

## Evaluation at the height of a pandemic: Lessons from creative mixing & innovative matching

*The year 2020 was unlike any the world has seen in almost 100 years. The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted normal work processes and required extensive adaptation. This paper presents methodological adaptations that were made for the midterm review of a scholarship-based agricultural education program in two universities: Egerton University in Kenya and Gulu University in Uganda. Traditional evaluation research methods such as interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys were complemented with systematic document analysis, outcome mapping and harvesting, and the use of the most significant change technique. The key lesson is that innovativeness and creativity are new requirements for conducting evaluations effectively under difficult circumstances.*

*Sinmi Akin-Aina, Bielefeld Graduate School; Charles Atamba, Parliament of Kenya; Florence Etta, GRAIDE International Consultants Limited, Nigeria; Jackson Mutavi, GRAIDE International Consultants Limited, Kenya*

## Key Messages

- Rendered necessary by the COVID-19 pandemic, social distancing limited the concept, definition, and reality of “the field.” It circumscribed evaluators’ opportunities to observe and interact with project participants, experience projects first-hand, engage with project locations and actors, and follow other processes associated with traditional fieldwork.
- But traditional, not-so-traditional, and new methods can be combined in creative and innovative ways to manage monitoring, evaluation, accountability, and learning (MEAL) functions in these uncertain and challenging times.
- Practices that were changed during the pandemic are not likely to revert to their pre-COVID-19 form. Evaluators, program officers, and managers need to re-tool, re-skill and re-imagine ways of working that respond to human needs in large virtual environments while ensuring that no one is left behind.

## Introduction

In January 2020, the Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture (RUFORUM) in Uganda issued a request for proposals for a Midterm Review (MTR) of its flagship program, Transforming African Agricultural Universities to Meaningfully Contribute to Africa’s Growth and Development (TAGDev). The MTR was to be undertaken in the six months between March and August 2020. The assignment commenced in the first week of March, and the inception report was presented at the end of the month. By this time, Kenya, one of TAGDev’s principal countries of implementation, had recorded its first case of COVID-19. Uganda followed soon thereafter.

The team learned very quickly that the health crisis would make it impossible to execute the MTR’s plan for extensive travel and in-person visits to the university sites. Most MTR actions were therefore undertaken using digital and virtual tools. This paper

presents the methodology that the MTR team designed in response to the restrictions and protocols imposed by the pandemic. It discusses how the MTR creatively mixed evaluation approaches—outcome mapping, outcome harvesting, and the Most Significant Change (MSC) technique—with more traditional methods of interviews and surveys to improve triangulation and strengthen the evidence. The paper also provides lessons, insights, and recommendations drawn from the team’s experience. Because of proprietary issues, the evaluation’s findings are not presented here.

## Background of the Midterm Review

The MTR was commissioned by RUFORUM, a networking, resource mobilization, and advocacy collaboration platform devoted to making African universities more relevant to transformative sustainable development. The consortium counts 129 member universities in 38 African countries: it helps the universities to contribute to the ►►

► well-being of smallholder farmers and the economic development of sub-Saharan Africa. RUFORUM also has a memorandum of understanding with the African Union to strengthen Africa's capacity for science, technology, and innovation. The MTR referenced in this paper reviewed TAGDev, one of RUFORUM's four flagship programs currently under implementation.

TAGDev is an eight-year initiative that began in 2016 with the support of the Mastercard Foundation. TAGDev aims to transform agricultural education in Africa with interventions that transfigure individuals, institutions, and communities with projects and activities. One of TAGDev's major activities is a scholarship scheme for 220 undergraduate students and 110 graduate students (students studying for their master's degree)—all economically disadvantaged, academically deserving, and carefully selected individuals—so that these students can pursue their university education.

TAGDev began in two anchor universities: Egerton University in Kenya and Gulu University in Uganda. The MTR covered activities that had been implemented in TAGDev's first four years (2016 to 2020). The MTR concentrated on these two early adopter universities because most program activities were well established there and because of the international travel limitations imposed by the pandemic and COVID-19.

The MTR's purpose was to support learning, improvement, accountability, and sustainability by assessing the progress, performance, achievements, and lessons from TAGDev's implementation.

### The influence of the COVID-19 pandemic on the Midterm Review

The MTR was expected to last six months, from March to August 2020. Kenya confirmed its first case of COVID-19 on Friday 13 March 2020, and Uganda confirmed its first case on Sunday 22 March 2020.

The governments of Kenya and Uganda responded to the emergence of the disease by imposing daily curfews from 7 pm to 5 am and restricting travel to and from the parts of the countries with the highest number of caseloads. The restrictions were relaxed when infection numbers stabilized or fell, as they did from time to time. The population was encouraged to wear masks, use hand sanitiser, and practice social distancing to deter infection. The governments did not generally provide free personal protective equipment to the public, but they made the equipment available for purchase.

Imposed two to three weeks after the MTR began, these measures and the COVID-19-induced reality affected the MTR immediately and directly. The MTR's careful plans were disturbed and most were delayed. The original dates of significant milestone activities were dislodged by up to three months. The inception report, for instance, had been due at the end of March and was initially submitted at that time, but it was revised and re-submitted in May. Data collection was not only delayed from April until July but instead of data being collected in person in at least five of TAGDev's 15 program countries, it was only collected in two countries, principally because most international travels was suspended.

Of the three main challenges created by the circumstances, delays were perhaps the easiest to handle. The commissioners were very understanding and recommended that the MTR team take as much time as needed to do a good job. The methodological challenge was managed by revising evaluation techniques: namely, by mixing and matching approaches and methods. Finally, the evaluation confronted ethical challenges in terms of the health risks involved with MTR team members collecting data in person, namely by visiting respondents and project field sites. Although the MTR team and respondents were given personal protective equipment, fear and anxiety overexposure to city residents<sup>1</sup> made some individuals in the field reluctant to participate in the ►►

► MTR. The team was thus confronted with a structural barrier: the fact that many people affected by the project did not own a cell phone and had limited or no access, inclination, or familiarity with the Internet and/or the other digital tools that they needed to participate in the evaluation. This made participation, collaboration, and empowerment—three values and principles that are a cornerstone of the MTR team's practice—a major hurdle.

## Mixing approaches, matching methods

The methodological strategy chosen by the MTR team to deal with these obstacles was to apply innovative approaches alongside the traditional methods of evaluation proposed in the MTR's terms of reference. The team thus conducted a desktop document review, face-to-face and telephone interviews, field visits, focus group discussions, and surveys. Because of travel limitations, restrictions on gatherings, and social distancing requirements, data was mostly collected remotely using software such as Zoom, Skype, and WhatsApp. Field visits were almost impossible. A few focus group discussions and face-to-face interviews were conducted when the restrictions eased. On these occasions, the team enforced the mandatory protocols.

**Overall approach to evaluation:** The MTR deployed two broad evaluation approaches: utilization-focused evaluation, and participatory, collaborative, and empowerment approach. Outcome mapping, outcome harvesting, and the most significant change (MSC) technique were deployed to broaden engagement and participation.

### Data collection: Background

To engage and involve TAGDev program participants, students, scholarship recipients, representatives of partner institutions, and smallholder farmers, the team used mixed methods (quantitative

and qualitative methods) to collect data. Of the 410 respondents who participated in the MTR, 230 identified themselves as male (56%), 179 identified themselves as female (44%), and one did not identify their gender.

Data were collected from June to December 2020 and validated from September to December 2020. Data was collected with six methods: key informant interviews, focus group discussions, rapid outcome mapping, outcome harvesting, the case story method, and surveys.

The traditional evaluation methods of key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys were used to generate basic data. The other methods and techniques—rapid outcome mapping, outcome harvesting, and the case story method (the MSC technique)—were used with the traditional methods to complement them.

The mixing and matching occurred at three levels: the level of sampling, the level of methods, and the level of data analysis. Using multiple methods is a well-established strategy for triangulating data; in this case, however, participants were carefully surveyed using multiple methods. All TAGDev's partner groups—including lecturers, students, farmers, and implementers—were exposed to more than two data collection tools/methods each. The reasons were twofold: first, to overcome severe shortcomings in the ability of the MTR team members to see implementation sites for themselves; and second, to mine as much data as possible. This produced richer, deeper analyses and results.

### Data collection: Different methods

This section describes the creative and innovative ways that the MTR used three complementary approaches to collect data. The three approaches were the MSC technique, outcome mapping, and outcome harvesting is described. ►

### ► **Data collection using the case story method**

Drawing on the MSC technique,<sup>2</sup> the case story method was used to collect stories that recounted a significant transformation. Jess Dart and Rick Davies (2003) define the MSC technique as “a dialogical, story-based technique. Its primary purpose is to facilitate program improvement by focusing the direction of work towards explicitly valued directions and away from less valued directions” (p.137).

The MSC technique has three stages:

- Establishing domains of change
- Setting in place a process to collect and review stories of change
- Analyzing the stories

The MTR team applied all three stages of the technique. They identified domains of change from TAGDev's program literature, which stated TAGDev's transformational goals for the scholarship recipients, the implementing institutions, and the institutions' staff. The stories extracted from interviews disclosed changes at the level of individuals, communities, and institutions. Stories were collected from individuals (groups or institutions) who had been directly involved with project activities or interventions. The case stories were about individuals or institutions, depending on the teller, and were primary or secondary, depending on how the story was collected. Primary case stories were collected during the MTR, and secondary case stories had been compiled by TAGDev before the MTR and were mentioned in TAGDev's documentation.

### **Data collection using rapid outcome mapping and outcome harvesting**

Developed by the International Development Research Centre in the 1990s, outcome mapping is an approach to evaluation at whose heart lies the

change (the “outcome”) that occurs when individuals or institutions are involved in a development intervention. Outcome harvesting has similar roots but interprets “outcomes” in contexts that are complex or not fully understood. A major difference between outcome mapping and outcome harvesting is that in outcome mapping, the changes (outcomes) are graduated in intensity, and the most intense change is assumed to be more transformational. Outcome mapping and outcome harvesting are usually deployed independently. This was not the case in this MTR.

The MTR team deployed the first five of outcome mapping's 12 steps in a two-hour virtual workshop with 13 TAGDev staff members. During the workshop, TAGDev's outcomes were identified and collected, and TAGDev's mission and vision were affirmed. For each main group involved with TAGDev—farmers, students, lecturers, and institutions—the workshop participants stated the boundary partners, the outcome challenges, and the progress markers (i.e., graduated outcomes). This process of coaching program staff in the steps of outcome mapping was a critical and uncommon part of the MTR made necessary by the pandemic-imposed travel limitations.

Outcome harvesting was applied to “harvest” outcomes from the transcripts of key informant interviews. The outcomes were substantiated in program documents (Grau, 2019). All outcomes, whether from outcome mapping or outcome harvesting, were classified using outcome mapping's categories of “expect to see,” “like to see,” or “love to see.” The MTR team labelled the process, which combined outcome mapping and outcome harvesting, as rapid outcome mapping and harvesting (ROMAH).

### **Analyzing the general data**

For the survey, the MTR team performed traditional quantitative data analysis using Excel and SPSS. SPSS was used to generate descriptive statistics, frequency tables, and graphs. Qualitative data ►►

► from the interviews was sorted, coded, and thematically analyzed. Qualitative data from case stories and the outcomes that surfaced during the ROMAH exercise underwent quantification-based analyses. The MTR team considers the quantification (and thus the quantitative analysis) of the case stories and ROMAH outcomes to be innovative. For that reason, the next two sections of this paper describe the quantification process in some detail.

### Analyzing the case stories

A total of 24 stories were analyzed and scored for eight elements that indicated the desired individual or institutional transformation (Table 1, column 1). The analysis had three steps:

- Sorting the stories to isolate eight key elements of transformation
- Scoring the elements using a four-point scale ranging from 0 to 3, where 0 represents no transformation and 3 represents the most significant change. Two assessors separately scored all elements in each story.

Performing quantitative analyses of the scores. The team recorded the story elements for all the stories in an Excel table and calculated the total and average score for each story (i.e., each storyteller) and each story element (Table 1). The team then disaggregated the scores by the gender of the storyteller to compare the averages for stories told by men to the averages for stories told by women. In addition, the team compared the highest- and lowest-scoring elements in all stories to the highest- and lowest-scoring elements of stories told by men and stories told by women. The MTR team considers this an innovation.

### Analyzing the rapid outcome mapping and harvesting findings

The ROMAH findings (outcomes) were also quantified and analyzed. All outcomes collected from the ROMAH exercise for

stakeholder groups were classified in outcome mapping's terms "expect to see," "like to see," or "love to see," and were assigned a value of 1, 2, or 3, accordingly.

Box 1 presents the results of this analysis for one group of stakeholders: the staff of universities and technical and vocational educational training (TVET) institutions. The box describes the kinds of changes that TAGDev was said to have influenced. Column 1 lists the outcomes as described by the respondents, Column 2 labels each outcome or progress marker, and Column 3 lists the number of respondents who stated that outcome as having been realized. A value of zero in Column 3 means that an outcome had been identified in an interview transcript but had not been substantiated, i.e., corroborated or "owned" by someone in that boundary/partner group (in this case, by a member of the university or TVET staff). The colours in Column 3 denote the intensity of the change, where green is used for "expect to see," yellow for "like to see," and orange for "love to see." The changes in orange have strong potential for transformation. When a number in Column 3 is followed by a plus sign and the number one (+1), the outcome in that row was also harvested from a key informant interview.

## Lessons and recommendations

This section discusses issues with the MTR exercise and draws lessons and recommendations for evaluations now and in the future.

### Insights

By mixing methods innovatively, the MTR team was able to prioritize TAGDev's core objectives and ethos of participation, co-creation, empowerment, and community focus. The perspectives of program participants at various levels—scholarship recipients, administrators, project implementers, farmers, and institutional partners—enriched the results obtained with traditional methods. ►►

**Table 1: Story Element Scores by Gender**

Participant ID	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10	#11
Story Element	F	F	M	M	M	M	M	F	F	M	F
Confidence	2.5	2	1.5	2	2.5	2	2	2	3	2	2
Empathy	2	1.5	1	2	2	2	0.5	0.5	2	1	2
Leadership	1	1	1.5	1	2.5	2	2	1	2.5	1.5	1.5
Sensitivity	2	1.5	0.5	1	1.5	2	0.5	0.5	1.5	1.5	1
Responsive to family, community	2	2	1.5	1.5	2	2.5	1	1	2.5	0.5	2
Optimal study habits	2.5	2	1.5	2	2	2	2	2	2.5	2	2
Knowledge	2.5	2	1	1.5	2	2	2	2	3	2	2.5
Creativity	2.5	1	1	1	2	2	1.5	2	2	2	1.5
Innovativeness	2.5	0.5	1	1	2	2.5	2	2	3	1.5	1.5
Empowerment	2.5	2	2	1	2	2.5	2	2	2.5	2	2
Influence on others	1.5	2	1	1.5	2.5	2.5	1	0.5	1.5	1	1
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>1.80</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>1.38</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.80</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>1.71</b>	<b>1.71</b>

M=male; F=female

**Box 1: Outcomes Named by Staff of Universities and TVET Institutions, Type and Frequency of Mention**

Outcome	Outcome Label	Number of Respondents Who Mentioned the Outcome
Capacity for experiential or practical teaching/training	Expect to see	5
Improving tools and techniques for field-based teaching and learning	Expect to see	2 + 1
Improving students' business plans/ideas	Expect to see	1
Attending and presenting in symposiums, workshops, and conferences to share research work	Expect to see	3
Building farmers' capacity to use or adopt new farming technologies, new practices, new crop varieties, new animal breeds, etc.	Like to see	2 + 1
Better entrepreneurial skills	Like to see	1
Integrating community engagement processes in teaching, and research	Like to see	2
Better monitoring of research activities	Like to see	1
Preparing and presenting publications/policy briefs at national and international forums	Love to see	1
Changed attitude towards entrepreneurship and agribusiness	Love to see	1
Identifying and proposing solutions to gaps and challenges in the food value chain through research	Love to see	0
Review course outlines to include course work on field projects	Expect to see	0
Supporting students to develop entrepreneurial skills	Expect to see	0

TVET=technical and vocational educational training



	#12	#13	#14	#15	#16	#17	#PS 21	#PS 22	#PS 23	#PS 24	Average
	F	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	F	
	2.5	3	2.5	3	2.5	2	2	2.5	2.5	2	2.23
	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	2.5	1.75
	2.5	2.5	1.5	2	2	2	2.5	3	3	2	1.83
	1.5	1	1	2	1	1	2.5	2	2	2	1.50
	3	3	2.5	3	2	1.5	2	2.5	2.5	3	2.16
	2	2	2	2.5	2	1.5	2	2	2	2.5	2.00
	3	2.5	3	2.5	2.5	2	2.5	3	2.5	2.5	2.25
	3	3	2	2.5	2.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	2	1.85
	3	3	2	2.5	2.5	1	2	1.5	3	2.5	2.08
	3	2.5	3	3	2.5	2	2.5	3	2.5	2.5	2.23
	2.5	2	3	2.5	2	0.5	2	2	2	2.5	1.72
	2.83	2.42	2.28	2.60	1.83	1.57	2.00	2.42	2.40	2.20	

► The MSC technique made it possible for individuals, communities, and institutions to report on their unique experiences of change and transformation in a very personal voice. It also allowed the MTR team to observe changes along gender lines.

The variety of the findings produced a holistic view of TAGDev but also revealed details and intricacies of how TAGDev's operations, implementation, sustainability, and transformative effects affected individuals, communities, and institutions.

Five months after the MTR, the RUFORUM manager responsible for the MTR exercise commented on the utility of the MTR's methods: "First and foremost, [the MTR] took an institutional approach to evaluate the TAGDev project. This provided feedback to RUFORUM beyond the scope of the TAGDev as a project. The methodology was quite thorough.... The difference with the process you had was that it provides an opportunity for reflection and learning co-currently" (email to the evaluation manager, August 2021).

The MTR team faced several challenges to implementation:

- Travel was restricted, as was the number of people who could gather at one time. More focus group discussions had to be held, especially in Uganda.
- Travel restrictions made it almost impossible to collect data from such project locations as farms. The MTR, therefore, relied on photographs and verbal descriptions provided by program implementers and used communications technology in program countries other than Kenya and Uganda (Benin, Ghana, Sudan, and Zimbabwe). Of course, these were not as good as in-person observations.
- Time on Zoom, Skype, and the telephone was limited by practical factors, such as interruptions and problems with network connectivity.
- Other challenges were as follows:
  - Program implementers were not familiar with some of the ►



- ▶ *data collection methods (outcome mapping, outcome harvesting, and the MSC technique).*
- *Not all the narratives of the stories were structured in the same way.*
- *Some secondary case stories did not highlight the key elements of change and transformation that the MTR team was looking for.*

## Findings

The key informant interviews, the surveys, the virtual focus group discussions, and the case stories did not require interaction in person and could thus take place remotely. Outcome mapping and outcome harvesting, however, are participatory methods that had to be modified for remote use. The great casualty of the pandemic was the traditional field visit.

The MTR team's use of diverse, flexible, and accessible methods allowed multiple stakeholders at different levels to contribute through whatever mediums were available to them in their location and context (cell phones, computers, laptops). The results of mixing outcome mapping and outcome harvesting show that the two approaches can work well together.<sup>3</sup> Innovation was at the heart of harvesting outcomes from the transcripts of key informant interviews, which were also analyzed traditionally. To adapt the MTR to COVID-19, the MTR team coached participants on outcome mapping for two hours. Traditional training would have lasted much longer, possibly days.

Virtual focus group discussions were a useful cost-saving strategy. When national team members conducted face-to-face focus group discussions in communities using full COVID-19 protocols and personal protective equipment, additional costs were incurred.

Transforming and quantifying qualitative data allowed for quantitative analyses and produced different, useful ways to visualize the findings.

## Lessons learned from evaluating during the pandemic

The first lesson from monitoring and evaluation in the COVID-19 context was that social distancing limited the concept, definition, and reality of “the field.” It circumscribed evaluators’ opportunities to observe and interact with project participants, experience the project first-hand, engage with project locations and actors and apply other processes associated with traditional fieldwork.

The second lesson was that traditional, not-so-traditional, and new methods can be combined in creative and innovative ways to manage monitoring, evaluation, accountability, and learning (MEAL) in these uncertain and challenging times. The circumstances suggest that evaluators need a new skill set: skills in data science and visualization as well as skills to apply not-so-common evaluation methods, new methods, and methods that are still developing.

The third lesson was that development programming will continue, as will monitoring and evaluation, a health crisis notwithstanding. The pandemic has emphasized the critical value, indeed the necessity of information and data for decision-making. But delays are to be expected and planned for accordingly.

The principal lesson for the post-COVID-19 context is that practices that were changed during the pandemic are not likely to revert to their pre-COVID-19 form. Evaluators, program officers, and managers need to re-tool (use digital tools), re-skill (learn to operate effectively in virtual settings), and re-imagine ways of working that meet human needs in virtual environments.

## Conclusion

The 2020 COVID-19 pandemic has produced global ravages for almost two years. Despite the emergence of new variants ▶▶

► of the virus from time to time, the situation is improving slowly as vaccines become available around the world and therapeutics are discovered. But the virus is still very much a danger, in Africa as in the rest of the world. What does this mean for the practice of M&E in general? What does it mean for M&E in Kenya and Uganda, where most of the MTR took place?

Most commentators believe that life as we know it is unlikely to revert to what it had been before the pandemic. Under the “new normal,” it is imperative that MEAL continues and that MEAL evaluators find ways of being creative and innovative. The MTR discussed in this paper proves that today’s context requires flexibility and a careful choice of tools, techniques, and methods that generate meaningful information and data by engaging stakeholders—even remotely—to capture an initiative’s real effects.

Given the above, we recommend the following. First, evaluation commissioners should allow more time and methodological flexibility for evaluations. Short timeframes of two or three months ought to be a thing of the past. Second, evaluators should become more innovative and creative, mixing tools, techniques, and methods to improve their evaluations and guarantee the use of their findings. Better skills and competencies and more knowledge of new tools, techniques, and methods are critical in uncertain times, such as during pandemics. Third, methods that perfect the participation, inclusion, and involvement of all groups of individuals engaged with an initiative—especially methods that involve collecting data remotely—should be selected with care to avoid the systematic marginalization or discrimination against certain groups. eVALU

---

## Endnotes

---

1. The members of the MTR team were seen as coming from Nairobi and Kampala, which were epicenters of the disease outbreak.
2. <https://www.mande.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2005/MSCGuide.pdf> The ‘Most Significant Change’ (MSC) Technique A Guide to Its Use
3. A recent publication of the Outcome Mapping Learning Community discusses the concepts: their similarities, their differences, and their uses. <https://www.outcomemapping.ca/resource/outcome-mapping-and-outcome-harvesting-common-concepts-differences-and-uses> 27/4/21  
*Note: Only registered users/members have access to this link.*

## References

1. INASP, Evidence-informed policy making (EIPM) toolkit. INASP. <https://www.inasp.info/publications/evidence-informed-policy-making-eipm-toolkit> [Accessed May 2, 2020].
2. Aisiri, A. et al., 2020. Use of the most significant change technique to evaluate the intervention in promoting childbirth spacing in Nigeria. *African Evaluation Journal*, 8(1).
3. Anon, Guidelines for Evidence Use in POLICY Analysis and Decision Making. No. 10 of 2017 <http://www.kenyalaw.org:8181/exist/kenyalex/actview.xql?actid=No.+10+of+2017> [Accessed May 2, 2020].
4. Dart, J. & Davies, R., 2003. A dialogical, story-based evaluation tool: The most significant change technique. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(2), pp.137–155.
5. Dart, J., Stories for change: A systematic approach to participatory monitoring. Available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228931057\\_Stories\\_for\\_Change\\_A\\_systematic\\_approach\\_to\\_participatory\\_monitoring](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228931057_Stories_for_Change_A_systematic_approach_to_participatory_monitoring) [Accessed May 2, 2020].
6. Earl, S., Carden, F. & Smutylo, T., 2014. *Outcome mapping building learning and reflection into development programs*, Ottawa: IDRC Books / Les Éditions du CRDI.
7. GRAIDE International Consultants, 2021. Midterm review (MTR) of RUFORUM's 'Transforming African Agricultural Universities to Meaningfully Contribute to Africa's Growth and Development (TAGDev)'.  
8. Ministry of Health Republic of Kenya, 2022. Update on Novel Coronavirus. (02/02/2020). Ministry of Health-Republic of Kenya. <http://www.health.go.ke/press-releases/>
9. Ministry of Health- the Republic of Kenya, 2020. Update on Novel Coronavirus. (04/03/2020).
10. Ministry of Health- Republic of Kenya, 2020. Update on Novel Coronavirus. (19/02/2020).
11. President of Kenya, 2020. Presidential address on the state interventions to cushion Kenyans against economic effects of covid-19 pandemic on 25th March 2020. *The Presidency*.
12. <https://www.president.go.ke/2020/03/25/presidential-address-on-the-state-interventions-to-cushion-kenyans-against-economic-effects-of-covid-19-pandemic-on-25th-march-2020/> [Accessed May 2, 2020].
13. Serrat, O., 2017. The most significant change technique. *Knowledge Solutions*, pp.35–38.
14. ThinkWell, 2022. Uganda's Emergency Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Case Study Uganda Report / <https://thinkwell.global/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Uganda-COVID-19-Case-Study-18-Sept-20201.pdf> [Accessed May 2, 2020].

## Authors' profile

**Sinmi Akin-Aina** is a doctoral researcher in history and sociology at the Bielefeld Graduate School in Bielefeld, Germany. She researches refugees, cities, citizenship, and transnationalism. Her experience covers research, project coordination, program evaluation at the African Leadership Centre (Nairobi and King's College London), and evaluations for the Borderless Higher Education for Refugees Project at Dadaab Refugee Camp (York University). She has worked with the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System for Kenya, and the Regional University Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture. Sinmi holds a bachelor of arts degree in sociology from McGill University and a master's degree in social work from Carleton University.



**Charles Atamba Elly** holds a master of arts degree in economics and a bachelor of arts degree (with honours) in economics and sociology. He is a trained monitoring and evaluation expert and has over 10 years of experience in development work, strategic planning and performance management, baseline surveys, project/program monitoring and evaluation, ISO 9001:2008 quality management, and the economic analysis of public policy, evaluation, and research. He is also an experienced trainer of trainers.



Charles has worked as a program staff member and as a project coordinator for various public organizations. Among other assignments, he coordinated a World Bank program under a ministry. He has extensive exposure in grassroots project management, project monitoring and evaluation, and the use of impact assessments to link public policy to citizens' needs. Charles has participated in several technical working groups tasked with such important national assignments as strengthening the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) and developing a national public policy handbook.

**Jackson Mutavi** is a monitoring, evaluation, accountability, and learning (MEAL) specialist and an expert in strategic planning with over 12 years of experience in human rights; health care (maternal and child well-being, health systems, mental health); sexual gender-based violence; and gender-responsive, equity-focused international development. He is based in Nairobi, Kenya.



Jackson is a seasoned evaluator, data management specialist, researcher, and trainer with experience in government and non-profit organizations. He works in various cultural contexts, including in north-eastern Kenya (camp-based refugees), Nairobi County (urban refugees), and East Africa. His most recent work has concentrated on midterm reviews, program evaluations, capacity building, impact studies (random controlled trials), and research on deeply mixed methods. Jackson has substantial experience in qualitative and quantitative methods alike.

Jackson holds a Master of Science degree in social statistics and information technology from Kenyatta University and has a certificate in Monitoring & Evaluation for health programs from Nairobi University.

**Florence Etta** - A judge of the World Evaluation Case Competition, Florence Etta is the vice co-chair of EVALSDGs, a global network created in 2015 by EvalPartners, and the vice-chair of the Africa Gender and Development Evaluators network, which was established in 2002. She chaired UN Women's Global Evaluation Advisory Committee between 2017 and 2019 and was the sixth president of the African Evaluation Association. Florence is a fellow of the Nigerian Evaluators Association. She holds a doctorate from the University of London's Institute of Education.

