



MODULE-IV EVALUATION

Contents in Brief

CHAPTER-1	INTRODUCTION	4
CHAPTER-2	OVERVIEW OF EVALUATIONS	6
CHAPTER-3	PREPARE THE EVALUATION	19
CHAPTER-4	PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION	38
CHAPTER-5	EQUITY-FOCUSED EVALUATION	39
CHAPTER-6	TERMS OF REFERENCE	42
CHAPTER-7	REFLECTION	44
	REFERENCES	45
	ANNEXURES	46

Contents in Detail

CHAPTER-1	INTRODUCTION	4
CHAPTER-2	OVERVIEW OF EVALUATIONS	6
	2.1 OBJECTIVES AND MEANINGS OF EVALUATIONS	6
	2.2. INTERNATIONAL TRENDS OF AID AND EVALUATIONS	8
	2.3. TYPES OF PROJECT EVALUATIONS	10
	2.4. EVALUATION CRITERIA, METHODS AND TOOLS	13
	2.5. PRINCIPLES, GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS	16
CHAPTER-3	PREPARE THE EVALUATION	19
	3.1. WRITING THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION	20
	3.2. ESTABLISH DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES	21
	3.3. STATING AN EVALUATION OBJECTIVE	21
	3.4. RESOURCES FOR EVALUATION	23
	3.5. WHO WILL CONDUCT THE EVALUATION?	25
	3.6. WHAT SHOULD BE EVALUATED?	26
	3.7. IDENTIFYING EVALUATION STAKEHOLDERS	26
	3.8. CHOOSING EVALUATION QUESTIONS	28
	3.9. CHOOSING EVALUATION TOOLS	32
	3.10. HOW ARE EVALUATION FINDINGS ANALYSED, INTERPRETED, REPORTED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE?	34
CHAPTER-4	PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION	38
CHAPTER-5	EQUITY-FOCUSED EVALUATION	39
CHAPTER-6	TERMS OF REFERENCE	42
CHAPTER-7	REFLECTION	44
	REFERENCES	45
	ANNEXURES	46

List of Annexures

ANNEX-1	OECD / DAC QUALITY STANDARDS FOR EVALUATIONS	46
ANNEX-2	GENERAL GUIDELINE FOR THE PREPARATION OF AN EVALUATION	58
ANNEX-3	EXAMPLE OF TOR	61

CHAPTER-1

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation is an important tool that an organisation can use to demonstrate its accountability, improve its performance, increase its abilities for obtaining funds or future planning, and fulfil the organisational objectives. By communicating the results of the evaluation, an organisation can inform its staff, board of directors, service users, funders, the public, or other stakeholders about the benefits and effectiveness of the services and programme's, and explain how projects work and how they are monitored. Although there are many benefits in conducting evaluation, it will be a waste of an NGO's resources if the evaluation results are not used.

Often training is necessary or an intense preparation for such evaluations not only for the project staff but also for the consultant; therefore this module gives hints and information that is guiding both, the internal staff and/or the external consultant.

Certain projects are **self evaluated (Internally)** or **evaluated by external consultants**. Both, internal and external evaluation examines the relationships between a project's implementation, objective achievement and other project outcomes and impacts. This module gives hints and insights into both types of evaluations and does not distinguish between external and internal evaluation.

The objective of an evaluation is to provide information for actions such as decision-making, strategic planning, reporting, or programme/project modification. Project evaluation helps to understand the progress, success, and effectiveness of a project. It provides the organisation with a comprehensive description of a project, including insight on the

- Needs the project will address;
- People who need to get involved in the project; definition of success for the project;
- Outputs that the project could expect; outcomes the project is intended to achieve; activities needed to meet the outcomes; and
- Alignment and relationships between the activities and outcomes.

Evaluation is a systematic investigation of the worth or significance of a project or programme. Evaluation normally involves some standards, criteria, measures of success, or objectives that describe the value of the project/programme. Evaluation can identify criteria for success, lessons to learn, things to achieve, ways to improve the work, and the means to move forward.

Project evaluation assesses activities that are designed to perform a specified task in a specific period of time. For example, a five-day seminar on volunteerism, a one-year fundraising campaign against child labour, a three-year food security project in a tribal area, a five-year HIV/Aids prevention programme, or an ongoing orientation training programme for unemployed youth are all projects that an organisation can evaluate.

Project evaluation and project management are interrelated. Evaluation can help the organisation complete a project successfully, provide evidence of successes or failures, suggest ways for improvements, and inform decisions about the future of current and planned projects.

Project evaluation is an accountability function. By evaluating a project, the progress is monitored to ensure that appropriate procedures are in place for completing the project on time, and it identifies and measures the outcomes to ensure the effectiveness and achievements of the project. All these efforts make an organisation capable of reporting, answering all inquiries, and being accountable for its plans.

CHAPTER-2

OVERVIEW OF EVALUATIONS

2.1. OBJECTIVES AND MEANINGS OF EVALUATIONS

The OECD Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) laid out that the main objectives of evaluation of development assistance are to improve aid and to provide basis for accountability in its "Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance" (1991).

The objectives of independent project evaluations can be summarised into two points: Independent evaluations should serve both as

- A learning tool for the improvement of projects and
- To demonstrate accountability

Project evaluations objectives in detail:

1. To improve projects through feedback from findings into decision-making processes:

- In formulation of the aid strategy and implementing policy.
- In decision-making about implementing, modifying, and continuing corporation of the project to be evaluated.
- In facilitating learning effects of participants/stakeholders and organisations involved.

(Utilised in planning and implementation/supervision of similar projects, as well as enhancement of the project and capacities of relevant organisations).

An independent evaluation is an effective means for learning how projects can be strengthened and how resources can be used more effectively. It provides an understanding of the following:

- i. How well a project has articulated objectives in line with the organisations vision and achieving the mission.
- ii. The quality of activities and how useful they are in meeting beneficiaries' needs.
- iii. How capacities such as financial and executive management and governance affect quality.

Evaluation that is driven by the need to make better project decisions should clarify with some specificity **“who needs to learn what.”** This frames the exercise and gives it greater legitimacy and focus. Thus, a primary audience for the evaluation should be “agents for change” within the project, including team leaders and managers. Funders will also need assurance that they are supporting project learning.

2. To disclose information extensively for the sake of improvement of transparency and accountability of cooperation projects:

- Ensuring transparency and accountability of the project.
- Disclosing information regarding effects and process of the implementing organisations cooperation, both in its own country and internationally.

Because development resources are limited and the time frame to achieve larger goals and impacts, donors are increasingly focusing on outcome or impact oriented evaluations. Many foreign donor funded projects are under particular scrutiny because grant resources are especially scarce. Independent evaluation is crucial for demonstrating how resources have been spent and what changes have been achieved. At the same time, it is important that the evaluation go beyond results and their attribution to ask, “What would have happened if the project did not exist? What would happen if the project ceased to exist?”

It is important that the evaluation go beyond asking, “is this being done well” to ask, “how can this be done better.”

Better implementation: Evaluation is a tool for better implementation of the project, presenting participants / stakeholders with information regarding the needs of the beneficiaries in the society, smooth implementation of the project, outcomes and impacts made in the community, and factors affecting implementation of the project through the entire process of implementation or supervision of the project.

Organisations utilise lessons learned from the findings through the process from evaluations as management tools in planning and implementation of projects, for more effective implementation.

2.2. INTERNATIONAL TRENDS OF AID AND EVALUATIONS

In the past decade, the international development community has been accelerating its efforts towards “Managing for Development Results” (= MfDR) in order to enhance aid effectiveness of ODA projects through reducing procedural costs that are charged to developing countries due to different assistance procedures among donors. Key milestone included the UN Millennium Declaration and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (2000), the Memorandum of the Marrakech Roundtable on Managing for Results (2004), and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and now the transition to the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with its 169 targets. The proposed SDGs offer major improvements on the MDGs. The SDG framework addresses key systemic barriers to sustainable development such as inequality, unsustainable consumption patterns, weak institutional capacity, and environmental degradation that the MDGs neglected.

There is an agreed upon definition (See box below): MfDR calls for developing countries to increase their commitment to policies and actions that promote economic growth and reduce poverty, and developed countries to support them through more effective aid and trade policies.

Box: Definitions and principles of Managing for Development Results (MfDR)

Definitions:

Managing for development results (MfDR) is a management strategy focused on development performance and on sustainable improvements in country outcomes. It provides a coherent framework for development effectiveness in which performance information is used for improved decision-making, and it includes practical tools for strategic planning, risk management, progress monitoring, and outcome evaluation.

MfDR core principles

1. Focus the dialogue on results at all phases.
2. Align actual programming, monitoring, and evaluation activities with the agreed expected results.

3. Keep the results reporting system as simple, cost-effective, and user-friendly as possible.
4. Manage *for*, not *by*, results.
5. Use results information for management learning and decision-making, as well as for reporting and Source: *Memorandum of the Marrakech Roundtable on Managing for Results, 2004* accountability.

The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, adopted at the "High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness" held in Paris in March 2005, is based on these principles and summarises partnership commitments by both donors and recipient countries for necessary measures to improve quality of assistance and maximising development results (See box below).

Box: Five key principles for improving aid effectiveness in the Paris Declaration

1. Ownership

Recipient countries exercise leadership in establishing and implementing their national strategies, and aid providing countries and organizations shall support said leadership.

2. Alignment

Donors provide their overall support for the development strategies of recipient countries, and utilize the systems and procedures, such as financial management and procurement, of the recipient country to the highest degree possible.

3. Harmonisation

Donors use common systems and procedures whenever possible for assistance planning, implementation, evaluations, and reporting.

4. Managing for Results

Systems in recipient countries for development plans, budgetary measures, and evaluations shall be strengthened, and development results increased by fortifying a mutual relationship

of those systems.

5. Mutual Accountability

Donors and recipient countries shall enhance transparency and take mutual responsibility for aid resources, procedures, and development results.

International trends towards "Aid Effectiveness" and their implications on evaluation: The emphasis on MfDR can be explained as a process for both donors and recipient countries to adapt themselves to **Result-based Management (RBM)**. Indicator-based monitoring and evaluation are incorporated as management tools in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) at the UN Millennium Summit and the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS).

RBM is defined as "a management strategy focusing on performance and achievement of outputs, outcomes, and impacts" and means a set of processes for performing *strategic planning, performance measurement, and evaluation* as well as utilizing these results for management (*Refer to the module on monitoring*). **As per DAC definition, results are understood as changes = outputs, outcomes and impacts.**

The OECD / DAC quality standards for evaluations are given in Annex 1

2.3. TYPES OF PROJECT EVALUATIONS

Internal and external evaluation

Depending on whom an evaluation is conducted by, one distinguishes between internal and external evaluations, which are characterised by different respective degrees of independence. An internal evaluation or self-evaluation (or self reflection) is an important internal instrument for project analysis / project management and is the direct responsibility of those organising implementation. Self-evaluation refers to the evaluation of a development intervention that is carried out by persons who are responsible for the planning and implementation of the project and who report to the management of

implementation organisation, the partner or the co-financer. Self-evaluation makes learning processes during projects possible and, if necessary, plan adjustments can be made in the project cycle.

External evaluations are carried out by entities and / or persons belonging neither to the implementing nor to the donor organisation of the project. **Independent evaluations** are conducted by entities and / or persons free of any control of those responsible for the design and implementation of development interventions. Independence implies freedom from political influence, organisational pressure and economic dependence. An independent evaluation is characterised by full access to information and full autonomy in carrying out investigations and reporting findings.

Evaluation in the project cycle

Depending on the use of the evaluation in the course of the project or programme, a distinction is made between ex-ante evaluations, interim evaluations, final evaluations and ex-post evaluations. Each of these types addresses a specific task and has a special focus. **Ex-ante evaluations** are conducted in the phase of project design and analysis. They focus on a situation analysis (Including an analysis of the executing agency) and the feasibility of the project. In this sense, project assessments and feasibility studies can also be regarded as ex-ante evaluations. **Interim evaluations** are conducted in the course of the project often roughly in the middle of implementation and focus on a comparison of the actual situation with targets, the prospects of attaining the desired outcomes and short-term effects. **Final evaluations**, which are carried out at the end of a project phase or a project, focus on a projects outcomes and effects in the short and medium term. **Ex-post evaluations** are conducted immediately or long after completion of a project. They concentrate on factors of success and failure as well as lasting impacts and a projects sustainability.

Thus evaluations may be **formative**, i.e. of an actively designing nature and process-oriented, or **summative**, i.e. of a more summary and stocktaking nature and focused on outcomes and effects.

In contrast with evaluation, which carries out an assessment at a certain point in time, the term **monitoring** refers to a continuing process of data collection and data analysis in the course of a project (Please refer to module on monitoring).

Distinction according to the object of evaluation

Depending on the object to be evaluated, a distinction can be made between project, programme, instrument and process evaluations:

Project evaluations are planned and designed to assess individual projects according to relevant criteria (See point 2.4. below).

Programme evaluations assess a series of individual projects run by an organisation according to a specific aspect. To this end, a sample of individual evaluations is taken matching this specific focus. Programme evaluations may relate to a country, a region, a continent or an area of assistance and / or assistance priority or to specific topics such as gender and the relevance of projects to poverty.

Instrument evaluations assessing individual instruments, such as country concepts, concept papers or PME systems are also conceivable.

A **process evaluation** is a systematic assessment of the internal dynamics of implementing organisations, their policy instruments, their service delivery mechanisms, their management practices and the linkages among these aspects. Process evaluation is often part of other types of evaluation. All these types of evaluation take the framework conditions and the context in which these interventions take place into consideration in addition to the project and programme measures.

Other types of evaluation

The term **meta-evaluation** is used for the evaluation of an evaluation, in which the quality of evaluation systems and / or the performance of the evaluators are assessed. In addition, in accordance with the DAC, the term also refers to evaluations designed to aggregate

findings from a series of evaluations. In this sense, programme evaluations are meta-evaluations as well.

Joint evaluations are those in which different donor organisations and / or partners participate. The intensity of this participation may vary and relate to all types of evaluation mentioned above.

2.4. EVALUATION CRITERIA, METHODS AND TOOLS

Evaluation criteria: Evaluations assess individual projects, programmes, policies and/or instruments according to the following criteria:

The term **relevance** applies when assessing whether and to what extent the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with the beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners and donors policies.

Effectiveness refers to the extent to which the development interventions objectives were achieved or are expected to be achieved. It also assesses the extent to which effects or changes result from a development intervention.

The term **efficiency** is used in assessing how economically resources and inputs (Funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to outputs and outcomes.

The term **significance** assesses whether a development intervention has a widespread impact at sector or regional level, bears a model character or can be repeated elsewhere. Another aspect that is assessed is whether and how it can contribute to the formation of structures and/or institution building.

Sustainability is used to assess the extent to which the benefits a development measure has generated continue when external support has ended. Four dimensions of sustainability can be distinguished:

- **Project-oriented sustainability** assesses whether and to what degree target groups and/or executing agencies continue with changes in their own interest and for their own benefit.
- **Output/production-oriented sustainability** analyses whether and to what degree the target group and / or implementing agency disposes of a structure enabling it to ensure a lasting benefit.
- **Innovation-oriented sustainability** evaluates whether and to what degree the target group or the executing agency disposes of an innovation potential provided by the development measures enabling an appropriate response to further changes and
- **System-oriented sustainability** assesses whether and to what degree the innovation results in enhancing the performance of the system as a whole via diffusion processes (This concept of sustainability refers to the above-mentioned term of significance).

It is important for an evaluation to consider all these criteria. For an intervention may well be efficient without being effective. This will for instance be the case if a sanitation project has constructed toilets in a cost-effective way but the toilets are not in use by the beneficiaries since there was no awareness and behavioural change component in the project. What is equally conceivable is that a project is very effective but lacks relevance and efficiency. Or projects may be relevant and effective without being sustainable. Projects may well be sustainable (In the sense of the three dimensions mentioned above) without their making a significant contribution to solving crucial development problems (see the last of the dimensions of sustainability referred to). Evaluations on hand show that sustainability in projects focusing on significance is more difficult to attain than in less sophisticated, small, mono causal projects. For development policy reasons, the two criteria of sustainability and significance should to be in balance and should be evaluated accordingly. Impact-oriented evaluation asks both whether we are doing the right things properly and whether these things have a lasting impact in terms of positive changes among the target groups.

The methodical problem of actually attributing identified impacts and their contribution to development to a specific intervention in a causal chain continues to remain unsolved, for possible impacts resulting from other interventions and environmental factors have to be taken into account (See module monitoring – attribution gap). This **attribution gap** can only be filled by demonstrating plausibility based on relevant impact hypotheses. Given this condition, laying claim to actually measuring the impact of the intervention may have to be put in relative terms. Instead, it should to be asked what impacts are contributed to.

Example attribution gap

A project aims to reduce the number of new HIV/AIDS diagnoses. One of the intervention areas is an enhanced awareness programme of HIV/Aids among the people in the area it is working in. To achieve this, a well-designed multi-media approach is applied involving street theatre performances, poster campaigns, discussions, trainings and community information centres. At about the same time, the government repeatedly introduces television ads on the same topic on a frequent basis. The challenge for impact-oriented evaluation is to find out how awareness among the population has changed and to what extent changes in awareness of HIV/Aids can be attributed to the project or the government measures.

Evaluation methods and tools

A wide range of methods and tools are used for collecting and analysing data in evaluations. They include:

- Quantitative methods such as standardised interviews, efficiency measurements (Cost-benefit comparison), scaling/rating, cross tables, regression analysis and
- Qualitative methods such as introductory talks, partly structured interviews, focus group discussions, observations, ranking and mapping.

Specially designed survey and analysis tools such as questionnaires, checklists, scales and computer programmes can be used as tools.

Often, a mix of methods and tools is used to optimise data collection and analysis. The choice of method depends on various factors such as the objective and the type of problem being dealt with, measurability and the availability of resources. The appropriate method has to be developed by the evaluators and co-ordinated with all those involved in the context of planning the evaluation, taking into account the respective advantages and disadvantages of the various methods.

Care should be taken that, as far as possible, the principle should be applied that **two pairs of eyes are better than one**, with the local perspective being incorporated, and that the method chosen enables **verifications** to be made in data collection and data analysis, e.g. via triangulation. A verification of the findings is essential to give the evaluation credibility. To achieve this, preliminary evaluation findings are submitted and discussed with various actors as a rule. Here, it is important to correct factual mistakes and develop a good common understanding of the evaluation findings, arrive at recommendations and document possible divergence in assessments.

Evaluation findings are summarised in an **evaluation report**. This report contains background information, methodology, findings, recommendations and lessons learnt in the evaluation. In programme and instrument evaluations, a **cross-section report** is compiled in addition to the individual reports that describe their analysis at aggregate level in a clear and comprehensible manner.

2.5. PRINCIPLES, GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS

Principles of independent evaluations are:

For any evaluation there needs to be clarity about what will be considered a quality and ethical evaluation. In some organisations there is agreement about using particular evaluation standards and / or ethical guidelines to guide the evaluation and to evaluate it.

Many organizations have guidelines that address issues of quality and ethics together. For example, the UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) Norms for Evaluation state that evaluation in UNDP should be:

- **Independent** — Management must not impose restrictions on the scope, content, comments and recommendations of evaluation reports. Evaluators must be free of conflict of interest.
- **Intentional** — The rationale for an evaluation and the decisions to be based on it should be clear from the outset.
- **Transparent** — Meaningful consultation with stakeholders is essential for the credibility and utility of the evaluation.
- **Ethical** — Evaluation should not reflect personal or sectoral interests. Evaluators must have professional integrity, respect the rights of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.
- **Impartial** — Removing bias and maximizing objectivity are critical for the credibility of the evaluation and its contribution to knowledge (= fair / neutral).
- **Of high quality** — All evaluations should meet minimum quality standards defined by the Evaluation Office
- **Timely** — Evaluations must be designed and completed in a timely fashion so as to ensure the usefulness of the findings and recommendations
- **Used** — Evaluation is a management discipline that seeks to provide information to be used for evidence-based decision making. To enhance the usefulness of the findings and recommendations, key stakeholders should be engaged in various ways in the conduct of the evaluation.

Different evaluation associations have articulated what is expected of members in terms of conducting ethical and quality evaluations, for example the German Society for Evaluation or the European Evaluation Society.

Evaluation guidelines:

- Review measurable indicators of outputs, outcomes and impacts – and assist projects to develop improved indicators
- Be conducted on average every three to five years (This decision is also depending on the funding received. A few international donors have guidelines

for evaluations, in particular for those partners who receive total funding of \$300,000 or more).

- Be owned and utilised by all partners and not be driven solely by the needs of the funder. Therefore, timing and coverage should take into account partner preferences.
- Be overseen by the governing body and conducted with the assistance of the organisations management.
- Be conducted by individuals or companies that have been at “*arm’s length*” from the initiative.
- Report on outputs, outcomes and impacts.
- Address the performance of the governing body as well as of management.
- Make recommendations for financial sustainability as well as project delivery.
- Have terms of reference and selection of consultants cleared between management and funder.
- Budget should be sufficient to cover evaluation costs.

CHAPTER-3

PREPARE THE EVALUATION

Preparing the evaluation and creating an evaluation plan is the very first stage of conducting an evaluation. This chapter explains the essential steps to help an organisation or the evaluator create an evaluation plan for its project. The preparation plan should answer questions such as

- What is being evaluated?
- Why is it being evaluated?
- Who wants the evaluation?
- Who will do it?
- How will it be done?
- What results do you expect?

Independent evaluations should be carried out in ways that support the principles of good evaluation shown above. Important questions that need to be addressed are the following:

- What are the decision-making processes for the evaluation? Who governs the evaluation process? The governing body or management? Who should formulate key questions in consultation with other partners / donors / stakeholders? The management should make final decisions on terms of reference and selection of consultant(s) and decide to whom the consultant should report.
- Who pays for the evaluation? If there are several donors, costs should be borne equitably by various donors. No one donor should pay for or drive the process. Or the costs are part of the implementing organisations budget and they decide locally on the consultant(s) and terms of reference in consultation with the donor agency.
- How much should the evaluation cost? Costs will vary depending mostly on the size of the project and the need for field work as well as aspects of the terms of reference.
- To contain costs (And to focus attention), evaluations should generally be

limited to three to four weeks depending on the size and complexity of the project.

- How should evaluators be selected? Evaluators should be selected on the basis of their expertise in the field, the diverse points of view they bring to a team and their objectivity. Evaluators should have knowledge of evaluation methodology and be familiar with development issues.
- To avoid conflict of interest, evaluators should have a “*neutral*” relationship with the project: They should have had no substantive prior involvement in its establishment or operation. Competitive bidding for consultants is sometimes encouraged but not required.
- How should the evaluation be carried out? The evaluation will typically involve a desk review of documents, interviews with stakeholders and, where applicable, collection of data and evidence to determine development impacts. Because of the importance of assessing the changes induced by the project, the involvement of other counterparts and knowledgeable outsiders or key informants / agencies who know the project is often crucial.

Some more details on the above mentioned points are outlined here:

3.1. WRITING THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Understanding a project is crucial to evaluating its progress or **outcomes**. One should create a project description that includes

- The needs and objectives that the project will address
- The target group that will take action in this project
- The target group that will be affected by the project
- The planned outcomes of the project
- The activities which are required to meet those outcomes

This information should be found in the project proposal or in related project documents such as reports and minutes of meetings.

If there is not enough information to complete the project description, talk to the project managers to determine their understanding of the project. Use the bullet points above to

prepare a set of questions for the managers.

3.2. ESTABLISH DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

A variety of decisions must be made during an evaluation including: What the focus of the evaluation will be; who will undertake the evaluation; how data will be collected and analysed; how the evaluation will be reported; and who will have access to the final report. Therefore, it is important to establish a decision making process to ensure agreement can be reached on how decisions will be made.

A variety of groups may be established within the governance structure in order to advise on the evaluation. Evaluation decisions are often made by a steering committee, with representatives from different stakeholder groups. An expert or technical reference group or an advisor with specific expertise might provide targeted advice. A diverse range of stakeholders with different perspectives might also be consulted about the scope of the evaluation or on specific issues such as the accuracy of the program logic or the interpretation of findings.

Control may be centralised in a specific manager or committee or it may be shared by a working party involving representatives from many different stakeholders.

It is important to be clear about the roles and responsibilities of steering committees and other stakeholders. They might have the following roles:

- Advise – review material and make suggestions to others who make the decisions
- Recommend – review material and suggestions and make recommendations to others who make the decisions
- Decide – have final control over decisions in the evaluation

3.3. STATING AN EVALUATION OBJECTIVE

The objective statement presents the reasons that led the organisation to conduct this evaluation, so you should already have the information you need to prepare it. As an evaluator, you only need to clarify and write it as a statement. This statement should echo the objectives, values and significance of the project from either its funder's or the

organisation's perspectives (See example 1).

Along with the objective, the type of evaluation should be determined. Selecting an evaluation type provides direction for the evaluation. It helps keep the evaluation process focused on its main objective and determines the evaluation questions that should be answered and the data that should be collected. The most common types of evaluation are: formative, process, summative, and outcome. (See types of evaluation under 2.3.) Equally important is to decide on the time frame and where the evaluation stands in the project cycle: Ante, mid term, final, ex-post.

How to select an evaluation type

Select the evaluation type based on

1. The objectives and priorities of your project
2. The objective of the project evaluation
3. The nature of the project (E.g. whether it is process-oriented or outcome-oriented)
4. The time frame for conducting the evaluation (E.g. during or after the project: mid term/post)
5. How, and by whom, the results will be used
6. The time frame and budget for completing the evaluation.

The **evaluation objective** statement can also determine the type of evaluation one has to undertake. If the objective is to demonstrate how the project is meeting its objectives, using its resources, and whether any modifications in its process are required, one should conduct a *process evaluation*. If the purpose is to assess the extent to which the project has affected its participants or environment, then an outcome evaluation should be conducted. The objective statement will be helpful to write the appropriate evaluation questions, which are more elaborated in “**Choosing Evaluation Questions**” (See 3.7.)

If the objective of evaluation is not clear, the project manager and senior staff needs to be contacted in order to find out how they view the importance of the evaluation, how they would like to use the results, and the information that would be useful to them.

Examples of evaluation objective statements

- To assess the degree to which project objectives were achieved.
- To document the lessons learned
- To provide recommendations for project development and improvement.
- To examine the changes that resulted from doing the project.
- To provide input to guide decision making for the upcoming renewal and extension of project funding.

Example 1: Objective of evaluation**Introduction of a pilot study “rural development”**

The University of Nutrition and Agriculture received funding to conduct a one-year (2015-16) pilot project “Introduction of a post graduation study on rural development in India”:

The faculty’s tasks were to provide courses to students to deepen their knowledge and understanding on project management for rural India to opt for careers in rural development. The project objective was to enable students to enter the job market in the rural development sector thereby increasing the number of students who take up employments in the development sector. The Centre for Rural Development (Donor) funded this project to find a new way to promote careers in the development sector and use locally available experts. The funder asked for an evaluation and provided tools, assistance, and advice.

The objective of the project evaluation was to assess the participants’ perception of the project activities (= different courses), identify the project’s longer-term impact, and monitor the activities to demonstrate the project’s success.

3.4. RESOURCES FOR EVALUATION

The purpose and scope of the evaluation needs to be considered when determining the budget. The amount of resources available may influence the level of an evaluation’s rigor or the certainty of its findings. The importance of the project, existing knowledge about the project from previous evaluations and the decisions to which the evaluation will contribute are important factors to consider.

A project that has been thoroughly “tested” in a context similar to the current implementation setting may require fewer resources to satisfy information needs. A higher proportion of funds may be necessary for:

- Evaluations that will contribute to important decisions, such as whether to roll out a large-scale project as follow up.
- Evaluations that require highly defensible findings or will come under scrutiny
- Projects that have not been evaluated before

Very often the available resources (Time, money and expertise) will restrict the scope of the evaluation (The number of questions, size of the sample, data collection and analysis options) or influence the choice of evaluation designs. Some organisations have a policy of setting aside a certain percentage of the total project budget for evaluation. Organisations often use a “rule of thumb” to specify considerations in making a budget estimate. Common budget estimates range between 5 – 20% of project costs.

When commissioning an evaluation it is wise to start the budgeting process. Engage project staff, stakeholders, and MME staff or professionals to ensure that the budget is comprehensive and accurate.

The process of developing an evaluation budget may be an excellent opportunity to encourage stakeholders to agree on the value of the evaluation and the amount and type of resources necessary to support it. Sometimes after intended users are engaged and the evaluation objective and questions decided there is scope to add additional resources in order to undertake the type of evaluation that is required.

Budgets are just as critical for planning an internal evaluation as an external one. Although an internal evaluation draws primarily from resources within the organisation, getting agreement on available resources will ensure the evaluation runs much more smoothly. For example, staff may be more flexible than consultants, but developing an accurate calculation of staff time costs early in the process helps to enlist their commitment.

3.5. WHO WILL CONDUCT THE EVALUATION?

A range of different actors can conduct evaluations: External consultants, internal staff, those involved in delivering services, by peers, by the community, and by a combined group. Therefore it is important to make decisions about who is best to conduct the evaluation.

Consider the relative importance of different types of expertise. Relevant expertise may include skills and knowledge in evaluation, in the specific domain (eg education) or program (e.g. delivering health services), or the local culture and context.

Consider the balance of distance and involvement that will be most suitable and that will support use of the evaluation findings. An external, unaligned evaluator may be viewed as more (or less) credible by different stakeholders. Involving staff and communities may be important for supporting cultural change, knowledge building and supporting the utilization of the evaluation findings.

Different management tasks arise depending on who is involved in which evaluative activities. For example, when using an external evaluator you will need to develop a process for selecting and managing them. If internal staff and/or intended beneficiaries are involved there may be a need to ensure processes are well documented and that relevant training in specific evaluation options is conducted to ensure that quality and ethical standards are maintained.

Decisions about who will conduct an evaluation, or components of an evaluation, will also be informed by timelines, resources, and the purpose of the evaluation.

Options are:

- **Community:** conducting an evaluation by using the broader community or groups of intended beneficiaries.
- **Expert Review:** conducting an evaluation by using someone with specific content knowledge or expert judgment and professional expertise.

- **External consultant:** contracting an external consultant to conduct the evaluation.
- **Combination:** Internal staff and an external (usually expert) opinion to jointly conduct an evaluation.
- **Internal staff:** conducting an evaluation using staff from the implementing agency.
- **Learning alliances:** bringing together different groups to conduct the evaluation
- **Peer review:** conducting an evaluation using individuals/organisations who are working on similar projects.

3.6. WHAT SHOULD BE EVALUATED?

The evaluation should examine how activities have been carried out and how they could be done differently. The focus should be on the following:

- Project performance, including an assessment of its mission, objectives, governance, policies, management, operational modalities and impacts.
- Evaluations should examine progress and its changes against indicators established by the project (Refer to the planning documents).
- The performance of other stakeholders/partners, and coordination needed among them.
- The perspectives of other stakeholders, including beneficiaries.
- The key outside or contextual factors that affect implementation of the project.
- Projects that principally involve networking or advocacy should pay particular attention to how successfully the project has facilitated the participation and commitment of partners / collaborators.
- A cross cutting issue such as gender or equality.

3.7. IDENTIFYING EVALUATION STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholders are the individuals or organisations that have an interest in the project; they may make decisions, participate in the project activities, or be affected by those activities.

A project may have both **primary** and **secondary** stakeholders. The primary stakeholders are those who are closely and directly involved in or affected by the outputs and outcomes of the project (e.g., the participants themselves and an organisation that has invested in the project). Secondary stakeholders are those who are less involved and less affected by the project but may have some benefits in in (e.g., an organisation that is interested in knowing about the outputs and changes of the project).

Identifying the evaluation stakeholders can help establish the relationships and networks necessary to successfully complete the evaluation. It can also help to decide who to approach, how to approach them, and what one should expect from them. And it can help to develop useful evaluation products (e.g., reports) that are written in the most appropriate language for the project stakeholders.

How to identify evaluation stakeholders

1. Prepare a list of the individuals and organizations that have interests in the project and its evaluation.
2. Determine their interests in this project and its evaluation.
3. Identify their information needs, particularly from this evaluation.
4. Identify their level of involvement in the project, based on their needs and interests.
5. Identify potential evaluation participants (E.g. Primary stakeholders).
6. Invite participants to be part of the project evaluation group (see implementing evaluation).
7. Identify the potential users of the products of this evaluation (E.g. Secondary stakeholders).

Primary stakeholder: Project team members, project participants, funder(s), project management staff, board members, and volunteers.

Secondary stakeholders: Members of the community in which the project is being conducted, members of the project's target population (E.g.: Youth, seniors, village head), implementing organisation's external members or partners, associations related to the topic

of the project

3.8. CHOOSING EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluation questions are the key questions that need to be answered to ensure the successful completion of the project or to understand its outcome, impact, effectiveness, and achievements. These questions determine what is important to be addressed or assessed. Asking and answering the right questions will lead to useful evaluation results that can be easily communicated with external audiences or put to use in the organisation.

Evaluation questions play a crucial role in the analysis and interpretation of the data the evaluator collects. Therefore, there should be enough time and discussion with key stakeholders to develop and select the questions. These selected questions might be also revisited and revised, or questions could be added as the project is unfolding.

How to choose evaluation questions?

1. Review the objectives, activities, and anticipated outcomes of the project.
2. Ask your stakeholders what questions this evaluation should answer.
3. Identify the level of details that are required for this evaluation (E.g., whether the evaluation should be designed based on the individual activities or components of the project).
4. Prepare a list of questions to determine the value and significance of various aspects of the project.
5. For each question, identify whether it relates to the process of the project, to its outputs and to the outcomes and changes the project could create for its participants and environment, to the lessons learned and points that can affect future planning and decision making, or to the new ways of work and innovations.
6. Select questions that are directly associated with at least one project objective. Their answers can verify the project's achievements or success.
7. Select questions that are related to the future of the project. Their answers can lead to ways to make the project – and other projects – sustainable.

Examples of evaluation questions

1. Evaluation questions related to process:
 - Are the activities being performed as planned?
 - Is the project reaching the intended target population?
 - How satisfied are the participants with their involvement in this project?
 - How should the planned activities be modified to work better?
 - What lessons can we learn from the way in which the project is unfolding?
2. Evaluation questions related to outputs:
 - Is the project reaching the intended number of participants?
 - Is the project providing the planned services?
 - Are the activities leading to the expected products?
 - Are there any unexpected products/services?
3. Evaluation questions related to use of output/outcomes/impacts:
 - Did the participants experience any changes in their skills, knowledge, attitudes, or behaviours (= Use of output)?
 - What changes were expected?
 - What are the effects of the project on the organization (e.g., organisational pride, enhanced networking, and stronger partnerships)?
 - Did the project meet the needs that led to this project? Do those needs still exist?
 - Are there any other related needs that have arisen that the project did not address?
 - Did the participants experience any changes as a result of the project? Are the changes positive?
 - What could be the long-term impacts of this work?
4. Evaluation questions related to alternatives and lessons learned:
 - What could have been done differently to complete the project more effectively?

- What key changes should be made to the project to enhance achievement of objectives?
- What are the lessons learned for the future?
- What outcomes should be considered if an organisation wants to repeat this or conduct a similar project?

Example: Evaluation questions

Fostering youth activity in NGO's culture working in urban slums (= Involve them as volunteers)

In 2015-2016, the Centre for Community Youth conducted a pilot project that focused on promoting meaningful contributions by youth volunteers. The project objective was to make full use of youth volunteers by fostering youth-led activities.

The objectives of the project were to build a relationship with two organisations as pilot sites and work with them to evaluate and shift their cultures. Introduce the concepts of youth inclusion and community youth development as a framework and guide for the organisations to explore their organisational cultures. Start and support the two pilot sites in their process of building relationships with youth and engage them as volunteers. Develop tools and learning resources from the pilot sites to share with the larger community.

The potential evaluation questions were

- a. How successful was the process for selecting two organisations as pilot sites?
- b. How adequate were the tools, models, resources, and the process that helped the organisations engage with youth volunteers? Could it be done differently?
- c. Was the project able to identify conditions and circumstances for building relationships with youth and engage them as volunteers?
- d. What are the effects of this project on the two pilot sites? Were they able to shift their cultures adequately and engage more with them?

Typical key evaluation questions for the three main types of evaluation

Main Type Of Evaluation	Typical Key Evaluation Questions
Process evaluation	How is the program being implemented? How appropriate are the processes compared with quality standards? Is the project being implemented correctly? Are participants being reached as intended? How satisfied are project beneficiaries? For which group of beneficiaries? What has been done in an innovative way?
Outcome evaluation (or impact evaluation)	How well did the project work? Did the project produce the intended outcomes in the short, medium and long term? For whom, in what ways and in what circumstances? What unintended outcomes (Positive and negative) were produced? To what extent can changes be attributed to the project? What were the particular features of the project and context that made a difference? What was the influence of other factors?
Economic evaluation (cost-effectiveness analysis and cost-benefit analysis)	What is the most cost-effective option? Has the intervention been cost-effective (Compared to alternatives)? Is the program the best use of resources? What has been the ratio of costs to benefits?

Three broad categories of key evaluation questions to assess whether the program is appropriate, effective and efficient are often used. Organising key evaluation questions under these categories, allows an assessment of the degree to which a particular program in particular circumstances is appropriate, effective and efficient. Suitable questions under these categories will vary with the different types of evaluation (Process, outcome or economic).

Categories Of Key Evaluations	Typical Key Evaluation Questions
Appropriateness	To what extent does the program address an identified need? How well does the program align with government and agency priorities? Does the program represent a legitimate role for government?
Effectiveness	To what extent is the program achieving the intended outcomes, in the short, medium and long term? To what extent is the program producing worthwhile results (outputs, outcomes) and/or meeting each of its objectives.
Efficiency	Do the outcomes of the program represent value for money? To what extent is the relationship between inputs and outputs timely, cost-effective and to expected standards?

3.9. CHOOSING EVALUATION TOOLS

Evaluation tools help to gather the information the evaluation needs to answer for the evaluation questions. They can be different from the tools one uses to carry out the core activities of the project. For example, conducting *workshops* to train organisations about youth volunteers is a project tool; *interviewing key* participants to ask their opinions about the content and success of the training workshops is an evaluation tool.

Evaluation tools can use both formal and informal methods for gathering information. Formal evaluation tools include focus groups, interviews, survey questionnaires, and knowledge tests. Informal evaluation tools include observations, informal conversations, and site visits.

Depending on the evaluation questions, a tool might be selected that helps gathering quantitative information by numbering, rating and ranking information. Or a tool may be needed to gather qualitative information such as stories, anecdotes, and opinions about a

particular aspect of the project, or observation notes.

How to choose evaluation tools

- Review your evaluation questions and project activities.
- Think about the information you need to answer these questions.
- Check the tools required for gathering the necessary information to answer each question.
- Identify whether the tools are available and need modification, or if you need to develop them.
- Think about the information that you can gather by using each tool. You may use a tool to address more than one question.
- Discuss the ideas (You can design a matrix presenting the ideas) with the evaluation group / co-evaluator and project team.
- Learn more about the selected tools and, if necessary, make sure that there are enough internal resources (E.g. time, skills, and budget) to develop them.
- Search for external resources and learning materials if the internal resources are insufficient.

Ethical considerations when collecting data

- Inform participants about the purpose of data gathering and how you will use and analyse data.
- Tell participants how the results will be used and any potential negative consequences. Explain to participants about data privacy and confidentiality and how it will be protected.
- Obtain consent forms if you think that identifying a respondent might be necessary. When analysing or reporting the qualitative data, be careful about sensitive comments or those that may reveal personal identities.
- Obtain necessary permission when approaching children, institutions (E.g. hospitals, rehabilitation centre, etc.), or other sensitive groups for data (E.g. taboos, intimacy, etc.).

- Understand the participants' cultural norms before approaching them for data. Consider offering incentives for participants – both people and organisations – such as providing some feedback or a summary of the evaluation results.

For example: UNICEF, Plan International and Save the Children and others have ethics and minimum standards for consulting with children

The Minimum Standards on Consulting with Children and the associated Operations Manual were developed as part of a process to ensure meaningful and high-quality children's participation in the UN Study on Violence against Children. This is a major contribution to global efforts to increase the quality and effectiveness of children's participation, based on systematic experiences in preparing children for meetings, facilitating representative selection of children, ways of involving them in adult discussions, modes of facilitating their contributions and including these in outcome documents.

3.10. HOW ARE EVALUATION FINDINGS ANALYSED, INTERPRETED, REPORTED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE?

Data can't speak alone, it needs a dialogue and we need to give data a "voice". To do this, we first analyse the data and then interpret the results. Data, which is collected, are only facts and figures with the potential to direct us to conclusions. The data needs to be analysed and transformed them into conclusions, answers to the evaluation questions, and actionable suggestions.

Interpreting results is a process of linking the facts or points identified through your data analyses to the objectives and values that drove your evaluation. Through this process, the information turns into evidence that can demonstrate the progress, success, and achievements of the evaluated project. This process should also result in project learning's, improvements, and suggestions for making decisions or planning in the future. You should also be aware of both confirmatory, or positive, and contradictory, or negative, findings, as well as expected and unexpected ones.

How to interpret the results

The following are some tips for interpreting your evaluation results:

- Review each section of results and ask yourself, “**So what?**”
- Address each project objective and evaluation question by using both qualitative and quantitative results as well as other information you may have obtained during the project.
- If the results are positive and confirm project achievements, explain how they support the project objectives and their success.
- If the results are negative and contradict a planned achievement, explain how they fail to meet the project expectations and what should have been done differently.
- Think about other questions that can be answered with the results.
- Use these results to draw overall conclusions on the impacts that the project has had on its internal and external stakeholders.
- Provide suggestions for:
 - The future of the project.
 - Modifications that may be required.
 - How to increase the success or effectiveness of the project
 - How to decrease the weaknesses or potential risks of the project.
 - How to use the results of this evaluation.

Evaluation reports typically include the following sections:

1. Summary and conclusions
2. Description of project objectives, components and activities evaluated
3. Methodology used to develop findings
4. Implementation experience
5. Responses to core questions
6. Key findings: Impact, relevancy, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability
7. Conclusions and lessons learned (Inclusive best practices)
8. Recommendations

A completed evaluation should be sent first to the project holder or those who commissioned the evaluation. Key partners should have an opportunity to provide feedback before the evaluation is released to a wider circle in the organisation or the public. The project management and the project team / team leaders should ensure that evaluations are discussed at meetings and that a record of that discussion is made available in the organisation. Depending on the policy of the commissioning organisation, the evaluation should be disseminated widely, including on the Internet.

Following up on the organisations response to evaluation findings is an essential part of supporting use. The organisation can use the **results of a project evaluation** to

- Identify ways to improve or shift your project activities
- Facilitate changes in the project plan
- Prepare project reports (e.g., mid-term reports, final reports)
- Inform internal and external stakeholders about the project
- Plan for the sustainability of the project
- Learn more about the environment in which the project is being or has been carried out
- Learn more about the target population of the project
- Present the worth and value of the project to stakeholders and the public
- Plan for other projects
- Preparation and planning for a new project
- Compare projects to plan for their futures
- Make evidence-based organisational decisions
- Demonstrate the organisation's ability in performing evaluations when searching for funds
- Demonstrate the organisation's concerns to be accountable for implementing its plans, pursuing its goals, and measuring its outcomes.

Disseminating of the evaluation is often a management responsibility rather than evaluators. The organisation / management can make a list of options for follow-up.

Indeed, time should be built into the evaluation budget to account for support beyond report delivery. There are ranges of options that can be used:

- Annual reviews: Reviewing major evaluation findings and conclusions based on evaluation studies completed during the preceding year.
- Conference Co-presentations: Take place when evaluators and evaluation commissioners or users jointly present findings or discussions about processes from an evaluation.
- Data use calendar: Guides the collection of data and reporting requirements, as well as ensuring that analysis and evaluation data is actively used.
- Policy briefings: Providing evaluation findings and lessons learned in an accessible manner for target audiences that can be followed up by management and staff.
- Tracking the recommendations: Keeping a transparent record of the responses to and action from recommendations.
- Publishing parts of the evaluation and making the document available in public sphere.

CHAPTER-4

PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION

Participatory evaluation is an evaluation method, to which attentions are recently being drawn because stakeholders' participation in evaluation can improve the quality of its findings. There are a multitude of theories and methods for participatory evaluation, tailored to evaluation purposes or processes to be focused on. In the field of development assistance, different aid agencies have different definitions of participatory evaluation, but they seem to share common ideas including:

- 1) That it is performed jointly by the project participants including the beneficiary population, and
- 2) That a wide spectrum of parties concerned will actively participate in the whole process of the evaluation, from evaluation design through information gathering and analysis to feedback of findings.

However, the extent of project participants and degree of participation are different, depending on aid agencies and specific projects.

Having such characteristics, participatory evaluation takes a different approach from traditional evaluation that is performed by evaluation experts or a particular group of experts. In participatory evaluation, the stakeholders themselves perform a value judgment about the evaluation, a decision about the evaluation methods, including evaluation criteria by consensus among participants, and investigate and extract findings. Arguably, capacity development of participants (Abilities in task analysis, self-evaluation, etc.) can be expected from these processes, exerting positive influence on subsequent implementation of the project. Therefore, in participatory evaluation, evaluation experts should abandon their traditional role of assessors, concentrating on such roles as meeting convener, opportunity provider, facilitator, catalyst, or supporter. Evaluators should commit themselves to be facilitators, indirectly supporting stakeholders to perform evaluation.

Participatory evaluation does not work well if participation is introduced only in the evaluation stage. This is because sharing the merit of participatory evaluation becomes difficult without constant participation of stakeholders throughout planning and implementation processes.

CHAPTER-5

EQUITY-FOCUSED EVALUATION

An equity-focused evaluation looks explicitly at the equity dimensions of interventions, going beyond conventional quantitative data to the analysis of behavioural change, complex social processes and attitudes, and collecting information on difficult-to-reach socially marginalised groups. In addition, Equity-focused evaluations study the processes through which interventions are implemented and the context in which they operate.

Equity-focused evaluation contributes to two additional main objectives (Beside the other objectives mentioned in 2.1.):

Empowerment of worst-off groups. If equity-focused evaluation is to be truly relevant to interventions whose objective is to improve the well-being of worst-off groups, the evaluation processes must be used to foster wider participation of worst-off groups, facilitate dialogue between policy makers and representatives of worst-off groups, build consensus, and create “buy-in” to recommendations. In addition, involving these groups in the evaluation can be empowering. It imparts skills, information and self-confidence and so enhances the “evaluative thinking”. It can also strengthen the capacity of worst-off groups to be effective evidence-based advocates. Employing equity-focused evaluation as a project strategy to achieve empowerment can be very effective, and it can reinforce the other objectives of evaluation.

Empowering worst-off groups, including children, through equity-focused evaluation processes

Equity-focused evaluation processes should be used to empower worst-off groups to the maximum extent possible, as well as to ensure that evaluation questions are relevant to the situation of these groups. This has two major implications:

Equity-focused evaluation should be culturally sensitive and pay high attention to ethics. Evaluators should be sensitive to local beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relationships with all stakeholders, including worst-off groups, as stated in the

standards for evaluation in the UN System (UNEG 2005). In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights conventions, evaluators undertaking equity-focused evaluation should operate in accordance with international values. Evaluators should be aware of differences in culture; local customs; religious beliefs and practices; personal interaction and gender roles; disability; age and ethnicity; and, be mindful of the potential implications of these differences when planning, carrying out and reporting on evaluations. In addition, the evaluators should ensure that their contacts with individuals are characterised by respect. Evaluators should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might often negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, the evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its objectives and results in a way that clearly respects the dignity and self-worth of the worst-off groups.

Equity-focused evaluation should use participatory and/or empowerment evaluation processes to ensure worst-off groups are involved and/or co-leading the equity-focused evaluation process starting at the design phase. Participatory equity-focused evaluation processes should pay particular attention to existing imbalances in power relationship between worst-off groups and other groups in society. This is to avoid worst-off groups participating in the equity-focused evaluation being merely “providers” of information or even of being manipulated or excluded. Selection of stakeholders in these evaluation processes should ensure that the processes and methods used serve to correct, not reinforce, patterns of inequity and exclusion. In addition, these evaluations must also be aware of power relations within worst-off groups. In many ethnic minorities and under-disadvantaged groups, certain sectors are further marginalised on the basis of factors such as age, gender, land ownership, relative wealth or region of origin. Great cultural sensitivity is required to respect cultural norms while ensuring that marginalised groups are able to participate and have access to services.

Equity-focused evaluations should also involve children as appropriate, since children are also among the worst-off groups. The Convention of the Rights of the Child provides clear initial guidance for the participation of children in evaluation, when it states that the views of children must be considered and taken into account in all matters that affect them. They should not be

used merely as data providers or subjects of investigation (CRC, 1990). Article 13 of the CRC states that children have the right to freedom of expression, which includes seeking, receiving and giving information and ideas through speaking, writing or in print, through art or any other media of the child's choice. Their participation is not a mere formality; children must be fully informed and must understand the consequences and impact of expressing their opinions. The corollary is that children are free not to participate, and should not be pressured. Participation is a right, not an obligation.

CHAPTER-6

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Developing a well-specified Terms of Reference (ToR) is a vital step in managing a high-quality evaluation. ToRs provide an important overview of what is expected in an evaluation. In an external evaluation the ToR document provides the basis for a contractual arrangement between the commissioners of an evaluation and a consultant/evaluation team and establishes the parameters against which the success of an evaluation assignment can be assessed. The specific content and format for a ToR will vary to some extent according to organizational requirements, local practices, and the type of assignment. Common elements of a ToR include:

- 1. Why and for whom the evaluation is being done**
 - Background knowledge about the evaluation and including objective, strategy and progress to date
 - Objective(s) of the evaluation
 - Primary intended users and uses
 - Key evaluation questions.
- 2. How it will be accomplished**
 - Overall scope and approach
 - Evaluation methodology/evaluation plan (sometimes done as part of the ToR and sometimes done as part of the evaluation proposal or as the first deliverable in the evaluation project)
- 3. Who will undertake the evaluation and accountabilities**
 - Professional qualifications, experience and expertise required for the evaluator or evaluation team.
 - Roles and responsibilities of the parties, including processes for signing off on the evaluation plan and reports
- 4. Milestones, deliverables and timelines**
 - What deliverables are required and when - for example, detailed evaluation plan, inception report, progress report, interim report, draft final report, final report

- Timelines
5. **What resources are available to conduct the evaluation?**
- Budget (if organisation's policy allows this to be stated)
 - Existing data

Annex 2 gives a general guideline for the preparation of an evaluation

Annex 3 gives an example of ToR.

CHAPTER-7

REFLECTION

Here are some questions for you to reflect on and even open up for discussion in your organisation:

- Clarify the distinction between monitoring and evaluation.
- What are your experiences of evaluations, either conducting them or being evaluated in the project in which you work?
- What are the different stakeholder groups in your project? How they might react to an evaluation? How can you try to overcome the problems of people reacting negatively?
- What would be the good aspects of evaluating your project? What type of evaluation would you choose?
- What other types of problems occur from your viewpoint in an evaluation? How can you avoid or limit some of these problems?
- Do you have currently an evaluation system in place in your organization? If yes, describe it in brief. How does it work and do you think it can be improved?
- What are your views on ethical standards and guidelines for evaluations? Which aspect is most important to you?
- How would you plan an evaluation for your project?
- What information would you need to evaluate a project?
- What methods would you use to evaluate a project?
- What are the main skills you would need to be able to evaluate a project?
- When you collect information out in the community how do you know it is accurate
- How would you use the findings from an evaluation in your project?

REFERENCES

Quality standards for development evaluations, DAC Guidelines and reference series, OECD, 2010

Evaluation quality standards, DAC, Evaluation Network, OECD, 2010

Writing terms of references for evaluations, Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) of the World Bank, USA, 2011

Code of conduct for evaluations, United Nations Evaluation Group, USA, 2007

Welthungerhilfe, Concept paper, impact-oriented evaluation, Bonn, 2003

Outcome mapping, building learning and reflection into development programmes, Sarah

Earl et al, International Development and Research Centre (IDRC), Canada, 2010

Tools and methods for evaluating the efficiency of development interventions, Federal

Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Berlin, 2011

Standards for evaluation, German Evaluation Society, Mainz 2014

Capturing change in women's realities, a critical overview of current M&E frameworks and approaches, Association for Women's Rights in Development, Canada, 2010

Guide for project M&W, International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Italy 2010

How to design and manage equity focussed evaluations, UNICEF, USA, 2011

ANNEXURES

ANNEX 1: OECD / DAC QUALITY STANDARDS FOR EVALUATIONS.

Introduction

The DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation identify the key pillars needed for a quality development evaluation process and product. They are intended for use by evaluation managers and practitioners. The Standards are not mandatory, but provide a guide to good practice. They were developed primarily for use by DAC members, but broader use by all other development partners is welcome.

The Standards aim to improve quality and ultimately to strengthen the contribution of evaluation to improving development outcomes. Specifically, the Standards are intended to:

- improve the quality of development evaluation processes and products, facilitate the comparison of evaluations across countries,
- support partnerships and collaboration on joint evaluations, and
- increase development partners' use of each others' evaluation findings.

The Standards support evaluations that adhere to the *DAC Principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance* (1991), including impartiality, independence, credibility and usefulness, and should be read in conjunction with those principles. The Principles focus on the management and institutional set up of evaluation systems and remain the benchmark against which OECD DAC members are assessed in DAC Peer Reviews. By contrast, the Standards inform evaluation processes and products. The Standards can be used during the different stages of the evaluation process and in a variety of ways, including to assess the quality of evaluations, inform practice, strengthen and harmonise evaluation training, or as an input to create evaluation guidelines or policy documents.

The Standards should be applied sensibly and adapted to local and national contexts and the objectives of each evaluation. They are not intended to be used as an evaluation manual

and do not supplant specific guidance on particular types of evaluation, methodologies or approaches. Further, these Standards do not exclude the use of other evaluation quality standards and related texts, such as those developed by individual agencies, professional evaluation societies and networks.

This document is structured in line with a typical evaluation process: defining purpose, planning, designing, implementing, reporting, and learning from and using evaluation results. The Standards begin with some overall considerations to keep in mind throughout the evaluation process. An annex provides references to related OECD DAC development evaluation publications.

Terms used in this document

The term ‘development intervention’ is used in the Standards as a general term for any activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, theme, sector, instrument, modality, institutional performance, etc, aimed to promote development.

The term ‘evaluation report’ is used to cover all evaluation products, which may take different forms, including written or oral reports, visual presentations, community workshops, etc.

1 OVERARCHING CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION

Development evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed development intervention, its design, implementation and results. In the development context, evaluation refers to the process of determining the worth or significance of a development intervention.

When carrying out a development evaluation the following overarching considerations are taken into account throughout the process.

1.2 FREE AND OPEN EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation process is transparent and independent from programme management and policy-making, to enhance credibility.

1.3 EVALUATION ETHICS

Evaluation abides by relevant professional and ethical guidelines and codes of conduct for individual evaluators. Evaluation is undertaken with integrity and honesty. Commissioners, evaluation managers and evaluators respect human rights and differences in culture, customs, religious beliefs and practices of all stakeholders.

Evaluators are mindful of gender roles, ethnicity, ability, age, sexual orientation, language and other differences when designing and carrying out the evaluation.

1.4 PARTNERSHIP APPROACH

In order to increase ownership of development and build mutual accountability for results, a partnership approach to development evaluation is systematically considered early in the process. The concept of partnership connotes an inclusive process, involving different stakeholders such as government, parliament, civil society, intended beneficiaries and international partners.

1.5 CO-ORDINATION AND ALIGNMENT

To help improve co-ordination of development evaluation and strengthen country systems, the evaluation process takes into account national and local evaluation plans, activities and policies.

1.6 CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Positive effects of the evaluation process on the evaluation capacity of development partners are maximised. An evaluation may, for instance, support capacity development by improving evaluation knowledge and skills, strengthening evaluation management, stimulating demand for and use of evaluation findings, and supporting an environment of accountability and learning.

1.7 QUALITY CONTROL

Quality control is exercised throughout the evaluation process. Depending on the evaluation's scope and complexity, quality control is carried out through an internal and/or external mechanism, for example peer review, advisory panel, or reference group.

2 PURPOSE, PLANNING AND DESIGN

2.1 RATIONALE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The rationale, purpose and intended use of the evaluation are stated clearly, addressing: why the evaluation is being undertaken at this particular point in time, why and for whom it is undertaken, and how the evaluation is to be used for learning and/or accountability functions.

For example the evaluation's overall purpose may be to:

- contribute to improving a development policy, procedure or technique,
- consider the continuation or discontinuation of a project or programme,
- account for public expenditures and development results to stakeholders and tax payers.

2.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The specific objectives of the evaluation clarify what the evaluation aims to find out.

For example to:

- ascertain results (output, outcome, impact) and assess the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability of a specific development intervention,
- provide findings, conclusions and recommendations with respect to a specific development intervention in order to draw lessons for future design and implementation.

2.3 EVALUATION OBJECT AND SCOPE

The development intervention being evaluated (the evaluation object) is clearly defined, including a description of the intervention logic or theory. The evaluation

scope defines the time period, funds spent, geographical area, target groups, organisational set-up, implementation arrangements, policy and institutional context and other dimensions to be covered by the evaluation. Discrepancies between the planned and actual implementation of the development intervention are identified.

2.4 EVALUABILITY

The feasibility of an evaluation is assessed. Specifically, it should be determined whether or not the development intervention is adequately defined and its results verifiable, and if evaluation is the best way to answer questions posed by policy makers or stakeholders.

2.5 STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

Relevant stakeholders are involved early on in the evaluation process and given the opportunity to contribute to evaluation design, including by identifying issues to be addressed and evaluation questions to be answered.

2.6 SYSTEMATIC CONSIDERATION OF JOINT EVALUATION

To contribute to harmonisation, alignment and an efficient division of labour, donor agencies and partner countries systematically consider the option of a joint evaluation, conducted collaboratively by more than one agency and/or partner country.

Joint evaluations address both questions of common interest to all partners and specific questions of interest to individual partners.

2.7 EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation objectives are translated into relevant and specific evaluation questions. Evaluation questions are decided early on in the process and inform the development of the methodology. The evaluation questions also address cross-cutting issues, such as gender, environment and human rights.

2.8 SELECTION AND APPLICATION OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation applies the agreed DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The application of these and any additional criteria depends on the evaluation questions and the objectives of the evaluation. If a particular criterion is not applied and/or any additional criteria added, this is explained in the evaluation report. All criteria applied are defined in unambiguous terms.

2.9 SELECTION OF APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose, scope and evaluation questions determine the most appropriate approach and methodology for each evaluation. An inception report can be used to inform the selection of an evaluation approach.

The methodology is developed in line with the evaluation approach chosen. The methodology includes specification and justification of the design of the evaluation and the techniques for data collection and analysis. The selected methodology answers the evaluation questions using credible evidence. A clear distinction is made between the different result levels (intervention logic containing an objective-means hierarchy stating input, output, outcome, impact).

Indicators for measuring achievement of the objectives are validated according to generally accepted criteria, such as SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Timely). Disaggregated data should be presented to clarify any differences between sexes and between different groups of poor people, including excluded groups.

2.10 RESOURCES

The resources provided for the evaluation are adequate, in terms of funds, staff and skills, to ensure that the objectives of the evaluation can be fulfilled effectively.

2.11 GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES

The governance and management structures are designed to fit the evaluation's context, purpose, scope and objectives.

The evaluation governance structure safeguards credibility, inclusiveness, and transparency. Management organises the evaluation process and is responsible for day-to-day administration. Depending on the size and complexity of the evaluation, these functions may be combined or separate.

2.12 DOCUMENT DEFINING PURPOSE AND EXPECTATIONS

The planning and design phase culminates in the drafting of a clear and complete written document, usually called "Terms of Reference" (TOR), presenting the purpose, scope, and objectives of the evaluation; the methodology to be used; the resources and time allocated; reporting requirements; and any other expectations regarding the evaluation process and products. The document is agreed to by the evaluation manager(s) and those carrying out the evaluation. This document can alternatively be called "scope of work" or "evaluation mandate".

3. IMPLEMENTATION AND REPORTING

3.1 EVALUATION TEAM

A transparent and open procurement procedure is used for selecting the evaluation team.

The members of the evaluation team possess a mix of evaluative skills and thematic knowledge. Gender balance is considered and the team includes professionals from partner countries or regions concerned.

3.2 INDEPENDENCE OF EVALUATORS VIS-À-VIS STAKEHOLDERS

Evaluators are independent from the development intervention, including its policy, operations and management functions, as well as intended beneficiaries. Possible conflicts of interest are addressed openly and honestly. The evaluation team is able to

work freely and without interference. It is assured of co-operation and access to all relevant information.

3.3 CONSULTATION AND PROTECTION OF STAKEHOLDERS

The full range of stakeholders, including both partners and donors, are consulted during the evaluation process and given the opportunity to contribute. The criteria for identifying and selecting stakeholders are specified.

The rights and welfare of participants in the evaluation are protected. Anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants is protected when requested or as needed.

3.4 IMPLEMENTATION OF EVALUATION WITHIN ALLOTTED TIME AND BUDGET

The evaluation is conducted and results are made available to commissioners in a timely manner to achieve the objectives of the evaluation. The evaluation is carried out efficiently and within budget. Changes in conditions and circumstances are reported and un-envisaged changes to timeframe and budget are explained, discussed and agreed between the relevant parties.

3.5 EVALUATION REPORT

The evaluation report can readily be understood by the intended audience(s) and the form of the report is appropriate given the purpose(s) of the evaluation.

The report covers the following elements and issues:

3.6 CLARITY AND REPRESENTATIVENESS OF SUMMARY

A written evaluation report contains an executive summary. The summary provides an overview of the report, highlighting the main findings, conclusions, recommendations and any overall lessons.

3.7 CONTEXT OF THE DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTION

The evaluation report describes the context of the development intervention, including:

- policy context, development agency and partner policies, objectives and strategies;
- development context, including socio-economic, political and cultural factors; and
- institutional context and stakeholder involvement.

The evaluation identifies and assesses the influence of the context on the performance of the development intervention.

3.8 INTERVENTION LOGIC

The evaluation report describes and assesses the intervention logic or theory, including underlying assumptions and factors affecting the success of the intervention.

3.9 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF INFORMATION SOURCES

The evaluation report describes the sources of information used (documents, respondents, administrative data, literature, etc.) in sufficient detail so that the adequacy of the information can be assessed. The evaluation report explains the selection of case studies or any samples. Limitations regarding the representativeness of the samples are identified.

The evaluation cross-validates the information sources and critically assesses the validity and reliability of the data.

Complete lists of interviewees and other information sources consulted are included in the report, to the extent that this does not conflict with the privacy and confidentiality of participants.

3.10 EXPLANATION OF THE METHODOLOGY USED

The evaluation report describes and explains the evaluation methodology and its application. In assessing outcomes and impacts, attribution and/or contribution to results are explained. The report acknowledges any constraints encountered and how

these have affected the evaluation, including the independence and impartiality of the evaluation. It details the techniques used for data collection and analysis. The choices are justified and limitations and shortcomings are explained.

3.11 CLARITY OF ANALYSIS

The evaluation report presents findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons separately and with a clear logical distinction between them.

Findings flow logically from the analysis of the data, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. Conclusions are substantiated by findings and analysis. Recommendations and any lessons follow logically from the conclusions. Any assumptions underlying the analysis are made explicit.

3.12 EVALUATION QUESTIONS ANSWERED

The evaluation report answers all the questions detailed in the TOR for the evaluation. Where this is not possible, explanations are provided. The original questions, as well as any revisions to these questions, are documented in the report for readers to be able to assess whether the evaluation team has sufficiently addressed the questions, including those related to cross-cutting issues, and met the evaluation objectives.

3.13 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CHANGES AND LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation report explains any limitations in process, methodology or data, and discusses validity and reliability. It indicates any obstruction of a free and open evaluation process which may have influenced the findings. Any discrepancies between the planned and actual implementation and products of the evaluation are explained.

3.14 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF DISAGREEMENTS WITHIN THE EVALUATION TEAM

Evaluation team members have the opportunity to dissociate themselves from particular judgments and recommendations on which they disagree. Any unresolved

differences of opinion within the team are acknowledged in the report.

3.15 INCORPORATION OF STAKEHOLDERS' COMMENTS

Relevant stakeholders are given the opportunity to comment on the draft report. The final evaluation report reflects these comments and acknowledges any substantive disagreements. In disputes about facts that can be verified, the evaluators investigate and change the draft where necessary. In the case of opinion or interpretation, stakeholders' comments are reproduced verbatim, in an annex or footnote, to the extent that this does not conflict with the rights and welfare of participants.

4 FOLLOW-UP, USE AND LEARNING

4.1 TIMELINESS, RELEVANCE AND USE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation is designed, conducted and reported to meet the needs of the intended users. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons are clear, relevant, targeted and actionable so that the evaluation can be used to achieve its intended learning and accountability objectives. The evaluation is delivered in time to ensure optimal use of the results.

Systematic dissemination, storage and management of the evaluation report is ensured to provide easy access to all development partners, to reach target audiences, and to maximise the learning benefits of the evaluation.

4.2 SYSTEMATIC RESPONSE TO AND FOLLOW-UP ON RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations are systematically responded to and action taken by the person(s)/body targeted in each recommendation. This includes a formal management response and follow-up. All agreed follow-up actions are tracked to ensure accountability for their implementation.

4.3 DISSEMINATION

The evaluation results are presented in an accessible format and are systematically distributed internally and externally for learning and follow-up actions and to ensure

transparency. In light of lessons emerging from the evaluation, additional interested parties in the wider development community are identified and targeted to maximise the use of relevant findings.

ANNEX 2: GENERAL GUIDELINE FOR THE PREPARATION OF AN EVALUATION

Relevancy:	Is the project doing the right thing?
Effectiveness:	Has the project achieved its specific objectives? Is the program doing the thing right?
Impacts:	What is the change at the beneficiary level / long term effects and changes caused by the programme
Efficiency / cost effectiveness:	Has the project achieved its objectives in an economically way?
Sustainability:	Do positive impacts last over time?

1. INTRODUCTION

- Objective of the evaluation and key questions
- Profile of the consultant or members of the evaluation team and their independency
- Methodology including sampling, etc.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

- Short description: Project objectives, budget, duration of the program, database, description of the target group and beneficiaries, staff member of projects, staff structure etc.

3. PROJECT HOLDERS AND PARTNERS

- Staff competencies and development
- Other relevant changes of the project holders and partners

4. IMPACT ANALYSIS

4.1. RELEVANCY (IS THE PROJECT DOING THE RIGHT THING?)

- To what extent is the project suitable to contribute to solving crucial development problems of the target groups
- To what extent does the project comply with official (Sectoral) policies and action plans and international efforts (e.g. MDGs/SDGs)?

4.2. EFFECTIVENESS (HAS THE PROJECT ACHIEVED ITS SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES? IS THE PROJECT DOING THE THING RIGHT?)

- To what extent were the specific objectives achieved? Has the project exceeded or has it fallen short? (Planned vs. achieved comparison)
- What are determining reasons for reaching or not-reaching the objectives?
- What is the contribution of different stakeholders towards positive or negative target achievements?

4.3. EFFICIENCY (HAS THE PROJECT ACHIEVED ITS OBJECTIVES IN AN ECONOMICALLY WAY?)

- Appropriateness of resources mobilized in the course of the implementation in comparison with results achieved (Cost-benefit-analysis or cost-impact-analysis).
- Were program activities adequately coordinated with other organizations, programs, etc.? What has supported or hampered coordination?
- Were services and contributions provided and achieved at the right time and in an appropriate time frame?

4.4. IMPACTS (INDUCED CHANGES AND CONTRIBUTION TO THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE OVERALL OBJECTIVE)

- To what extent has the project contributed to the achievement of the overall objective? What (Positive and negative) changes can be observed?
- What kind of changes on different levels (Population, sector, institutions, etc.) can be linked to the interventions of the project? What did the project contribute?
- What kind of structural changes at the higher levels (block, district, state) can be linked to the interventions of the project? What did the project contribute? How far does the concept have the potential to contribute to structural changes in monitoring the existing legislation or even improving legislative mechanisms?

- What are determining reasons for reaching or not-reaching the intended impacts?

4.5. SUSTAINABILITY (DO POSITIVE IMPACTS LAST OVER TIME?)

- To what extent can achievements of the program be secured?
- What approaches, instruments, methods or concepts did the target groups, local counterparts or other actors adopt? How far are they institutionalised or further developed? How does this look like?
- To what extent and how long are (Organisational, personnel, financial, economical, etc.) resources and capacities available to secure (Future) impacts?
- What are crucial risk factors for sustainable development and long-term impacts? How is the current situation and expected situation concerning those risk factors?

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS (FOR THE DONOR AND THE PROJECT HOLDERS AS WELL AS CONCERNING PROJECT MANAGEMENT)

- Project specific conclusion, incl. its potential to contribute to structural changes
- Follow-up recommendations (E.g. follow-up without changes in objectives, strategies and activities or follow-up with modified objectives, strategies and activities or extension of program duration)
- Recommendations for (Additional) important activities to achieve the project objectives
- Major lessons learned and good / best practices

ANNEX 3: EXAMPLE OF TOR

Evaluation Theme Leaders are responsible for drafting Terms of Reference, drawing on the Approach Paper and consulting appropriately. Consultants will not normally be involved in this process. The following provides an overview of the minimum content required within Terms of Reference for development of an Evaluation Study.

TITLE:

1. BACKGROUND

General narrative, to include as a minimum:

- Origins and context of the study
- Detail on existing key initiatives and studies within the area
- Relevance to 3-yr evaluation study topic list and/or approved Annual Work plan
- Linkages and potential synergies with other areas of work within XXX (and with other donors)
- Any findings from the study scoping work
- Key findings and recommendations from the Approach Paper
- Proposed Governance arrangements (Management and Reference Groups), as proposed within the Approach Paper
- Lead Director for the study

2. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

To include, as a minimum:

- Rationale / intervention logic for the study
- Evaluation questions to be answered by the study
- Gender issues to be addressed
- Target audience/s

3. EXISTING INFORMATION SOURCES

Detail any relevant sources and documentation for the study, including commentary on the quality and reliability of any datasets / resources. This should include:

4. METHODOLOGY

Outline the key principles behind the study, and provide a breakdown of the primary activities and milestones (including a detailed timetable) that will be necessary for delivery of the study. This should incorporate detail on the stakeholders to be consulted during the work.

5. SKILLS AND QUALIFICATIONS

Provide detail on the essential and desirable competencies and experience that the contractor/s will need to deliver the work.

6. LOGISTICS AND PROCEDURES

Use this section to detail any resources that will be available to the contractors, such as in-country transport, translation and logistical support, office space, and insurances.

In addition, this section should be used to detail, *as a minimum*, the procedures that DFID will apply with regards to:

- Who will be responsible for compiling initial documentation (EvD, Evaluator and/or Evaluatee)
- An indication of the time that is likely to be required to collate, at least, internal DFID documentation
- Ethics
- Fieldwork
- Inception, workplanning and review meetings
- Commenting on study outputs (including timescales)
- Quality assurance of study outputs (including timescales)
- Post-study learning review

7. OUTPUTS

The Terms of Reference should require contractors to produce, *as a minimum*, the following outputs:

- Communications plan (to be developed and delivered during inception phase of study)

- Evaluation Study Report (to include a set of actionable recommendations)

Delivery timescales should be clearly stated for these and any other outputs. Additionally, the Terms of Reference should indicate that all outputs must be in line with guidance as set out within “*Editorial requirements for consultants preparing evaluation reports for xxx*”.

8. REPORTING AND CONTRACTING ARRANGEMENTS

Names, contact details and contractual responsibilities of the Evaluation Theme Leader and Evaluation Manager that will support the development and delivery of the study. This section should also include detail on the roles and responsibilities of any Steering Groups that will oversee the study.

9. BUDGET

Include budget detail, or does this go against tendering guidance? If including budget, can / should this be broken down against activities and milestones from section 4 above?

ANNEXES

Attach any information that will closely inform proposals being developed in response to the TORs, such as:

- Approach Paper
- Details of any monitoring or results frameworks that have direct relevance to the study
- Terms of Reference for any Management or Reference Groups overseeing the study
- Editorial requirements for consultants preparing evaluation reports for xxx.
- Evaluation Guidance Notes:
 - Ethics
 - Fieldwork Rights, Roles and Responsibilities