

Memorandum Reference No. M17-12-671**Guidelines in the Institutionalization of the Agriculture and Fisheries Extension (AFE) Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME) System****February 13, 2017**

The memorandum provides a guideline that determine the results of the interventions - policies, programs, and projects - as it answers the "so what" questions whether the organization successfully implemented the interventions, whether the interventions produced the actual and intended results for the beneficiaries, and whether the organization achieved the changes that it envisioned during the development of the interventions.

Salient Extension Provisions

As of November 2017, the following are the AFE RBME indicators and their respective descriptions:

Result Indicator	Description
Increased access to AFE interventions	
# of clients served	Total number of clients provided with AFE interventions
% of marginalized clients trained	The proportion of marginalized clients such as out of school youths, rural women, indigenous people, senior citizen, and persons with disabilities trained
% of area coverage	The proportion of clients' area coverage reached by AFE interventions
Improved attitude, skills, and knowledge of clients	
% of clients saying that they an increase in an increased knowledge	The proportion of clients that perceived an increase in knowledge based on the provided intervention
% of clients passing the Post-test	The proportion of clients scoring at least 60% in the Post-test
# of clients certified with skills competencies	Total number of clients gaining TESDA national competency certification (NC I, II, III, IV) on AF related subjects
% of adopters based on the action plan	The proportion of AEWs trained that complied to/implemented their action plan
% of clients that adopted new AF technologies	The proportion of clients (small farmers) that adopted new AF technologies or practices
Improved provision of interventions	
% of clients satisfied with the intervention they received	The proportion of clients that gave at least a satisfactory rating after being provided with the intervention
% of clients saying that the intervention is relevant	The proportion of clients that gave at least a somewhat relevant rating on the intervention given in terms of the current situation and needs
% of accomplished interventions as scheduled	The proportion of timely delivery of interventions based on its targeted schedule of implementation
% absorptive capacity	The proportion of institutional extent by which the fund allocated for AFE intervention was spent by all AFE institutions
Increased productivity of clients	
% of clients engaged in diversified farming	The proportion of clients using diversified farming methods/techniques
% of clients engaged in value-adding	The proportion of clients that ventured into value addition of products
% of clients with increased income	The proportion of clients that showcased improved AF practices resulting in an increased income
Increased empowerment of clients	
% of clients turned into agripreneurs	The proportion of clients transformed into agripreneurs
% of marginalized clients turned into agripreneurs	The proportion of marginalized clients transformed into agripreneurs
% of clients employed in AF related job or promoted to a higher position	The proportion of clients (including scholars) that have been employed to AF related job or have been promoted to higher positions
# Schools for Practical Agriculture assisted	Total number of learning sites elevated into Schools for Practical Agriculture with the assistance of ATI

# Farm Tourism sites assisted	Total number of Schools for Practical Agriculture elevated into Farm Tourism sites with the assistance of ATI
Increased resiliency of clients	
% of clients with social protection	The proportion of clients with crop or livestock insurance, SSS, PhilHealth, among others
% of clients saying that they are confident of coping from unfortunate events	The proportion of clients that perceived confidence in coping from unfortunate events/total # of clients served
% of clients that have coped with unfortunate events by applying adaptation and mitigation measures	The proportion of clients that have adopted adaptation and mitigation measures and have coped with unfortunate events
% of clients with alternative AF- related job competencies	The proportion of clients that are considered to be more adaptive because they have other AF-related job competencies
Increased competitiveness of clients	
% of farms certified	The proportion of client farms certified as GAP, OA, GAHP, among others
% of products certified by an accreditation body	The proportion of clients that produced products certified as organic, HALAL, GMP, HACCP, among others
% of clients producing demand-driven products	The proportion of clients providing produce to institutional or commercial buyers
% of clients engaged in the overseas market	The proportion of clients exporting products to overseas markets

The details on the data sources and the computational framework for each indicator are presented in Annex A.

C. Data Collection Process

The data collection for the AFE RBME system will be done once a year (annually). It will require collection and organization of primary and secondary data. The secondary data are based on previous reports and documents prepared by each training center arranged to suit the needs of the RBME system. On the other hand, the primary data will be gathered through a one-shot survey questionnaire (Annex B) of clients, particularly farmers.

Since the focus of the AFE RBME system is on determining the achievement of ATI's desired results, the clients to be assessed for a given fiscal year (F'?) would be those that received it's interventions three (3) years before. Thus, for FY 2018, the respondents of the survey will be ATI's clients in 2015. By 2019, the respondents would be clients in 2016 and so on.

Determining the Sample Size

Using the guide in computing sample size as mentioned in the ATI Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines and Toolkit (2017), the sample size for each training center is 278 individuals. This is based on the assumption that there are at least 1000 farmer clients trained and not more than 2500 individual.

Population (N): Famers trained is < 1000 but > 2500
Sample size (n): 278 individuals
Margin of Error: ± 5
Confidence level: 95%
Distribution: 50%

The database for the farmer clients will be provided by the Policy and Planning Division based on the consolidated TOACR submitted by each training center.

In the case of the ATI-ITCPH and the Central Office, which has a lower number of trained farmers compared to other training centers. The sample size will be determined through an online sample size calculator - <http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html> using the same margin of error, confidence level, and distribution.

For AEWs trained, the sample size is set at 72 individuals. The information gathered from AEWs will serve as reference and validation to the responses of farmers.

A total of at least 350 individuals will be interviewed. The target individuals to be interviewed should not be lower than the prescribed 278 farmers and 72 AEWs.

Determining Respondents for the Survey

The selection of respondents to be interviewed will be equally distributed per province in each region. The respondents per province will be randomly selected using the random number generator from <http://www.random.org/>. It must be ensured that each client in the database has an assigned sequential number.

The sample computation for the number of respondents per province is as follows:

Computation:	
$\frac{278 \text{ farmers} / 72 \text{ AEWs}}{\text{No. of province}}$	= No. of respondent per province

For instance, where the rounded off number does not equal 278 and 72 respectively, the training center has the discretion to remove or add target respondents in a given province.

Further, in the case where the randomly selected respondents were not able to participate in the interview, their replacement must be randomly selected as well.

D. Data Analysis and Interpretation

To ensure that all reports for each training center are similar and includes appropriate information, dummy tables are provided (Annex C).

E. Deliverables

The expected deliverable for the system are the packaged reports of each training center and the complete raw data set. All implementing units shall be provided with the excel template where data will be encoded.

F. Roles and Responsibilities

Training Center Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit

- in charge of data collection at the regional level
- submits the consolidated Regional AFE RBME Report and the raw data of the data collected
- coordinates with the ATI Central Office National Extension System Planning Monitoring and Evaluation Section regarding concerns with the AFE RBME system

National Extension System Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Section

- responsible for consolidating the reports submitted by each training center
- develops the National AFE RBME Report - in charge of reporting and disseminating the report
- coordinates with each training center regarding concerns with the AFE RBME system
- in charge of maintaining the AFE RBME system

Source:

Retrieved from ATI Quality Management Systems Documents (Guidelines)