Annex 1: Qualitative monitoring tool for gender-transformative change in CEFMU

The draft monitoring tool is adapted from SASA! Together's community tracker. It will need pilot testing and adaptation to specific contexts.

Purpose: This tool documents changes that indicate a programme's progress towards gender-transformative change to prevent CEFMU.

Who fills this in: Implementing partner staff fills in this form.

How to collect information: Implementing partners can collect this information in different ways depending on their existing monitoring approaches, resources and capacity. These may include:

→ focus group discussions or in-depth interviews that include questions on indicators below
→ participatory activities like timelines, maps, pile sorting etc. that include a focus on the selected indicator.

Who to collect information from: To triangulate different perspectives it is recommended to collect information from:

→ a group of girls
→ another community group, most likely parents, but also potentially boys or community stakeholders.

The questions are slightly different for each group, as some people will not be able to answer all questions usefully.

How often is the information collected: The implementing partner team should determine how often to conduct this data-collection based on when they expect gender-transformative change to be visible, existing resources and time. Data-collection can take place during community engagement. Data should be collected at least on a quarterly basis.

Questions: For each indicator several questions are suggested. Implementing partners should select the most relevant given their interventions and activities, and their programming context. Normally one question would be rated per indicator. However, other questions may be used for wider discussion.

How to rate responses: A five-point scale (from no people to almost all people) is used to rate responses to each question. The purpose is to translate qualitative responses into quantitative estimates that can be used to gauge the approximate proportion of people that agree with the listed statements through observation, discussion or participatory activities, to facilitate communication of changes. Though this may not be scientifically valid, efforts should be made that implementing partners can collect data from at least 95 participants/beneficiaries per community, per cycle of data-collection. Before rating, those assigned to rate should discuss each of the questions and the rating scale to ensure common understanding, approach to assessment and consistency of rating.

Rating scale:

1	No/almost no respondents (0-20%)
2	Few respondents (21-40%)
3	Some respondents (41-60%)
4	Many respondents (61-80%)
5	Almost all respondents (81-100%)

Monitoring tool

Completed by:
Name .... **Position** .... **Date** .... **Location** ....

Domains	Indicators	Who to ask	Monitoring questions	Rating 1-5
Agency				
Girls' role in marriage decision-making	**1. Girls' aspirations for their futures**	Girls	Can girls identify and freely discuss their aspirations for their futures: → with trusted friends/ relatives → with parents and other people who influence marriage decisions.	
Girls' role in marriage decision-making	**2. Who makes the final decision on marriage**	Girls; parents & community	Do key decision makers for girls' marriage seek girls' opinions about when to marry or on specific bridegrooms before making decisions? Are girls' opinions and preferences a primary factor guiding decisions for when and with whom girls marry?	
Girls' role in marriage decision-making	**3. Who girls can turn to for support in refusing a marriage proposal**	Girls	Do girls feel there are people they can turn to for support in refusing a proposal? Do these people take action to support girls who want to refuse a proposal?	
Girls' agency to complete school	**4. Girls' perceived ability to return to school after dropout, when married, pregnant or with children**	Girls; parents & community	Can girls return to school after dropout? Are there other places where girls can continue education after getting married? Do parents and other family members support married girls to continue schooling?	
Gender relations				
Family relationships and attitudes to girls' marriage	**5. Perceived consequences for girls and families if daughters are unmarried after a certain point**	Girls; parents & community	If a girl delays marriage past X age, is she still able to get married? Would a girl's sisters/brothers still be able to get married if she was not married by X age? Do community members (family, neighbours, leaders, influential others) publicly support delaying girls' marriage until adulthood?	
Community views and expectations on marriage	**6. Perception of changes in community response to unmarried girls who get pregnant**	Girls; parents & community	Does the community support unmarried pregnant girls to freely choose who they marry, and when? Can an unmarried pregnant girl seek and obtain SRHR services?	

Structure				
Quality of services	**7. Access to relevant services, including SRHR services, legal support, social services**	Girls; Parents & community	Can boys and girls speak to school staff about early marriage? Have/would child protection actors (school staff, health service providers, social service providers, law enforcement services, community leaders, religious leaders, etc) intervene on behalf of a girl? Does the community support boys and girls who access SRHR services? Do service providers direct girls and families to health, education, social or legal support to prevent CEFMU? Do service providers come to community meetings to talk about child marriage?	
Livelihoods opportunities for young women and their families	**8. Girls'/ young women's participation in skills development or income generating activities**	Girls; parents & community	Do older girls/ young women in this community take part in skills training or income-generation programmes? Do older girls/ young women in this community do paid work (have jobs, run their own businesses or farm?)	
Supportive legal and policy frameworks	**9. Community support for laws and policies to end CEFMU**	Parents & community	Are community members aware of laws or policies to end CEFMU? Do community members express support for laws or policies to end CEFMU? Do men and boys [insert other group as relevant e.g., religious leaders] speak up as advocates for ending CEFMU?	

*Note, the above indicators are suggested for qualitative monitoring for programmes working on gender-transformative change to prevent CEFMU. Programmes may choose alternate direct or broader indicators listed in the report that are more relevant to their theory of change, resources and expected outcomes.

Probing the reasons for responses

Asking the reasons for responses to questions is encouraged as it gives further insights into both what is working well, the key bottlenecks that programmes should seek to address and enabling factors that programmes can build on. These wider insights should be noted for discussion within the programme team, alongside further details of points raised in the discussion. Possible probing questions include:

→ **Is the situation changing?**
→ **Why/ why not?**
→ **What would enable change on this issue?**

Other observations. Use this space to note any key differences, explanations, further points raised by participants.

Analysis of findings:

Rating scale

Analysing how common each response is will give a sense of progress on individual indicators. Responses can also be examined in terms of how far they show progress in each 'block': agency, gender relations, structures.

The results from the two groups (girls and parents/ community stakeholders) should be checked against each other for similarities and differences in findings. Results should also be compared over time to show any progress or regression.

Probing questions/ wider discussion

Consider responses to probing questions and wider discussion, in particular:

→ Were there any important differences of opinion? What?

→ On what issues/ indicators (if any) did participants note change?
→ What did they consider was leading to change?
→ What did they consider was blocking change?
→ Any other key observations?

Implications of findings:

Low ratings (1–2) on the rating scale indicate that limited change has so far occurred. A rating of 3 shows a change process under way. Ratings of 4–5 suggest that norms and practices have successfully changed in the intended gender-transformative direction. The table below suggests some possible responses to low scores by group of indicators.

 The discussion of what is or is not changing, and why will help identify whether changes in programme activities are needed.

Domain	Indicator	Possible responses to low score
Agency	**1. Girls' aspirations for their futures**	→ enhance opportunities for girls to identify, and discuss aspirations/marriage preferences and practice communication skills → raise awareness among girls of sources of support and train service providers (see also 7) → intergenerational forums to build understanding and support for girls' aspirations/marriage preferences, and support for adolescent mothers → targeted financial or childcare support for adolescent mothers to return to education → work with schools, training providers and community leaders to increase opportunities for adolescent mothers to return to education.
	2. Who makes the final decision on marriage	
	3. Who girls can turn to for support in refusing a marriage proposal	
	4. Girls' ability to return to school after dropout, when married, pregnant or with children	
Gender relations	**5. Perceived consequences for girls and families if daughters are unmarried after a certain point**	→ intergenerational dialogues to shift perceived desirability of child marriage, including in cases of adolescent pregnancy → engage community and religious leaders in discussion, training and reflection to shift support for girls' delayed marriage → encourage public demonstration or role modelling to support girls' delayed marriage.
	6. Perception of changes in community response to unmarried girls who get pregnant	
Structures	**7. Access to relevant services (education, SRHR, legal support etc.)**	→ training and skill building for service providers to strengthen adolescent-friendly provision → strengthen programmes addressing financial barriers to services and poverty-related causes of CEFMU. training and skill building for service providers to strengthen responses in cases of (proposed) CEFMU → strengthen community-based training, employment and entrepreneurship opportunities for young women to expand possible options and life paths. → engage in intergenerational facilitated dialogue, reflection and discussion of policies, laws, values, norms and behaviours → work with local institutions to publicize laws, policies and create implementation plans.
	8. Girls'/ young women's participation in skills development or income generating activities	
	9. Community support for laws and policies to end CEFMU	