Self-Reflection

As they are intervening in complex human systems, capacity-development practitioners need to be flexible, adaptable and willing to learn from what they do. An important source of learning in real time is the processes and results of monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

Bruce Britton explains M&E activities as they are commonly pursued and explores creative ways in which practitioners can use them for personal learning and self-reflection. He also provides suggestions on how this can be done under non-conducive organizational conditions.

Monitoring and Evaluation for Personal Learning

Bruce Britton

By three methods we may learn wisdom: first, by reflection, which is noblest; second, by imitation, which is easiest; and third by experience, which is the bitterest.

(Confucius)

Introduction

Capacity development practitioners collaborate in efforts to improve the capabilities of complex human systems that operate and connect at different levels. First and foremost, capacity development is a process based on the assumption that better understanding and knowledge will bring about change. Also, the planning for capacity development interventions typically rely on variations of the Logical Framework Approach (LFA), which encourage careful thinking about expected outcomes and impacts. By its very nature LFA assumes that intended results of an initiative can be established in advance because the path that a capacity development process will take can be adequately assured, which requires a reasonably stable operating environment. The reality is usually very different.
Reflecting the perspective of other chapters in this volume, capacity development processes often evolve in ways we cannot anticipate. Their paths are rarely predictable and sometimes seem to defy the logic that was used to plan them. Consequently, by requiring progress to be assessed against pre-determined outcomes – which time and experience may demonstrate are unrealistic – organizations providing capacity development services can sabotage the very process they wish to support. In doing so they can undermine the self-confidence of the practitioners involved. The negative effects of this are experienced in different ways: at an organizational level in terms of frustration over unachieved goals and at an individual level as poor performance and de-skilling. However, there is another way of viewing deviation from plans, namely by using divergence as experience-based opportunities for reflection.

In other words, the unpredictability and fluid nature of capacity development can be viewed not as a failure of planning but as an indication of the need for adaptability and an opportunity for learning. As capacity development practitioners become more experienced, they develop a deepening understanding of the complexity of the issues with which they are working. Using the insights generated through reflection, advisers can become more adaptable and flexible in dealing with the unexpected challenges and problems that arise in day-to-day work with clients.

So, how can practitioners accelerate the pace at which they deepen their mastery of capacity development? One powerful way is through experience-based learning processes such as shadowing, coaching and action-learning. Unfortunately, not all practitioners have access to these structured experiential learning opportunities. However, practitioners can also develop their expertise using personal techniques for reflecting on and learning directly from their work. Using the formal feedback mechanisms of monitoring and evaluation is an important and often overlooked way to do so. This being said, using monitoring and evaluation in this way can be difficult because most of these systems are designed with other purposes in mind.

The conventional view of monitoring and particularly evaluation sees them as processes that are used primarily for assessing performance and ensuring accountability, not for reflection and learning. Reasons for this are explored in detail in Chapter 21. Consequently, if monitoring and evaluation rigidly focus on performance management it may be necessary for the practitioner to ‘subvert’ these systems – in the sense of challenging and expanding their intended purpose – in order to maximize the learning opportunities they offer.

This chapter examines how capacity development practitioners can use formal and informal monitoring and evaluation systems not only to assess progress towards intended outcomes but also, and just as importantly, for the purposes of self-improvement. In addition, by taking a creative approach to informal monitoring, practitioners can also create valuable opportunities for strengthening mutual support with colleagues.

The rest of the chapter is organized as follows. We begin with a brief introduction to the monitoring and evaluation of capacity development initiatives, also discussed in more detail in Chapter 18. The chapter then focuses on what can be characterized as the conventional purposes and uses of both monitoring and
evaluation, which are contrasted with a more creative, learning-oriented approach. Thereafter, suggestions are made for how capacity development professionals can strengthen their own practice and influence the development of a more reflective approach to capacity development in their work. The chapter ends with suggestions about resources that can help capacity development practitioners make use of monitoring and evaluation for personal development through self-reflection.

**Monitoring and evaluating capacity development**

Monitoring and evaluation are usually spoken of together as in the abbreviation ‘M&E’. The abbreviation gives the impression that the ‘M’ and the ‘E’ are inseparable or even interchangeable processes. The two terms are joined together because of their similarities. However, it is equally important to recognize the differences between monitoring and evaluation in order to identify how each can contribute to personal reflection and learning. A short examination of the usual understanding of monitoring and of evaluation can shine some light on the often untapped potential of each as a trigger for one’s professional development as a practitioner.

**What is monitoring?**

Monitoring is commonly described as the systematic and continuous assessment of the progress of a piece of work over time. Monitoring activities check that things are ‘going according to plan’, enabling adjustments to be made in a methodical way. This conventional type of definition underplays the reflective, learning aspect of monitoring. A more comprehensive description of monitoring can be found in the Barefoot Collective’s *Guide to Working with Organizations and Social Change*. This valuable publication explains that ‘Monitoring should be seen as a reflective practice that assists learning to take place, enabling improvement in practice, including possible rethinking and re-planning. It can also be an important affirming practice of what is going well’ (Barefoot Collective, 2009, p154).

Monitoring is an integral part of management systems. It is typically carried out by those who are involved in the work on a day-to-day basis. It usually involves gathering data in a number of ways including examining work records (often, but not exclusively, in the form of quantitative data), holding meetings, interviewing those involved, using participatory techniques, using secondary information (from documents) and observing activities. The most common tangible outputs of this data-gathering are client records and regular progress reports. Examples are: monthly contract reports; quarterly reports to clients and senior managers and annual reports to clients, board members and, if relevant, donor organizations that support the capacity development initiative.

It is still common to hear the complaint from practitioners that monitoring creates ‘one-way traffic’. Information flows from the place where the work is being undertaken upwards or inwards through an organization. But analysis rarely flows back to those who gathered the data in the first place. The underlying and usually unspoken principle that guides many monitoring systems is ‘no news is good news’. In other words, the only reason that those who generate the monitoring data
may receive feedback from those who examine and analyse the data is when there is a discrepancy between what was supposed to happen in the ‘plan’ and what actually happened in practice. When feedback is given in these circumstances, it can take the form of criticism for a ‘failure’ to deliver agreed targets or to deliver them on time. Even if the intention is not to criticize, that is often how the feedback is perceived by the practitioners on the receiving end. It is hardly surprising that such monitoring systems create an (albeit unintended) disincentive to report truthfully and hence limit the formal opportunities for practitioners to honestly reflect on and learn from their experience. In contrast, ‘good monitoring shows a genuine interest in what is being done and a constant and curious questioning of activities and their emerging effects… If monitoring is separated from learning it risks becoming a policing function’ (Barefoot Collective, 2009, p154).

What is evaluation?

Evaluation is the most formal way in which work is examined and feedback generated. Evaluation involves the periodic assessment of the relevance, performance, efficiency or impact of activities with respect to their purpose and objectives. Evaluation is often carried out at some significant stage in a change-oriented process, for example towards the end of a planning period, as the work moves to a new phase, or in response to a particular critical issue (Bakewell et al, 2003). Usually, but not always, evaluation involves one or more people from outside the organization working as independent evaluators or, together with staff from the organization, forming part of an evaluation team.

When evaluations are conducted there is often a lot at stake. Future funding streams; staffing levels; accountability for the use of resources; career development decisions and professional reputations may all apparently depend on a ‘positive’ evaluation. On the face of it, this does not appear to be fertile ground for reflection and learning. Anxiety and stress levels can be high. There may be an understandable fear about exposing unintended outcomes and unachieved goals to wider scrutiny. Much depends, of course, on how the evaluation is conducted. A generally agreed basic principle is that the monitoring and evaluation of a capacity development initiative should itself contribute to developing capacity. Although it can be difficult to achieve this in practice, some external evaluators of capacity development initiatives do take this responsibility seriously. Horton et al (2003, pvi) describe this in the following way: ‘When we take people through a process of evaluation – at least in any kind of stakeholder involvement or participatory process – they are, in fact, learning things about evaluation culture and often learning how to think in these ways. The learning that occurs as a result of these processes is twofold:

• the evaluation can yield specific insights and findings that can change practices and be used to build capacity, and
• those who participate in the inquiry learn to think more systematically about their capacity for further learning and improvement.’
What typically gets monitored and evaluated in a capacity development initiative?

What gets monitored and evaluated depends, of course, on the objectives and scope of the capacity development initiative. There is an understandable tendency for organizations to monitor what is measurable in a capacity development process, for example, the number of training workshops run, or the introduction of a new finance software system. However, the tendency to monitor the more easily measurable activities and outputs of capacity development interventions often means that the purpose and ‘invisible’ dimensions of this effort become lost. This may also mean that the monitoring system is blind to the unintended effects – both positive and negative – of the capacity development initiative because there are no indicators to measure them. Most significantly, for the development of the practitioner, there may be no focus at all on the unfolding process of the capacity development initiative. But this need not be the case.

Among the most well-developed tools for monitoring and evaluating capacity development are those that examine and assess changes in organizational capacity. Organizational assessment (OA) tools go beyond the output measures of counting, for example, the number of participants attending training courses. Such information tells us little about consequent changes in the workshop participants’ competencies and even less about how they subsequently apply their new knowledge and skills in pursuit of their organization’s goals. Whilst OA tools may have their faults (and some can be time-consuming, difficult to validate or based on culturally inappropriate concepts), they do focus on outcomes – acknowledged changes in organizational capacities – so they provide a gauge of the effects of an organizational capacity development intervention, not simply a record of activities undertaken.

However, even well-designed OA tools do not usually elicit explanations of why and how some organizational capacities have developed more than others and what the capacity development practitioner did to facilitate or hinder those changes. Answers to these questions are of considerable importance to the thoughtful practitioner who wishes to strengthen their practice. Because the answers are often of less immediate concern to a practitioner’s own organization, the questions may not be asked as part of the formal monitoring process and hence important opportunities for feedback, learning and professional development are lost.

So, as we have seen, focusing only on the conventional uses of monitoring and evaluation can overlook their potential for helping capacity development practitioners to reflect on and learn from their experience. Practitioners, as outsiders or as staff, may view monitoring or evaluation as external, demand-driven processes designed by someone else to generate data for their managers to make judgements about their performance and achievement of targets. Monitoring is thus seen as a chore and evaluation treated as an unpleasant but necessary task that is demanded by others but remains disconnected from the day-to-day reality of developing the quality of work practice. However, this situation is not inevitable if creativity is applied.
Creative approaches to monitoring and evaluation in capacity development

There are proven ways to turn the processes and information generated by monitoring and evaluation into potentials for self-development. Three examples are explored below.

Living the principles of reflective practice

When a capacity development practitioner embraces the idea of learning from evaluation and particularly from monitoring they demonstrate a commitment to what is often referred to as ‘reflective practice’. Reflective practitioners apply a powerful combination of self-awareness, critical thinking and analytic ability allied to a commitment to continuously apply on-the-job learning to their work.

Reflective practice involves the professional stepping back from an experience to make sense of it, understand what it means, learn from it and apply that learning to future situations. Applying critical thinking to experience develops and deepens insights. But what makes reflective practice different from other approaches to learning is the focus on action. Reflective practice is more than examining the past to identify ‘what went well’ or ‘what could have been done better’. Reflective practice occurs when the practitioner initiates a cycle of action learning. The key to being a reflective practitioner is combining genuine inquisitiveness with a commitment to do things differently based on careful consideration of alternatives. The process of reflective practice can be summarized as a cycle comprising six steps.

1 Experience: Select a ‘critical incident’ to reflect on
2 Appraisal: Describe and unpack the experience
3 Analysis: Examine the experience
4 Discovery: Interpret and draw realizations from the experience
5 Integration: Explore the alternatives and re-think future action
6 Informed Action: Take action with new intent

By following these steps, the process of reflective practice brings together the skills of self-understanding, critical thinking, analysis and experience-based learning. These are skills that practitioners can readily learn and develop, given the right conditions.

Using monitoring as a springboard for learning – a practical example

Framework is a collective of consultants working with not-for-profit organizations worldwide. Currently the membership is six consultant practitioners. Each is self-employed and of equal status: there is no management hierarchy. A key organizing principle in Framework is mutual accountability for high quality.

Framework practitioners have developed tools for enabling reflective practice and experiential learning, the most important of which is peer supervision. This process involves a circular arrangement with each consultant supervising a colleague and, in turn, being supervised by another. The following example demonstrates peer supervision focusing on the on-going monitoring of contracts.
Box 20.1 The value of peer support

‘I was in an awkward situation. I had been contracted by a client organization to help them develop a strategy for organizational learning. A week interviewing staff and other stakeholders led to an understanding of what was working well and some ideas for how learning could be organized more strategically. But at the same time I was increasingly aware that interviews had been used by staff as an opportunity to ventilate their feelings about the organization’s leadership. It was uncomfortable to hear the criticism and I was finding it difficult to work out how to handle the situation. Although a small steering group had been set up within the organization to manage the strategy development process I was not sure how best to raise the concerns with them. I decided to talk through my concerns at my next peer supervision session. Before the session I reflected on the progress I had expected to achieve at this stage in the contract against the agreed timeline for the work. I also developed a list of what was going well with my work and where my anxieties lay. During the peer supervision session, I reviewed the progress I had made on the contract and reassured myself that I had enough good quality data to make a comprehensive assessment of the current situation. My colleague then helped talk through my feelings about the concerns that had been expressed about the organization’s leadership. Through the sensitive use of questioning my colleague helped me realize that this ‘critical incident’, that is a willingness of staff to express their criticisms rather than keep them private, was a positive sign. This created an opportunity for change that was in the best interest of the organization. I began to recognize that my worries related mainly to a need to feel in control of the situation: I was worried that by passing on the critical feedback I might open up a ‘can of worms’ leading to internal conflict with negative consequences for the organization. Worse still, if relationships in the organization deteriorated it would be my fault! My colleague also helped me to see that my own discomfort in facing this potential conflict was a reflection of the discomfort that was held by many in the organization. I could see that I had a responsibility to share all the data that was relevant to the work. Leadership style was an important part of that data because it influenced the organization’s learning culture. The key then was to design a process that would enable the organization to express and hear the different viewpoints, draw conclusions without those involved becoming defensive and then work out ways of improving the situation. With a peer review, I developed a strategy for discussing my concerns with the steering group and with the leadership. I then developed some new proposals for the design of a feedback and planning workshop. Reflecting on the progress of this contract with a valued colleague helped me to develop a much clearer understanding of the boundaries of my responsibilities and gave me the confidence to communicate this to my client. Those insights continue to shape my work.’
Reflective practice flourishes in a supportive environment and fails to thrive when circumstances are inhospitable. Organizations employing capacity development practitioners as staff or as external advisers have a crucial role to play in encouraging and supporting reflective practice by ‘nurturing a culture of critical self-reflection and self-evaluation’ (Dlamini, 2006, p13). A useful way for managers to think about this is to consider the motive, means and opportunity for reflective practice. ‘Motive, means and opportunity’ is a tool that detectives use to investigate crimes. It provides a useful metaphor for understanding what needs to be put in place to encourage learning and reflection (Britton, 2005). In the context of reflective practice, the ‘motive’ refers to understanding the nature of reflective practice and why it is important. The ‘means’ involves having the models, methods and sources of support necessary for reflective practice. And the ‘opportunity’ refers to creating the spaces for reflective practice. In criminal investigations, all three must be established to ensure a ‘watertight case’. So if an organization providing capacity development wishes to encourage reflective practice, it needs to ensure that practitioners have the motive, the means and the opportunity.

Unfortunately, not all organizations are willing or able to create these conditions and capacity development practitioners may find themselves relatively unsupported in their attempts to reflect on and learn from their experience. In this case, the practitioner may need to demonstrate another important characteristic of reflective practice, namely self-reliance!

Developing a personal action learning system

If the monitoring system used by their organization does not encourage reflection and learning, practitioners may need to develop their skills of reflective practice by putting in place their own personal action learning system. This may sound time-consuming but many of the most useful tools and techniques for reflective practice are deceptively simple. Some practical ideas can be found in the following section.

Tools and techniques for reflective practice

Use critical incident technique. Critical incidents are short descriptions of experiences that have particular meaning to the practitioner. In this context, the word ‘critical’ means ‘of crucial importance’. These experiences can be used as the basis of critical incident technique – a tool that can be used systematically to examine, reflect and learn from positive and negative incidents. See the ‘Recommended readings’ section for details of a manual by Hettlage and Steilin (2006) that covers the practicalities of learning from critical incidents.

Ask interesting questions. When, as practitioners, we ask ourselves interesting or searching questions the process of answering often encourages a deep reflective approach to our practice. As Dlamini puts it, ‘A questioning orientation should... lie at the heart of monitoring and evaluation and be integral to the orientation, culture and practice of the organizational whole and all those within it’ (Dlamini, 2006, p5). Sometimes it is the simplest questions that generate the deepest insights. Asking: ‘Why did I decide to do things that way?’ can bring to the surface deeply held beliefs that may act as an obstacle to facilitating genuinely developmental
processes. If, for example, the practitioner becomes aware of their need to be seen as an ‘expert who can be relied on to come up with an answer to any challenge’, they will find it difficult to work with clients who prefer to work more collaboratively or to deal with new challenges outside their normal realm of experience. This kind of insight based on a willingness to think deeply about our questions can be genuinely liberating, leading to greater humility and more authenticity in our work with clients and partners.

**Draw a rich picture.** Complex organizational issues always involve multiple inter-acting relationships. Pictures are a better medium than text for exploring complex relationships because they enable a more dynamic and holistic representation of the situation – in short they can provide a rich amount of information in an easily digestible form. The term ‘rich picture’ is borrowed from ‘soft systems methodology’ and simply means a visual (usually cartoon-type) drawing of an organizational problem, showing the main actors (including the practitioner) and the relationships between them. Figure 20.1 shows a number of dimensions of a breakdown in senior management: disconnection, facing in different direction, jumping ship. Can you see other issues?

Drawing a picture may feel uncomfortable at first but by helping us to make use of the right-hand side of the brain which is responsible for creativity, intuition and synthesis, drawing can facilitate deep intuitive understanding of complex issues.

**Keep a journal.** Keeping a personal journal or diary is a simple but powerful way for practitioners to develop and learn from their own self-directed monitoring.

---

**Figure 20.1 A rich picture**
process. At different stages of a capacity development process, practitioners can write in their journal their thoughts, feelings, questions and learning points about their work – the things that do not usually find their way into the formal monitoring or recording system. By reading through the journal from time to time, reflecting on the questions posed and looking for critical incidents or patterns that shed light on work practices, the capacity development practitioner can readily create a platform for the six steps of reflective practice referred to earlier. Some practitioners take journalling a stage further in terms of openness by using an online blog to make their journal more widely available, although it is important to bear confidentiality issues in mind when reflecting on experiences that involve clients and colleagues!

**Develop a timeline.** A timeline is a simple technique for showing events over time in a graphic way. It can be used to examine a critical incident by looking at the circumstances, decisions and actions that led up to the incident and the consequences (both intended and unintended) that followed. Timelines lend themselves well to exploring the often enlightening question ‘Why then?’ In the illustration in Figure 20.2, what might the sequence of events have to do with a funding crisis? Timelines are also very useful ways of examining inter-relationships between apparently disconnected events, activities or decisions because they allow the practitioner to step back and see the context and patterns of decision-making more clearly.

**Write a mini case study.** The process of writing a short, one- or two-page mini ‘case study’ on a piece of work for discussion with colleagues can be extremely enlightening even before the discussion takes place. Using some specific headings and questions can make it easier and less time-consuming to write the case study and also encourages a more self-critical approach.

**Hold an ‘after action review’.** An after action review (AAR) is a meeting of colleagues to reflect on an event or task they have just accomplished. The purpose of an AAR is to learn from the team’s experience in order to take the lessons learned into the next phase of the work or to accomplish the team’s task more effectively the next time it is done (Serrat, 2008).

![Figure 20.2 Timeline example](image-url)

**Figure 20.2 Timeline example**
Develop monitoring and evaluation systems towards reflective learning

Practitioners often experience one or more of the following obstacles in learning from monitoring and evaluation systems: limited experience in analysing monitoring data; ineffective processes for discussing and identifying action points arising from monitoring data and evaluation recommendations; and structural barriers to making changes in capacity development initiatives that are under way because of organizational or contractual constraints.

Applying a utilization focus to monitoring as well as evaluation can be one way to overcome these obstacles. Carlsson and Wohlgemuth (undated) suggest some basic principles for improving the learning potential of evaluations and these principles can be applied equally well to systems for monitoring: the intended users must be identified at the beginning of an evaluation process; the evaluation should be planned and designed with utilization in mind; stakeholders should be involved in the whole evaluation process not just at the data-collection stage; and finally, recommendations should make clear who should act on them and results should be widely distributed.

When practitioners are expected to log their time use under different categories, there are some very practical improvements that can be made to time-recording and time-management systems. For example, reflection time is often overlooked as a category. As a result, practitioners understandably give priority to activities that are seen as more ‘legitimate’ and may believe that they have to use their personal ‘non-work’ time for reflection. Time-recording systems should include a category for agreed time spent on focused reflection.

A further strategy is to create opportunities for joint reflection in regular one-to-one meetings between practitioners and their colleagues or supervisors. Time to discuss a specific piece of work can be prioritized in managerial supervision and team meetings. Supervisors can encourage practitioners to discuss issues that arise from their individual reflection. Preparing critical incident studies or examining unanticipated outcomes gives focus and structure to these discussions. A simple form comprising a few key questions makes it easier for busy capacity development practitioners to prepare their critical incident studies. It is surprising just how many insights can emerge from as little as half an hour spent preparing a critical incident study.

Finally, peer review can be a powerful method for creating a more open and reflective working environment. When practitioners engage in discussions with their peers to interpret the data from monitoring, each learns in the process. Peers can also be involved in evaluating each other’s capacity development initiatives.

Conclusions

What the individual capacity development practitioner can do to make more creative and personally developmental use of monitoring and evaluation to a large extent depends on how much influence they have on the design and implementation of the systems they use in their daily work practice.
As an individual, the practitioner can develop their personal action-learning system: expanding their ‘toolbox’ of techniques for reflective practice using, as a springboard, the techniques described in the section on tools and techniques. They may also consider ‘subverting’ their existing monitoring and evaluation systems to create new opportunities for reflection and learning. As a colleague or team member, the capacity development practitioner can work with other practitioners to develop peer review and feedback mechanisms which will help to create a working environment that provides the ‘motive, means and opportunity’ for reflective practice. Finally, as a member of a capacity development organization, the practitioner may have enough influence to initiate a re-examination of the systems used for monitoring and evaluation and, if necessary, help to redesign the systems to place greater emphasis on learning from experience.
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Recommended readings

The topics in this chapter have interesting connections to others in this volume. Readers may wish to look at Chapter 4 which describes advisers’ roles as well as Chapter 5 which addresses combining technical and change expertise that would both be a source of reflection on M&E information. Chapters 18 and 21 cover the monitoring and evaluation of capacity development and its relation to learning and on accountability. The following is a short selection of useful resources as a starting point for further reading on this topic.


The Barefoot Collective is an international group of development practitioners who have written a practical and engaging do-it-yourself guide for leaders and facilitators wanting to help organizations to function and to develop in more healthy, human and effective ways as they strive to make their contributions to a more humane society. Their inspiring *Barefoot Guide*, together with a range of practical resources related to organizational development, change, monitoring and evaluation and learning are available from www.barefootguide.org, accessed November 2009.


Although the illustrative examples focus on knowledge management, this is an excellent introduction to the use of critical incident technique for the purposes of planning, evaluation and empowerment.


More than most other guides to monitoring and evaluation, this comprehensive and well-written manual emphasizes the importance of critical reflection and learning. The focus is on projects but the lessons are equally applicable to capacity development. Section 8 is a particularly valuable source of practical ideas for reflective practice.


The Asian Development Bank’s knowledge management specialist has put together a wide-ranging compendium describing 38 tools almost all of which are directly relevant to developing reflective practice.


This paper provides an excellent overview of how to overcome the particular challenges of monitoring and evaluating capacity development. The emphasis on systems thinking and learning together with a comprehensive bibliography make it an invaluable source of ideas.
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