Module 2: Setting objectives and indicators

Outcomes from using this module

You will understand:

- the concept of indicators and what they can and cannot tell us
- how to set objectives and indicators
- why they are important
- how they can help you to assess the progress of your project
- the difference between SMART and SPICED indicators
- the importance of working closely with stakeholders to set indicators and define what change means to them

Introduction: The importance of participatory indicators

This module introduces the concept of indicators and highlights the steps that you need to go through to set project objectives and identify the indicators you can use to see if you programs or projects are meeting their aims and having an impact. It is important to set objectives and assessment indicators that are realistic as too often these steps are taken without consulting with the people who are the so-called 'targets' or 'primary stakeholders' of the project.

Working with primary stakeholders enables projects to be established in which the objectives are driven by local realities. Working with communities to understand what they feel is a successful outcome and what social change means to them is challenging and requires patience, time and resources. Ideally, a wide group of stakeholders and community members would be involved, facilitated by inclusive processes and dialogue, and an empowering research approach. It is important that we do not impose our visions of what change means on to the people we work with, so the initial steps of understanding what changes are sought and how we will measure them are critically important.

While it may be tempting to forego the use of participatory approaches to setting indicators due to lack of time and other resources, it is important to take a **long-term perspective that considers the benefits of participatory M&E**. These benefits include: flexibility of the process, increased ownership of the M&E process by community members and other stakeholders, better quality evaluation outcomes, strengthened evaluation capacities, and improved program impacts.

In summary, setting indicators with your key stakeholders and communities is important for the following reasons:

- The process results in more realistic, meaningful and achievable indicators than those set by top-down methods.

- The process can often highlight the different information needs and ideas of change of different stakeholders and community groups (including women and men).
- The focus is not just on *what* is measured but on *how* it is measured and *who* has decided which indicators are important.
- Information about *why* and *how* change has happened and how important that change is to those affected is more likely to emerge.
- The process helps to increase community ownership of and involvement in projects, awareness, mutual learning and empowerment – this can increase the potential that your program has positive impacts of various kinds.

Overview of the concept of indicators

Indicators are ways of measuring (indicating) that progress on your programs or projects is being achieved, with 'progress' being determined by the aims and objectives of an initiative. Indicators are used to measure the impact of interventions and to monitor the performance of programs or projects in relation to pre-determined targets. Some evaluators consider indicator setting to be the most difficult step in designing an evaluation or impact assessment. In the attempting to provide indications of change in complex contexts

What indicators can and cannot tell us

Indicators can tell us things such as:

- To what extent our program objectives have been met
- What progress our project or program has made
- The extent to which our targets have been met
- That a change we are interested in is happening

However, indicators only provide an *indication* that something has happened – *they are not proof* and they cannot tell us:

- Why our program or project has made a difference
- Why and how change occurs
- How our communication activities should be undertaken

Types of indicators

Indicators need to measure physical and visible (measurable) outcomes, but also changes in attitudes and behaviour, which is often less tangible and not always easy to count. While quantitative indicators are emphasised in mainstream M&E approaches, for communication for development, and especially Communication for Social Change, they often need to be qualitative to be most effective and appropriate. Qualitative indicators can help us to assess the impacts of our projects and the extent to which change has occurred. They are generally more descriptive. Quantitative indicators can help to assess if our projects are on track. Indicators can take different formats such as pictures or stories of social change. This is particularly important to consider when we are working with people who have low levels of education or literacy.

The most important indicators are often not quantifiable. For example, the number of people participating in a social network is relatively unimportant compared to the *quality of relationships and dialogue* within that network.

There are many different types of indicators, for example, '**process indicators**' (the number of people trained) '**output indicators**' (increased dialogue within a community) and '**outcome or impact indicators** (for example, the proportion of youth who know about safe sexual practices).

Examples of types of indicators for monitoring and evaluating CFSC initiatives

Input indictor:

- Funds covering the planned communication activities
- Qualified staff

Process indicator:

- Number of participatory radio programmes aired
- Number of people reached through popular theatre activities

Output indicator:

- Percentage of participants by men and women
- Exposure to needed information/messages
- Expanded public and private dialogue

Outcome/impact indicator:

- ICT increasingly used for dialogue and debate
- Percentage of men and women who know about voting procedures

(from DANIDA, 2005)

Gender-sensitive indicators

CFSC initiatives are extremely gender-sensitive and women and men in developing countries usually have unequal access to information, freedom of expression and communication technologies such as radio. Indicators for your programs therefore need to provide data that is divided by gender and other relevant characteristics such as age, caste or ethnic group.

Objectives and indicators

Most projects begin with a design process during which the objectives and indicators are set. Often, donors state objectives in broad terms, i.e. % reduction in HIV or increase in gender empowerment, and they expect their project partners to identify clear links between their activities and the achievement of these development objectives, using standardised tools such as the logframe. Broad objectives relating to things such as human rights or gender empowerment often mean very different things at the local level. Gender empowerment, for example, might be understood at the local level as a series of small and ongoing changes that gradually lead to changes in the overall status of women.

What makes a good indicator

There are many different ways of assessing how useful our indicators are. Some guidelines include:

- They are relevant and accurate enough for those concerned to interpret the information – they do not need to be perfect.
- Relevance of information is essential to identifying appropriate indicators.
- The need to be achievable and realistic.
- They should enable you to assess change over a period of time.

Since social change can often take a long time, progress toward long-term social change can at times be an acceptable measure of effectiveness.

How Equal Access Nepal assessed change results before the AC4SC project

In the initial stages at EAN, we gathered lots of qualitative data through letters, feedback forms, group discussions and interviews but we had no mechanism to mange and analyse them. Indicators were not set to show impact results. Case studies, quotes and photos were considered as change results of the radio programs. Although lots of qualitative data were received, the information provided to donors was more quantitative, such as the number of letters received. This happened because there was more involvement of donors in our activities throughout each project. Impacts were more visible to donors because they visited the field a lot and met the beneficiaries frequently. Because of our donors' direct involvement in project activities, no questions were asked about M&E activities like setting objectives and indicators. That is why we had no mechanism to set objectives and indicators and did not think about the need for this.

Later on, training in Ethnographic Action Research was provided to program managers and M&E field staff in EAN to maintain field data as field notes, code them and then present impact results in the form of photo essays and features. However, there was no direct involvement of stakeholders in this analysis and reporting process.

During an initial AC4SC planning meeting, the following comment was made: 'EAN wants to be able to identify indicators of social change but donors are uninterested in indicators that don't fit their framework. That is why current indicators don't assess social change'. This helps to explain why indicators that were previously set were often quantitative, not focussed on social change impacts and set without the input from beneficiaries. Instead, they were often based on things like the number of trainings conducted, numbers of persons trained, and number of listeners clubs formed.

SPICED and SMART indicators

While there are no set rules to selecting indicators, one popular guideline has been to use the acronym 'SMART': indicators should be Specific, Measurable, Attainable and action-oriented, Relevant, and Time-bound. This guideline tends to suit quantitative indicators in particular. Another acronym recently suggested is 'SPICED': Subjective, Participatory, Interpreted, Communicable, Empowering and Disaggregated. SMART describes the properties of the indicators themselves, while SPICED relates more to how indicators should be used, as the following table illustrates:

SMART indicators	**SPICED indicators**
Specific (to the change being measured)	Subjective
Measurable (and unambiguous)	Participatory
Attainable (and sensitive)	Interpreted (and communicable)
Relevant (and easy to collect)	Cross-checked
Time bound (with term dates for measurement)	Empowering
	Diverse and disaggregated

You don't always have to use SMART or SPICED indicators, but you can use them as a way of evaluating what you are doing with your indicators. They give you clear criteria to evaluate the quality of your indicators.

Essentially, your choice of indicator depends on what stakeholders want to measure or the type of changes they want to better understand and assess. The SPICED approach puts more emphasis on developing indicators that stakeholders can define and use for their own purposes of interpreting and learning about change, rather than simply measuring or attempting to demonstrate impact to meet donor requirements. This approach is more appropriate for the participatory monitoring and evaluation of CFSC programs, which is likely to draw heavily on qualitative and descriptive measures. However, SMART indicators and quantitative approaches also have a role, depending on the indicators and their purposes as designed through participatory processes. We also recognise that SMART indicators may better meet donor requirements, as the comments below indicate.

Some challenges in using SMART and SPICED indicators: a view from EAN

The major challenge in developing SMART indicators is coming into agreement with certain stakeholders (such as radio program team members) and giving briefings about indicators to beneficiaries at the community level. It took a long time to reach agreement on all of the SMART indicators we developed for our first six month research plan. Then, at the last moment, the M&E team was asked to remove indicators for certain themes by the SSMK team.

In terms of donor requirements, it is easier to set SMART indicators than SPICED indicators. From this point of view, SMART indicators are more practical than SPICED indicators. The SPICED approach is good as it uses a bottom-up participatory approach, but it requires more involvement of community members to define indicators of social change impact and they take a longer time to set. This means that more resources are needed than for the SMART approach.

Some resources about indicators and the SMART and SPICED approach to assessing indicators can be found in the **Useful resources, information and tools** section.

The SPICED approach

The **SPICED** approach is a useful tool for thinking about how project objectives and indicators can be set in a participatory and inclusive way with local communities. The approach is summarised below:

SPICED: Subjective - Participatory - Interpreted and communicable - Cross-checked and compared - Empowering - Diverse and disaggregated

Subjective: Informants have a special position or experience that gives them unique insights which may yield a very high return on the investigators time. In this sense, what others see as 'anecdotal' becomes critical data because of the source's value.

Participatory: Objectives and indicators should be developed together with those best placed to assess them. This means involving a project's ultimate beneficiaries, but it can also mean involving local staff and other stakeholders.

Interpreted and communicable: Locally defined objectives/indicators may not mean much to other stakeholders, so they often need to be explained.

Cross-checked and compared: The validity of assessment needs to be cross-checked, by comparing different objectives/indicators and progress, and by using different informants, methods, and researchers.

Empowering: The process of setting and assessing objectives/indicators should be empowering in itself and allow groups and individuals to reflect critically on their changing situation.

Diverse and disaggregated: There should be a deliberate effort to seek out different objectives/indicators from a range of groups, especially men and women. This information needs to be recorded in such a way that these differences can be assessed over time.

The **SPICED** approach is a very useful tool for thinking about how to set participatory objectives and indicators. It is qualitative; it appreciates local understandings of change and is a good tool for thinking about why it is important to work with communities. It identifies that different people have different ideas about what change means. Developing indicators that help us understand what change means at the community level is challenging, but several steps can be taken that make the process simpler to understand and implement. Key steps relevant to EAN include:

Step 1: Identify and engage stakeholder groups and community researchers

An important first step is to first identify the key stakeholder groups who should be involved in the process of setting objectives and indicators. Using different participatory processes to engage different groups is also important. You will need to consider which methods would work best with different groups in order to ensure that everyone's voices and views are heard. Using these processes as part of regular meetings or community-based activities can be one way to reduce the amount of time and effort that may be needed to organise special research-related meetings or workshops. Methods that could be used to identify and engage stakeholders include:

- Interviews with key informants who then suggest others.
- Holding a workshop with staff to identify key stakeholders

- Stakeholder analysis based on analysis of social networks (see **Useful resources** section).
- Conducting a survey to identify stakeholder groups and their type and level of stake then making contact with the main leader of each group.

The most appropriate community members and groups to involve in the process of identifying indicators also need to be identified. This step would include engaging listener club members and others in the community and who would take part in research related to identifying what social change means to the community. It is helpful to invite both program participants and non-participants to take part in the process of setting indicators. This enables the perspectives of different people affected by your project or programs to be taken into account and fosters greater ownership of the project among local people. A smaller number of stakeholder groups can be prioritised for the indicator development process.

Example of the successful engagement of internal stakeholders in setting radio program objectives

After the AC4SC project started, there were different meetings with the SSMK and NN content teams and management team members. EAN regularly involved content team members in setting objectives and indicators for the SSMK and NN radio programs. This process helped us to develop our first six month research plan which includes objectives, indicators and research questions. It also helped to develop better dialogue and cooperation between the M&E and content team members and raised the value of M&E work within EAN.

As an initial step in the design of the impact assessment of the SSMK and NN programs, the content and M&E teams met in a workshop and came up with different objectives related to the NN and SSMK programs. The aim was to identify the indicators that would be the focus of the initial impact assessment/PM&E process. This involved the following steps:

- A pre-workshop was held with fourteen EAN staff including senior management, program and production staff and M&E staff.
- Program objectives were listed and combined with similar objectives that were identified during previous workshops. This resulted in a list of twelve objectives for SSMK and ten for NN.
- Each workshop participant was given five red dots which they placed against the objectives they considered most important.
- Participants discussed the votes given to various objectives for the programs.
- The wording of some objectives was changed and agreement reached on which were more important than others.
- Further work on the objectives and more discussions were held at subsequent workshops involving a smaller number of EA staff.
- EAN staff eventually decided on the two objectives for each program that would be the focus of the initial work on the impact assessment, to be conducted as part of the initial capacity development workshops and fieldwork.

Example of the process of identifying key stakeholders

Once the SSMK and NN program objectives were identified, workshop participants were asked to list various groups of stakeholders who could participate in setting indicators of social change related to the programs. Initially, the SSMK and NN teams each prepared lists of all of their stakeholders. They then collaborated to list the stakeholders who could be involved in setting indicators of social change and the ways in which they could be involved in this process. The final list of stakeholders and the ways that we thought they could participate was:

- Listeners (letters, emails, phone calls, feedback, face to face interaction)
- Listener clubs (letters, emails, phone calls, feedback, face to face interaction)
- Reporters (audio clips, reports, photographs, success stories, feedbacks, meetings - both formal and informal)
- Outreach partners and organisations (periodic reports, meetings)
- Content Advisory Group (CAG meetings)
- Project staff (reports, field audio, monitoring, visits, outreach staff activities)
- Donors (reports and feedback)

Step 2: Understanding the local context, issues and barriers to change

This step assumes that you have already identified the communities in which you will conduct your impact assessment research work. It includes:

- Undertaking scoping research in the communities and preparing reports on this research.
- The community researchers using participatory tools to identify barriers to social change and develop and plan strategies to address those barriers.
- Evaluating the various methods used in this research.
- Understanding the communication context in the selected communities, including what access different groups have to various communication technologies and other sources of information and what forms of communication they engage in.

Example of scoping research to understand local contexts, issues and barriers

One of the first steps in the AC4SC project was to conduct scoping studies in the Palpa, Dang, Dadeldhura and Dhankuta districts of Nepal which had been selected as the initial four research sites. The main aims of these scoping studies were to:

- Identify and engage key stakeholders in the community who could provide relevant information about the community and assist in identifying other stakeholders and potential community researchers. We thought that later on they could participate in setting indicators and engage in the impact assessment process.
- Explain the AC4SC project to key stakeholders in the community and the benefits of the project to the community.
- Identify and interview potential community researchers.
- Collect demographic data on each community.
- Collect relevant contextual information about the area, including the recent history of the area, and key community sectors and organisations.
- Undertake communicative ecology research and mapping.
- Conduct research to obtain relevant information related to SSMK and NN such as who listens to the programs and how and what the community's level of knowledge is about some of the core themes in the programs.

We used different participatory tools such as diamond, communicative ecology, spider diagram, community mapping, gender chart, interviews and focus group discussions to better understand the community in these four districts. In addition, we gathered government statistics and other data about the such things as: population numbers, age distribution, gender, ethnicity/caste, religion, educational/literacy levels, economic activity and migration to and from the area. We also gathered information about annual events such as religious and cultural festivals.

We found that lack of education, gender and caste discrimination, poverty and superstitious beliefs were the major barriers to social change. Communicative ecology mapping was used to understand the media preferences of individual community members and the community as a whole. People were using personal face to face contact, the telephone and mobile phones more as communicating tools. Some people knew what the internet was but lacked access to it. Regular research work conducted in these districts identified changes in people's interest toward media preferences. More people were found to be interested in watching TV than listening to the radio and more people were interested in listening to local FM stations with local radio programs than national broadcast services such as Radio Nepal.

Step 3: Identifying information needs and interests

This step includes:

- Using various methods to identify the needs and interests of diverse community groups related to social change information and other associated activities.
- Aligning objectives and media content to best meet those needs - the appropriate content for locally produced programs and nationally broadcast programs would need to be considered here. Local radio stations and advisory groups would also be involved.

Example of identifying the information needs of the community

Through our use of various PM&E methods, our research participants provided a range of feedback about ways that the SSMK and NN radio programs could be improved. This included the feedback that they wanted the programs to cover what they felt were issues in the local area such as the trafficking of girls, HIV and AIDS, impunity, and accountable government services. The following shows some of the issues that short questionnaire survey (SQS) respondents wanted to see included in the programs. They indicate that listeners are still interested to know more about many of the issues that these programs have been covering for a long time.

Issues for NN

- Improvement in the political process
- Impact of unstable political situation on youth
- Media and its security
- Update on the Constituent Assembly
- Role of youth during the transitional period
- Awareness of youth on criminal activities
- Role of youth on public justice and security
- Good governance

Issues for SSMK

- Girl trafficking
- Love and sex
- Development of youth
- Role and responsibilities of youth towards their nation
- Employability
- Vocational training
- Sexual and reproductive health
- Quality education

As well as this, Content Advisory Group meetings were held regularly at EAN to get feedback from different stakeholders to develop program issues for the content development of the radio programs. Feedback on radio programs through Critical Listening and Feedback Sessions was also used to triangulate with other data about the information needs of program audiences.

Step 4: Identifying social change impacts and indicators

This step includes:

- Using various participatory methods to identify different forms of social change impacts of the programs.
- Staff and others using this data to identify potential indicators of social change; i.e. what communities feel are achievable outcomes in the short, medium and long term.
- Identifying the things that need to occur to achieve change, i.e. what actions need to occur?
- Evaluating the methods used to identify impacts and indicators.

Participatory research techniques such as Most Significant Change and Roadblocks and Barriers (to name but a few) can help you to understand what 'success' or 'change' means at the local level.

Examples of identifying social change impacts and indicators

EAN used various methods to identify different types of social and behavioural change impacts of the SSMK and NN programs. Some of this data helped us to set indicators which were included in our first six month research plan.

Identifying what social change means to the community

During a community meeting held as part of a field visit to Dang and Dadeldhura in January 2009, community members were asked what social change means to them. Participants thought that raised level of awareness; decrease in caste and gender discrimination and no negative thoughts are social change. They suggested that many different things help to bring about social change such as education, awareness, discussion, youth activities, and people who motivate for change. They also thought that radio programs, wall paintings, posters and pamphlets, newspapers, and television programs can help to achieve social change. However, they have to regularly address an issue to help change happen. One method alone cannot make change happen. They all have to work together to create social change.

Identifying domains of change

After undertaking a review of 20 MSC stories, AC4SC project participants were able to identify a number of domains of change (DoCs) related to the NN and SSMK radio programs. This process included the following steps:

1. Reviewing the broad visions and objectives for the SSMK and NN programs
2. Sorting the MSC stories
    - Eliminate stories lacking in detail or that do not focus on change associated with SSMK or NN.
    - Categorise the remaining stories and data into piles of similar broad types of impact or change (for example, change in awareness related to education or health, or change in participation or personal relationships)
    - Note down the broad types of impact identified for each program
3. Developing draft DoCs: List up to eight possible DoCs for each program based on the broad objectives and the impact themes identified
4. Consulting the SSMK and NN program teams
    - Ask the teams to comment on the list of DoCs and suggest revisions and additions
    - Seek agreement on the list of draft DoCs and the wording of any revisions
5. Consulting the Community Researchers. In order to know how they interpreted the DOCs, each of the CRs were asked:
    - What changes does the Naya Nepal program help bring to its listeners and community?
    - What changes does the SSMK program help bring to its listeners and community?
6. Based on all of these inputs and ideas, decide on the final DoCs: Meeting participants further prioritised the DoCs and decided on the specific DoCs that will be used in future MSC story collection.

Example of indicators based on domains of change

These are some of the SMART impact indicators linked to the broad/ongoing objectives of the SSMK and Naya Nepal programs and the domains of change that were included in the draft six month research plan developed by EAN. They were later revised or refined.

SSMK indicators:
- At least 50% of the SSMK target group researched are sharing knowledge obtained from SSMK with family and/or peers.
- At least 50% of the SSMK target group researched give examples of how they have developed skills and knowledge to make informed decisions about one or more SSMK issues.
- At least 15% of the SSMK target group researched can give examples of how they or others in their family or community have changed their attitudes towards superstitions and social ills after listening to SSMK programs on these topics.

Naya Nepal indicators:
- At least 40% of NN listeners researched are aware of their duties and responsibilities as a citizen related to the promotion of democratic, inclusive, peaceful and sustainable systems of governance.
- At least 60% of NN listeners researched will have increased their awareness about reforms to the Justice and Security System.
- At least 10% of NN listeners researched can give examples of how they or others in their family or community have encouraged others to take part in socio-political activities and discussions during the previous 12 months.

Step 5: Identifying indicator categories and verifying indicators

This step involves:

- Identifying the most relevant, effective and appropriate indicators of social change for the key stakeholder groups (M&E staff, donors etc).
- Reaching agreement on definitions for each key indicator.
- Developing categories of indicators and impacts.
- Going back to community members and groups to check the extent to which the indicators developed adequately captured their realities and perspectives.
- Seeking agreement on the wording of the indicators.
- Assessing the various methods used to develop the indicators.

Example of reaching agreement on indicator and impact categories

The indicators developed for the six month research plan as part of the AC4SC project were based on continuous dialogue between the M&E and content team members and input from the AC4SC research team. Before setting these indicators, this dialogue and cooperation was helpful to develop objectives of the radio programs first, based on which the indicators were set. As well as this, the development of the domains of change (DOCs) has helped us to assess various types of changes in program listeners. As for example, a DOC related to the NN radio program is 'changes in the attitude of citizens towards politics' which was been defined after we analysed MSC stories collected from listeners which mentioned that after they started listening to the NN program, they started think that politics is not a dirty game rather they should take an interest in it. This has also been verified by analysis of short questionnaire survey results. The impacts that were identified through this ongoing process of analysis and discussion are:

SSMK:
Can talk freely about sex
Dialogue among peers on HIV and reproductive health
Aware on HIV and AIDS and reproductive health
Able to make decisions
Able to convince parents that they should study and reject early marriage
Developed critical thinking

Naya Nepal:
Started taking interest in political matters
Able to understand Constituent Assembly and its process
Discussion and dialogue about political matters at the community level

Example of translating generic objectives/indicators to more local indicators

One of the broad objectives of the Naya Nepal radio program is 'to encourage discussion and dialogue about political matters at the community level'. These activities have been identified through the research conducted by community researchers and the M&E team at EAN. Analysis of MSC stories and the outcomes of group discussions and interviews show that listeners are taking more interest in political matters and having discussions about different political issues after listening to the NN program.

Some local examples of indicators of discussion and dialogue about political matters at the community level that were identified though community-based research are:

- Community members directly asking questions about local problems to local Constituent Assembly (CA) members
- Changes in women's participation in and interest in political matters and their increased self confidence in speaking about these issues
- Encouraging and motivating family members and neighbours to vote during the election.

The importance of being able to speak directly to CA members was verified by the results of an SQS which showed that the NN program segment 'Question to CA members' was ranked as the second most liked segment by a quarter of the survey respondents.

Some final words

The process of setting objectives and defining indicators is concerned with better understanding the people that you work with. Development is a partnership and understanding what change means at the community level, what change communities strive to realise and how CFSC programs and projects can help them achieve it places a very special emphasis on the kind of M&E process and methods that can be used. Increasingly, participatory approaches are helping to close the gap between project implementers and stakeholders and increase dialogue. Working with communities in a participatory and equal way from the outset and then throughout a project is essential to understanding what change is sought and what change has occurred.

Some useful tips and ideas for setting indicators

- ***Set appropriate indicators and methods***: Develop the types of indicators that are appropriate to your programs or projects, through processes that are appropriate – link them very strongly to your program objectives. Use methods that are appropriate for the type of indicator (tangible/intangible; process/outcome).
- ***Get good input from many stakeholders***: Indicators should be developed with input from a wide range of relevant stakeholders, using participatory processes that encourage discussion and enable people to identify indicators of social or behaviour change that are meaningful to them.
- ***Keep indicators manageable*** and keep them to a ***reasonable number*** – it's more useful to use a small number of meaningful and useful indicators which can be looked at regularly and carefully than a long and complicated list that's too time-consuming to use. Also remember that the most important indicators are often not quantifiable.
- ***Enable analysis of differences***: Ensure that indicators reflect the need for gender disaggregated data, or data on other important differences such as age, educational level or caste.
- ***Remember their limitations***: indicators are not able to capture complex realities and relationships – they are good ways of measuring change but not of capturing the reasons behind such change. See indicators as just one part of a PM&E strategy - they can allow you to demonstrate progress towards defined objectives, but cannot tell you why, or what this means to people's lives.
- ***Consider using alternatives***: It may be useful to consider using alternatives to indicators, such as Most Significant Change stories and 'verifying assumptions'. In some cases, such alternatives may provide better ways to monitor significant and sometimes unanticipated or negative impacts associated with long-term CFSC goals.