvalYouth Task Force II and EvalYouth Leadership**

The following questions were initially expected to be asked to EvalYouth Leadership, but became the main questionnaire for all program implementers.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>To help me understand your answers and perspectives, please introduce yourself and tell me how and why you got involved with EvalYouth and particularly the Mentoring Program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>What issues do you perceive this Program tried to address, and how relevant was the identified solution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>How effectively do you believe EvalYouth’s TaskForce 2 team implemented the Program? (i.e. how effectively did EY TF maximize their resources (human, financial, etc)?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means none /minimal and 5 means maximum, what how significantly has the EvalYouth Taskforce II positively contributed to achieving the objectives of the global evaluation agenda 2020? Please explain your answer. What have been the greatest achievements? What more needs to be done?

5. What do you perceive were the three major programmatic successes of the Program?

6. Was there anything that surprised you about the project or something you did not expect to happen as result of this project? (were there any unintended consequences as a result of the Program?)
   Probes: regional/local mentoring initiatives

7. How effectively has the Program taken initiatives to build the sustainability of the Program? What more could they do?

8. When you think of your participation or support of EvalYouth’s TF2 efforts to build this international mentoring program was worth the time and effort? Why or why not?

9. Is there anything else you think it would be important for me to know about your experience?

Thank you for participating in this evaluation!
Appendix C: Online Satisfaction Survey

EvalYouth’s International Mentoring Program thanks you for your participation in the Program’s pilot year! EvalYouth wishes to understand how well its program worked and what are areas for improvement. EvalYouth asks you to complete the following short satisfaction survey to support its ongoing work.

1. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being none / minimal and 5 being maximum, how satisfied were you with the quality of the following aspects of EvalYouth’s International Mentoring Program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moodle Program content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. On a scale of 1 to 10, 1 being none / minimal and 10 being maximum, how likely are you to recommend this mentoring program to fellow evaluators or mentors?

3. On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not true and 6 very true, how true are the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Program created a welcoming environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EvalYouth’s program staff were easy to communicate with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust EvalYouth as a reputable organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Moodle technology was easy to use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Would you participate in EvalYouth’s International Mentoring Program again? Yes or No

5. Was it worthwhile to participate in the Program at least once? Yes or No

6. What role did you play in the EvalYouth International Mentoring Program?
   __ Mentor
   __ Mentee
   __ Other, please explain_______________________

Thank you for participating in this survey!
Appendix D: List of Documents Reviewed

Below is a list of documents reviewed which informed this evaluation:

- EvalYouth Concept Note: A global network to promote engagement, innovation, and exchange among young and emerging evaluators and youth and young people. Montrosse-Moorehead, B., Gervais, M. & Bitar, K.
- EvalYouth Mentoring Program Survey Infographic: exploratory research on opportunities and the needs of Young and Emerging Evaluators.
- Programmatic online Moodle content and modules.
- EvalYouth. Pre and Post survey of participant knowledge and skills.