**APPROACH TO PARTICIPATORY REFLECTION PROCESSES**
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|  | **OXFAM AMERICA** | **ACTION AID** | **MERCY CORPS** | **CHILDFUND INTERNATIONAL** |
| **Why do we do Participatory Reflection Processes?** | Create equal space among program stakeholders to jointly make sense of program M&E data and evaluative findings to agree on program progress – key for realizing monitoring, evaluation & learning in a rights-based approach to programming; Internal accountability and learning; Inform annual planning | Embedded in our ethos of accountability to the communities and partners that we work with, PRRPs promote reflective learning, space for community level participatory planning, monitoring, assessments and reporting on the programmes and projects. PRRPs empower communities to take ownership of and become agents of their own change, including challenging AA on issues of concern. | This started as a process and system (“Mission Metrics”) to align program results with our Mission Statement and better understand our achievements and improve our performance. Focus was mostly on the data definition and collection, but the approach included a participatory reflection process to review results and ‘make decisions.’  | Involving children and youth in program design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation serves two main goals: to develop and improve strong programs that respond to their needs; and to promote the voices of children/youth and their participation in the development of their communities.  |
| **What do they look like?** | 1-3 day reflection sessions; facilitated with participatory methods; no prescribed methodology – many AIRs use MSC (Most Significant Change) or other story telling method | 1-3 days reflection & review meetings/workshops, Often facilitated by a community member, a representative from a community based partner organization or an AA community staff member.Guided by participatory tools and methodologies found in AA Reflect- Action tool kit such as power analysis, problem tree, community stakeholder mapping, FGDs, matrix scoring/ranking, outcomes mapping, Score Cards etc. Tools are selected to suit the key purpose of the PRRP. Similar processes happen at National and International level though not as often. | Varied over 3 years of implementation – large group presentations with key questions prepared and discussed in small groups. Also targeted reports, meetings and analyses, attempts to engage and review with stakeholders, but not fully successful. | 1-2 day workshops involving various hands-on, age-appropriate activities with children and youth. Methodologies include: Body Map, Silent ranking, Stories of Significant Change, Train of Happiness, Timeline, and The Boat is Sinking. |
| **Who participates?** | Oxfam regional program staff, local partner staff, primary change agents (beneficiaries), government officials, experts (researchers/content experts), private sector/other stakeholders | **At community level**, COMMUNITY MEMBERS e.g. community women’s groups, OTHER STAKEHOLDERS i.e. community leaders, business owners, civil servants and government officials; PARTNER ORGANISATIONS, ACTIONAID COMMUNITY STAFF, **Regional and National Level** attended by partners, private sector, government officials, and AA Staff.**International level** is usually only ActionAid Staff | Mostly HQ level technical teams, regional program directors, and senior leadership. Field teams submit data, and are encouraged to use it in different ways to reflect on their work, but process difficult to enforce and didn’t really take off. | Children, Youth, Local Partner staff, National Office staff external facilitator (possibly) |
| **How often?** | Annually | **Community level:** mostly quarterly but sometimes monthly**National and International level:** Mostly annually but sometimes bi annually | Annually | Annually during reflection and planning period; Every 3 years more extensive consultations are undertaken as part of strategic planning |
| **What is done with the outputs/data?** | Used for annual planning locally with partners; report is drafted and shared with HQ, specifically senior management. First year held agency-wide webinar series to present AIR findings from each program with intention of creating cross-pollination between programs and with HQ units (private sector team, campaigns, etc…).  | PRRPs inform planning and reporting. Lessons and successes captured from community level PRRPs feed into regional, national and international level planning and reporting. Agenda for community level campaigns stem from these meetings. | Intended to be used for internal reflection meetings and annual planning meetings. Reports generated for countries and sectors. Final year did a glossy publication, but it was never really a ‘PR’ intention.  | Used by Local Partners and National Offices for strategic and operational planning at the sub-national and national levels. |
| **What is unique about your process?** | High emphasis on ensuring equal space and participation by all stakeholders including Primary Change Agents (beneficiaries); No prescribed way to conduct, therefore difficult to “just tick a box”. | PRRPs are a ritual in AA, an important accountability mechanism and a core part of programme interventions and AA Values. To the extent that communities demand for them and organize them whenever they wish to.  | Was unique because it didn’t require additional data collection, just reporting against mission alignment in a separate database. Was able to aggregate results without ‘common indicators. | Involve children ages 6-14 and youth ages 15-24 in intergenerational community consultations and in child/youth-only exercises using hands-on, child friendly methods. |
| **Biggest learning to date** | 1. Our local-level monitoring systems are weak – flagging importance of developing robust data systems at the program/local level through participatory methods.
2. No clear connection between AIRs and annual planning/budgeting cycle = no transparent process to address AIR findings and recommendations.
 | Originally designed to support learning, PPRPs have become integral to monitoring, planning, and reporting. However the methods and tools we use have not kept pace with the high expectations of PRRPs for planning and reporting which demand increasingly sophisticated data (qualitative & quantitative). Moving forward, we intend to stick to the concept, because we have been successful, but we are looking to combine with other methods in order to get a balance. | Mission Metrics was discontinued last year. Lessons:1. Limited set of indicator results (outcome only), so wasn’t fully representative and didn’t serve program management needs.
2. Defining results by mission was a mistake – too abstract and had no real ownership for data and results. Nobody was interested or compelled, thus the desired ‘reflection’ part of the process never really took place.

For these reasons, the results were not valued enough to justify the costs and MM was ended. | * If you have faith in the abilities of children and young people, you will be impressed by what they can do.
* Invest the necessary time and resources in planning, developing a strong, contextualized methodology, and in securing an experienced and impartial facilitator
 |
| **Who to contact for more information?** | **KIMBERLY MILLER**Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning OfficerOxfam Americakmiller@oxfamamerica.orgSkype: kimberlyj.miller.oaTel: 617-728-2418 | **BEVIS KAPASO**M&E Advisor Action Aid InternationalEmail: Bevis.Kapaso@actionaid.orgOr Bevis.Kapaso@gmail.comSkype: Bevis.KapasoTel: +27810555250 | **BARBARA WILLET**Director – Monitoring, Evaluation & LearningMercy Corpsbwillet@mercycorps.orgSkype: blwillett62Tel: 503-896-5832 | **JULIA FISCHER-MACKEY**Program Assessment and Learning SpecialistJFMackey@childfund.org Skype: JFMackey.ChildFund |