

# Monitoring and Evaluation in Stabilisation Interventions

## Rationale, challenges and principles of effective monitoring and evaluation

### RAND EUROPE RESEARCH AREAS

CHOICE MODELLING & VALUATION  
 COMMUNITIES, SAFETY & JUSTICE  
 DEFENCE & SECURITY  
 EDUCATION, ARTS & CULTURE  
 FUTURES THINKING  
 EVALUATION & PERFORMANCE AUDIT  
 HEALTH & HEALTHCARE  
 INNOVATION & TECHNOLOGY  
 INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
 POPULATION & MIGRATION

This product is part of the RAND Europe research brief series. RAND research briefs present policy-oriented summaries of an individual peer-reviewed document or a body of published work; current or completed work; and innovative research methodologies.

RAND Europe  
 Westbrook Centre  
 Milton Road  
 Cambridge CB4 1YG  
 United Kingdom  
 TEL +44.1223.353.329  
 FAX +44.1223.358.845

37, Square de Meeus  
 B-1000 Brussels  
 Belgium  
 TEL +32.2.791.7500  
 FAX +32.2.791.7900

Matt Bassford  
 bassford@rand.org

© RAND 2011

[www.rand.org/  
randeu](http://www.rand.org/randeu)

Effective monitoring and evaluation should be an integral part of stabilisation interventions. It is essential to track and evaluate the outcomes of activities, to maximise positive impacts, and to minimise unintended consequences. This is particularly important in stabilisation environments, because they are often complex, unpredictable and characterised by a lack of information, which can lead to plans quickly going off track.

Monitoring and evaluation frameworks provide the means to link inputs, processes, outputs and outcomes together when planning and prioritising interventions. This helps planners design cogent and coherent interventions, articulating clearly the underpinning logic of the programme. Moreover, effective monitoring enables real-time evaluation during an intervention, and allows plans to be adapted accordingly. This helps to ensure that stabilisation is achieving the desired impact, and that unintended consequences are minimised. Achieving the desired ends set out in a plan may not be enough in itself: it is also essential to minimise adverse impacts created by the means, particularly where these undermine longer-term goals, and to ensure that “tactical successes” do actually lead to the achievement of strategic goals.

In the longer term, evaluation is also important in supporting accountability and in identifying lessons that can help improve future efforts at strategic, operational and tactical levels.

### What are the key challenges that make monitoring and evaluation difficult?

Stabilisation activities present five particular challenges that make monitoring and evaluations difficult:

1. The stabilisation environment is complex and turbulent, making it difficult to establish reliable baselines or to distinguish between strategic shifts in the environment and shorter-term fluctuations.
2. There are often multiple actors (local, national and international) undertaking a range of con-

### Abstract

Monitoring and evaluation should be an integral part of stabilisation interventions in order to improve planning, maximise intended impacts and reduce unintended consequences. The stabilisation environment is a challenging context within which to conduct effective evaluation; however, there are a number of practical steps that can be taken to mitigate these challenges.

This policy brief is based on interviews with policymakers and practitioners from a number of nations, conducted by RAND Europe between April and July 2010.

- current activities with different underlying logics over different time horizons. Interventions are often politicised, which creates different pressures in measuring progress and can lead to perceived imperatives to achieve tangible outputs quickly, at the expense of longer-term impacts.
3. The rapidly evolving and sometimes unpredictable nature of stabilisation environments requires regular reframing of the intervention logic, testing of assumptions, and adaptation of intervention activities. Change is often non-linear and hard to measure, which can make it hard to attribute cause and effect.
  4. Identifying and collecting suitable indicators of change requires a composite picture that includes both quantitative and qualitative metrics. Indeed, much of the most relevant information – for example, perceptions, relationships and behaviours – is qualitative in nature, can be challenging to measure and requires social/political analysis.
  5. Insecurity can make it difficult to ask the right questions to the right people and interpret the answers, and it may even place those collecting data in danger.

However, while monitoring and evaluation in stabilisation interventions is challenging, there are examples of good practice from which a set of principles can be drawn.

### **What are the principles of effective monitoring and evaluation in stabilisation environments?**

“Theory of change” approaches are widely used for evaluation in complex change programmes, as well as in many of the planning approaches used in stabilisation environments. The experts consulted in this study advocated a monitoring and evaluation framework based on the theory of change approach, but noted the limitations in rapidly changing and unpredictable environments. A more nuanced approach is required that incorporates the following key principles:

- Monitoring and evaluation methods should be based on an explicit theory of change that sets out the overall aims of the stabilisation intervention and explains how proposed activities will contribute to desired outcomes.
- The theory of change can be articulated in “contribution stories” that also set out risks and possible side effects, make explicit the assumptions being made and allow them to be tested throughout the intervention.
- Monitoring and evaluation efforts need to be embedded in stabilisation planning, management and delivery rather than conducted as a discrete or ad hoc activity.

People responsible for monitoring and evaluation should form an integral part of the intervention/programme team.

- Appropriate measures of effect (both quantitative and qualitative) must be identified at the planning stage, and modified as necessary, to enable real-time evaluation of outcomes and impact (or campaign effectiveness assessment, in military terminology).
- Regularly reviewing the validity of theories of change and contribution stories will help build understanding of changes in the stabilisation environment. This will enable adverse impacts (or second and third order effects) to be identified sooner and dealt with more quickly, and inform revision of plans as and when necessary.
- Sufficient resources must be allocated to monitoring and evaluation, though the framework must also be designed to be proportionate to the plan and resources available.
- Imperfect data might still be “good enough” for monitoring and evaluation of stabilisation interventions; expert judgment can play an important role in contextualising and interpreting data.
- To avoid the risk of bias it is desirable to use information from a wide range of sources; it will, however, remain important to prioritise data collection in order to prevent information overload. ■

This research brief describes work within RAND Europe documented in TR-962-SU, *Monitoring and evaluation in stabilisation interventions: Reviewing the state of the art and suggesting ways forward*, by Christian van Stolk, Tom Ling, Anais Reding, and Matt Bassford, TR-962-SU, (available at [http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical\\_reports/TR962.html](http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR962.html)), 2011, 41 pp.

---

RAND Europe is an independent not-for-profit research institute whose mission is to help improve policy and decision-making through research and analysis. RAND Europe's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors. **RAND®** is a registered trademark.

#### **RAND Offices**

Santa Monica, CA • Washington, DC • Pittsburgh, PA • New Orleans, LA/Jackson, MS • Boston, MA • Doha, QA • Abu Dhabi, AE • Cambridge, UK • Brussels, BE



## EUROPE

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES  
EDUCATION AND THE ARTS  
ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT  
HEALTH AND HEALTH CARE  
INFRASTRUCTURE AND  
TRANSPORTATION  
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS  
LAW AND BUSINESS  
NATIONAL SECURITY  
POPULATION AND AGING  
PUBLIC SAFETY  
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
TERRORISM AND  
HOMELAND SECURITY

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit institution that helps improve policy and decisionmaking through research and analysis.

This electronic document was made available from [www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org) as a public service of the RAND Corporation.

### Support RAND

[Browse Reports & Bookstore](#)

[Make a charitable contribution](#)

### For More Information

Visit RAND at [www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org)

Explore [RAND Europe](#)

View [document details](#)

### Research Brief

This product is part of the RAND Corporation research brief series. RAND research briefs present policy-oriented summaries of individual published, peer-reviewed documents or of a body of published work.

### Limited Electronic Distribution Rights

This document and trademark(s) contained herein are protected by law as indicated in a notice appearing later in this work. This electronic representation of RAND intellectual property is provided for non-commercial use only. Unauthorized posting of RAND electronic documents to a non-RAND Web site is prohibited. RAND electronic documents are protected under copyright law. Permission is required from RAND to reproduce, or reuse in another form, any of our research documents for commercial use. For information on reprint and linking permissions, please see [RAND Permissions](#).