

Complexity-Aware Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning for Social and Behavior Change Interventions

SBC Complexity Indicators Matrix (SCIM)



SBC Complexity Indicators Matrix (SCIM)

CORE Group's Social and Behavior Change (SBC) Working Group has developed a set of complexity-aware tools to help design and evaluate SBC-focused interventions. Tools in this set include:

1. **An advocacy booklet** to help guide communication with donors and to build fluency in communicating how to monitor and evaluate SBC interventions.
2. **A core set of indicators** related to adaptation, learning, and collaboration that can be used in proposals and work plans.
3. **A checklist** intended to help in the consistency and completeness of documenting SBC interventions.

Complexity is a key factor—perhaps *the* key factor—in social and behavior change.

Complexity affects most SBC interventions through:

- **Contextual complexity:** the fact that the environment and implementation process itself shape outcomes of an intervention.
- **Temporal complexity:** interventions evolve over time, as target population and implementers change behaviors and come to new understandings, and as programmatic environments shift in response to new constraints, opportunities and priorities.
- **Interpretive complexity:** as interventions are social activities, practitioners should acknowledge that every stakeholder has a unique perspective, and understands the intervention partially and differently.

SBC projects operate at multiple and interconnected levels of the social ecology and physical environment. While a project may include a theory of change that anticipates causal pathways and intermediate changes, it always operates in complex contexts that shift over time. Activities may be implemented differently than planned, and individual stakeholders—including community members and implementers—will understand and respond to project activities differently based on their knowledge and prior experiences. Understanding how projects operate in such complex environments, then, is critical to know how SBC projects affect communities (and vice versa) and ultimately, how projects achieve or do not achieve expected and sustained outcomes.

Traditional monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is vital to track activities and assess changes in knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. Still, much more can be gained by integrating complexity-aware monitoring, evaluation and ongoing learning (MEL). The SBC Complexity Indicators Matrix (SCIM) is a continuation of the CORE Group's effort to advance the practice of MEL with greater real-world understanding and consequently improve the effectiveness of SBC activities and projects.

How to Use the SCIM

The indicators in the SCIM are suggestive and not comprehensive; instead, they can be used to inspire the development of complexity-aware indicators relevant to an SBC project aiming to improve health.

The top row of the matrix is divided into three general dimensions of complexity: **Contextual** (comprised of external factors like the project site setting, macroeconomic conditions, policies, and program specifics such as project duration, budget, activities, and capacities); **Temporal** (measuring changes or effects of project implementation over time, as communities are increasingly exposed to or engaged in activities); and **Interpretive** (assessing differences in individual and/or group perspectives among stakeholders and how these differences in understanding shape differing behaviors and reactions to project implementation).

The left-hand column shows three conventional phases of the SBC project cycle requiring assessment: **Formative Assessment** (providing data about the complexity of the behavioral ecology in which a project will be undertaken); **Monitoring and Process** (tracking activities and how communities or project groups react and interact with activities); and **Outcome Evaluation** (assessing complex and context-specific outcomes program outcomes at a project's end).

The three dimensions of complexity and three phases of the SBC project cycle produce a matrix with nine cells. Within each cell, we draw on the theoretical and evaluation literature on complexity and systems to suggest some “areas of complexity” that might characterize the cell. And finally, we offer several illustrative indicators for each of the areas (with further description of indicators in the Addendum). The objective here is not to comprehensively inventory all the possible indicators or even all areas of complexity, but to provide a practical framework for implementers to use their creativity and detailed understanding of an SBC project to assess how well activities address the real dynamism of SBC programming.

Users will note that we mix quantitative and qualitative indicators. Although some indicators are amenable to quantification by gauging percentages or extent, the complexity effects we seek to assess, monitor and evaluate are frequently subjective and based on assessments by internal and external stakeholders of how SBC programs operate in complex environments. Indicators such as these will also be essential to guide ongoing adaptation to achieve sustainability post-project and to achieve successful scale-up, as projects expand to new regions where they will encounter new complexities requiring adaptation.

SBC Complexity Indicator Matrix (Illustrative)

| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
|----------------------|--|---|--|
| Formative assessment | <p>Novelty and complexity of project approach within the context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder consensus that target behaviors are broadly observable by the community Extent to which the project's theory of change includes assumptions that demonstrate complexity-awareness <p>Social and political context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interconnectedness of social and political influences and power surrounding the project Community social cohesion and shared community vision and goals | <p>Stability of implementation context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants confident they can make and maintain specific life plans for at least one year in the future Participants strongly agree or agree with the statement "I only act to deal with today's concerns; I will deal with the future in the future" <p>Shifts in target behavior prior to intervention</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of historic shifts in policy, climate events, and economic conditions likely to impact implementation | <p>Community consensus around target behavior(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants who believe that they and others in their community can make recommended changes Stakeholder consensus that the target behavior or issue is one of their top 3 health and wellbeing priorities <p>Alignment with perceived social norms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder consensus that most people in their community would support the behavior change. Stakeholder consensus that people in their community should make the targeted behavior change |
| Monitoring & Process | <p>Interaction and reinforcement among project activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff reporting improved capacity to use adaptive practices <p>Knowability, accessibility, and certainty of implementation context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of project locations judged to have recently experienced significant instability Stakeholder consensus that frontline observations of community response are being used for adaptive management | <p>Responsiveness to changes in context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number and type of planned project activities modified due to unforeseen changes Frequency of meetings in which community members and/or frontline workers participate in activities to assess project progress and contribute to problem-solving or decision-making <p>Stability of implementation context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of shifts in policy, climate, and economic conditions during project implementation | <p>Adaptive capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frontline workers who can distinguish project activities that may pose future problems. Frontline workers who observed that newly identified barriers or problems have been addressed. <p>Managerial responsiveness to diverse perspectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frontline workers routinely tapped for assessment of implementation Scheduled dialogic meetings among stakeholders in which problems identified by stakeholders are earmarked for change. |
| Outcome Evaluations | <p>Knowability, accessibility, and certainty of implementation context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder consensus on which project adaptations have contributed most to achieving project objectives Stakeholder consensus on contextual factors that most significantly impacted outcomes <p>Political economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder consensus on how government policies and laws have shifted in ways that impacted outcome achievement Number, type, and importance of unexpected outcomes identified by stakeholders | <p>Sustainability of target behaviors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants reporting behavior change who express confidence in sustaining the target behavior over the next year, without additional project support. Stakeholder consensus that the participants will be able to maintain target behaviors after the project's completion <p>Continuation of adaptive management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High-level stakeholder expectation that frontline workers will continue to participate in decision-making after project completion | <p>Alignment with perceived social norms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder consensus that most people in their community support the targeted behavior Stakeholder consensus that people in their community should maintain the targeted behavior <p>Continued managerial responsiveness to diverse perspectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High-level stakeholder consensus on the importance of continued participatory decision-making practices after project completion |

Addendum

SCIM Illustrative Indicator Descriptions

| Complexity Dimension: | Contextual | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Contextual</th> <th>Temporal</th> <th>Interpretive</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <th>Formative</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Monitoring</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Outcome</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | Formative | | | | Monitoring | | | | Outcome | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|--|------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Formative | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Application: | Formative Assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Novelty and complexity of project approach within the context</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Extent of stakeholder consensus that target behaviors are broadly observable by the community | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | The less observable (or more hidden) a behavior is in a particular context, the more difficult it will be to assess, publicly monitor, and influence. Formative assessments that analyze each target behavior’s observability and relationship to other contextual dynamics can help inform project design. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Qualitative assessments of key stakeholder group perspectives through interviews and focus group discussions. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | People representing different stakeholder groups: A mix of internal stakeholders (managers, supervisors, frontline workers, etc.), and external stakeholders (technical experts, community leaders both formal and informal, partner NGOs and government actors) who are familiar with community dynamics and target behaviors. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Can be usefully disaggregated by stakeholder type, as different behaviors will be more observable to some groups than to others. Knowing this variation in observability of target behaviors between groups can inform better targeting of project activities including monitoring of progress of behavior change. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Contextual | | | |
| Functional Application: | Formative Assessment | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Novelty and complexity of project approach within the context</i> | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Extent to which the project’s theory of change includes assumptions that demonstrate complexity-awareness | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | A project’s theory of change (ToC) represents the expected change pathways for how activities lead to outcomes. ToCs generally include assumptions on factors that may be preconditions for/risks to project implementation and some explicitly address complexity in the external environment. A “good” ToC would help ensure complexity is recognized in activity design and overall project approach. | | | |
| Potential Methods: | A qualitative assessment of the ToC, evaluating whether its assumptions about preconditions and risks adequately take into accounting contextual complexity. | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Stakeholders who can be asked to analyze the project's implicit or explicit ToC, evidence supporting assumptions about preconditions and risks, and theoretical approach. | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Disaggregation is not recommended. Ideally stakeholders representing different perspectives assess together the ToC. | | | |
| Other Comments: | This indicator should reflect a nuanced assessment of how complexity-aware the ToC is in terms of its assumptions rather than a binary assessment of whether it is (or is not) complexity-aware. | | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|----------|--------------|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Formative | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Outcome | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|--|--|------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Contextual | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Contextual</td> <td>Temporal</td> <td>Interpretive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Formative</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Monitoring</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> | | | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | Formative | | | | Monitoring | | | | Outcome | | | |
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Formative | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Application: | Formative Assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Social and political context</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Extent of interconnectedness of social and political influences and power surrounding the project | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | The more complicated, overlapping, and interconnected the social, political, and power influences surrounding a project’s location and target behaviors, the more complex project implementation, monitoring, and evaluation will be. These external dynamics often fall outside the ToC, evidence, and models used in behavioral interventions and yet can have a significant influence on project success. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | <p>Interconnected dynamics can be understood using tools such as stakeholder mapping, power analysis, and conflict analysis. Some resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIDA’s Power Analysis: A Practical Guide (see link) • Tools4Dev’s Stakeholder Analysis Matrix https://www.tools4dev.org/resources/stakeholder-analysis-matrix-template/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Each methodology will have its own recommended data sources. However, efforts should be taken to ensure diverse stakeholders are consulted. Different types of stakeholders may have very different understandings and awareness of these social, political, and power dynamics. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Consider disaggregation by group differences believed to lead to variation in understanding of social, political, and power dynamics. Generally, these would include gender, age, socio-economic position, religious affiliation, and race or ethnicity. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Comments: | This indicator represents an assessment of how complicated, overlapping, and interconnected the social, political, and power influences surrounding a project’s location and target behaviors are rather than the mere fact that they are interconnected. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|--|------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Contextual | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Contextual</td> <td>Temporal</td> <td>Interpretive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Formative</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Monitoring</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> | | | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | Formative | | | | Monitoring | | | | Outcome | | | |
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Formative | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Application: | Formative Assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Social and political context</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Extent of community social cohesion and shared community vision and goals | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | <p>Community social cohesion can facilitate or block participation in project activities and the uptake of new behaviors and systems of organization. Social cohesion, or the willingness and ability of community members to work together, cooperate, and share resources toward a common goal, is often weakened in situations of rapid change, crisis, or conflict. Low social cohesion is connected to low social trust, low risk tolerance, and lower capacity to mobilize group action and take risks on new behaviors. Measuring community social cohesion prior to and during implementation can provide an indicator of how significant these dynamics are and how they are shifting during implementation. Project activities can contribute positively or negatively to community social cohesion. Understanding the level of social cohesion within the project area, as well as the different levels of social connection and separation within that area, can assist in project design and better targeting.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | <p>Depending on what type of social cohesion is most relevant to the project goals, consider: qualitative community capacity assessments of community participation and cohesion (e.g., CHW Central's Community Capacity Assessment Tool); or include in quantitative surveys questions to assess level of social trust (e.g., World Values Survey https://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSDocumentationWV1.jsp, perceptions of social inclusion, or participation in civic groups.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | <p>Data sources depend on the method used. Some measures are quantitative, such as level of economic inequality or participation rates in social and civic groups. Most metrics rely on self-reported stakeholder perceptions of community dynamics and cohesion.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | <p>Consider disaggregation by sub-communities within the target area. For example, even if social cohesion is low at the level of the full project catchment area, social cohesion may be strong within certain smaller neighborhood areas or within certain social and demographic groups (e.g., among women within a religious group).</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|--|------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Contextual | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Contextual</td> <td>Temporal</td> <td>Interpretive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Formative</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Monitoring</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> | | | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | Formative | | | | Monitoring | | | | Outcome | | | |
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Formative | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Application: | Monitoring & Process | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Degree of interaction and reinforcement among project activities</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Percentage of staff reporting improved capacity to use adaptive practices | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | Adaptive capacity is the ability to translate knowledge and critical thinking about complexity and adaptation into complexity-aware project implementation. Adaptive capacity among staff is a necessary first step for adaptive management practices to take hold. Adaptive capacity is a foundational capacity needed across project activities. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Change in adaptive capacity can be measured through the self-reporting of project staff awareness of complexity and the ability to anticipate potential problems. Measurement areas can include: critical thinking; depth of understanding of local context complexity; how this understanding relates to the context in which the SBC approach was designed and tested; and awareness of system and cultural factors that may inhibit or support the resilience and adaptability of programming. These may be gauged through interviews or rapid surveys. Questions should focus on how the respondents perceive their own ability to quickly identify unanticipated problems and subsequently make efforts to resolve them relative to their earlier experiences. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Self-assessments of project staff. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Consider disaggregation by staff-type (leadership, supervisors, frontline, etc.), gender, education level, and geographical or organizational location. This disaggregation can give a sense of the distribution and uptake of adaptive capacity within the project or organization. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Comments: | This indicator is focused on the increasing capacity for adaptive management across the organization. It does not, however, measure the quality of implementation improvement as a result of adaptive management or the overall impact of increased adaptive capacity. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Contextual | | | |
| Functional Application: | Monitoring & Process | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Knowability, accessibility, and certainty of implementation context</i> | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Number of project locations judged to have recently experienced significant instability (e.g., armed conflict, rapid climate shifts, social disruptions, political instability, etc.). | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | A key element of contextual complexity is the instability of the implementation context. Instability creates uncertainty, complicates planning and logistics, introduces difficulty in mitigating risks for staff and participants, and makes it difficult to monitor change and attribute impact to project activities. In SBC projects, regular documentation and reporting by project locations experiencing instability allows for tracking these dynamics. Collecting this type of information over time provides an opportunity to discuss how these types of contextual instability are being addressed through programmatic adaptations. | | | |
| Potential Methods: | This can be monitored using a rapid recurrent, site-specific checklist tool. This type of tool asks appropriate staff to note the existence of different types of instability in each project location and to rate how disruptive this has been to implementation. Ideally the checklist is completed at regular intervals (e.g., twice yearly), and includes space for comments on the changes being noted and stepstaken to address them. | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Staff in project and site management positions. | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Potential useful disaggregation by source of instability (e.g., armed conflict, rapid climate shifts, social disruptions, political instability, etc.) | | | |
| Other Comments: | Note that positive factors can also disrupt the implementation environment, such as a new governmental policy that allows community health workers to offer expanded services. Note also that such information is not comparable across projects. Its value is for comparing contextual change over time within a given location and project. Deeper qualitative analysis would need to detail the disruptions happening in a specific site, the impact on implementation, and possible adaptation strategies to be considered. | | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Formative | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Outcome | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Contextual | | | |
| Functional Application: | Monitoring & Process | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Knowability, accessibility, and certainty of implementation context</i> | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Extent of stakeholder consensus that frontline observations of community reaction/response are being used for adaptive management | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | This indicator attempts to measure whether there is a widely shared consensus among diverse stakeholder groups that a project’s frontline staff are regularly sharing their observations and that this staff input is being used in adaptive management. Frontline staff are generally the closest to the community—often part of the community themselves—and understand community response best. Effective adaptive management practice will include regularly using the perspective and input from the frontline to make adaptative decisions. This indicator attempts to gauge the extent to which frontline observations/input are being tapped by managers. | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Focus group discussions and interviews that occur regularly with diverse types of stakeholders. | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Internal stakeholders (management, supervisors, frontline workers). External stakeholders (project participants, formal and informal community leaders, and staff at partner NGOS or governmental bodies who are familiar with the project’s operational details and community dynamics). | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Consider disaggregation by stakeholder type, gender, level of responsibility for project decision making, and project location. | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|------------|----------|--------------|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Formative | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Outcome | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------|----------|--------------|
| Complexity Dimension: | Contextual | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Functional Application: | Outcome Evaluations | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Knowability, accessibility, and certainty of implementation context</i> | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Extent of stakeholder consensus on which project adaptations have contributed most to achieving project objectives | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | This indicator assumes that adaptation has occurred and attempts to assess which adaptive approaches and project shifts have been most useful for the accomplishment of project objectives. | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Measured at project completion through qualitative methods such as focus group discussions, interviews, Most Significant Change (MSC), and Outcome Harvesting. | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Internal stakeholders (management, supervisors, frontline workers). External stakeholders (project participants, formal and informal community leaders, and staff at partner NGOs or governmental bodies who are familiar with the project’s operational details and community dynamics). | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Consider disaggregation by stakeholder types, by gender, level of engagement with project decision making, and project location. | | | | |
| Other Comments: | There are likely to be differences of opinion between stakeholder groups on this question, which can also provide useful information about how different parts of the project and context are understood by different groups, and conversely, how widely shared understandings of these dynamics are between these groups. This reflects an interpretive dimension of complexity. | | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|------------|----------|--------------|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Formative | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Outcome | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|--|------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Contextual | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Contextual</td> <td>Temporal</td> <td>Interpretive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Formative</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Monitoring</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> | | | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | Formative | | | | Monitoring | | | | Outcome | | | |
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Formative | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Application: | Outcome Evaluations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Knowability, accessibility, and certainty of implementation context</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Extent of stakeholder consensus on contextual factors that most significantly impacted outcomes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | After project completion, this indicator attempts to evaluate the relative impact of different contextual factors on achievement of project objectives. Understanding more clearly the different impacts of different contextual factors on implementation, and how these are understood by different stakeholder groups, can help make sense of project achievements and help inform future scale up and adaptation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Qualitative methods including focus group discussions, interviews, Outcome Harvesting with diverse types of stakeholders, and Contribution Analysis. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Internal stakeholders (management, supervisors, frontline workers). External stakeholders (project participants, formal and informal community leaders, and staff at partner NGOs or governmental bodies who are familiar with the project’s operational details and community dynamics). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Consider disaggregation by stakeholder type, gender, level of engagement with project decision making, and project location. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Comments: | This indicator assumes that context will impact achievement of project objectives and attempts to assess which specific contextual factors were most impactful. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Complexity Dimension: | Contextual | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Contextual</th> <th>Temporal</th> <th>Interpretive</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <th>Formative</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Monitoring</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Outcome</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | Formative | | | | Monitoring | | | | Outcome | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|--|------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Formative | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Application: | Outcome Evaluations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Political economy</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Extent of stakeholder consensus on which government sectoral policies and laws have shifted during the project period in ways that impacted outcome achievement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | Understanding more clearly the impacts different governmental shifts have had on implementation can help make sense of project achievements. This indicator assumes that governmental policy and laws impact achievement of project objectives, and that this legal and policy context have likely shifted during implementation. The indicator attempts to assess which laws or policy shifts were most impactful and how. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Measured at project completion through qualitative methods including focus group discussions and interviews with diverse types of stakeholders. Most Significant Change and Outcome Harvesting techniques may also inform this indicator. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Internal stakeholders (management, supervisors, frontline workers). External stakeholders (project participants, formal and informal community leaders, and staff at partner NGOS or governmental bodies who are familiar with the project's operational details and community dynamics). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Consider disaggregation by stakeholder type, gender, level of engagement with project decision making, and project location. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Comments: | There are likely to be differences of opinion among stakeholder groups on this question, which can also provide useful information about how different parts of the project and context are understood by different groups and conversely how widely shared understandings of these dynamics are between groups. This reflects an interpretive dimension of complexity. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|--|--|------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Contextual | <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Contextual</td> <td>Temporal</td> <td>Interpretive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Formative</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Monitoring</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> | | | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | Formative | | | | Monitoring | | | | Outcome | | | |
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Formative | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Application: | Outcome Evaluations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Political economy</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Number, type, and importance of unexpected outcomes identified by stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | This indicator attempts to capture and understand unforeseen impacts (both positive and negative) of project activities. Understanding these unexpected outcomes provides a fuller understanding of the project’s impact and can help inform future iterations and scale-ups of similar projects. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Many methods are possible for assessing unexpected outcomes. Two commonly used qualitative methods are Most Significant Change (MSC) and Outcome Harvesting. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Internal stakeholders (management, supervisors, frontline workers). External stakeholders (project participants, formal and informal community leaders, and staff at partner NGOs or governmental bodies who are familiar with the project’s operational details and community dynamics). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Consider disaggregation by stakeholder type and level of engagement with project decision making, and project location. Additional disaggregation may be needed (e.g., by gender) depending on the project’s objectives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Comments: | There are likely to be differences of opinion among stakeholder groups on what unexpected outcomes emerged and which were most significant. Understanding the key differences in perceptions among groups can be as useful as an overall summary of unexpected impacts. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Temporal | | | |
| Functional Application: | Formative Assessment | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Stability of implementation context</i> | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Percentage of participants confident they can make and maintain specific life plans for at least one year in the future. | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | This indicator gauges past or present risk calculations of participants. Historical events and circumstances, such as war or climatic conditions, can influence a person’s and community’s ability and confidence to manage their life and make changes in behavior. Understanding a community’s planning time horizon may offer insights into how open communities may be to take risks and consider behavior change. | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Quantitative methods could include a survey to assess average planning time horizon for different participant groups. Qualitative methods including focus group discussions and interviews that suggest which specific historical experiences or cultural understandings are driving this risk assessment by participants and how it may be addressed. | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Project participants, formal and informal community leaders. | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Consider disaggregation by participant type, gender, and project Site. | | | |
| Other Comments: | Measuring resilience at individual and community levels may be another way of tapping self-efficacy. For ideas, see: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Psychology “How to Measure Resilience with these 8 Resilience Scales” • USAID “Community Resilience: Conceptual Framework and Measurement” | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|------------|----------|--------------|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Formative | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Outcome | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Temporal | | | |
| Functional Application: | Formative Assessment | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Stability of implementation context</i> | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Percentage of participants who strongly agree or agree with the statement “I only act to deal with today’s concerns; I will deal with the future in the future.” | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | This indicator explores past or present risk calculations of participants. Historical contextual realities, such as war, can influence a person’s ability and confidence to manage their current life and their ability to make changes in behavior going forward. There may be contextual drivers of behavior change that have a historical basis. Understanding the planning time horizon of participants can shed important light on how open they may be to take risks and consider behavior change. | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Quantitative methods such as surveys can include questions to assess average planning time horizon for different participant groups. Qualitative methods including focus group discussions and interviews can shedlight on which specific historical experiences or cultural understandings are driving this risk assessment by participants and how it may be addressed. | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Project participants, formal and informal community leaders. | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Consider disaggregation by participant type, gender, and project Location | | | |
| Other Comments: | Measuring resilience at individual and community levels may be another way of tapping self-efficacy. For ideas, see: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Psychology “How to Measure Resilience with these8 Resilience Scales” • USAID “Community Resilience: Conceptual Framework and Measurement” | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|------------|----------|--------------|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Formative | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Outcome | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Temporal | | | |
| Functional Application: | Formative Assessment | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Shifts in target behavior prior to intervention</i> | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Qualitative assessment of historic shifts in policy, climate events, and economic conditions likely to impact implementation | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | Historical events and circumstances, such as new state government or extreme weather, may influence how a community understands and responds to project activities. Such systemic drivers may play important roles in successful behavior change programming but are often not accounted for in ToC or project planning processes. It is important during the design stage to understand the historical dynamics that are most likely to influence community readiness to support a change process. | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Methods could include a participatory timeline technique with key stakeholders groups to list and explore consequences of recent historic shifts seen as most likely to impact project implementation and likelihood of communities to be open to the type of change process being pursued. This could be complimented with relevant policy, academic, and donor document reviews. | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Stakeholders with deep knowledge of relevant historical patterns (formal and informal community leaders, elders, academics with expertise in the area, and staff at partner NGOs or governmental bodies who are familiar with the historical dynamics within the target area). Published document and studies (secondary data) exploring relevant historical trends. | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Useful disaggregation can be done based on group (e.g., religious, ethnic) differences mostlikely to be associated with significant differences in historical experience. | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|------------|----------|--------------|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Formative | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Outcome | | | |

| Complexity Dimension: | Temporal | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Contextual</th> <th>Temporal</th> <th>Interpretive</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <th>Formative</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Monitoring</th> <td></td> <td style="background-color: #f4a460;"></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Outcome</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | Formative | | | | Monitoring | | | | Outcome | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| | Contextual | | Temporal | Interpretive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Formative | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Application: | Monitoring & Process | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Responsiveness to changes in context</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Number and type of planned project activities modified (e.g., rescheduled, added, expanded, canceled) due to unforeseen changes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | When there are significant shifts in context (across any of the domains of complexity discussed), important opportunities and needs often exist to make real-time adaptations to project activities. Such responsive shifts may yield a better performing project and behavior change outcomes. One simple monitoring approach is to track each time an adjustment is made and explain why that adjustment was made. Often in adaptive management these decisions to make adjustments are the result of “dialogic” meetings where the format is designed to exchange information rather than deliver information from the top-down . | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Analysis of meeting minutes in which such decisions are made. If guided dialogic reflection sessions are held as part of adaptive management, these can be documented using simple reporting formats to document the project modifications made and the reasons for those shifts. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Minutes and reports from the types of meetings listed above. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | These types of change could be disaggregated by type of adaptation made, primary reason for the adaptation, or stage in project implementation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Comments: | One approach to classify types of adaptations is provided in Stirman et al. Implementation Science 2013, 8:65. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Complexity Dimension: | Temporal | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Contextual</th> <th>Temporal</th> <th>Interpretive</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <th>Formative</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Monitoring</th> <td></td> <td style="background-color: #f4a460;"></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Outcome</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | Formative | | | | Monitoring | | | | Outcome | | | |
|---|---|--|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| | Contextual | | Temporal | Interpretive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Formative | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Application: | Monitoring & Process | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Responsiveness to changes in context</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Frequency of meetings in which community members and/or frontline workers participate in activities to assess project progress and contribute to problem-solving or decision-making | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | Understanding local project contexts and real-time shifts in those contexts are necessary for making effective project adaptations. Guided reflection meetings with frontline field staff and/or community members can help to ensure that the community perspectives are represented and contribute to adaptive and responsive decision-making. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Analysis of meeting minutes which include this type of reflective feedback. If guided dialogic reflection sessions are held as part of adaptive management, these can be documented using simple reporting formats to document the type of input given, who has giving the input, the project modifications made as a result, and the reasons for those shifts. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Minutes and reports from the types of meetings listed above. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Potential disaggregation by type of stakeholder giving input (e.g., frontline staff or community member) demographic characteristics of stakeholders (e.g., by gender or age), geographic location of communities represented, or type of input given. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Comments: | Frequency of data collection should be connected to how quickly the situation is changing. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Complexity Dimension: | Temporal | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Contextual</th> <th>Temporal</th> <th>Interpretive</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <th>Formative</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Monitoring</th> <td></td> <td style="background-color: #f4a460;"></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Outcome</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | Formative | | | | Monitoring | | | | Outcome | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| | Contextual | | Temporal | Interpretive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Formative | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Application: | Monitoring & Process | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Responsiveness to changes in context</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Qualitative assessment of shifts in policy, climate events, and economic conditions during project implementation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | <p>Changes in contextual realities, such as new state government or extreme weather, may influence the success of SBC efforts. Such shifts during project implementation may play important roles in successful behavior change programming but may not be accounted for in project planning or reporting, and therefore less likely to be used in making mid-project adjustments. ‘Sentinel’ indicators of significant contextual shifts can be measured through repeated use of checklists to monitor shifts such as project-relevant government and donor policies (e.g., technical, financial, planning), macro-level social and economic factors, such as famine, and local factors such as local health service budgets, and population migrations due to conflict. In addition to tracking pre-established sentinel indicators, monitoring should look for unexpected contextual changes linked to project activities, such as big increases in demand for services or social opposition.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | <p>A repeated checklist for environmental scanning for sentinel and other changes in the project context or environment. This could be done recurrently throughout project implementation (for example every six months). Qualitative methods like interviews and focus groups could be used to understand the impact of these shifts more fully.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | <p>Internal stakeholders (management, supervisors, frontline workers). External stakeholders (project participants, formal and informal community leaders, and staff at partner NGOs or governmental bodies who are familiar with the project’s operational details and community dynamics).</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | <p>If perceived as relevant, consider disaggregating by geographic region.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Comments: | <p>Environmental scanning is the ongoing tracking of key trends and changes in the project’s internal and external environment. An example of an events timeline which documents the environmental scan can be found here.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Complexity Dimension: | Temporal | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Contextual</th> <th>Temporal</th> <th>Interpretive</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <th>Formative</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Monitoring</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Outcome</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | Formative | | | | Monitoring | | | | Outcome | | | |
|---|--|---|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| | Contextual | | Temporal | Interpretive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Formative | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Application: | Outcome Evaluations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Sustainability of target behaviors</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Percent of participants reporting behavior change who express confidence in sustaining the target behavior change over the next year, without additional project support. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | <p>Sustainment of individual behavior change is predicated not only by participant-level outcomes but also by community normative and institutional outcomes. At the community level, behaviors become normalized when a proportion of the community is practicing the behavior and/or believes that others are practicing the behavior. At an institutional level, the routinization of a service may support continued behavior change (such as institutionalization of a product, practice, or services access in normative guidelines). Together individual, community, and institutional indicators predict whether the behavior will be sustained or not after project completion. This indicator assesses how widespread individual confidence in sustainment of the behavior change is among participants.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | <p>This can be evaluated alongside measurements of the primary behavior change outcome. For those participants reporting to have made the target behavior change, a simple follow up question can be added to gauge their level of confidence that they can sustain this behavior for the next year without additional project supports. Alternatively, this could be evaluated through qualitative methods like focus group discussions or individual interviews to gain a deeper sense of why different participants have different levels of confidence in sustaining this behavior.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | <p>Project participants, related stakeholders, and formal and informal community leaders.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | <p>Consider disaggregation by participant type, gender, project location and role in sustaining the behavior (for example parents may be key to sustainment of child and adolescent behavior changes)</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Complexity Dimension: | Temporal | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Contextual</th> <th>Temporal</th> <th>Interpretive</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <th>Formative</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Monitoring</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Outcome</th> <td></td> <td style="background-color: #f4a460;"></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | Formative | | | | Monitoring | | | | Outcome | | | |
|---|---|--|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| | Contextual | | Temporal | Interpretive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Formative | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Application: | Outcome Evaluations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Sustainability of target behaviors</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Extent of stakeholder consensus that the target population will be able to maintain target behaviors after the project’s completion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | Together, individual, community, and institutional indicators predict whether the behavior will be sustained or not after project completion. This indicator assesses the community’s normative belief in the sustainability of the behavior change. People may be more willing to give an honest assessment of whether others can sustain the change than to admit that it will be personally difficult. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | This can be evaluated through qualitative methods like focus group discussions or individual interviews to gain a deeper sense of why different participants have different levels of confidence in sustaining this behavior. Alternatively, a quantitative survey could include questions on sustainability to get more representative data on community perceptions. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Project participants, related stakeholders, and formal and informal community leaders. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Consider disaggregation by participant type, gender, project location and role in sustaining the behavior (for example parents may be key to sustainment of child and adolescent behavior changes) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Complexity Dimension: | Temporal | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Contextual</th> <th>Temporal</th> <th>Interpretive</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <th>Formative</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Monitoring</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Outcome</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | Formative | | | | Monitoring | | | | Outcome | | | |
|---|--|---|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| | Contextual | | Temporal | Interpretive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Formative | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Application: | Outcome Evaluations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Continuation of adaptive management processes</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Extent of high-level stakeholder expectation that frontline workers will continue to participate in decision-making after project completion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | Adaptive management mechanisms designed to include frontline worker participation are sometimes assumed by project plans to continue after project completion. However, post-project such mechanisms may weaken or be abandoned and so factors effecting sustainability need to be assessed. A key determinant of whether adaptive techniques will be sustained is the belief by key high-level stakeholders (such as implementing managers within organizations or government institutions) on the importance of this work and the prioritization of resources to sustaining it after project completion. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Qualitative methods include focus groups and interviews with the relevant high-level stakeholders within the organization, relevant government agencies, and the community. These methods will assess the extent that these stakeholders believe the adaptive techniques will be continued, that sufficient resources are available and prioritized do sustain this work, and that concrete plans exist to sustain this work after project completion. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Relevant high-level stakeholders within the organization, relevant government agencies, and members of the community. In some cases, this can be supplemented by analysis of relevant project documents that define turnover plans (if transferring project to a new partner). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Potential disaggregation by geographic location and type of stakeholder (e.g., external government representative vs. internal organization managers). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Interpretive | | | |
| Functional Application: | Formative Assessment | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Community consensus around target behavior(s)</i> | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Percentage of participants who believe that they and others in their community have the ability to make the recommended behavior changes | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | In the formative phase it is useful to assess perceived self-efficacy of different types of participants. Research has shown an association between higher self-efficacy and positive behavior change. Conversely, lower self-efficacy has been associated with lack of behavior change. Stakeholder perceptions of the ability of others in their community to perform the behavior is important to know at baseline, as collective efficacy can reinforce individual perceptions of self-efficacy and therefore the probability of achieving behavioral outcomes. Relative levels of perceived self and collective efficacy may influence project strategy and resource allocation. | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Quantitative methods including questionnaires or survey instruments focused on self and collective efficacy. | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Project participants, related stakeholders, formal and informal community leaders, health providers, government officials, and implementing actors | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | By stakeholder type. Disaggregation by sex and district or region may also be warranted depending on the target behavior. | | | |
| Other Comments: | Measures may be developed using frameworks and resources such as Bandura's (2006) Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents,307–337 and Band et. al (2019) Collective Efficacy of Networks (CENS) . It may not be useful to apply statistical tests since perceptions of self and collective efficacy can change rapidly and be interpreted differently. Instead, the survey sample should be purposive to ensure different cadres of stakeholders are included. | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|------------|----------|--------------|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Formative | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Outcome | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Interpretive | | | |
| Functional Application: | Formative Assessment | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Community consensus around target behavior(s)</i> | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Percentage of community participants—or extent of stakeholder—consensus that the target behavior or issue is one of their top 3 health and wellbeing priorities | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | It is important to understand the extent to which potential community participants and relevant stakeholders agree that target behavior(s) or associated issues are a top priority. If these are not priorities for the community or the individuals involved, there may not be the motivation necessary for change. Conversely, if target behavior(s) and associated issues are a low priority, the project may need to focus early efforts on raising the profile and importance of the behaviors and associated rationale for change. | | | |
| Potential Methods: | A range of participatory ranking, sorting, mapping, or scoring methodologies exist that give respondents the opportunity to rank a list of behaviors from most to least important (see this helpful summary of possible techniques from Folding Burritos). Most online survey tools allow of simple ranking techniques. For low-resource or low-literacy settings, techniques can include using pictures or symbols to facilitate ranking. | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Project participants, related stakeholders, formal and informal community leaders, health providers, government officials, and implementing actors | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Depending on the specific target behavior(s), consider disaggregating by the stakeholder groups most likely to have differences in prioritization, including by age, gender, education level, economic level, geographic area, etc. | | | |
| Other Comments: | Ranking is imprecise, as each respondent may be thinking of specific behaviors in different terms. For this reason, it may be advisable to provide a list of 6 or more different behaviors (including distractor behaviors that will not be addressed in the intervention) and treat the “top three” as essentially high priority and the rest as lower priority. | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|------------|----------|--------------|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Formative | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Outcome | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Interpretive | | | |
| Functional Application: | Formative Assessment | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Alignment with perceived social norms</i> | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Extent of stakeholder consensus that most people in their community would support the behavior change. | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | When designing a project aimed at behavior change it is useful to understand how normative the behavior is within the community. Are the targeted behaviors already recognized and accepted as what ‘most people’ in the community would do? These community beliefs reveal how current or desired behaviors are understood by communities and how challenging a given behavior change will be. | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Quantitatively, this could be measured using a Likert-scaled survey question asking for perceptions of the level of community support for the target behavior change (i.e., no support to high support). Qualitative methods could include focus groups or interviews. Consider using vignettes to create a “typical” situation before asking for the likelihood of community support. For ideas on how to measure see Resources for Measuring Social Norms: A Practical Guide for Programme Implementers https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/resources-measuring-social-norms-practical-guide-programme-implementers | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Project participants, related stakeholders, formal and informal community leaders, health providers, government officials, and implementing actors | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Could usefully be disaggregated by stakeholder type. A priority might be analyzing responses differently for participants and influential members within that community (e.g., religious and community leaders). | | | |
| Other Comments: | Measures of increasing or decreasing normative status for each target behavior could be collected periodically throughout implementation to observe perceptions of change. Depending on the number of stakeholders being surveyed, this could be done qualitatively or quantitatively. | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|------------|----------|--------------|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Formative | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Outcome | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------|----------|--------------|
| Complexity Dimension: | Interpretive | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Functional Application: | Formative Assessment | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Alignment with perceived social norms</i> | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Extent of community and stakeholder consensus that people in their community should make the targeted behavior change. | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | When designing a project aimed at behavior change it is useful to understand how different stakeholder perspectives on whether a behavior should change and if social sanctions exist for deviation from the norm. These community beliefs reveal how current or desired behaviors are understood by communities, how challenging a given behavior change will be to implement, and what normative sanctions will need to be addressed. | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Quantitatively, this could be measured using a Likert-scaled survey question asking for perceptions of the level of community support or sanction for the target behavior change (i.e., no support to high support). Qualitative methods could include focus groups or interviews. Consider using vignettes to create a “typical” situation before asking for the likelihood of community support. Qualitative methods may be useful in gaining a deeper understand for the specific norms and sanctions involved in each community. | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Project participants, related stakeholders, formal and informal community leaders, health providers, government officials, and implementing actors | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Could usefully be disaggregated by stakeholder type. A priority might be analyzing responses differently for participants and influential members within that community (e.g., religious and community leaders). | | | | |
| Other Comments: | Measures of how appropriate each behavior is in the eyes of the community could be collected periodically throughout implementation to observe perceptions of change. This could be paired with an assessment of beliefs about how commonly the target behavior is practiced to evaluate injunctive and descriptive norms, respectively. | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------|----------|--------------|
| Complexity Dimension: | Interpretive | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Functional Application: | Monitoring & Process | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Adaptive capacity</i> | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Percentage of frontline workers who can distinguish project activities that are unstable and may pose future problems. | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | The adaptive capacity of frontline workers is fundamental for effective adaption to changing contexts. This is an indicator of how well frontline workers can anticipate the need for adaptation in their work. Staff are unlikely to respond to complexity effectively if they do not have this capacity and are not aware that some elements of a project are likely to require change (due to a wide variety of contextual pressures). Conversely, if adaptive capacity is strengthened, frontline staff may perform better as partners in adaptation to shifting circumstances. | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | A list of project variables can be provided for which respondents are asked to determine (using a Likert scale) the likelihood that a specific variable will change during an activity. For each variable not considered “very stable or dependable” a reason may be requested to evaluate the thinking behind this evaluation. | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Sample or entire population of the frontline staff. | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Could be useful to disaggregate data by gender, staff type, or area of assignment to detect categories of frontline workers who may require more support to effectively participate in adaptive processes. | | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|------------|----------|--------------|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Formative | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Outcome | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------|----------|--------------|
| Complexity Dimension: | Interpretive | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Functional Application: | Monitoring & Process | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Adaptive capacity</i> | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Percentage of frontline workers who have observed that newly identified barriers or problems have been addressed. | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | Effective adaptive management in the face of a complex and shifting context requires not just that appropriate practices and capacities are in place, but that actual adaptations are being taken to address newly identified problems or concerns. This indicator aims to measure whether frontline workers, in fact, see these adaptations occurring in the field to address unanticipated problems. This evaluates whether frontline staff perceive that adaptive-related decisions have moved into practice to resolve problems as they arise. | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Interviews or rapid surveys can be conducted to gather this data. Some questions should focus on how the respondents perceive their own ability to quickly identify unanticipated problems and take measures to resolve them. Other questions should focus on perceptions of how responsive the management of the project is in acting on the observations of frontline staff. | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Frontline workers (depending on project this may include CHWs as well as service providers in public or private sector clinics). | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | By type of frontline worker. | | | | |
| Other Comments: | Could be useful to disaggregate data by gender, staff type, or area of assignment to detect categories variation in how effectively adaptive methods have been put into practice. | | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|------------|----------|--------------|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Formative | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Outcome | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------|----------|--------------|
| Complexity Dimension: | Interpretive | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Functional Application: | Monitoring & Process | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Managerial responsiveness to diverse perspectives</i> | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Percentage of frontline workers being routinely tapped for their assessment of the project's implementation | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | Adaptive management is a primary way in which adaptive capacity is translated into context-sensitive action. This indicator measures the extent to which frontline workers formal participate in project management (i.e., whether their suggestions for addressing problems they observe are formally solicited). | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Interviews or rapid surveys can be conducted asking whether frontline workers have been asked for their assessment of project activities and context within a defined period. Ideally, surveys are done in a way which permits assessment of the percentage of frontline workers have been tapped in this way. However, qualitative methods are needed to evaluate the extent to which their assessments have solicited. | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Frontline workers (depending on project this may include CHWs as well as service providers in public or private sector clinics). | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | By type of frontline worker. | | | | |
| Other Comments: | Note that this is a measure of adaptive management practice as perceived by frontline workers rather than managers. It measures whether project managers are actively seeking information about problems and solutions from frontline workers. Unlike the indicator above, this indicator focuses on whether frontline staff are being included in assessing the project rather than perceptions of project responsiveness. | | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|------------|----------|--------------|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Formative | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Outcome | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Interpretive | | | |
| Functional Application: | Monitoring & Process | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Managerial responsiveness to diverse perspectives</i> | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Number of scheduled dialogic meetings among stakeholders in which problems that are identified by stakeholders are earmarked for programmatic change. | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | Adaptive management involves managers seeking to understand progress from both internal and external stakeholder perspectives, fostering diverse stakeholder understanding and buy-in of project aims. Stakeholders may also have a better vantagepoint for assessing project success at different levels and identifying problems early. In “dialogic” meetings managers with stakeholders can generate actionable critiques. This contrasts with meetings where the goal is to deliver information such as giving updates and reporting on successes and challenges. The number and regularity of these dialogic meetings toget actionable input from stakeholders is an indicator of how seriously adaptive practices are being applied. | | | |
| Potential Methods: | If dialogic reflection sessions are held as part of adaptive management, these can be documented (and later analyzed) using simple reporting formats to include: the type of input given, who has giving the input, the project modifications made as a result, and the reasons for those shifts. Multi-stakeholder meetings are routinely held to share project information and, importantly, elicit reactions and assessments from external stakeholders. | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Minutes and reports from internal and external stakeholder meetings listed above. | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Disaggregation by stakeholder type can be useful to detect if there are some perspectives or types of stakeholders that appear to be more commonly tapped for input than others. | | | |
| Other Comments: | This indicator emphasizes the importance of seeking suggestions for change from stakeholders in a formal, public setting so that ideas are recorded for future action. Importantly, this indicator does not assess how well managers acted on these suggestions. It complements other indicators evaluating if responsive action is being taken and how effective these actions have been. | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|------------|----------|--------------|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Formative | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Outcome | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Complexity Dimension: | Interpretive | | | |
| Functional Application: | Outcome Evaluations | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Alignment with perceived social norms</i> | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Extent of stakeholder consensus that most people in their community support the targeted behavior. (Descriptive norm) | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | When an intervention is ending or has ended, understanding how diverse stakeholders view the manner and degree to which targeted behavioral norms have changed is useful in predicting the likelihood that a new behavior will be sustained. This indicator assesses whether there is a widely shared stakeholder and community belief that a targeted behavior is now widely practiced and supported by the larger community, an indication that a new norm has taken root within the community. This is a measurement of descriptive norms. | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Quantitatively, this could be measured using a Likert-scaled survey question asking for perceptions of the level of community support for the target behavior (i.e., no support to high support). Qualitative methods could include focus groups or interviews. Consider using vignettes to create a “typical” situation before asking for the likelihood of community support. | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Project participants, related stakeholders, formal and informal community leaders, health providers, government officials, and implementing actors | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Could usefully be disaggregated by stakeholder type. A priority might be analyzing responses differently for participants and influential members within that community (e.g., religious and community leaders). | | | |
| Other Comments: | This indicator measures the perception of how widely norms with sanctions for practicing a behavior exist within a community; it does not necessarily reflect respondents’ own behavior or support for the change. Alternatively, an indicator could measure how widely adopted the current behavior is within the community. | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|------------|----------|--------------|
| | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive |
| Formative | | | |
| Monitoring | | | |
| Outcome | | | |

| Complexity Dimension: | Interpretive | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Contextual</th> <th>Temporal</th> <th>Interpretive</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <th>Formative</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Monitoring</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Outcome</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="background-color: #f08080;"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | Formative | | | | Monitoring | | | | Outcome | | | |
|---|---|--|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| | Contextual | | Temporal | Interpretive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Formative | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Application: | Outcome Evaluations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Alignment with perceived social norms</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Extent of stakeholder consensus that people in their community should maintain the targeted behavior (Injunctive norm, that is, community belief of what others should do) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | When an intervention is ending or has ended, understanding how diverse stakeholders view the manner and degree to which targeted behavioral norms have changed is useful in predicting the likelihood that a new behavior will be sustained. This indicator assesses whether a new behavior has become expected and approved of within the community and so will be more like to be sustained. This is a measurement of whether the injunctive norm relating to the behavior has shifted. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Quantitatively, this could be measured using a Likert-scaled survey asking for perceptions of whether community sanctions exist for not adopting the behavior change. Qualitative methods could include focus groups or interviews. Consider using vignettes to create a “typical” situation before asking for the likelihood of community support. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Project participants, related stakeholders, formal and informal community leaders, health providers, government officials, and implementing actors | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Could usefully be disaggregated by stakeholder type. A priority might be analyzing responses differently for participants and influential members within that community (e.g., religious and community leaders). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Comments: | This indicator measures the perception of injunctive norms for practicing a behavior within a community; it does not necessarily reflect respondents’ own behavior or experience with sanctions for or against a behavior. Alternatively, an indicator could measure whether the respondent has experience of community sanctions for those who do not adopt the new behavior. This provides a less direct, but perhaps more concrete, measure. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Complexity Dimension: | Interpretive | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Contextual</th> <th>Temporal</th> <th>Interpretive</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <th>Formative</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Monitoring</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <th>Outcome</th> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Contextual | Temporal | Interpretive | Formative | | | | Monitoring | | | | Outcome | | | |
|---|--|---|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|--|
| | Contextual | | Temporal | Interpretive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Formative | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Application: | Outcome Evaluations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Area of Complexity: | <i>Continued managerial responsiveness to diverse perspectives</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illustrative Indicator: | Extent of high-level stakeholder consensus on the importance of continued participatory decision-making practices after project completion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual Rationale: | Adaptive management structures designed to include internal and external stakeholder participation are sometimes assumed within project plans to continue after project completion. However, there is often little assessment of how likely sustainment of these practices is and the factors making it more or less likely. A key determinant of whether adaptive techniques will be sustained is the belief by key high-level stakeholders (such as implementing managers within organizations or government institutions) on the importance of continued participatory decision-making processes (such as regular dialogic meetings with frontline staff) after project completion. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Methods: | Qualitative methods include focus groups and interviews with the relevant high-level stakeholders within the organization, relevant government agencies, and the community. These methods will assess the extent that these stakeholders believe that participatory decision-making processes will be continued, that sufficient resources are available and prioritized do sustain this work, and that concrete plans exist to sustain this work after project completion. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Potential Data Sources: | Relevant high-level stakeholders within the organization, relevant government agencies, and the community. In some cases, this can be supplemented by analysis of relevant project documents that define turnover plans (if transferring project to a new partner) to see if adaptive practices are included. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note on Disaggregation Considerations: | Potential disaggregation by geographic location and type of stakeholder (e.g., external government representative vs. internal organization managers). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Authors:

Paul Shelter Fast, Mennonite Central Committee
 Susan Igras, Georgetown University’s Institute for Reproductive Health
 Joseph Petraglia, Syntegral

