



*Environmental Foundation  
of Jamaica*

Measuring the Impact of the  
Environmental Foundation of Jamaica  
on National Development.

*Karen McDonald Gayle & Alicia Hayman*

# Background: About the EFJ

- The Environmental Foundation of Jamaica (EFJ) provides funding to Non-Governmental and Community based Organisations, Academic Institutions throughout the length and breadth of the island.
- By the end of 2012, the Foundation would have managed over US\$20million dollars and over 1,200 grant awards.



# About the Assessment

- The EFJ has been particularly keen on evaluating the impact of the projects and documenting lessons learnt in relation to its Universal Indicators Framework (UIF) which was developed for the EFJ in 2009. Consequently, the Foundation sought to scale up individual project impact to be measured against its UIF.
- Assessed a total of 50 projects in the environment and child thematic areas that were completed since 2007.



# Methodology

- The scope of work for this Impact Assessment included the following:
  - Meetings with relevant EFJ Staff;
  - Review Project documents;
  - Assessment of both quantitative and qualitative data;
  - Recommendations for future use of the indicators for impact assessment both for EFJ staff and grantees;
  - Information that can be translated in various forms and communicated to EFJ publics.



# Limitations

- Not a representative sample of all EFJ-funded projects.
  - Findings should not be extrapolated to be a representation of the whole.
- Not in-depth (e.g. file review – no site visits or interviews)
  - Often not evident on closure of projects, but perhaps some time after.
  - The evaluators could only comment on the M&E as was presented in file records, measurable indicators noted or not noted, or how achievements have been recorded, as well as use of the EFJ format
- Grantee project M&E was evidently weak, and produced variable measurable indicators that were also sometimes non-specific.



# Impact Assessment Results and Analysis

## Relevance of projects

- (Broader significance and consequences on national development)
  - Contribution to Vision 2030
    - “Sustainable management and use of environmental and natural resources”: 8 recycling + 14 enforcement
    - “..each child has equal opportunity ...through best care, affection and protection”: 5 projects
    - “...children 0-8 years have access to adequate early childhood education and development..”: 8 projects
  - Contribution to National Policies and commitments
    - UN Conventions on the Rights of the Child & Biological Diversity
    - Vision 2030 (Jamaica National Development Plan)
    - Early Childhood Commission Standards
    - National Solid Waste Management Act
    - Watershed Policy
    - National Forest Management Plan
    - Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park Management Plan
    - National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
    - Jamaica’s Protected Areas Capacity Plan & Strategic Action Plan
    - National Environmental Education Action Plan for Sustainable Development



# Indicator Analysis

- 28 hectares under improved natural resources management as a result of EFJ assistance
  - Others did not report measures but included home and school gardens promoted; recycling of organic waste; green space; reforestation
- 20 hectares in areas of biological significance under improved management as a result of EFJ assistance
- 80 people with increased benefits derived from partnerships established as a result of EFJ assistance, including **10 new Roving Care Givers** (impacting 300 children)
  - *Two projects to generate income said to have met the objective of income generation but no indication of how much.*
- Impact of training on change in knowledge attitudes and practices: *No pre/post tests were done.*
  - 2,944 persons receiving EFJ supported training in parenting skills, identifying children with disabilities, supporting programmes for children in dangerous circumstances. *Some mentioned improved literacy; increased CXC passes; change in knowledge, change in attitudes of mothers with children,*
  - *no tools were identified to have been used to determine the change or impact.*



# Indicator Analysis II

- Number of persons receiving EFJ supported training in natural resources management and/or conservation: *No overall measure of # of persons receiving support from training in NRM.*
- Revenue change for individuals and groups as a result of EFJ assisted enterprises and interventions: *The only project that gave some indication of income was JCDT's Green Expo with income of **\$200,000.***
- Number of grantee staff trained in technical areas for effective implementation: **Over 270 persons trained** in different areas
- **Over 14,000 children benefit from 11 projects.** – *Possibly more but some projects have no measureable indicators.*



# *Lessons - Best practices*

- Good examples of M&E came from the projects which applied some amount of systematic and thorough analyses to their project results. To this end, measurable indicators were included in reports and the impact of the project well communicated.
- Lack of detailed results in the inability to communicate impact properly.
  - In majority of the projects assessed, M&E was weak and reporting done with the use of ‘general expressions’ rather than through “systematic and thorough analysis”.
    - # of persons attending a training workshop as a measure of impact of the workshop.



# *Lessons - Best practices II*

- Grantees were often weak in reporting and did not follow EFJ reporting guidelines – which also needs improvements.
- Sustainability was often weak as many grantees cited sustained action “if new project funds are found” and is dependent on “funding”. Few grantees did forward planning to source such funds throughout the duration of their projects.
- Grantees generally did not make a link between their projects and contribution to national development. Although there was no such question on the Application form, this link was also never made in the project summary or problem statement.



# *Recommendations*

- Adherence to EFJ reporting formats: Grantees **MUST** adhere to the EFJ reporting format and this must be **STRICTLY** enforced by EFJ programme and finance staff.
  - Better incorporation of EFJ UIF into the Call for Proposals form
  - Build grantee capacity to conduct project M&E
- Establishment of baselines
- Alignment of projects with National Development Priorities
  - Grantees should be guided on how to research National Development priorities and in so doing develop a better appreciation for the relevance of their projects and the importance of achieving objectives.



# *Recommendations II*

- **EFJ's consideration of specific targets for national development**
  - Should be more specific in its own strategies where that contribution will be made
- **Targeting projects for greatest impact:** The EFJ should continue to target projects that can provide greatest impact and maximize the outcomes of its funding support.



# Conclusion

- It is evident that there have been significant improvements and benefits from EFJ-funded projects

## **BUT**

- the impacts have not been efficiently recorded and reported by grantees.
  - More details are required in grantee M&E, and reporting and EFJ programme staff must ensure compliance.
  - Projects that are participatory should be developed in that manner, and assurance of collaboration identified and evident throughout.
  - Sustainability efforts should be given greater focus to ensure that the intervention is not just a one-time or one-off activity, but the impact and benefits can accrue in the long term.
  - Both new and existing grantees will require capacity building in M&E in order for the EFJ to be able to measure its impact in the future.

