



JUNE 15, 2022

EVALUATION: FRAMING IMPACT WITH PARTICIPATORY VIDEO

DIANA HARPER, MPH

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHODOLOGY	2
III. FINDINGS: COMMUNITY EVALUATORS	5
PERCEPTIONS OF PVE	5
EFFECTS OF PVE	6
FUTURE USE OF PVE.....	9
IV. FINDINGS: COMMUNITY MEMBERS	9
PERCEPTIONS OF PVE	9
EFFECTS OF PVE	11
FUTURE USE OF PVE.....	12
V. FINDINGS: EVALUATION USERS	13
PERCEPTIONS OF PVE	14
EFFECTS OF PVE	15
FUTURE USE OF PVE.....	16
VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18
ANNEXES	23
ANNEX A: EVALUATION USERS INTERVIEW GUIDE.....	23
ANNEX B: COMMUNITY MEMBERS INTERVIEW GUIDE	25
ANNEX C: COMMUNITY EVALUATOR WORKSHOP SESSION OUTLINE.....	26
ANNEX D: EVALUATION SCHEDULE	28

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This evaluation was the result of a tremendous collaboration across War Child Canada. Throughout the process, Morganne King Wale provided expert leadership and vision to this effort. Different country offices successfully collected data during a difficult and busy time. Special thanks are provided to the following contributors (in no particular order): Barnabal Chol and Emmanuel Gumbiri from South Sudan; Eddy-Charles Iragi, Theirry Nzewo, and Joslyne Kankwenda from DRC; and Joseph Lakony and Sandra Nalumansi from Uganda. Lotte van Vleit from EyeOpenerWorks provided valuable context on Participatory Video Evaluation methodology and its implementation in different WCC settings. Finally, we gratefully acknowledge the project funders at the U.S. Department of State Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor for investing in initiatives to elevate youth voices in complex settings.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction: War Child Canada works with war-affected communities to help children reclaim their childhood through access to education, opportunity, and justice. In response to challenges of evaluating development activities in complex and insecure settings, methods such as Participatory Video Evaluation (PVE) are now being applied to better collect and analyze information, as well as engage communities as leaders in the process.

From 2019 to 2022, War Child Canada piloted PVE in three countries under the Framing Impact through Participatory Video project, funded by the U.S. Department of State Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor. The goal of this project was to expand the global knowledge base on PVE methodologies to place youth at the center of evaluation work. PVEs were conducted in the DRC, South Sudan, and Uganda. This evaluation was conducted to inform WCC's approach to using PVE worldwide, as well as offer lessons to the broader development and evaluation communities on using PVE.

Methodology: This evaluation took a partnership approach, leveraging the skills of an external consultant for the evaluation design and engaging in-country team members to lead data collection. In late 2021 and early 2022, the evaluation consultant held a series of training and coaching sessions for WCC staff and local consultants. Field data was collected from a total of 56 people. Methods included interviews with key stakeholders, interviews with community members, interactive workshops with community evaluators, and online peer exchanges among WCC staff.

Findings from Community Evaluators: Reflections from community evaluators after the PVEs had been completed showed that participants strongly valued the technical skills they gained, specifically for video recording and production which was seen as useful career development. For youth, applying new skills through the PVE strengthened inclusion, leadership, motivation, and self-confidence. Finally, as a result of the PVE process, community evaluators reported that they improved their relationships with peers and their fellow community members.

Findings from Community Members: Despite the fact that community members contacted came from different backgrounds, contexts, and cultures, many common themes emerged. These included a high degree of trust in the PVE process, a perception that video is an accurate and authentic tool, an eagerness to share their story and connect directly with decision-makers, and a desire to continue using PVE in the future rather than traditional evaluation methods. Community members contacted for this evaluation overwhelmingly felt that their voice was heard through the PVE process and expressed hope for the future based on the PVE, even if all of the specific recommendations had not yet been taken up.

Findings from Evaluation Users: Local decision-makers contacted for this evaluation also demonstrated a high degree of satisfaction with PVE, considering it a transparent, trustworthy, and accountable tool. Many interviewees held PVE in contrast to negative evaluation experiences in the past that did not accurately reflect reality, or had been purposefully falsified. PVE was credited with helping to share knowledge and experience among community members, as well as to encourage communities to provide feedback. Stakeholders reflected that the process had shifted their views on evaluation, and that they intended to use PVE in the future.

By the end of this project, field teams from War Child Canada were already using this experience to integrate PVE into their programming. Teams were starting to use PVE across different projects, sectors, and geographic settings to improve the effectiveness and responsiveness of development efforts. Moreover, government and NGO partners also demonstrated interest in replicating and institutionalizing the PVE process in their future work.

Conclusions and Recommendations: PVE has been shown to be a valuable tool that can successfully be integrated into different contexts. The experience gained under the Framing Impact for Participatory Video project was a strong proof of concept for using PVE in other settings.

Local stakeholders were extremely satisfied with the process of conducting a PVE as well as its results, and demonstrated a high level of demand for its future use. Few criticisms were raised regarding PVE as a method. PVE was successfully applied in environments where communities and governments would otherwise prohibit or be uncomfortable with video recording. This was achieved through thoughtful planning and upfront stakeholder engagement to identify and address privacy concerns.

Considering the results of PVE, local communities and decision-makers reflected that PVE increases community engagement, as well as increases transparency and accountability. Community evaluators who were trained and applied their skills through PVE showed improvements in their leadership, self-confidence, and peer relationships, among other results. PVE is expected to be particularly useful in projects and programs with the following characteristics:

- Target populations who do not traditionally have decision-making authority
- Aim to increase the skills and inclusion of target populations
- Address a complex issue or sector such as education or economic development
- Include a physical component that can be shown on video such as construction, materials, and equipment
- Expected to continue over time and are not a “one-off” activity

Based on this evaluation, the following recommendations are provided:

- Scale up the use of PVE beyond the pilot countries in settings that would benefit from elevating the voice of participants, especially youth.
- Ensure that future PVEs also include sufficient time and attention for community and stakeholder engagement during planning, implementation, and follow up.
- Continue to uphold privacy and protection methods conducted under this project.
- Increase the cadre of program staff with skills to plan, implement, and adapt PVE in their contexts.
- Summarize costs required to implement PVE in different contexts, to facilitate budget requests and advocate for funding for future initiatives.
- Strengthen feedback loops following a PVE by incorporating time and processes for follow up after the PVE is completed.
- Follow up with participating communities in DRC, South Sudan, and Uganda about future plans for PVE, given their high level of interest and demand.
- Consider how to meet the dual purposes of career development and community-based evaluation in implementation.
- Anticipate the demand for video equipment and supplies and communicate plans during implementation.

I. INTRODUCTION

War Child Canada works with war-affected communities to help children reclaim their childhood through access to education, opportunity, and justice. In such complex and constantly shifting environments, traditional approaches to M&E often fail to capture the results of development initiatives. Practical considerations for evaluation include limited access, security risks, diverse languages and cultures, and highly vulnerable target groups. Moreover, in the M&E community at large, evaluations are often criticized for being top-down and externally-led, which fail to represent the true perspectives of communities. New approaches to evaluation are expected to offer opportunities to better understand and address the needs of vulnerable communities, especially youth.

Through the Framing Impact with Participatory Video Project, War Child Canada sought to test a new methodology specifically designed to engage youth in data collection and program evaluation focused on their rights. Participatory Video Evaluation (PVE) examines a project or an issue from the community's perspective. In this approach, project participants are trained in basic video production and editing skills, as well as research techniques such as conducting interviews. These community evaluators then collect data in their communities and present the results in video format. The final videos describe the project's progress, strengths, and weaknesses, as well as provide future recommendations to key stakeholders.

From late 2020 to early 2022, War Child Canada piloted PVE in three countries under the Framing Impact through Participatory Video project. The goal of this project was to expand the global knowledge base on PVE methodologies to place youth at the center of evaluation work. PVEs were conducted in the DRC (2 sites), South Sudan, and Uganda, as summarized below.

Country	Location	Timeframe	Focus of PVE
Uganda	Adjumani	2019-2020	Education Program
DRC	Kinshasa	2020-2021	Education Program
DRC	Uvira	2021-2022	Education Program
South Sudan	Malakal	2021-2022	Peacebuilding and Livelihoods Program

The implementation generally followed three phases:¹

1. Introduction to PVE: Project participants such as students, teachers, and WCC staff were introduced to PVE methodology during a 5-day training. The training focused on building skills in: use of video equipment, interviewing techniques, designing questions using the Most Significant Change approach, visual storytelling, planning data collection, ethics, and evaluation methods.
2. Story Collection: Following the training, community evaluators interviewed each other, their peers, parents, institutional leaders, local decision-makers, and others about their experience with the project being evaluated.
3. Analysis, Editing, and Reflection: Community evaluators analyzed the collected stories, edited the responses into a series of review videos. The results were then presented to stakeholders and discussed during a review session.

This report summarizes an evaluation of how PVE was used in three different countries. The results are expected to inform WCC's approach to using PVE in their programs worldwide, as well as offer lessons to the broader development and evaluation communities on using PVE.

¹ "Participatory Video Evaluation Process Report." EyeOpenerWorks. December 2020.

II. METHODOLOGY

This evaluation took a partnership approach, leveraging the skills of an external consultant for the evaluation design, tool development, and final analysis and writing, and engaging in-country team members to lead the data collection. The evaluation sought to examine the results of the project from the perspectives of different stakeholders, using a variety of participatory data collection tools. The methodology was intended to build project partners skills in evaluation tools and increase their ability to share evaluation results more broadly.

A series of evaluation questions were collectively developed, prioritized, and refined. Questions were oriented toward the most relevant issues for the project’s objectives as well as opportunities for generation of new learning. The evaluation questions considered the experience and impact of PVE from the perspective of:

- Community Evaluators: Youth, teachers, and partners trained and supported in the use of PVE
 - How effective was PVE at engaging participants in the evaluation process?
 - To what degree is PVE in coherence with protection and ethics principles?
 - Did the training program meet participants’ expectations?
 - Is it clear to participants how their feedback will be used?
 - Have project activities augmented the leadership/inclusion of youth?
 - Were there any unintended negative or positive consequences?
 - Was any difference noted for female participants?
- Community Members: Parents, teachers, and other community members who contributed to the evaluation as interview subjects (or in other ways)
 - What was the experience of community members participating as respondents in video evaluation?
 - Do participants in the evaluation feel their inputs served a purpose?
 - Have the project activities had an impact on other members of the household, particularly women?
- Evaluation Users: Government, NGO, and other local partners in the youth, education, peacebuilding, and livelihoods sectors who would use the results of PVE
 - Does PVE provide a solution or complementary approach to other evaluation approaches?
 - How do sectoral actors and stakeholders perceive PVE?
 - How will stakeholders apply what they have learned for their projects and interventions?
 - How will stakeholders apply what they have learned for their evaluations?
- Global M&E Practice: Global implementers, M&E practitioners, and funders in youth, education, peacebuilding, and livelihoods sectors who can use the PVE methodology
 - How can PVE best be integrated and adopted by others?

Data Collection

From late 2021 to early 2022, the evaluation consultant held a series of training and coaching sessions for WCC staff to support their in-country data collections. Field data was collected by WCC staff and local consultants in early 2022. The number of people reached in each country is summarized in the table. In total, 56 people from 3 countries participated in the data collection, including key stakeholders, community members, and community evaluators.

Country	Key Stakeholders	Community Members	Community Evaluators
Uganda	5	2	9 (2 workshops)
DRC	5	8	9 (1 workshop)
South Sudan	5	5	8 (2 workshops)
Total: 56	<i>15</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>26 (5 workshops)</i>

The data collection methods were developed based on the evaluation questions, current M&E practices, and practical considerations. The main data collection methods are listed below, and data collection tools are included in annexes to this report.

Community Evaluator Workshops: This activity was oriented toward youth and teachers trained and supported in the use of PVE. Community evaluators were invited to participate in a 2-3 hour workshop to share their perspectives on PVE now that the activity had been completed. Informed consent was collected verbally and/or in writing, and all participants were aged 18 years or older.

Community Member Key Informant Interviews: A series of KIIs sought to explore how community members experienced PVE. In some sites, contact information for community members had not been collected, and teams were challenged to follow up. As a result, a purposive sample rather than a random sample was used. Country office staff selected community members with available contact information who could be visited in person during the evaluation period. The interviews were approximately 30 minutes in length and used a semi-structured interview guide. Informed consent was collected verbally and/or in writing.

Evaluation User Key Informant Interviews: A series of KIIs sought to understand the perspective of evaluation users and local decision-makers. Participants were selected purposively to be actors who have power and influence to affect change in their settings. The interviews were approximately 60 minutes in length and used a semi-structured interview guide. Informed consent was collected verbally and/or in writing.

Peer Exchange Workshops: Two 90-minute online workshops were facilitated by the evaluator to explore the results of the field data collection and reflect on the evaluation questions. In the first workshop held in October 2021, WCC country office staff reflected on their experience to date with PVE and their ideas for the upcoming data collection. In the second workshop held in February 2022, WCC country office staff shared the key findings from their data collections and discussed how they were incorporating PVE into their work going forward.

Document Review: The project had strong existing reflection processes including: participant feedback, review and evaluation workshops, reflection forms, and debriefing sessions. The results from these reflection and learning processes were incorporated into the evaluation in alignment with the evaluation questions.

Data Analysis

Structured data collection sheets captured answers to the questions and facilitated quantitative coding and analysis of responses (for example: not at all, somewhat, very). Qualitative data from interviews and focus groups was analyzed using thematic coding in WebQDA software and Excel. A grounded theory approach to analysis was used. The analysis was conducted on the full set of interview notes, peer exchange transcripts, and consultation transcripts at one time after the field data was completed. First, an initial set of themes was developed based on the evaluation questions and themes that emerged during the country staff peer exchanges. Then, qualitative content was coded according to the themes, with codes added, edited, and combined according to the content. At the end of the content review, the set of coded responses were reviewed again to allocate them to new codes, as needed. The final set of themes served as structure for the report's findings section.

Limitations

This evaluation plan was subject to a number of limitations, though most limitations were anticipated and several mitigation measures were put in place. First, as described above, purposive and convenience sampling was used to identify respondents. This raises a risk of selection bias as individuals who were available and interested to participate may have had more strong views about the project. Future efforts would benefit from random sampling methods as were originally planned for this evaluation. Though the informed consent process emphasized that no current or future benefits from WCC would be affected by participation in the evaluation, there remains a risk of social desirability bias as project participants hope for

more support in the future. These risks were mitigated through emphasis of the evaluation as a learning opportunity for participants, WCC and its funders. In addition, data collection tools were oriented toward actively seeking out examples of challenges, seeking substantiation and evidence for perception data, as well as triangulating self-reports with observations.

Second, in order to integrate evaluation processes into implementation, build capacity for evaluation, and streamline the data collection process, each country conducted its own data collection. While all countries used the same data collection tools and received similar training and support for their use, it is likely that the tools were applied slightly differently in different contexts. The benefits of fostering a useful learning process in country were determined to outweigh the drawbacks of slightly different data collection processes.

On a related note, each country was on a different timeline and determined the best timing for their data collection. This meant that for some sites (Uganda and DRC Kinshasa), data collection occurred several months or more after the PVE was completed, and for other sites (DRC Uvira and South Sudan), the data collection occurred shortly after the PVE. For the first sites, participants might have had trouble remembering the results. For the later sites, not enough time might have passed in order to see the effects in themselves and in their communities. These factors were considered when analyzing and summarizing the results.

For privacy and cost-efficiency reasons, interviews and focus groups were not recorded and transcribed. Instead, notes were taken directly in the local language and/or in English. Wherever possible, a second person was assigned to the data collection expressly to take notes. Field teams used the same format for note-taking sheets to record the results of the interviews and focus groups, which required them to translate the results into English. Differences in how complete and comprehensive the note-taking process was, as well as how well the ideas translated into English, may affect the findings in this report. These factors were mitigated by holding follow up calls after the data collection to clarify the notes whenever possible.

Finally, for practical and cost-efficiency reasons, the qualitative analysis and writing for this report was completed by the external consultant. Though field teams had an opportunity to review and validate the information, the results are likely not as complete or comprehensive as would be expected from a more participatory analysis and writing process.

III. Findings: Community Evaluators

This section describes how community evaluators who were trained in PVE perceived the experience, what changes they have seen as a result of the PVE, their ideas about PVE as an M&E method, and their recommendations for the future. In alignment with the objectives of PVE, this section presents the analyzed themes from the qualitative data collection, with as many direct quotations as possible.

These findings are drawn from a total of 5 workshops with a 26 participants in the three countries. The workshops used a highly interactive format and were led by WCC staff with the help of a structured facilitator's guide. The sessions began by asking participants to describe what it means to be a community evaluator by drawing a picture. Next, participants shared their views with the group, and continued to discuss the effects of the program. By the end of the session, the facilitator had developed a list of categories (potential impact areas). The group then reviewed the list and through a discussion and/or a vote, made their recommendations on what impact areas PVE is best suited to address.

In Uganda and South Sudan, workshops were held with trained community evaluators from the project including youth aged 18 and older and teachers. In DRC, the workshop was held with teachers and key stakeholders, as the trained community evaluators were secondary students below the age of consent. Additional context and reflection was also provided by War Child Canada field teams during their peer exchanges and individual consultations.

Reflections from community evaluators after the PVEs had been completed showed that participants strongly valued the technical skills they gained in video recording and production, especially for career development. For youth, applying new skills through the PVE strengthened inclusion, leadership, motivation, and self-confidence. Finally, as a result of the PVE process, community evaluators reported that they improved their relationships with peers and their fellow community members. Discussion of these themes and quotations from participants follow in the next sections.

Perceptions of PVE

Community evaluators provided **highly positive ratings of the training** received under the project, noting that they found it enjoyable and practical. Participants particularly appreciated the interactive nature of the training and the opportunities provided for peer learning.

"Training was very interactive and there were a lot of opportunities to learn from one another."

"We learnt from others and vice versa due to the lots of opportunities given for discussions."

Considering what they gained from the project, community evaluators most commonly referenced their improvements in **technical and video production skills**. Participants noted that gaining digital and technology skills is very desirable and that it offers them opportunities for employment in the future. **Career development** was the most prominent benefit cited among community evaluators.

"I have gained knowledge, experience, and we are strengthened technically on use of camera."

"Community evaluators are professional in video making."



Participants valued that the project **combined training with skills application** through a practical exercise. They felt confident in their ability to repeat a similar activity in the future, specifically to conduct interviews and to create short videos.

"With the PVE I have knowledge and skills to do simple videos on some of the issues within my community."

"Learnt good communication skills and able to go to any community and get good information from people since the approach has been clearly explained during the PVE training and practical data collection exercise."

"We didn't expect to achieve this much. We thought we would just be taught how to do the videos and then stop there. Our expectation was more than achieved because we had the chance to do this ourselves."

Community evaluators considered that PVE is an extremely useful approach because it tells stories with evidence directly from the perspective of people affected. In some cases, participants said PVE is "the best" method. Evaluators **strongly recommended PVE as a tool** considering that it can give evidence of what has been achieved, and generate momentum for continuing successes in the future. Participants also emphasized the authenticity and quality of information generated through PVE, as it helps viewers to understand the positive and negative aspects of the community's experience.

"This approach is very good and in future this should be used because it portrays real feelings from a beneficiary when he or she is being interviewed. Most times people can quote but we don't see the emotions from the participants themselves."

"The approach was the best that we get details and practical valid ideas from the participants. This helps the organization to get quality data."

"PVE gives the opportunity to hear from the beneficiaries and parents directly. You see whether somebody is happily telling their experiences or not."

"PVE gives the background evidence on project deliverables. For example, there are tangible things that you can see live on video, so this project should not stop here, it should continue."

Overall, community evaluators reflected that they were strongly **motivated by the PVE process**. Participants discussed how PVE **promotes youth and community inclusion** by providing space for meaningful participation and discussion.

"PVE promotes the spirit of discussion."

"We are so inspired, including the community. You can see really see that some youths especially and other community members already want to do such course or training."

"Through videography it was easier to tap interest of the youths and it became much easier to express and pass on their opinion."

"Youth have space within existing structure that will allow them have a place for reflection and elaboration of proposal aimed at strengthening youth participation and their leadership."

"PVE expresses the challenges of youth."

Effects of PVE

Considering the effects of PVE on themselves and their communities, community evaluators identified several common themes across the different countries. First, participants described improvements in their **leadership, communication, and interpersonal skills**. Evaluators

discussed how they had learned to plan and manage an activity, supervise others, as well as discuss and resolve problems that arose.

"Built strong organizational ability as all evaluators were able to take initiatives to plan and lead in preparation to conduct the community evaluation exercise."

"Built strong sense of togetherness and division of roles in planning the conduct of the community evaluation."

In a related theme, evaluators frequently discussed how PVE had increased their **self-confidence and self-esteem**.

"Participation in the PVE has made me believe that I can do a lot for myself using the knowledge and skills gained."

"This exercise has built in us very strong self-esteem and confidence because we were well prepared with good knowledge and skills."

"I used to be very shy but now I am very confident because of what I learnt from the training. Everyone during the training was given opportunity to talk and so I gained the confidence which made me to get a job with Wave mobile money as an agent."

War Child Canada staff also considered that the community evaluators found the process positive and empowering. They reflected that the evaluators didn't feel pressured to only talk about successes, and that they could openly discuss challenges and opportunities for improvement. They considered that the PVE process has encouraged project participants as well as community members to speak up for themselves.

For example, in South Sudan where projects are ongoing, staff report that they have observed a real improvement in the level of engagement and feedback that they receive among those who have participated in a PVE compared to those who have not.

Community evaluators described the effects on their relationships in a few different ways. Youth evaluators discussed how the PVE process had improved their **relationships with their peers**, both during the PVE and afterward. Many participants reflected the activity was a good opportunity to meet other youth and exchange their ideas. PVE was described as creating a place where youth reconnect themselves. Additionally, evaluators in multiple countries described how their participation in the project had helped them to attract the attention of other youth in their community and share the methods and ideas from the training.

"Through my involvement in the PVE training, my friends in the community also admire what I do and they are also interested in learning how to interview people and make videos."

A community evaluator from Uganda described the interpersonal and soft skills necessary to be a successful evaluator, including tolerance, openness to opinions, empathy, and confidentiality.



"The PVE approach is a great methodology for peer to peer mentorship as most youths have big interest in videography, so it's a very good methods that easily attract youths attention and participation. Through this they learnt fast from their peers."

"Family and friends also gain same knowledge that I gain through our interaction and information sharing."

One of the workshops was held with teachers in Uganda who were trained as community evaluators. These participants reflected that the PVE process also created **stronger bonds among colleagues**. Further, they noted that an important effect of PVE was to improve their relationships between teachers and students. By jointly working on an activity together and creating open and honest dialogue, teachers gained feedback on their student interactions in a way that they had not heard before.

Finally, community evaluators described how the PVE project has **improved their relationships with the community**. Participants described how they had gained skills to create good rapport with the community and to understand their needs.

Participants' drawings from South Sudan on what it means to be a community evaluator.



"To be a good evaluator one needs to know and learn how to build rapport, learn the community where they are going, have patience to wait for people in case they are engaged in other demanding tasks that may not give them enough time to participate."

"Through the training as a community evaluator, you need to learn how to relate and promote peaceful co-existence to bridge the gap in the service delivery."

Evaluators also described how the process improves collaboration and collective action among different community members.

"PVE has created good relationship among people, collaboration and cooperation. PVE has promoted peace among them."

"Regarding the evaluation, parents must dialogue with each other, and with the children, in order to identify difficulties and provide solutions, follow together with the children documentaries and films that instruct and edify children in order to immortalize the rights and duties of parents towards their children and vice versa."

"PVE affects community, families, and friends by empowering them to take action to solve their problems."

Further, community evaluators emphasized that their new roles have strengthened their ability to represent their communities.

"Community evaluators reconnect community. They are the bridge between community and stakeholders."

"Community evaluators are custodians of technology in which they utilized that capacity for their community to raise their voices."

"Community evaluators are the voice of community."

Future use of PVE

During workshops and follow up after the PVEs were completed, community evaluators shared how they were **applying their new skills** in different ways. In Uganda, several youth community evaluators had started income-generating opportunities using their video production skills. For example, they took videos and photos at events such as wedding ceremonies. In addition, teacher community evaluators in Uganda set up a YouTube page where they conducted lessons in multiple languages while schools were shut down during the COVID pandemic, helping them to reach students and in particular refugees. In the DRC, some of the learners took the initiative on their own after the project had ended to interview other community members on topics of interest.

Considering future needs and improvements for the use of PVE, community evaluators were **interested in receiving more training** on video production skills. While participants were satisfied with what they achieved as a result of a short training, they were interested to have more in-depth learning opportunities. In alignment with the feedback noted earlier about how community evaluators valued the project for career development skills, participants were eager to continue their learning in this area and hoped to produce more professional products. In particular, more support was requested for graphics training and using backgrounds effectively. Community evaluators contacted did not specifically cite applications of M&E skills, though it was posited that this might be a future benefit to make the participants more employable.

IV. Findings: Community Members

This section describes how community members who participated in PVE perceived the experience, what changes they have seen as a result of the PVE, their ideas about PVE as an M&E method, and their recommendations for the future. In alignment with the objectives of PVE, this section presents the analyzed themes from the qualitative data collection, with as many direct quotations as possible.

These findings are drawn from a total of 15 semi-structured interviews in the three countries with people who were interviewed in the PVE, such as teachers and parents. Additional context and reflection was also provided by War Child Canada country office teams during their peer exchanges and individual consultations.

Despite the fact that interview participants come from different backgrounds, contexts, and cultures, many common themes emerged. These included:

- High degree of trust in the PVE process
- Perception that video is an accurate and authentic tool
- Eagerness to share their story and connect directly with decision-makers, and
- Desire to continue using PVE in the future rather than traditional evaluation methods.

Community members contacted for this evaluation overwhelmingly felt that their voice was heard through the PVE process and expressed hope for the future based on the PVE, even if the specific recommendations had not yet been taken up. Discussion of these themes and direct quotations from interviewees follow in the next sections.

Perceptions of PVE

Community members felt extremely confident in using video as a method of communication because it captured their words and likeness exactly. Interviewees had a **high degree of trust in the PVE process because video is considered an accurate, authentic tool**. Video was also appreciated for its ability to convey emotion and nuance through tone and body language. Interviewees considered that video allows the viewer to understand the extent to which people truly believe in what they are saying.

"With video evaluation, one will be in position to see and hear their evidence from the face of the interviewee. There is also originality in giving information. It builds confidence to the community and even to the donors by seeing the beneficiaries live."
-Teacher from Uganda

Video was considered an opportunity to **provide evidence of changes** that have been made. It was valued for being able to show what communities actually look like, whether they have improved, and what needs remain. PVE was also seen as a useful method for documenting and preserving the results of a specific initiative.

"This form of evaluation is very good because, the evaluator has more details in terms of context and environment. Seeing the person, we understand more than he wants to say." -Teacher from DRC

"The videos were used to show evidence that the project has truly helped the community, to give their concerns and recommendations for the future... Yes I am confident my voice was heard, because PVE is a tool of evidence whereby my video is there speaking about challenges of facing people in the community including myself, as a community member." -Teacher from DRC

Interviewees held PVE **in contrast to their previous experiences in evaluation**. Many community members have participated in evaluations and assessments in the past. However, they lacked confidence that their voice was heard through traditional methods. First, the feedback that they have provided in the past was not taken up and acted upon. Second, interviewees frequently mentioned the risk that researchers would fabricate the findings altogether—that they would not even visit the community and would instead write up imagined results. On a related point, interviewees indicated a lack of confidence in written feedback as it can be easily changed to better fit the viewpoints of researchers, donors, or other stakeholders.

"We do give feedback on projects in our community, but the channel of communication was not clear to us." - Community member from South Sudan

"Evaluations sometimes fail to identify the real problems since the questionnaires are not cohesive and poorly structured." -Education director from DRC

"I understood why the evaluation was done, and that was to say, it was done to collect accurate information not like a written source whereby interviewers would just have to cheat by writing his/her own story and not reach the main persons needed and nothing will prove that they really did the interview or assessment." -Teacher from DRC

"We are satisfied with PVE as a tool for sharing information. The reason being that we are concentrating on the new technique compared to the traditional ways of evaluation in the past. Through PVE, people come to realize their views, feedback, and recommendations are trusted." - Parent from South Sudan

Participants also reflected on their satisfaction with PVE as a method **to share their story** and communicate the problems they face. Interviewees described how PVE can help to understand the problems in a community, and that they found it a good experience to talk about these issues in a video.

"This form of evaluation is good. We parents suffer a lot, there is no job, here in Uvira, there is a lot of insecurity. When we have videos like that, those videos also show the problems we live with." -Parent from DRC

"Thanks to the videos of PVE, we saw that [WCC] heard our difficulties and they continue to help us. We must not be forgotten." -Teacher from DRC

Community members felt that video evaluation gave them more **direct access to decision-makers and donors**, as their perspectives would be conveyed without being changed or filtered.

"I was able to openly express the real need during the video evaluation." – Teacher from Uganda

"Personally, I appreciated this way of doing the evaluation by video, it helped us to make our voice heard and its puts us directly in contact with the decision-makers. We will assume that this way of doing things remains permanent." –Teacher from DRC

Interviewees reflected that the people who are affected by an issue are best suited to talk about their community's needs, progress of specific programs, and opportunities for future improvement. They described how video creates a direct connection between project participants and decision-makers at higher levels.

"I was happy because my information would reach the final destination. It should be accurate and balanced to those who would listen to it and watching me speaking on the things that need to be done and things which are already done." – Teacher from South Sudan

"We are satisfied with PVE I have seen in my life. It seemed through this PVE our voices can reach donor abroad. It provided good documentation with evidence." – Student from South Sudan

"Most people speak of things that are not helpful to communities, especially stakeholders. They don't give information about needs, so that is why I can say having this opportunity is a big appreciation: to speak and give feedback on things that face or challenge my community." – Business person from South Sudan

In addition, interviewees appreciated the ability to speak at length about their opinions and to provide a higher level of detail than they would be able to do through other formats. While PVE was clearly a time commitment, those who participated in both the PVE and this evaluation found value in having more time to express their concerns. While not explicitly noted, it seemed that other types of evaluation feedback mechanisms did not offer this space for reflection, reformulation, and consolidation of ideas that was available through WCC's PVE process.

"I was so audible enough to express my view and had time to clarify where I was off track. I was given enough time to express my opinion without limitation." – Education committee member from Uganda

"It gave us the chance to talk about our problems." –Parent from DRC

Effects of PVE

This evaluation also sought to understand what types of changes resulted from the PVE, to include changes in the individuals, their communities, and the projects under review. Some interviewees discussed how video evaluation **increased inclusion and recognition of community members**. Interviews offered an opportunity to show appreciation for people who have been involved in a specific project. Being interviewed on camera meant that a person's opinions were valued and worthy of consideration.

"Yes, I am very glad to have this opportunities to provide feedback on behalf of my community... To get this opportunity, I am satisfied to give or provide feedback needed for the future and betterness of my community." –Teacher from South Sudan

"Since it's a rare opportunity to be in a camera, our community feels more recognized while talking on the camera." –Teacher from Uganda

However, most community members contacted **did not consider that PVE had a direct effect on them individually**, either positively or negatively. A few interviewees noted that their participation in the PVE improved their skills in conveying their ideas concisely, improved their confidence in responding to questionnaires, or improved how they present themselves to others. Based on this feedback, participation as an interviewee in a PVE may be particularly relevant for educators, leaders, and similar roles who benefit from seeing themselves on camera.

"It prepared me to be more organized to present information which needs a lot of clarity in communication and to be viewed by different part of the world." – Teacher from Uganda

[Responding to the question of what has changed as a result of the evaluation:] "My position to stand in front of the learners! The video made me see that it was not very good." –Teacher from DRC

In many cases, interviewees had **not yet seen changes happen in their communities and programs as a result of the PVE**. It should be noted that in South Sudan and one of the DRC sites, the data collection period for this evaluation came just a short period after the actual implementation of the PVE. Community members reflected that more time would be needed to implement their recommendations. Interviewees expressed hope and high expectations for the future that their feedback would be used to improve programs in their community.

"I have no changes that I have seen but everyone was tired of written source questionnaires but video does give hope that there will be changes." –Business person from South Sudan

"At the moment there are no changes observed because an idea is still new and not integrated into the humanitarian context. We expect some changes if people get to know about methodology and ideas are captured well." –Student from DRC

In other cases, interviewees credited program continuation and improvements to the PVE.

"Yes, I know our voices were heard because we received books, capacity building training. That's a good sign, even if all the things we asked for aren't there yet." – Teacher from DRC

"Some of the areas of improvement we talked about are slowly improving like meeting cost of examinations, teachers, well fares and other scholastics are provided and timely, etc." –Teacher from Uganda

However, it was not clear that the examples cited by interviewees were actual results of the PVE process and subsequent follow up on its recommendations. For example, in Uganda community members praised the new curriculum modules and increased teaching staff, though these changes occurred before the PVE was conducted. In DRC, interviewees said their voices were heard because they received books and training, which were likely part of existing project plans. One potential explanation for this perception was offered:

"These improvements were there, but it became more visual and when they participated and when this was documented. So people were able to jump and attribute and they could say because of the PVE, this is why it was improved. I don't think it's necessarily the PVE that made these things. It made it more visual." –Implementer

Future use of PVE

Considering the use of PVE as an M&E tool, interviewees pointed to several **success factors of the implementation**. Interviewees explained that they received a sufficient orientation to the evaluation purpose and process. They understood why they were participating in the interview and how it would be used, and as a result they were able to speak openly and freely.

Community members also found value in being interviewed by another member of their community. Several interviewees praised the ease of communication, which likely referred to speaking the same language as well as sharing similar backgrounds, and experiences, and cultures. Interviewees noted that the process flowed especially well among peers, who have established trust with each other.

A few community members also identified some **doubts and challenges that they faced** during the PVE process. Some interviewees, especially youth participants, expressed a fear that their images or videos might be used for other purposes if not properly protected. Other interviewees noted some challenges in language and presentation. For example, participants were fearful of speaking poorly on camera or making spelling mistakes during production. This reflects that even when PVE is well accepted by a group, doubts and challenges may emerge. Being able to anticipate these doubts in advance and to remain open to feedback during the process will likely be important for successfully using PVE in the future, especially when working with youth and in educational settings.

As a whole, community members saw an enormous potential for PVE to be used as a useful tool for providing feedback in the future. Interviewees unanimously **recommended to use PVE in the future** in their own communities, as well as to **expand PVE to other similar communities**. Additionally, the majority of community members contacted for this evaluation felt that their voice was heard through the PVE process.

Interviewee Responses	Did you feel your voice was heard?	Would you recommend PVE?
Yes	9	15
Maybe	4	0
No	0	0

Some of the most prominent reasons community members cited for supporting its further use were how useful PVE is as an accountability tool, how the process brings people together, and how the people most affected by an issue are leaders in the process.

"PVE is a powerful tool that needs to be used in every community in South Sudan so the source is feeding donors with trusted accurate information. It has to be extended to other communities." –Businessperson from South Sudan

"In my recommendation our community should use video evaluation. This is a very good approach that enhances accountability and transparency." –Teacher from Uganda

"Yes I do recommend PVE to be used in other communities because it limits the cheating and because of being a great way of bringing people together and exploring issues." –Community member from South Sudan

"Because the evaluation by video traces the true reality of the field and is done by the people concerned." –Teacher from DRC

Considering the future outlook for PVE in their community, interviewees frequently mentioned that they **lacked the necessary equipment** of such as cameras and microphones. They requested from War Child Canada further equipment and follow up training. Without such support, they were unlikely to continue PVE.

V. Findings: Evaluation Users

This section describes how key local stakeholders perceived the PVE experience, what changes they have seen as a result of the PVE, their ideas about PVE as an M&E method, and their recommendations for the future. In alignment with the objectives of PVE, this section presents the analyzed themes from the qualitative data collection, with as many direct quotations as possible.

These findings are drawn from a total of 15 semi-structured interviews in the three countries with decision-makers who would use the results of the PVE, such as government officials and

institutional leaders. Additional context and reflection was also provided by War Child Canada country offices teams during their peer exchanges and individual consultations.

Stakeholders contacted for this evaluation demonstrated a high degree of satisfaction with PVE, considering it a transparent, trustworthy, and accountable tool. Many interviewees held PVE in contrast to negative evaluation experiences in the past that did not accurately reflect reality, or had been purposefully falsified. PVE was credited with helping to share knowledge and experience among community members, as well as to encourage communities to provide feedback. Stakeholders reflected that the process had shifted their views on evaluation, and that they intended to use PVE in the future. Discussion of these themes and direct quotations from interviewees follow in the next sections.

Perceptions of PVE

Stakeholders contacted for this evaluation demonstrated a **high degree of satisfaction** with PVE, with 9/15 responding that their overall impression of PVE was “very positive” and the remaining 6/15 responding their impression was “somewhat positive.” No stakeholders contacted considered their view to be neutral or negative on PVE, which was also reflected in their commentary.

Approximately half of interviewees (8/15) had participated in a review session where the results of the PVE were discussed. Among these, most (6/8) remembered the findings from the PVE. The remaining interviewees had not participated in a review session or did not remember the evaluation results such as the recommendations. However, they still had many positive impressions to share about the methodology and the process.

Key stakeholders described PVE as a highly **transparent, trustworthy, and accountable tool** for understanding community needs and project progress. Similar to what was described in the previous sections for community evaluators and community members, interviews with local decision-makers and leaders saw many positive aspects of PVE. Stakeholders demonstrated trust in the PVE process because it accurately documented people’s views and the situation on the ground. Interviewees described how **hearing from the person of concern directly** made them confident in the quality and usefulness of the information.

“PVE is very accurate and should be used by all organizations within this community because it’s the data source that provides information with evidence.” -Government official from South Sudan

“It is very original as the information comes right from the participant without alteration. Nobody can doubt when he or she sees and hears from the person being interviewed.” -Education leader from Uganda

Video was considered a way to avoid forgeries that could easily be introduced through written, second-hand means. Interviewees praised the transparency provided by a direct video record – that nothing could be changed, added, or misconstrued. Additionally, many interviewees held PVE **in contrast to negative evaluation experiences in the past**, indicating that organizations had intentionally misrepresented the situation or the results.

“Many organizations just carry out assessment locally and lack to request the donor with data or information of no evidence of good documentation so WCC should work entirely to carry out awareness and the good of PVE approach which is the best.” -Government official from South Sudan

“The way is very different from traditional ways that have been used in the past that create a lot of forgeries, challenges and conflict among beneficiaries and community at large.”— Humanitarian Assistance Leader from South Sudan

Another way that stakeholders described the value of PVE was its ability to provide authenticity and to allow **people to speak in their own voice**.

"It's the first of its kind for me. This is different from other form of evaluation because this one gives detailed information in the respondents own voice." –Head Teacher from Uganda

"PVE is very interesting and motivating. It is different from other forms of evaluation like written type because it makes the situation real and you hear and see directly from the respondent while the written one is not." –Implementer from Uganda

Similar to what was heard from community evaluators and community members, stakeholders appreciated the **combination of visual and audio feedback**. This was considered to provide more accuracy and nuance to the information.

"One is able to see live the visual expression. Also, the recording can be replayed instantly to check if everything is captured correctly unlike other data collection." Teacher from Uganda

"This is different from other forms of evaluation because it reflects both video and audio information from the participants. The interviewer can see physically the facial expressions and the reactions and deduce whether the responded is understanding, interested or not etc." –Head Teacher from Uganda

On a related note, video was also appreciated for its ability to **share more comprehensive information** than a written document. By better representing the context, physical states of schools and communities, stakeholders expected that they would better understand and be able to share information from the evaluation.

"Video evaluation is a good initiative because it allows to present more information that is not on the written document." –Teacher from DRC

"The evaluation with video is good because we can show the environment where our learners study, we can see the person, the life of the community." –Teacher from DRC

As a result of these factors, some stakeholders described their perception that PVE **increases accountability**. With trusted video evidence directly from the people concerned by a specific issue, it would be harder to deny or ignore the results. The fact that a video record exists and can be referred to in the future was also appreciated as an accountability tool.

"PVE makes stakeholders more responsible, accountable, and transparent to ensure right implementation, documentation, and design." –NGO Coordinator from South Sudan

"I say yes in favor of the approach. It's like someone who was staring at us in front of us for a crime committed. If we do not blame ourselves for anything and the teachings are well dispensed we rub our hands." –Education Director from DRC

Stakeholders described very few doubts about PVE or challenges with the implementation. Similarly to community evaluators and community members, local decision-makers noted that there was a need to provide camera and video equipment. They expressed concern over the expense of procuring equipment and that they would be unable to continue with this method in the future without support.

Effects of PVE

Stakeholders also described what kinds of effects PVE can have on communities, individuals, and development activities. The most prominent effects noted by stakeholders were related to community relationships and engagement. Stakeholders described the positive benefits of **bringing people together** and encouraging participation, including from vulnerable groups. PVE was credited with helping to share knowledge and experience among community members, as well as to **encourage communities to provide feedback**.

"People will share their thoughts, raise concerns, feedback. Even deaf can participate and see what is taking place." –NGO Coordinator from South Sudan

"PVE influenced the willingness of the community to actively participate." –Head Teacher from Uganda

Stakeholders described how this improved the process of community engagement and feedback would result in better decisions according to community needs. Several interviewees indicated that PVE had the potential to **increase the responsiveness of government and donor partners**.

"PVE gave hope to the people. Now these committees are very [aligned] with the approaches of WCC because accurate information would be collected, whereby a person's concerns and his/her challenges will be shared to bring change." – Government official from South Sudan

"It can build more confidence between communities and donors to work together with information needed." –Government official from South Sudan

Stakeholders described some of the effects from the PVE they have seen among community evaluators. In alignment with what was discussed in previous sections, stakeholders described improvements in participants' motivation, self-confidence, and leadership and technical skills. One stakeholder from Uganda noted that the PVE video that shared the successes of the AEP program helped to motivate other learners to join.

Considering how the PVE has affected activities in the projects and communities, most stakeholders were unaware or indicated it was too early to assess. In some sites, the project evaluated had ended so there was a feeling that there was no opportunity to apply the learning. At the same time, stakeholders emphasized that there was inherent value in promoting freedom of expression and community engagement through this process.

"There was no total change because the activity was always the same, except that it gave the learner freedom of expression." –Teacher from DRC

"The PVE approach enlisted positive changes. However since the project ended, some of the recommendation can't be implemented now. Maybe in other upcoming projects." –Education Leader from Uganda

While there were fewer examples of how stakeholders acted on the result of the specific PVEs conducted under this project, there was much more information about how **stakeholders changed their attitudes toward evaluation** generally.

"This approach gives very good reflection on projects and my participation has influenced my thinking about the need to do evaluation of projects when they are conducted but not just closing and leaving." –Teacher from Uganda

"It has taught us that there is another way to do the evaluation. Videos can be kept and reviewed later. We have not yet had to apply what we have learned but the classes continue despite the difficulties." –Teacher from DRC

These changing attitudes toward evaluation were reflected in the future plans to use PVE in their communities, which is further described in the next section.

Future use of PVE

Considering the outlook for PVE in their communities, stakeholders expressed a **high degree of confidence that the method would continue to be used**. Among interviewees, 11/15 said that PVE would definitely be used in their communities in the future and 2/15 said PVE would probably be used. One interviewee was neutral on the question, and one said it was not at all likely that PVE would be used. In both of these cases, the interviewees cited the lack of equipment and training as the reasons why PVE would not continue.

In fact, already at the start of this project, there was evidence that local stakeholders rated PVE highly and would like to use it in their communities. War Child Canada had previously

used PVE in Wau in South Sudan, and field teams described how the state government became interested in the approach and wanted to adapt all donor-funded projects to use PVE. Though the tool had initially been regarded with skepticism and considered a tool for spying, after sensitization and completing the experience, that government found immense value in PVE. Leaders expected that PVE would help them to monitor the diverse activities in their state, which they otherwise lack the time and resources to do. The team in South Sudan also shared the experience with groups such as food security and protection clusters, who demonstrated interest to explore and adapt PVE into their programming as well.

"It's a new trend in South Sudan and we are happy to be pioneers of this activity." –Staff from WCC South Sudan

Following the implementation of this PVE project, government partners also demonstrated interest in **replicating and institutionalizing the PVE process** in their future work. For example in Malakal, South Sudan, the government requested smart phones and training for their extension workers so they could continue the methodology to monitor programming. In Uganda, the government also recommended that future projects use PVE, not only those from War Child Canada but also from other partners.

By the end of this project, field teams from War Child Canada also described how they were already using this experience to **integrate PVE into WCC programming**. Teams were considering how to use PVE across different projects, sectors, and geographic settings. For example in Uganda, the team is leveraging their plans for digital literacy and ICT programming to increase use of PVE in the future. The positive experiences under this project has also let teams to incorporate PVE into their future project proposals to enhance monitoring, community engagement, impact measurement, and sharing of results.

VI. Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the findings described in the previous sections, this section considers the implications for War Child Canada and other development actors who may apply PVE in their work.

Considerations for War Child Canada

Relevance and acceptability of PVE

From the feedback received by community evaluators, key stakeholders, and community members, PVE has been shown to be a valuable tool that can successfully be integrated into different contexts. The three different countries where PVE was implemented have different development needs, histories, cultures, and languages, yet the feedback received was remarkably similar. PVE was well received in the education and livelihoods sectors, by youth and adults, and in rural and urban settings.

Within this activity, there were not notable differences by sector or context, but it is likely that a broader data collection would have been needed to identify such issues. Based on this experience, PVE is expected to be particularly useful in projects and programs with the following characteristics:

- Target populations who do not traditionally have decision-making authority
- Aim to increase the skills and inclusion of target populations
- Address a complex issue or sector such as education or economic development
- Include a physical component that can be shown on video such as construction, materials, and equipment
- Expected to continue over time and are not a “one-off” activity

While youth were expected to enjoy the technology component of PVE, the methodology was equally well accepted by adults and among populations with less access to technology in their everyday lives. As a result, the future use of PVE does not need to be limited to youth.

Local stakeholders were extremely satisfied with the process of conducting a PVE as well as its results, and demonstrated a high level of demand for its future use. Few criticisms were raised regarding PVE as a method. The main doubts identified by stakeholders were related to the scope and sustainability of the effort, seeking more support and equipment for the future, which are described further below. Nevertheless, PVE requires effort for planning and implementation and may not be appropriate or feasible in all circumstances. A community’s previous experience with video recording should be considered: whether they have primarily seen video as a method of generating success stories, or alternately that video is for documenting poor conditions for fundraising purposes. PVE is a qualitative method suited to exploring perspectives and themes, rather than conducting statistical studies about outcomes. Accordingly it serves as a useful complement to other methods of assessing progress.

Considering the results of PVE, local communities and decision-makers reflected that PVE increases community engagement, as well as increases transparency and accountability. Community evaluators who were trained and applied their skills through PVE showed improvements in their leadership, self-confidence, and peer relationships, among other results.

In summary, the experience gained under the Framing Impact for Participatory Video project was a strong proof of concept for using PVE in other settings.

Recommendation #1: Scale up the use of PVE beyond the pilot countries in settings that would benefit from elevating the voice of participants, especially youth.

Stakeholder engagement and privacy protection for PVE

PVE was successfully applied in environments where communities and governments would otherwise prohibit or be uncomfortable with video recording. This was achieved through thoughtful planning and upfront stakeholder engagement to identify and address privacy concerns. Country office teams have emphasized the need to reinforce sensitization activities during the implementation process and be flexible in project plans to fully address concerns of stakeholders, particularly as professional staff and government counterparts change posts frequently.

The privacy and ethical requirements followed under this project were successfully implemented, which was particularly important when working with vulnerable and minor populations. Working with target populations below the age of consent required additional protection methods and, in some cases, adjustments to the methodology. Individuals contacted for this evaluation emphasized that it would be necessary to protect the videos against potential misuse, as well as to discourage the application of video skills for purposes such as pornography. Core to

Participants and community members contacted for this evaluation felt comfortable to speak freely and honestly in their videos as a result of this high level of engagement and protection methods put in place. In future applications of PVE, this process cannot be overlooked as it was considered key to PVE's success.

Recommendation #2: Ensure that future PVEs also include sufficient time and attention for community and stakeholder engagement during planning, implementation, and follow up.

Recommendation #3: Continue to uphold privacy and protection methods conducted under this project.

Implementing PVE

War Child Canada was well positioned to integrate PVE into its work, conducting the PVEs in communities where they had ongoing activities and relationships with the community. Country staff led the PVEs with targeted technical support from methodological experts and headquarters. Most staff reflected that there was a learning curve during the first iteration of PVE, which helped them to adapt their next PVE activity or consider how to adjust it in the future.

Country office staff from the three pilot countries demonstrated a strong desire and specific plans to integrate PVE into their own work going forward. Additionally, the process of conducting this evaluation of PVE seemed to foster useful self-reflection and learning. Field teams led their own data collections, and as a result were deeply knowledgeable about the results and equipped to incorporate the learning into their work. Further efforts to build organizational capacity for PVE and attract funding for PVE is expected to strengthen the performance, responsiveness, and sustainability of War Child Canada's programs.

Recommendation #4: Increase the cadre of program staff with skills to plan, implement, and adapt PVE in their contexts. Foster internal reflection and peer exchange activities to accelerate and solidify learning. Activities conducted under this evaluation such as holding online peer exchanges and country offices leading their own data collection can serve as a model for the future.

Recommendation #5: Summarize costs required to implement PVE in different contexts, to facilitate budget requests and advocate for funding for future initiatives.

Support to communities and decision-makers

While PVE was extremely well received and thoughtfully implemented, this evaluation showed that in many cases the results of the specific PVEs had not yet been translated into action. Many stakeholders contacted did not know or remember the findings and recommendations of the PVE that was conducted. The period after implementing a PVE offers a critical window for renewing community participation and trust. If community members do not see that their feedback is being used, there is a risk that PVE becomes seen as yet another empty assessment tool. The improved relationships that had been fostered between youth evaluators and their friends, family, and community members might degrade as well.

Recommendation #6: Strengthen feedback loops following a PVE. In the project lifecycle, it will be useful to build in time for follow up after the PVE to support continued dialogue. Understanding that change takes time and that the recommendations from a PVE may range from basic to complex issues, program staff can nevertheless support a transparent and accountable process. In addition, the PVE analysis component of the PVE training could be reviewed to ensure quality of the products and usefulness for stakeholders. Strategies to support follow up could include approaches such as a review of the final video at a future stakeholder meeting, a summary document with the results and recommendations organized by responsible actor, and individual follow up and consultations.

Recommendation #7: Follow up with participating communities about future plans for PVE. The communities who participated in this evaluation from DRC, South Sudan, and Uganda showed high demand for more training and equipment for PVE. As a first step, sharing the results of this evaluation and similar learning would help communities see their feedback and know what to expect.

Planning for future engagements

While the training program for community evaluators was intended to provide a basic level of videography and editing skills, there was a strong demand from participants to provide more in-depth training. Community evaluators and members clearly saw the project as a career development opportunity for youth, particularly for video skills, even when it was not implemented as part of a livelihoods program. As a result, they were interested in a greater depth of technical training and skills. Additionally, evaluators and community partners requested equipment and tools such as smart phones and editing software so that they could continue implementing PVE and more broadly for income-generating activities.

Recommendation #8: Consider how to meet the dual purposes of career development and community-based evaluation. While respecting the flexible nature of PVE and its ability to make anyone an evaluator, there are likely many creative strategies that could be used to achieve this goal. For example, PVE can be integrated into ICT and livelihoods activities where possible, either directly or through partnerships. In some settings, there may be ICT organizations and entrepreneurs who would benefit from being engaged as TOTs and a more permanent hub for video evaluation activities.

Recommendation #9: Anticipate the demand for video equipment and supplies and communicate plans during implementation. Communities contacted for this evaluation strongly requested provision of equipment through this type of project. In cases where there are budget constraints or sustainability concerns about equipment donations, these issues should be anticipated from the onset and communicated clearly to participating communities.

Considerations for the Global Development Community

While PVE can be conducted as a standalone activity for an individual project, it may offer more value when **incorporated into a broader platform for community feedback**. From a practical perspective, the first time PVE is introduced, it requires significant effort to sensitize the community and to train the evaluators. After community evaluators have gained experience through the first PVE, and community members and decision-makers have experience participating in PVE, it is expected that the process would move forward more efficiently. Each experience with PVE can build a foundation for better use in the next iteration.

Additionally, PVE appeared to be well suited for soliciting feedback on needs and experiences that are bounded by a specific topic, sector, or geographic region, rather than a specific project implemented by a specific partner. Due to its open-ended nature, it was likely that **participants generated feedback and recommendations on a broad range of issues** that are typically beyond the scope of a narrowly defined project activity. To the extent that communities are receiving services and engaging in multiple projects, combining PVE under a sectoral theme such as education and livelihoods would be more cost efficient than conducting multiple PVEs in the same communities. Additionally, this approach would reduce duplication and the time burden for communities to participate. That said, conducting joint evaluations across different stakeholder groups requires additional coordination and cooperation.

For individual projects and partners, a PVE process can offer specific utility in remote monitoring, establishing baseline situation and needs, providing in-process or mid-term feedback, and continuous learning and adaptation. One way to think about applying PVE is how it can be **incorporated into monitoring versus evaluation activities**. An illustrative framework is outlined in the table below.

PVE Approach for Monitoring	PVE Approach for Evaluation
Can be applied for specific projects and integrated into partner's monitoring plans	Potentially most useful at portfolio/sector level and can be used across partners
More frequent, lighter touch	Less frequent, more in-depth
Short-term course corrections	High-level needs and recommendations
Basic skills	Higher skills and production quality
Basic equipment and tools	Higher quality equipment and tools
Speak directly to project implementers	Speak directly to decision-makers and donors

Once PVE has been implemented, there is **high demand for PVE to continue** from community evaluators, community members, and local decision-makers. Moreover, several people contacted during the evaluation noted not only a desire, but an expectation that the PVE process will continue in their community. This highlights a potential risk to donors and implementers who might use PVE without a clear plan for follow-up and sustainability. Because the approach is so well received, there may be negative consequences to applying it in a one-off or unsystematic manner.

In addition to considering the positive reception of PVE, funders and implementers should **consider in advance PVE's ability to inspire replication**. Overwhelmingly, individuals contacted for this evaluation recommended to expand the use of PVE to other issues and communities. Several instances were noted where partner governments and other NGOs demonstrated their intentions to take up PVE in their own work. Funders and implementers of PVE might consider in advance how to capitalize on this type of enthusiasm, and build support for replication into their plans from the onset. Similar forethought would also be useful for determining how video equipment will be procured, maintained, and replaced beyond the project's lifecycle.

Areas for Future Exploration

While this evaluation examined a wide variety of topics and questions, additional areas of interest arose by the end of the evaluation. These questions would be worth further discussion and review in the future.

- Does PVE function differently in different sectors (education versus livelihoods?)
- What are the main considerations for budgeting for PVE, including country context, planned activities, staffing needs, and equipment?
- How can organizational headquarters best support PVE among their country offices?
- What are good practices for communicating results and feedback, and implementing change?
- What type of M&E can best support this work?

ANNEXES

ANNEX A: Evaluation Users Interview Guide

Date:

Interviewer:

Respondent Name:

Respondent Position/Role:

Respondent Email/Contact (for sharing summary of results):

INTRODUCTION AND CONSENT (5 minutes)

My name is [NAME] and I am working with War Child Canada in [COUNTRY] on a review of how video has been used as an evaluation tool. In the past year, War Child Canada conducted a participatory video evaluation, or PVE, of the [PROJECT NAME]. Now, we are following up with different stakeholders to understand their overall impressions of PVE, what has happened since the evaluation, and expectations for the future use of PVE. We are conducting this work in the DRC, Uganda, and South Sudan.

I encourage you to be open and honest in your responses, including any critical feedback, so that we can best learn from this effort. This discussion is confidential, which means that your responses will only be shared among a small team at War Child Canada working on the review. Your participation is completely voluntary. Nothing that you say today will affect any of your current or future benefits from War Child Canada programs. Further, in the final report, we will not quote anyone by name without permission.

This interview has 3 parts and is expected to last for 45 to 60 minutes. Your feedback will be used to help War Child Canada and its partners understand how to best use video as an evaluation approach. At the end of our review, we will develop a summary of findings, and will share this with you.

Do you consent to participate? Do you have any questions?

Part 1: OVERALL IMPRESSIONS (10 minutes)

1. In this first part, I'd like to hear about your **overall impressions** of the participatory video evaluation approach. How is it similar or different to other evaluations you've seen in the past? What did you think about using video, rather than other types of data collection?
2. So, in summary, how would you rate your impression of the video evaluation approach? On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 is very negative, 3 is neutral, and 5 is very positive, what do you think?

Part 2: WHAT HAS HAPPENED SINCE THE EVALUATION (15 minutes)

Now for part 2, I would like to hear about what, if anything, has happened since the evaluation occurred.

3. Did you participate in a workshop to review the findings of the evaluation?
4. Do you recall the findings of the evaluation?
5. Can you tell me, have you done anything differently based on the findings of the evaluation? Have you seen any changes in the project activities since the evaluation happened? Please explain.
 - a. *[If changes were noted, probe for details]* Was there something specific about the PVE approach that helped to make this change happen? Were there external factors that influenced this change?

Part 3: EXPECTATIONS FOR THE FUTURE (10 minutes)

6. Now, for the final part, I would like to hear about your expectations for the future. Do you think PVE will be used again in this community? Why or why not?
7. How would you rate the likelihood that PVE will be used here again? On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 is not at all, 3 is maybe, and 5 is definitely, what do you think? You can also say you don't know.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND CLOSING (5 minutes)

8. Is there anything else you'd like to share?

Thank you for your time. Your perspectives are valuable to War Child Canada to learn and improve about our work. We look forward to sharing the results back with you.

ANNEX B: Community Members Interview Guide

Date:

Interviewer:

Respondent Name:

Respondent Position/Role:

Respondent Email/Contact (for sharing summary of results):

INTRODUCTION AND CONSENT (5 minutes)

My name is [NAME] and I am working with War Child Canada in [COUNTRY] on a review of how video has been used as an evaluation tool. In the past year, War Child Canada conducted a participatory video evaluation, or PVE, of the [PROJECT NAME]. Now, we are following up with people who participated in the evaluation to understand what their experience was like. We are conducting this work in the DRC, Uganda, and South Sudan.

I encourage you to be open and honest in your responses, including any critical feedback, so that we can best learn from this effort. This discussion is confidential, which means that your responses will only be shared among a small team at War Child Canada working on the review. Your participation is completely voluntary. Nothing that you say today will affect any of your current or future benefits from War Child Canada programs. Further, in the final report, we will not quote anyone by name without permission.

This interview has 6 questions and is expected to last for 25 minutes. Your feedback will be used to help War Child Canada and its partners understand how to best use video as an evaluation approach. At the end of our review, we will develop a summary of findings, and will share this with you.

Do you consent to participate? Do you have any questions?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (15 minutes)

1. What is your experience with project evaluations? Is it common to give feedback on a project in your community? Have you had an opportunity to give feedback in the past? If so, how did you do that? *[As needed, probe for details to provide a comparison of how evaluations are typically done in this community.]*
2. What was it like to be interviewed in the video evaluation? *[As needed, probe for aspects such as: comfort of being on camera, understanding of the process and purpose, perspectives on the use of community evaluators.]*
3. Now that some time has gone by, do you think that participating in the video evaluation had any effects on you, positive or negative? *[If yes, probe for details about the effects, and how PVE contributed to the effects.]*
4. Have you seen anything happen in the project or the community as a result of the evaluation? Do you think there will be any changes in the future? Please describe.
5. Overall, did you feel your voice was heard? Why or why not?
6. Would you recommend that other communities use a video evaluation? Why/why not?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND CLOSING (5 minutes)

Is there anything else you'd like to share?

Thank you for your time. Your perspectives are valuable to War Child Canada to learn and improve about our work. We look forward to sharing the results back with you.

ANNEX C: Community Evaluator Workshop Session Outline

SESSION OUTLINE

PART 1 – Introduction, consent, and icebreaker (15 minutes)

INTRODUCTION AND CONSENT (5 minutes)

My name is [NAME] and I am working with War Child Canada in [COUNTRY] on a review of how video has been used as an evaluation tool. In the past year, War Child Canada conducted a participatory video evaluation, or PVE, of the [PROJECT NAME]. Now, we are following up with community evaluators to understand what their experience was like. We are conducting this work in the DRC, Uganda, and South Sudan.

I encourage you to be open and honest in your responses, including any critical feedback, so that we can best learn from this effort. This discussion is confidential, which means that your responses will only be shared among a small team at War Child Canada working on the review. Nothing that you say today will affect any of your current or future benefits from War Child Canada programs. Further, in the final report, we will not quote anyone by name without permission.

Do you have any questions about why we are here? Do you consent to participate?

ICEBREAKER (10 minutes)

PART 2 – Individual Sharing and Discussion (45 minutes)

INDIVIDUAL DRAWING (10 minutes): I'd like you to make a drawing to answer the question: "What does it mean to be a community evaluator?" You can be creative in how you respond. There are no right or wrong answers.

INDIVIDUAL SHARING (10 minutes): Let's go around the table and share our thoughts. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers here. And we know you are not all artists! We just thought this would be a good way to start hearing your ideas.

EVALUATION EFFECTS (25 MINUTES): Thanks everyone, great work! So, now that we've talked about what you think about being a community evaluator, let's talk about the evaluation that you did. We're curious to hear about what has happened since you finished the evaluation? What has happened to you? What has happened to the project that you evaluated? What has happened in your community?

Flipchart 1

What has happened as a result of the evaluation?	
Yourself	Project You Evaluated
Your Family, Friends, and Community	Other

I want everyone to reflect on this question individually: what has happened as a result of the evaluation? I would like each of you to write down 3-4 ideas on sticky notes. Write 1 idea on each note. Think about positive changes, as well as potentially negative changes. And, you can also write that nothing has happened.

Now, let's go around the table and share our thoughts. Everyone, please share just 1 idea at first, and then we'll keep going.

Great ideas! I'm going to start adding these to the flipchart. Let's keep going around the table.

Looking at this list, what do you think? Do you generally agree? Is there anything you're not sure about, or that you disagree with? Did we forget anything?

BREAK (10 minutes)

During the break, review the flipchart and make groupings by themes on Flipchart 2.

Flipchart 2

Effects of Participatory Video Evaluation	
Theme 1: [title] [sticky note] [sticky note] [sticky note]	Theme 2: [title] [sticky note] [sticky note] [sticky note]
Theme 3: [title] [sticky note] [sticky note] [sticky note]	Theme 4: [title] [sticky note] [sticky note] [sticky note]
Theme 5: [title] [sticky note] [sticky note] [sticky note]	Theme 6: [title] [sticky note] [sticky note] [sticky note]

PART 3 – Group Review and Vote (30 minutes)

Welcome back everybody. Thanks for your work so far. We really value your ideas, and you've come up with some great reflections.

While you were on break, I found some common themes in the ideas that we talked about. You can see on the flipchart that I've made a few groups of ideas. What do you think about this? Does it make sense to you? Would you change anything? Thinking about the effects of PVE, are there any important themes missing?

Now, we're going to consider a new question. Looking at these themes, which one is PVE best suited for? In other words, where does PVE have the biggest effect? Where is it most important? *Use the stickers or different coloured sticky notes so that each person can make their vote directly on the flipchart.*

PART 4 – Final Thoughts, Closing, and Thanks (20 minutes)

Now, to end the session, I'd like to hear a final reflection from each person. Now that some time has passed since the evaluation was completed, what key messages, what recommendations do you have for other people who want to do this work? And, is there anything else you'd like to share with the group?

Thank you everyone for your time. We enjoyed hearing from you, and your feedback will help War Child Canada and its partners to use PVE in the future.

ANNEX D: Evaluation Schedule

Phase	Date	Key Activities
Phase 1: Inception	Ongoing	Meetings with War Child Canada
	June 15	Kick-off and initial document sharing
	June 15-30	Initial consultations with WCC and stakeholders
	July 1-15	Draft evaluation methodology
	July 15-Aug 31	Review and finalize methodology
June – Aug 2021		
Phase 2: Supervision, coaching, and data collection	Sept 1-30	Refinement of data collection tools, preparation for field work period
	October 15	Peer Review Workshop #1
	Nov-Dec	Tools training, coaching, and related support
	Jan-Mar 2022	Field data collection and check-ins
	March 15	Peer Review Workshop #2
Sept 2021 – April 2022		
Phase 3: Writing, validation, and dissemination	May 1-15	Data completion review and cleaning
	May 15-31	Data analysis and report writing
	June 1-15	Presentation of findings, report feedback/revisions
	June 30	Submission of final report
May – June 2022		