Managing Evaluations in IUCN

A Guide for IUCN Programme and Project Managers

MANAGING EVALUATIONS

Prepared by the IUCN Monitoring & Evaluation Initiative

IUCN
The World Conservation Union

Managing Evaluations in IUCN

A Guide for IUCN Programme and Project Managers

Prepared by the IUCN Monitoring & Evaluation Initiative

2004

IUCN
The World Conservation Union

This publication has been made possible by funding from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD), the Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Danida), the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), and the Director- General of International Cooperation, The Netherlands (DGIS).

Published by: IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK

Citation: IUCN (2004) *Managing Evaluations: A Guide for IUCN Programme and Project Managers*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. 40 pp.

ISBN: 2-8317-0867-2

Cover design by: L'IV Communications, Chemin de la Brume 2, 1110 Morges 3

Layout by: Nikki Meith

Produced by: IUCN Monitoring & Evaluation Initiative

Translated by: Amalia Thaler

Printed by: SADAG Imprimerie, Bellegarde-sur-Valserine, France

Available from: IUCN Monitoring & Evaluation Initiative
Contact: evaluation@iucn.org
Tel: +41 22 999 0271

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Each year IUCN undertakes between 40-60 evaluations of projects, programme and organizational units. When compared with other organizations, this represents a significant level of evaluation activity. However for these evaluations to be effective and to play a major role in enhancing the performance of the Union they must be well managed.

The audience for this Guide is IUCN project and programme managers who initiate and manage the evaluations in IUCN. The purpose is to assist you as a manager in better managing evaluations that are required by donors as well as those you choose to initiate internally.

PART 1 provides an overview of IUCN's Evaluation Policy, emphasizing the most relevant issues for managers.

PART 2 reviews your general responsibilities with respect to evaluations in your project or programme.

PART 3 describes a standard evaluation process in IUCN and provides guidance for managing each stage in the evaluation process.

Annex 1 contains core evaluation references including evaluation journals, books and websites that managers may find useful.

In preparing the Guide we have drawn on materials developed by other organizations, including:

- The "Step-by-Step Guide to Managing Evaluations" developed by the Evaluation and Policy Unit of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR);
- The International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET)**:** Building Skills to Evaluate Development Interventions, "IPDET 2001," a course developed by the World Bank's Operations Evaluation Department (OED) and the Faculty of Public Affairs and Management at Carleton University; and
- "Program Evaluation: A Train the Trainer Workshop", a course designed by Universalia Management Group.

We welcome feedback on this Guide and suggestions for improvements – things you need to know more about, things that are not clear in the Guide.

Please send your comments and suggestions to evaluation@iucn.org.

I am grateful for the assistance of Charles Lusthaus and Marie-Helène Adrien (Universalia Management Group) in the prepration of this Guide and for the feedback from past and present regional M&E staff and consultants – Natalia Ortiz (Latin America), Veronica Muthui (Southern Africa), Mine Pabari (Eastern Africa), François Kedowide (West Africa) and Alejandro Imbach (Asia).

Nancy MacPherson, Coordinator, Monitoring and Evaluation
Email: Nancy.MacPherson@iucn.org

PART one

IUCN Policy and Rationale for Evaluation

EVALUATION IN IUCN

Evaluation is a broad term that can mean different things in different organizations. In IUCN evaluation is defined as:

> *a periodic assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of a policy, programme, project, Commission or organizational unit in the context of stated objectives. An evaluation may also include an assessment of unintended impacts.*

Evaluations are seen as formal activities of IUCN, comprising applied research techniques to generate systematic information that can help to improve the performance of the Secretariat. Evaluation studies are usually undertaken as an independent examination of the background, strategy, objectives, results, activities, and means deployed, with a view to drawing lessons that may guide future work.

IUCN also supports and promotes self-assessment processes and internal peer review processes, which although often considered less independent than external evaluations, help to build an internal culture of reflection and evaluation, as well as stronger ownership of the results. Regardless of whether an evaluation is a self-evaluation or one carried out by an external evaluator, all evaluations require the attention of managers and all must be carefully planned and conducted, according to the IUCN Evaluation Policy and standards.

THE PURPOSES OF EVALUATION

Evaluations provide performance information that is necessary for project and programme managers, the Director General, the Commissions and the Council, to carry out their accountability requirements. In addition, evaluations are part of the ongoing feedback, learning, and change process necessary for modern organizations. In IUCN, there are two purposes of evaluation:

Learning and Improvement

This focuses on using evaluation as part of the *learning* environment for IUCN, its partners and members. It involves the creation of an environment that engages staff and their partners in creative ways to learn how to improve IUCN's work. In this context, evaluations are instruments for making IUCN's policies, programmes, projects, and organizational units more effective through the provision of useful feedback and a commitment to act on that feedback. By doing so, evaluations are a way to understand why IUCN activities succeed or not. As learning tools, evaluations add to our body of knowledge with respect to best practices in evaluation and conservation.

Accountability

Evaluations are also part of IUCN's overall *accountability* system. IUCN must be able to demonstrate to its members, partners and donors whether IUCN's policies, programmes, and operations are working

well, and that its resources are used in a responsible way. The evaluation process, including the fulfillment of contractual and internal evaluation requirements holds IUCN staff and its contracted implementing partners responsible for their performance.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Evaluation Policy indicates that in general, evaluations in IUCN explore five major criteria, not all of which need to be systematically reviewed in all cases. In certain cases, e.g. organizational evaluations such as Commissions or Regional Offices, IUCN will make modifications to these criteria to fit the specific nature of the evaluation. In all cases, an IUCN evaluation must first consider all these criteria and decide which are the most important for the situation. IUCN evaluation TORs and reports must explicitly state the criteria used in the evaluation.

Relevance

The extent to which the policy, programme, project or the organizational unit contributes to the strategic direction of IUCN and/or its members and partners. Is it appropriate in the context of its environment?

Effectiveness

The extent to which intended outputs (products, services, deliverables) are achieved. To what extent are these outputs used to bring about the desired outcomes?

Efficiency

The extent to which resources are used cost-effectively? Do the quality and quantity of results achieved justify the resources used? Are there more cost-effective methods of achieving the same result?

Impact

The changes in conditions of people and ecosystems that result from an intervention (i.e. policy, programme or project). What are the positive, negative, direct, indirect, intended or unintended effects?

Sustainability

The extent to which the enabling environment supports continuity of the policy, programme, project or work of the organizational unit. To what extent will the outcomes be maintained after development support is withdrawn?

Other specific concerns such as financial viability, equity, gender, poverty reduction are also important criteria and should be explored as required by the situation.

Planning, monitoring and evaluation are linked to a regular programme planning process in IUCN led by the office of the Director of IUCN's Global Programme. Programme planning sets the stage for monitoring and assessing progress of activities and outputs against plans. Evaluation makes judgements about the quality of the programme work and the relevance of IUCN's work to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of natural resources.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR EVALUATION IN IUCN

The IUCN Evaluation Policy specifies that evaluations must adhere to 11 principles. These principles are based on best practice in the development evaluation field as found in OECD, bilateral and multilateral agency evaluation practices. These principles act as the foundation for the standards for IUCN evaluation practice. Managers are expected to promote and safeguard these principles in the management of evaluation processes in IUCN.

IUCN Principles for Evaluation	
Results-oriented accountability	Evaluations should make relevant links to the overall results and outputs of IUCN's programmes and policies.
Improving planning and delivery	Evaluations must provide useful findings and recommendations for action by managers.
Quality control	Evaluations must meet certain standards for acceptable procedures and products.
Supporting an evaluation culture	Evaluation is seen as a tool to help staff improve their work and results; it should be incorporated into ongoing work processes and incentive systems.
Work in partnership	Evaluations should consider the participation of members and other stakeholders.
Transparency	Evaluations require clear communication with all those involved in and affected by the evaluation.
Accessibility	The results of evaluations should be readily available to members, partners, donors and other stakeholders between Congresses, and at the World Congress itself; evaluation abstracts should be on the IUCN web site.
Ethics	Managers should carefully assess if evaluation is the appropriate tool to use in a given situation. Managers should remain open to the results, and consider the welfare of those involved in and affected by evaluations.
Impartiality	Evaluations should be fair and complete and should review strengths and weaknesses. The procedures should aim to minimize distortion caused by personal biases.
Credibility	Evaluations should adhere to standards or best practices, as developed by IUCN, and managers should strive to improve the quality of evaluations over time.
Utility	Evaluations must serve the information needs of intended users.

For a more detailed description of these principles, please refer to the IUCN Evaluation Policy. Additional information on evaluation standards can be found in the book by James R. Sanders entitled *The Program Evaluation Standards: How to Assess Evaluations of Educational Programs*, cited in Annex 1 on Core Resources for Evaluation in IUCN.

TYPES OF EVALUATION

IUCN engages in a range of evaluation activities at different levels and with different purposes. Programme and project managers should be familiar with these different types of evaluations.

IUCN's Evaluation Policy indicates the objectives of and level of intervention (organizational, programme, project, etc.) for different types of evaluation in IUCN. These evaluations can be carried out during implementation of activities, known as 'formative' evaluations, in order to provide programme design and performance feedback. Alternatively, evaluations may be conducted at the completion of activities, sometimes called 'summative' evaluations. They primarily assess outcomes and impacts.

Types of Evaluation in IUCN

TYPE OF EVALUATION	WHAT IS IT?	WHY IS IT CONDUCTED?
Meta Evaluation	Systematic analysis of previous evaluations	Generate knowledge about the quality of IUCN evaluations
Synthesis Evaluation	Systematic review that draws together the findings, recommendations and lessons of several evaluations with a common thread (thematic, geographic, etc.)	Learn across thematic programmes, projects or regions
Policy evaluation	Systematic review of Council-approved policies	Determine extent to which adequate guidance is given with respect to the specific policy area
Organizational evaluation	Systematic review of the performance of structural organizational units	Identify ways to improve the management and delivery of results in one or more structural unit (such as a regional programme, thematic programme or a Commission)
Programme (thematic) evaluation	Systematic review of programmes of the Secretariat as approved by IUCN Council	Assess the contribution of the programme outputs to the Key Result Areas or Objectives of the programme
Project evaluation	Systematic review of a time-bound set of activities aimed at solving specific conservation / development problem	Assess a project's contribution to solving the conservation / development problem that it has targeted
Strategic review	Selective evaluation that focuses on limited set of questions and areas of performance; conducted at the request of Director General and senior management	Address one or more issues related to rationale, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and financial viability at the level of policy, programme, project or organizational unit
Self-assessment	An internally guided and controlled process of self-assessment	Promote on-going processes of reflection and improvement, prepare for external evaluations or critical decisions at the level of policy, programme, project, or other organizational unit. In general, self assessment processes are initiated by a group or a unit for its own learning and improvement.

LINKING EVALUATION TO OTHER PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK MECHANISMS

While evaluation is an essential means of providing feedback to programme and project managers, it is not the only performance feedback process available. IUCN also uses internal audits, staff performance appraisals, monitoring and strategic planning to improve overall project and programme performance. Managers need to understand the differences and linkages between these mechanisms, and the role that each plays in reinforcing performance management and delivery of high-quality work in IUCN. As a manager, your role is to integrate these various management tools into an overall "performance management system".

In this context, it is important that each performance management component is used for its intended purpose and the data generated by each should be integrated into your decision making processes. Care needs to be taken to pick the right tool for the performance questions you may have. For example, internal audits could be used as a complementary process for programme and project evaluations but they are not a substitute for evaluation. Reviews and evaluations should not be used as a substitute for appraising the individual performance of managers and staff.

The following components comprise the IUCN Performance Management System:

- **Internal Audit** verifies that financial, administrative and operational policies are being implemented by all units within IUCN. Expected products include a yearly audit plan and independent audits that verify the quality and accuracy of financial information and verify that Council Policies are implemented. Such audits may lead to investigations of fraud and mismanagement if justified. For additional information, see the IUCN Internal Audit Policy.
- **Staff Performance Appraisal** process is an ongoing process to evaluate individual staff members' performance against set and agreed standards, objectives and targets and to take corrective action where required. Expected products include the individual performance appraisals carried out by programme managers, a summary report on the process and results presented to the Director General and the Human Resources Committee of Council, and performance management training and coaching made available to all managers. For additional information, see the IUCN Human Resource Policy.
- **Monitoring** provides regular information on the progress of programmes and projects and allows for adjustments and improvements to be made. Evaluation is conducted as a periodic event to gain more in-depth information of a programme or project. The existence of well-functioning, regular monitoring systems is a necessary basis for successful evaluations. For additional information, see the IUCN Quarterly Monitoring and Reporting System for the IUCN Intersessional Programme.

PART two

General Responsibilities of Managers for Evaluation in IUCN

INTRODUCTION

Depending on the circumstances, you will be working with or managing the following types of evaluation:

- *Organizational evaluations*, which are systematic reviews of the performance of structural organizational units such as regional or country programmes, thematic programmes or large projects;
- *Programme evaluations*, which are systematic reviews of component programmes of the Secretariat (thematic, global or regional) as approved by IUCN Council;
- *Project evaluations*, which are systematic reviews of a time-bound contractual set of activities aimed at solving a specific conservation / development problem;
- *Synthesis evaluations*, which are systematic reviews that draw together the findings, recommendations and lessons of several evaluations with a common thread (thematic, geographic, etc.);
- *Strategic reviews*, which are more selective evaluations that focus on a limited set of questions and areas of performance and are conducted at the request of the Director General and senior management;
- *Self assessments,* which are internally guided reflective processes initiated by a group and controlled by the group for its own learning and improvement.

You may play different roles in the different types of evaluations. Sometimes you will manage and implement the evaluation, as in the case of self-assessments and internal reviews. In the case of donor-required evaluations you will be involved in advising, monitoring and supporting their evaluation process. Other times you may be asked to manage the evaluation process conducted in your project, programme, Commission or organizational unit.

A Note About Self-Assessments

Self-assessments are increasingly being used by IUCN as a learning tool. In general, self-assessments are internally guided reflective processes initiated by a group or unit for its own learning and improvement. In IUCN's practice, questions have emerged concerning the ownership of the data or results of a self-assessment. Who owns the data? Do people outside the group have the authority to obtain the results of an assessment without consent of the group?

Depending on the agreement at the beginning of the self-assessment process, self-assessment results can either be used only by the group or they can be more generally used as an organizational document. The decision about use and control of the results needs to be made transparently at the beginning of the process. If ownership of the results is not clarified at the beginning of the process, the issue may be difficult to resolve at a later stage.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF MANAGERS

Even though your role may vary in the different types of evaluation that are conducted in IUCN, you always have a general set of responsibilities with respect to the evaluation function in your project or programme. Managers should always:

- Know and implement donor contractual requirements for evaluation of your programme and projects;
- Identify needs for internal evaluations and self-assessment processes that foster learning, reflection, and improvement;
- Ensure that resources for evaluation are built in to your budget at the target level of 3-5% of the total budget of your project or programme;
- Seek out the specialized M&E training needed to keep staff skills up-to-date on the use of evaluation techniques and tools;
- Link evaluations to the objectives of your component programme and, if possible, to the Intersessional Programme;
- Build time into workplans for anticipated evaluations;
- Liaise with the M&E global and regional staff to obtain the necessary support to design, manage and deliver high quality evaluations; and
- Create a culture of learning and reflection by actively using the results of evaluations for programme and project planning improvements.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF M & E STAFF

Regional and global M&E staff have specific responsibilities to assist you in initiating, managing and implementing the evaluations that you are responsible for.

Here are some of the roles they play to provide support to managers. They:

- Develop an annual evaluation plan and tracking system for evaluations and make this available to all programme managers throughout the Secretariat;
- Help managers to develop Terms of Reference for their evaluations, including helping you to identify appropriate evaluation questions, data collection tools and methods, good evaluators (consultants and internal peers);
- Provide advice on the quality of a good evaluation report;
- Help managers to monitor the quality of the evaluation process and suggest improvements;
- Help managers integrate evaluative thinking into strategic planning at all levels in the Secretariat;
- Provide training and coaching for staff and managers in the use of evaluation tools;
- Create processes to help IUCN staff learn lessons from the Secretariat's evaluation experience;
- Manage special evaluation studies as requested by the Director General, Regional Director, or the Director of IUCN's Global Programme;
- Participate on a selective basis in evaluation teams regionally and globally;
- Engage in research and development related to improved M&E tools and practices in the conservation field; and
- Connect IUCN to the professional evaluation community.

PART three

Guidance on How to Manage Evaluations

Most evaluations in IUCN will follow a standard process that begins with a planning stage and ends with the actions taken to follow up on the evaluation's recommendations.

In the sections that follow, we provide an overview of what is expected in each stage of the evaluation process. While your responsibilities in each stage of an evaluation may vary depending on the type of evaluation, in general you are expected to be involved throughout the entire process. Sometimes you will be responsible for carrying out the particular stage – e.g., writing terms of reference – while other times you might simply review the work of others. Regardless of the specific expectation, we have provided the general guidance you need to fulfill your role as manager at each stage of the process.

If you are conducting a self-assessment of one of your programmes, projects, or organizational units we suggest you contact the M&E Coordinator (or one of the Regional M&E Coordinators) who can provide you with specific guidance and a tool book on self-assessment processes.

1. Initial Planning

This section describes your responsibilities in the first stage of an evaluation, where you will have to make several critical decisions and prepare working documents to help guide the rest of the process.

ESTABLISHING THE NEED FOR AN EVALUATION

Evaluations are formal activities that use IUCN and donor resources. As such, managers need to make wise decisions about what should and should not be evaluated. It is important to remember that not all IUCN work needs to be, or can be, evaluated.

Evaluation is not the only tool available to managers. There are other tools, such as audits, performance appraisals, strategic planning processes and regular monitoring activities that can provide answers to questions and address issues and problems that arise during the implementation of a project or programme.

The following reasons often prompt the need for evaluations in IUCN:

Donor Requirements: an evaluation may be part of a donor contractual obligation.

Accountability: An evaluation may be necessary for you as a manager to fulfil your fiduciary role – for example a contractually required evaluation, or an IUCN Statutory requirement such as the Reviews of Commission.

Policy and Programme Relevance and Renewal: An evaluation may help you /IUCN improve policies and/or programme delivery. When a programme has reached the end of one phase and another is to be planned, an interim evaluation might be a useful input to planning the next phase.

Innovation: A review of a new innovative programme or project may help to determine whether to apply the approach with confidence elsewhere.

Learning and Change: Evaluation may represent a major opportunity for learning and change by capturing the reasons for successes or problems or failures in your programme/project and applying them elsewhere.

Responding to Changed Circumstances: If there has been a significant change in the external or internal operational environment for your project or programme an evaluation may help to make the necessary adjustments.

ASSESSING THE ABILITY AND READINESS TO EVALUATE

Once the need for an evaluation has been established, it is important to assess whether or not an evaluation is feasible at this time. Is the project or programme able and ready to conduct the evaluation? In this context you need to make an overall judgment with respect to the availability of resources (people, time, money), information about the project/programme and the probability that changes can occur as a result of engaging in the evaluation process. The following criteria may help you in making this decision:

✓	CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING THE FEASIBILITY OF EVALUATION
	Timing and stakeholder availability Are there competing demands on staff and other stakeholders right now? Will the people that need to participate in the evaluation be able to do so at this time? Are there other matters that are more pressing?
	Programme and project design elements Are the objectives, outputs and activities clear enough to be able to evaluate progress, results and impact?
	Available information Is there adequate information to engage in an evaluation?
	Financial considerations Are sufficient funds available for the evaluation? Can you raise additional resources? Is the evaluation cost-effective? Are the benefits greater than the costs?
	Utility Is there a high probability that the evaluation exercise will be used to improve the project or programme?

DEFINING THE FOCUS AND SCOPE FOR THE EVALUATION

When we refer to the scope and focus of the evaluation, we mean the basic parameters for its design and implementation. You will need to clarify these basic parameters before writing the Terms of Reference.

The questions below indicate some of the key factors that will shape the focus and scope for the evaluation.

What Type of Evaluation is Needed?

Since IUCN engages in a range of types of evaluations, you will need to decide what type of evaluation is appropriate for the needs of your project or programme. To do this you will need to clarify:

- What do you need to know – what are the principle issues and concerns that are driving the need for the evaluation?
- Who needs to know what – you as the manager, senior management, partners, donors, other stakeholders?
- Who are the intended users of the evaluation – for what purpose?

What is the Purpose of the Evaluation?

As described in Part 1, evaluations in IUCN are conducted with two general purposes – learning and accountability. It may be useful for you to draft a statement that clarifies the overall aim of the evaluation – for one or both purposes. Note that the purpose of the evaluation is closely linked to the type of evaluation.

What Level of Effort and Resources will you allocate to the Evaluation?

The level of effort is determined by the resources you are willing or able to assign to the evaluation. This will give you a sense of the relative importance or priority of the evaluation in the context of your project or programme activities. Once you have a notion of the level of effort to be assigned to the evaluation, you can focus the scope of the evaluation to reflect the available resources (time and funds).

What Evaluation Criteria Should be Used?

Evaluation criteria provide a framework for the central issues to be explored in the evaluation and help to focus the scope of the study. IUCN evaluations address some or all of the criteria of *effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability, and impact*, which together provide an integrated analysis of the performance of your project or programme. These criteria are defined in Part 1 and they form the Secretariat's standard evaluation criteria. Although not all IUCN evaluations have to systematically review each of these elements, every manager must consider them and decide which are the most important for the situation at hand.

Frequently, as a manager, you may limit the scope of an evaluation to a smaller number of criteria because of stakeholder interests and priorities or factors such as resource constraints and the feasibility of evaluating. If you need to limit the criteria, then you should focus the study on the two or three criteria that seem most likely to capture the concerns and issues that drive the need for the evaluation.

In addition to the standard IUCN criteria, there are cross-cutting issues in the Secretariat's work that need to be considered in defining the scope of any evaluation. As a manager, you should consider to what extent the evaluation needs to explore issues such as gender equity and poverty reduction in your project or programme. Again, you will have to assess the relevance and feasibility of applying these evaluation criteria in your particular context.

Which Stakeholder Groups Should be Involved and How?

Stakeholders are all those people or organizations that have a "stake" in your programme or project. Typically, they are those who are affected by the project or programme either during its lifetime or in subsequent years.

Stakeholders can include:

- **Participants:** people who participate or have participated in the project or programme.
- **Beneficiaries:** those people who currently benefit directly from the intervention.
- **Indirect Beneficiaries:** those people who are not recipients of the intervention but who benefit from others who are beneficiaries.

- **Donors:** the organizations or individuals that provide funding for your project or programme.
- **Programme or project managers**, other staff, volunteers.
- **Members of IUCN** with specific interest or competency in the project or programme area.
- **Community and interest groups**, including those that might have a different agenda from IUCN programme staff.
- **Government officials**, elected officials, government employees with a relevant interest.

Stakeholders bring different perspectives on the programme or project intervention. Donors may see things quite differently than the project's beneficiaries, for example. By drawing on this diversity, you will gain insights that should improve the design and implementation of the evaluation, and ultimately, the results that it generates. In addition, if stakeholders are involved from the start, they will be more likely to act upon the evaluation's recommendations. Thus IUCN recommends that you engage representatives of stakeholder groups throughout the evaluation process, beginning with the initial stage of planning and resourcing the evaluation.

Engaging stakeholders throughout the evaluation process may seem unwieldy. Who do you include? When do you include them and how? It is important to clarify these aspects at the outset. You will want to ensure that stakeholder participation is equitable across different groups, feasible in the context of the evaluation, and useful to the evaluation process. It is important to consider those stakeholders who would typically not be asked to participate in such activities. You may need to provide encouragement or design special approaches for obtaining the voices and opinions of some of these groups.

For more information on stakeholder participation, you can refer to *Program Evaluation: Forms and Approaches* by J.M. Owen and P.J. Rogers, one of the general texts on evaluation cited in the Annex on Core Resources.

Critical Moments for Stakeholder Participation

If you cannot engage stakeholder groups throughout the process, then you should engage representatives of these groups at least in the following critical moments:

- Deciding whether or not to evaluate: defining the type, scope and criteria for the evaluation.
- Defining the evaluation questions and key issues to explore in the evaluation.
- Defining the schedule of activities in the evaluation workplan; you should consult with stakeholders so that evaluation activities are scheduled and fit in their agendas
- Implementing the data collection strategy; stakeholders will most likely be consulted by evaluators during the data collection process.
- Disseminating and gathering feedback on the results.

✓	THE BENEFITS OF STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT
	Valuable insights that should improve the design of the evaluation
	An improved and shared understanding of the programme or project intervention and the challenges it faces in implementation
	Ownership of the results and lessons disseminated through the evaluation

2. Resourcing the Evaluation

Evaluations require substantial investments of financial and human resources. In your responsibility for providing resources for the evaluation, you need to carefully identify what you really have available in terms of funding and skilled people to carry out the evaluation. The section on "Engaging the evaluation team" provides some recommendations on staffing the evaluation and drawing on the resource people you know, including volunteers, peers, IUCN members, and external consultants.

Even with human resources at your disposal, the design and implementation of evaluations is often limited by lack of available funds. Many programmes and projects in IUCN have insufficient evaluation budget lines. IUCN's Evaluation Policy adopted in 2001 recommends the best practice of incorporating a *3-5% budget line for evaluation* in projects and programme budgets. As the policy is implemented, new projects and programmes will be expected to budget for and have access to sufficient funds for their evaluation processes.

For the evaluations of older projects with insufficient funds for evaluation, managers face the challenge of pooling together funds from different sources to meet evaluation requirements. Project budget lines earmarked for training, communication and lessons learned can often be merged to provide resources for monitoring and evaluation that include lessons learned. In some cases even these funds may still be insufficient; in which case managers will have to step back and reassess the importance and feasibility of the evaluation. After such an assessment, you may decide to reduce the scope of the study to fit the existing and limited budget. In some cases you may need to raise additional funds in order to conduct the required evaluation.

Finally, it is important to note that donor agencies vary with respect to their willingness to put adequate funding intoevaluations. This means that managers should pay attention to project and programme evaluation budgets when negotiating with donors. It is not in IUCN's interest to underfund this important project/programme function. IUCN is committed to working with its partners in creating the levels of resources that are required for generating technically sound and usable evaluation results.

3. Developing Terms of Reference

In IUCN, the programme and project manager is responsible for ensuring that clear and focused Terms of Reference (TOR) are written for evaluations. The TOR is a statement of expectations for the evaluation that generally includes the principle issues to be addressed in the study and details about the required methodology, scheduling, cost and evaluator qualifications.

The TOR is a key element in the evaluation process. It helps to clarify the reasons for the evaluation, flags issues that have become apparent, indicates the general depth and scope required, and clarifies any imperatives for the evaluators. The time invested to develop a good TOR will help to create a relevant and useable product at the end of the process. M&E staff will help you develop a good TOR.

All TORs for evaluations should be approved by the either the Regional M&E Officer or the Global M&E Coordinator before the evaluation process proceeds.

Suggested Outline for a TOR

A. Rationale or Purpose for the Evaluation

B. Audience for the Evaluation

C. Context for the Evaluation

D. Evaluation Stakeholders

E. Evaluation Issues and Questions

F. Methodology

G. Qualifications of Evaluators

H. Schedule

I. Outputs and Deliverables

J Cost

K. Appendices – Evaluation Matrix

In the sections below, we first present an overview of the content of the TOR, including a suggested outline for its presentation. We then focus on the development of evaluation questions, which form an essential part of the evaluation matrix that is expected in all TORs in IUCN. A suggested outline for the evaluation matrix is also included.

APPROPRIATE CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION OF THE TORs

The TORs should include information that will help clarify the purpose, nature and scope of the evaluation. The following outline presents a way of organizing the standard contents of a TOR. You may need to add components or consolidate the sections we suggest, depending on the type of evaluation you will manage and the information that you feel is essential for potential evaluators to understand your evaluation needs.

A. Rationale or Purpose for the Evaluation

This identifies why the evaluation is being commissioned at this time. Is it a formative or summative evaluation? Who is requesting it? (One or two paragraphs)

B. Audience for the Evaluation

This identifies who is commissioning the evaluation – usually the manager or group expected to act on the results.

C. Context for the Evaluation

This includes the critical aspects of the social, economic, cultural, political and environmental context for the programme or project. What is the programme or project all about? How and when did it begin? What does it aim to achieve? Who does it serve? Detailed background information on the programme/project can be included as an Appendix. (Several paragraphs)

D. Evaluation Stakeholders

This identifies the major stakeholders in the evaluation, including their interests and concerns about the project/programme. (One or two paragraphs)

E. Evaluation Issues and Questions – Evaluation Matrix

This identifies the evaluation criteria that should be used in the study. What are the principle issues and questions that will be explored in the evaluation? (Several paragraphs)

These issues and questions should be presented in an Evaluation Matrix that can be included in the main TOR or as an Appendix. The format for the matrix is presented on page 21 of this Guide. One to five pages for the matrix depending on the scope of the evaluation.

F. Methodology

This makes specific suggestions for the data collection strategy and methods to be used such as key informant interviews, questionnaires, focus groups. Are there geographic or cultural conditions or other aspects that evaluators will have to consider in order to design and implement an effective evaluation? (Several paragraphs)

G. Qualifications of the Evaluators

This identifies the specific skills or characteristics that you need in the evaluator or evaluation team. An overview of desired qualifications for evaluators are presented on page 23 of this Guide. (One or two paragraphs or often a bulleted list)

H. Schedule

This identifies the start and completion of the evaluation, and important milestones such as reporting on interim findings, submission of a draft report and the final report.

I. Outputs and Deliverables

This identifies the outputs and deliverables that are required from the evaluator or evaluation team. These often include a workplan, briefings, interim report, draft findings, presentations and the final report. Deadlines for these products should be specified in the schedule. (About a half-page, usually a list of the key deliverables and deadlines)

J. Cost

This identifies the resources available for the evaluation, including consultant fees, data collection and analysis, travel, reporting. This is not a detailed budget, but general allocations for broad budget categories.

K. Appendices – Evaluation Matrix and Other Attachments

This includes the detailed evaluation matrix and the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA)* for project evaluations.

* Log Frame Analysis is an analytical presentational and management tool including problem analysis, stakeholder analysis, determination of a hierarchy of objectives and selection of a preferred implementation strategy.

✓	CHECKLIST FOR APPROVING THE TOR
	Have different stakeholders been consulted in the process of writing the TOR?
	Do your TORs have all the suggested content and an adequate format?
	Have you included priority issues and questions in the evaluation matrix?
	Has one of your colleagues read the TOR to review the consistency, completeness, and clarity of the information it presents?
	Has the TOR been approved by your M&E staff person?

FORMULATING EVALUATION QUESTIONS

When you draft the terms of reference, you will have to decide which questions to ask in the evaluation. What do you need to know about your programme or project? Good questions are clear, focused, relevant and they make sense to other stakeholders. Deciding on which questions to ask is not easy since there are many questions that can be asked about any conservation and development intervention. Asking a slightly different question can sometimes take you down a very different path in terms of the data you will need to collect.

When deciding which questions to ask, you want to consider the following:

- Objectives and results of the project or programme;
- Stage of the project or programme in terms of its life cycle;
- Likely users of your evaluation study (donors, regional staff, IUCN members, etc.) and what they are most interested in;

- Relative importance of each of the possible questions; and
- Relative ease, data availability and resource requirements for answering the possible questions.

There should be a clear link between the evaluation questions and the purpose and evaluation criteria for the study. The issues of greatest concern for the evaluation should be addressed by the evaluation questions.

In thinking about the evaluation questions, you may want to consult with the following resources:

- Project and programme design documents – Do they specify objectives, outputs, outcomes and indicators for the intervention?
- IUCN's Intersessional Programme – How do your questions link to the Key Result Areas (KRAs) or the strategies of Knowledge, Empowerment and Governance? Do these suggest any additional questions for evaluating your project/programme?
- Other evaluations or studies that have been done in the same subject or area – What questions did they ask and what did they learn? Can you build on these in any way?
- Funding agreements – Determine whether specific evaluation questions are part of the funding agreements.
- Key stakeholders for the project or programme – What do they think are important questions?
- Experts in the field – What insights can they bring to bear on the formulation of evaluation questions?

You should try to remain open to a wide variety of possible questions and resist locking into a question before you have consulted the necessary background material, stakeholders, and experts in the field. You might want to keep a running list of questions with possible ideas about how they might be answered.

As you proceed, be realistic in the number of questions that can be answered in a single evaluation. The evaluation should focus on the important questions – the ones that must be answered as opposed to those that would be nice to know. Lastly, you need to consider the timing of the evaluation relative to the programme or project cycle. The questions about impact are best answered after the intervention has been fully operational for a few years.[1]

Once you have defined a set of evaluation questions, you can incorporate them into the evaluation matrix that is illustrated in the following section.

If you would like additional guidance in identifying issues and formulating questions, you can turn to *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* by Peter H. Rossi, a general text on evaluation cited in the Annex on Core Resources for Evaluation in IUCN.

PREPARING AN EVALUATION MATRIX

The evaluation matrix is a distinctive feature of TORs developed in IUCN. It is a working document that helps to clarify the principle performance areas, evaluation questions, sub-questions, indicators and anticipated sources of data for the study. IUCN's M&E team can provide managers with support in developing a matrix that is appropriate to the needs of the evaluation.

The following matrix illustrates a standard format for the matrix and provides examples of the type of content in each of the columns. Please note that the first two columns (Performance Areas and Key Questions) reflect generic evaluation criteria – these are not the questions that are asked directly of stakeholders, rather these are the key questions that you seek to answer by means of a

[1] World Bank and Carleton University, International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET): Building Skills to Evaluate Development Interventions, "IPDET 2001."

Suggested Format and Examples of Content for an Evaluation Matrix

PERFORMANCE AREAS	KEY QUESTIONS	SUB-QUESTIONS[2]	INDICATORS[3]	DATA SOURCES AND METHODS
Relevance and rationale	To what extent does the intervention (project or programme) respond to issues and trends in the situation analysis?	1. What are the major issues and trends in the region? 2. To what extent does the intervention meet the needs of the key stakeholders? 3. To what extent is the intervention aligned with the strategic objectives of IUCN and key donors? 4. Does the intervention still make sense today given any changes in the context?	1. Degree of satisfaction of key stakeholders. 2. Convergence with IUCN Programme KRAs. 3. Convergence with donor priorities.	Interviews with community members, IUCN programme managers, donors Desk review of situation analysis, trends data, and programme documents
Effectiveness	To what extent is the intervention achieving its planned results (outcomes and outputs)?	1. Have the products and/or services (outputs) of the project been delivered in a timely manner? 2. Are they being used by the intended users? 3. Are they considered to be leading edge thinking in conservation? 4. Are behaviours and practices changing as a result?	1. On time, on budget delivery of outputs. 2. Degree of use by intended users. 3. Perception of experts on leading-edge thinking. 4. Documented use.	Interviews with staff, users, members, experts, partners Monitoring data Observation
Efficiency	To what extent is the relationship between costs and results reasonable?	1. Do actual expenditures correspond to planned expenditures? 2. Is the ratio of administrative costs to output costs reasonable? 3. Are there more cost effective ways to achieve the objectives?	1. Ratio of planned to actual expenditures. 2. Ratio of output costs to administrative costs. 3. Comparison with other financial data.	Review of financial documents Data from other projects of similar scope
Sustainability	To what extent are the results and the processes initiated by the project sustainable beyond the period of implementation?	1. Is there an appropriate exit strategy for the project? 2. Has local capacity and expectations been nurtured to take over the project? 3. Are there alternative sources of financing?	1. Exit strategy details. 2. Number of alternative sources of funding available to community. 3. Expectations of users.	Interviews with community leaders Review of government or NGO budgets Interviews with donors
Impact	To what extent is the intervention contributing to a long-term positive effect on the ecosystem and the communities?	1. Are the threats to people's livelihoods and to the ecosystem being reduced? 2. Is there evidence of improvements in the state and condition of people and ecosystems?	1. Frequency of threats. 2. Indicators of state and condition – against a baseline, time series data, changing trends.	Data analysis from situation analysis, baseline studies, interviews with community leaders, experts

For an example of a complete evaluation matrix see *A Guide for the Planning and Conduct of IUCN Strategic Reviews*, Appendix III.

[2] We have identified several sub-questions for each key question for the purposes of illustration. There usually are between 5 and 10 sub-questions for each key question identified.
[3] As in the note above, there are usually a number of indicators for the sub-questions.

range of data collection methods. The examples for the latter columns are taken from a forestry project for the purpose of illustration.

Performance Areas

This column is used to highlight the principle areas that you will explore in the evaluation. The performance areas are often the same as the evaluation criteria you will use for your study. In many cases, for instance, you would explore key questions and sub-questions under effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability and impact. In some cases specific performance issues such as financial viability will be included as a performance area for the evaluation. This is often the case in the IUCN Strategic Reviews commissioned by senior management.

Key questions

This column presents the overall general questions that will facilitate analysis of the evaluation issues. As noted, these are not the questions that are asked directly of stakeholders, but rather the overall questions that you seek to answer. Some tips on how to identify evaluation questions are provided on pages 19 and 20 of this Guide.

Please note that there may be several key questions for any one performance area.

- **Relevance questions** focus on whether or not the intervention or programme or organizational unit is addressing important issues and concerns to IUCN, to partners, members, or other stakeholders, and/or whether it is on target in terms of solving the key problem(s). Do stakeholders care about the intervention and believe it makes sense given the problem and situation?
- **Effectiveness questions** refer to the results or outcomes of the project, programme or organizational unit. Is the intervention or organizational unit achieving its intended results?
- **Efficiency questions** look at the costs and services of the intervention or the organizational unit: Is the intervention or unit achieving results at a reasonable cost? Are there less costly ways of achieving the same thing?
- **Impact questions** examine the effects of the intervention on the broader context (organization, region, community). Have there been changes in the ecosystem functioning, and/or the community's quality of life as a result of the project?
- **Sustainability questions** examine to what extent there is an environment that favours the continuity of the intervention or the continuity of the organizational unit. Will participants and beneficiaries continue with the project activities beyond the project/programme timeframe?

Sub-questions

This column is used to list the specific questions that are needed to answer the key questions. They will provide more specific and concrete focus for the indicators and the types and sources of data that you will need for the evaluation. The data collection tools should provide the information needed to answer the sub-questions.

Indicators

An indicator is a measuring device that allows you to clarify and measure a concept: in this case, the sub-questions in the evaluation matrix. Indicators make these sub-questions more tangible and give something concrete to measure. They may be qualitative or quantitative signals that help you decide whether or not something has changed.

Examples of data sources

In this column, you should identify the possible sources of data that you will need to answer the sub-questions. These sources may include people, different kinds of documents such as situation analyses, trends analyses, other research, observation, or other types of information. You should be as specific as possible when citing these.

4. Engaging the Evaluator or Evaluation Team

Past experience in IUCN shows that a good evaluation requires both technical knowledge of the programme area and good evaluation skills. In many cases IUCN managers have hired good technical people to carry out evaluations who have little or no professional evaluation experience. The result is a technical opinion on a project or programme and not a structured evaluation that asks key questions, provides data from key stakeholders or makes judgments on key evaluation criteria.

Managers need to ensure that an evaluation team has both the technical knowledge required as well as the evaluation skills. Your ability to engage the most appropriate evaluator or evaluation team will make a huge difference in the quality and usefulness of the final product.

As project/programme manager, you will have to decide on the characteristics required of a good evaluator or evaluation team. This is true whether you are engaging the evaluator yourself or merely agreeing with an external donor on their choice of evaluator. Our experience indicates that the choice of evaluator is a key factor in a good evaluation process, and managers need to be involved in the choice. What are the special skills or knowledge needed for your particular evaluation? Are IUCN staff or members appropriate team members – or is an external consultant more appropriate for the circumstances? There are risks in using untried evaluators – either as peers from within IUCN or as external consultants. M&E staff can provide a list of good evaluators for you to consider.

USING TECHNICAL EXPERTS AND/VERSUS EVALUATORS

Historically, IUCN has often appointed trusted senior technical experts as evaluators without much attention to the evaluation skills that technical experts should also have to carry out a good evaluation. While this has often resulted in interesting 'expert opinions' and detailed technical analysis of specific aspects of projects and programmes, it has not given IUCN the structured feedback on a clear set of evaluation questions, and findings and conclusions that are linked to the feedback of stakeholders.[4] Technical expert opinions are generally not considered evaluations.

Consider carefully if what you need for your project or programme is a technical planning and future options study – or an evaluation that will make judgments on the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the project or programme. These are very different kinds of work requiring different skill sets, and both can be useful. If an evaluation is what you require, then it is best to have a combination of technical knowledge and evaluation skills for your evaluation.

PROFILE OF A GOOD EVALUATOR

A good evaluator will demonstrate the following characteristics[5]:

Technical evaluation expertise

Understanding of, and experience in, the required evaluation methodologies

Sectoral or thematic expertise

Expertise in the sectoral area of the project or programme being evaluated (conservation and development, or specific themes such as wetlands, species, protected areas, etc.)

Credibility

Recognized as expert evaluator and judge by the main stakeholders of the project or programme and its evaluation

---

[4] *IUCN Meta-Evaluation: An Analysis of IUCN Evaluations 1994-2000*, September 2000.

[5] Inter-American Development Bank, Evaluation Office, *Evaluation: A Management Tool for Improving Project Performance,* Washington, D.C., 1997, p.46

Impartiality

No conflict of interest with any of the parties involved in evaluation

Communication skills

Able to communicate the evaluation results in a manner that is easily understood by all parties

Interpersonal skills

Able to interact with all parties in a sensitive and effective way

Availability

Available to conduct the evaluation at the required level of depth in the specified time frame

PROFILE OF GOOD EVALUATION TEAMS

Evaluation teams may be used for some evaluations that are particularly complex. These teams need:

Leadership

An identified team leader who is accountable for evaluation results and for all levels of quality control

Complementary skill set

Evaluation teams should be composed of evaluators from multiple disciplines matched to the requirements of the project, programme or unit being evaluated

Ability to work as a team

Unless the team has a track record of working together, there is always the risk that the benefits of a team will be outweighed by non-functional disagreements and incoherent reporting

Effective mechanisms for coordination and communication

When team members are widely dispersed, procedures must be developed to ensure that they have good communication and time together for joint planning, analysis and report preparation

USING PEERS AS EVALUATORS

IUCN appoints peers (senior managers and technical programme staff) as Review Team members specifically in the cycle of Strategic Reviews that are commissioned annually by senior management. This is partly to support an internal culture of evaluation and learning within IUCN and partly to provide IUCN senior staff with direct evaluation experience.

If you wish to consider using a peer staff member for an Evaluation, keep the following in mind:

- **Reviews and evaluations take time** – peers must be able to set aside adequate time for the review otherwise you will find yourself picking up unfinished pieces of the Review. If a peer is to be considered for Review Team leader, then he/she must take responsibility for the overall conduct of the Review and the quality of the evaluation process – data collection, analysis, and report writing.
- **Peers should have basic adequate evaluation skills** to be considered for a Review Team – some knowledge of data collection methods, analysis, good interpersonal and communication skills. If they have the basic evaluation skills, they can learn and improve through the experience, yet still contribute to a good review. Peers who do not have any evaluation experience should receive basic evaluation training before being considered for Review Teams.

- **Be careful to avoid bias and preconceived solutions** when using peers for Reviews. While a peer may have had direct work experience with the project or programme under review, avoid situations where peers have had previous conflicts with the project or programme, or hold particularly strong views. They are unlikely to be well received by the project or programme or have an open mind to the situation, and thus will not be helpful in carrying out a good review.

THE ROLES OF IUCN MEMBERS AND VOLUNTEERS IN EVALUATION

IUCN members can play a number of roles in IUCN evaluations – as stakeholders and participants of Reviews if they are partners in implementation, as evaluators if they have recognized evaluation experience, and as recipients of evaluation results in their governance role at the World Conservation Congress.

As with peers, it is important that you consider the same factors of time, skills and bias before putting an IUCN Member or Volunteer on an Evaluation Team.

DONORS AND EVALUATION

Most IUCN evaluations are linked with donors in some way – either as a direct requirement of a donor contract, or an internal IUCN review that may also be of interest to a donor (particularly our core donors). In some cases, you will manage evaluations where the evaluation team includes representatives of the donor agency; in other cases you will be asked to coordinate with an external donor evaluation team. In all cases, evaluations are important events that can have a major influence on a donor's perception of IUCN's capacity and performance. As such they should be well prepared and managed carefully.

In all cases (external or internal evaluations), evaluation practice should conform to the standards and principles set out in the IUCN Evaluation Policy. M&E staff are available to discuss with you the evaluation requirements of your donors, and to help you design an evaluation that meets good evaluation standards. Most donors subscribe to the OECD Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance (cited in Annex 1 on Core Resources on Evaluation in IUCN), so you should not have difficulties negotiating a good evaluation Terms of Reference with donors.

Donor evaluation requirements also provide a good opportunity for you to discuss with donors ways of strengthening the learning methodologies of projects and programmes, and perhaps to engage the donor in a 'programme' level review focused on learning across a set of similar projects.

Joint evaluation teams with donors

When managing a joint evaluation with donors (joint IUCN-SDC Review, joint DANIDA-IUCN Review, etc.) it is important to be clear on who signs off on the TORs for each agency, how the quality of the evaluation will be ensured, and who is in charge of managing the evaluation consultants. For major joint reviews it is advisable to set up a Steering Committee comprised of the lead managers from each agency, and the IUCN global M&E Coordinator or Regional M&E staff person. The Steering Committee then signs off on the TORs, methodology and workplan, and provides direction to the consultants, even if IUCN or another agency takes care of the administrative aspects (consultant's contracts, etc.).

5. Approving the Evaluation Workplan

A workplan is the document that governs the implementation of the evaluation. It is an essential tool to clarify what will be done, how, by whom, and at what cost. It is an important communication and operational tool, but it should not be unduly rigid. It sets out the requirements for updating the preliminary evaluation matrix provided with the TOR, and specifies the specific evaluation issues, questions, methods of data collection and analysis that will be undertaken during a specified time and within a specified budget. It establishes commitments in terms of roles, deliverables, schedules, and budget. The workplan is prepared by the evaluator or the evaluation team and is presented to you as their proposal, in response to your TOR.

As the manager, you are responsible for approving the workplan. Thus, you will need to be able to make judgements regarding the quality of its components. Please note that you may request revisions from the evaluator or evaluation team before approving the workplan.

APPROPRIATE CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION OF A WORKPLAN

Although the content and format can be tailored to the scope and size of an evaluation, workplans usually include the following sections:

Suggested Outline for a Workplan

- **A. Project/Programme Overview**
- **B. Evaluation Mandate**
- **C. Evaluation Matrix**
- **D. Methodology**
- **E. Evaluation Team**
- **F. Activity and Effort Analysis**
- **G. Schedule of Activities**
- **H. Budget**
- **I. Outline of the Evaluation Report**

A. Project/Programme Overview

The first section of the workplan provides an overview of the programme/project and its logic (as expressed in the Log Frame Analysis, see page 19). It gives relevant information concerning background context, inputs and expected results.

B. Evaluation Mandate

This section should indicate the rationale and purpose for the evaluation, which usually are drawn directly from the TORs.

C. Evaluation Matrix

The evaluation presents the evaluator's approach to the conceptual issues and questions to be addressed in the evaluation. It should be based on the matrix that is included in the TOR, but the evaluators should enhance the matrix, by refining the questions and adding elements such as "indicators", or the basis for judgments.

D. Evaluation Methodology

This section usually begins with a summary of the general approach to be taken by the evaluation, including the reasons for choosing the proposed methodology. The section should indicate the general design or type of evaluation and the major methods of data collection and analysis. You should understand who will participate in the evaluation (stakeholders) and how their perspectives will be taken into account.

E. Evaluation Team

Where more than one evaluator is involved, the workplan should indicate the name and role of each member of the team. It should also summarize their prior experience and qualifications for playing that role in the evaluation.

F. Activity and Effort Analysis

The plan should list the evaluation's activities and estimate the effort required by each team member in order to accomplish them. The level of effort is recorded in terms of the number of person days it will take to complete the activity.

G. Schedule of Activities

The timeline and schedule for the evaluation is another important component. This schedule should clearly indicate the dates of particular milestones in the process (the presentation of draft findings, for example). It should note the meetings, briefings or reports that will facilitate the manager's role in monitoring the implementation of the evaluation.

H. Budget

The workplan's budget should present the costs of conducting the evaluation. It should include categories such as consulting fees/honoraria, travel and per diems, and other budget items associated with the evaluation (for example, translation of questionnaires and the final report).

I. Outline of the Evaluation Report

Although the report outline may change over the course of the study, it is important for the workplan to provide an overview of the expected components and organization of the final report.

ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

Since the evaluation's findings or results should be based on the data collected, it is critical to make appropriate decisions regarding which data to gather and by what means it should be gathered. This is what the "Methodology" component in the workplan should clearly present and justify. IUCN encourages managers to become comfortable enough with data collection strategies to be able to make general recommendations about methods, make decisions about appropriate and feasible methodology in a given context, and make judgments about the quality of the data generated. These are all critical functions in managing the methodological aspects of the evaluation.

This section provides a very general overview of issues concerning methodology. For further reading, you may want to consult some of the texts or research texts cited in Annex 1 on Core Resources for Evaluation in IUCN, particularly *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* by Michael Quinn Patton.

Adequate and Feasible Data Collection Strategies

In general, you want to ensure that the methodology in the workplan is both adequate and feasible. Adequate data collection will generate the information you need to answer the evaluation questions. Feasible data collection is both financially and logistically possible to implement in the specific context of a given evaluation.

In order to assess the data collection strategy you should consider:

- Size, geographical dispersion, literacy level of target population
- Resources available for data collection (time, people, money, technology)
- Sensitivity of the issues to evaluate
- Reliability and validity sought
- Needs of the evaluation

Data Sources and Collection Methods

In IUCN evaluations, the most common sources of data are people, documents, and infrastructure or environmental, social or cultural aspects that can be observed. The methods that are most frequently used for obtaining information from these sources are: existing documents, questionnaire surveys, interviews, focus groups, and observation.

There are advantages and disadvantages in using each of these methods for gathering data in an evaluation. Thus, it is important to consider which method is most appropriate in a given evaluation context.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Data Collection Methods

TYPE	STRENGTH	WEAKNESS
Questionnaire	Efficient Large # of respondents	Extensive planning Low response unless responses are followed up intensively
Interview	In-depth information High response	Extensive planning Time consuming Analysis difficult
Focus group	Group synergy Diverse perspectives	Extensive planning Analysis often difficult Logistics
Observation	Collects data on actual human behaviour and natural environment	Analysis difficult (potentially unreliable)

Adapted from Anderson, Gary A., *Fundamentals of Educational Research,* London, Falmer Press, 1998, p. 168-169.

Tips on When to Select a Specific Method

QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEYS	INTERVIEWS*	FOCUS GROUPS	OBSERVATION
May want to use when:	***May want to use when:***	***May want to use when:***	***May want to use when:***
The target population is large (i.e. greater than 200)	You need to incorporate the views of key people (key informant interview)	You need rich description to portray underlying attitudes	Need to determine actual conditions or behaviors
You require a large amount of categorical data	The target population is small (e.g. 50)	You believe that group synergy is necessary to uncover underlying feelings	Have few cases to observe
You want to see the different response of designated sub-groups (such as male, female)	Your information needs are for depth rather than breadth	It is feasible to assemble a group	Need to better understand the effect of social or cultural factors on behaviour.
The target population is geographically dispersed	You have reason to believe that people will not return a questionnaire	You have access to a skilled focus group leader and data recorder	
You have access to people who can process and analyze this type of data accurately			

**Note: telephone interviews are used frequently in IUCN.*

Adapted from Anderson, Gary A., *Fundamentals of Educational Research*, London, Falmer Press, 1998, p. 168-169.

CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING THE WORKPLAN

The following criteria may help you in making a decision about the proposed workplan. You may decide to approve it, request revisions, or reject it.

✓	CHECKLIST FOR APPROVING THE WORKPLAN
	Does it have the appropriate content and format? The workplan includes all the necessary elements of a good evaluation and is presented in an acceptable format (see suggested outline on p. 26).
	Does the evaluation seems "doable"? The workplan clearly illustrates: – how stakholders will be engaged – a reasonable time frame – feasible methods of data collection and analysis – the right mix of people involved as evaluators – sufficient allocation of resources
	Does the evaluation seem like a useful and worthwhile investment? The workplan clearly specifies the issues and questions to be explored and illustrates how the data collection and analysis will help to answer those questions. The cost of conducting the evaluation seems reasonable and does not exceed the benefits of the evaluation for IUCN.
	Does the schedule include reporting and feedback for monitoring the implementation? The workplan's schedule of activities includes briefings, reports, and draft findings to facilitate your role in monitoring the implementation of the evaluation and supporting the use of its findings.

6. Implementing and Monitoring the Evaluation

Once the evaluation team has been selected and contracts have been signed, the implementation of the evaluation can begin. Your role during the implementation will be one of supervising or monitoring the progress of the evaluation team.

The workplan provides you with an important tool for supervising the implementation of the evaluation. Your specific monitoring activities should be referenced in the workplan (field visits, briefings, presentation of draft findings, etc.) As with other planning instruments, it should guide practice, but not dictate it. All major deviations from the workplan, however, should be discussed between the manager and the evaluation team.

FACILITATING THE START-UP

Before the evaluation begins, you will need to inform and gain the cooperation of the different groups of people who will be involved. The evaluator's work will be much easier if everyone is familiar with the evaluation schedule, is familiar with the purpose of the evaluation, and sets aside the time required. You are responsible for facilitating the communications with each stakeholder group and, in some cases, will need to make personal visits and phone calls to help get the ball rolling. In addition, you are expected to provide the evaluators with all the documents that are necessary for the evaluation.

ENGAGING IN REGULAR REPORTING AND FEEDBACK

It is important to have regular reporting and feedback between the evaluation team and the manager, facilitated either through written or oral reports. You should try to meet in person with the team periodically to check on progress and assist with any problems that they are encountering.

Depending on the specific evaluation context, your responsibility for supervising the evaluation also may require you to review some of the data collection instruments, ensure that data collection is conducted appropriately (with due respect for participants), and conduct field visits to monitor the evaluation process.

As the evaluation proceeds, you may also want to inform key stakeholders about progress, changes or other aspects of potential interest.

REVIEWING DRAFT FINDINGS

IUCN recommends that the workplan include a presentation of preliminary findings (usually included in the schedule of activities at least a month before completion of the evaluation). If you have requested this draft, you will need to convene a meeting to review the findings, and raise any questions or concerns you have about their quality, including identifying any gaps in data collection or factual errors, and provide guidance on the completion of the evaluation report.

7. Assessing the Results of the Evaluation

There are a number of ways that evaluators can report on their findings. For example, they may organize briefings with key external stakeholders or special sessions with staff in order to analyze the evaluation's conclusions and recommendations. Virtually all professional evaluations produce a formal written evaluation report as the major output or product of the evaluation. It becomes the official record of what happened during the process and of the judgments that were made. Thus, it is crucial that each evaluation conducted in IUCN produce a clear and thorough report. In the past, evaluation reports in IUCN have been of variable quality[6]. As a result efforts are being made to improve the quality of reports, including clarity, structure and completeness. As the manager of the evaluation, you are responsible for reviewing this document and determining whether or not the evaluation TOR has been met.

APPROPRIATE CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The evaluator or evaluation team may choose a slightly different format or outline for the evaluation report. Nonetheless, you should ensure that the report covers in some way the components suggested below.

A. Executive Summary

Provides an overview of the key issues, findings and conclusions of the evaluation.

B. Table of Contents

A standard element of most professional documents, the table helps guide the reader through the text that follows.

C. List of Acronyms

Identifies all the acronyms used and what they mean

[6] See the *Meta Evaluation of IUCN Evaluations*, 2000-2003.

D. Introduction

Specifies background for conducting the evaluation, indicates type of evaluation, timing of the evaluation in the project/programme context (start-up, mid-term, etc.), who has commissioned it, and the intended audiences for the evaluation.

E. Purpose of the Evaluation

Presents the purpose, scope and focus for the evaluation, and the evaluation criteria that will be explored in the study.

F. Project/Programme Context

Describes the country, regional or institutional context for the intervention, highlighting issues such as the status of relevant development and environmental indicators, environmental and development priorities, and needs that are addressed by the programme/project or organizational unit.

G. Project/Programme Description

Gives a description of the project/programme as it was originally planned and notes major changes during its evolution. Often refers to elements of the Log Frame Analysis (LFA, see page 19 for an explanation).

H. Evaluation Issues and Questions

Presents the evaluation issues and questions that guided the evaluation (agreed to in the Workplan).

I. Methodology

Provides a detailed description of how the evaluation was executed, and gives a rationale for the approach that was used. Cites the sources of data, clearly stating the stakeholders who were consulted. Explains the data analysis techniques that were used.

J. Findings

Explains what was found by the evaluation and demonstrates how the findings are based on the data collected. The evaluator will often use different formats (graphs, tables, etc.) for presenting the data.

K. Conclusions and Recommendations

A conclusion is a judgment that is based on a number of findings, covering a major aspect of the evaluation. Recommendations are directed towards the evaluation's key audience and users. They state clearly the steps that can be taken in response to the evaluation's findings and conclusions.

L. Action Plan

An Action Plan sets out a proposed timeframe and responsibilities for acting on the Recommendations. It identifies the manager or unit responsible for each recommendation (to the greatest degree possible) and a proposed timeframe. The Action Plan provides is a starting point for managers to consider how to implement the recommendations.

M. Appendices

Should include the TORs, data collection instruments, a record of field visits, and for projects, the LFA.

Suggested Outline for the Formal Evaluation Report

A. Executive Summary

B. Table of Contents

C. List of Acronyms

D. Introduction

E. Purpose of the Evaluation

F. Project/Programme Context

G. Project/programme Description

H. Evaluation Issues and Questions

I. Methodology

J. Findings

K. Conclusions and Recommendations

L. Action Plan

M. Appendices – data collection instruments, TORs, etc.

ASSESSING AND PROVIDING FEEDBACK ON THE REPORT

As the manager of the evaluation, you are expected to review and assess the quality of the evaluation report. The following checklist may help you with this task.

✓	CHECKLIST FOR ASSESSING THE QUALITY OF THE EVALUATION REPORT
	Does the report respond to the key questions and issues defined in the TOR?
	Does it have the appropriate content and format?
	Is it clearly written and well organized?
	Does each component of the report meet evaluation standards?
	Is the factual data in the report accurate?
	Can you clearly see how the evaluators reached their conclusions from the findings and data analysis presented?

If the report is weak in any areas, you should give feedback on ways to improve the report in terms of organization and language (making it easier to read), clarity of data-based findings and conclusions, analysis of data by stakeholder group if that proves to be revealing and useful, or other changes to improve its usefulness to the evaluation audience.

It is important to note, however, that the judgments on data are the responsibility of the evaluator. Thus you cannot recommend changes in the conclusions or recommendations of the report. If you disagree with the judgments, you can write a critique of judgments and include them as an addendum.

COMMUNICATING THE RESULTS TO DIFFERENT AUDIENCES

You should communicate the results of the evaluation to the key audiences who need to act on the results. Internal audiences can include project and programme staff, senior managers at regional and global levels, and external audiences can include donors, partners, and beneficiaries. This can be done through informal means such as emails, internal correspondence or briefings and presentations, and by more formal means through submission of results to senior management for discussion and action.

You need to consider that different audiences and stakeholder groups have different needs and your reporting approach should reflect those needs. For example, donors may be more interested in aspects related to financial viability and sustainability. IUCN management may be interested in knowing if outside stakeholders (such as donors, partners) have a different perception than the inside stakeholders (IUCN staff and managers).

8. Developing an Action Plan for Follow-up

Managers have the responsibility to IUCN to ensure evaluations are useable and used to improve performance. Unfortunately, follow-up is often a weak part of evaluation processes in many organizations. Once the final report is complete, your work is just beginning. This is the opportunity to make full use of the results of the evaluation by working with key stakeholders to develop an action plan that responds to the results evaluation's conclusions and recommendations. The action plan may be included in the final report.

A suggested format for the Action Plan is provided below:

CONCLUSION RECOMMENDA-TION	ACCEPTED - NOT ACCEPTED AND WHY	WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE?	WHO WILL DO IT?	BY WHEN?

You should also determine the mechanisms for monitoring the implementation of the action plan.

9. Using Evaluation Results inside IUCN

All evaluation results have the potential to positively influence the performance of the organization, from project level through programme and organizational and governance level. However to maximize the use of evaluation results there must be an effective institutional system of collection of evaluations, synthesis of results, and targeted dissemination throughout IUCN and to key external audiences.

With the adoption of the Evaluation Policy in 2001, the global M&E office and regional M&E staff are responsible for the collection, synthesis and dissemination of the results of all evaluations. The global M&E office maintains an evaluation database of all evaluations in IUCN, and posts abstracts of all evaluations in three languages on the IUCN public website. In addition, the global M&E office reports regularly on the results of evaluation to the Director of IUCN's Global Programme, to senior management, and through the Director General to the IUCN Council and to donors. The Director General reports on evaluation to the IUCN World Conservation Congress each Intersessional period. Regional M&E staff are responsible for reporting evaluation results to regional senior managers and for sending evaluation reports and abstracts to the global M&E office.

Your responsibility as a manager is to communicate the results of your evaluations to your key stakeholders, to your Regional M&E staff, and to the global M&E office, and to ensure that you act on the results to improve your project, programme or organizational unit.

ANNEX one

Core Resources for Evaluation in IUCN

This Annex contains a list of core resources on evaluation that may be useful to IUCN Programme and Project managers in fulfilling your evaluation responsibilities.

These key references include journals, portal websites, and books that cover a wide range of topics. Three types of books are included in this list: general texts on evaluation, texts that focus on particular types of evaluation, and technical publications that provide greater detail on methodology.

In most cases, we have included a brief description of the content, primarily based on the publisher's information on the book. Many of these resources are also available from the IUCN's Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Collection of Resources (W = Web address)

JOURNALS

Evaluation: The international Journal of Theory, Research and Practice

This journal publishes original evaluation research, both theoretical and empirical, as well as reviews of relevant literature and overviews of developments in evaluation policy and practice. Sage Publications. W: http://www.sagepub.com/journals.aspx?pid=14

Evaluation Review: A Journal of Applied Social Research

Evaluation Review provides a forum for researchers, planners and policymakers engaged in the development, implementation and utilization of evaluation studies. Reflects a wide range of methodological and conceptual approaches to evaluation and its many applications. Sage Publications. W: http://www.sagepub.com/journals.aspx?pid=185

Education Policy Analysis Archives

This is a peer-reviewed journal on education policy analysis. Arizona State University. W: http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/

The American Journal of Evaluation

This journal publishes original papers about the methods, theory, practice, and findings of evaluation. The general goal of AJE is to present the best work in and about evaluation, in order to improve the knowledge base and practice of its readers. Elsevier Science. W: http://www.elsevier.com/locate/ameval/

The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation

The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation is provided by the Canadian Evaluation Society. W: http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/ The Journal can be accessed by clicking on the link "newsletter" on the left menu bar of the homepage.

WEB RESOURCES

The following web sites have a good selection of on-line material, as well as bibliographic references on evaluation.

- American Evaluation Association: http://www.eval.org
- Canadian Evaluation Society: http://www.evaluationcanada.ca
- The European Evaluation Association: http://www.europeanevaluation.org
- Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: http://www.eldis.org/participation/pme/index.htm
- Monitoring and Evaluation News: http://www.mande.co.uk/

The following sites provide evaluation information on the evaluation approaches and requirements of many bilateral and multilateral donor agencies with whom IUCN works:

Organization/Website Name	Address
African Development Bank (AfDB)	http://www.afdb.org/
Agence française de développement (AfD), France	http://www.afd.fr/
Asian Development Bank (AsDB)	http://www.adb.org/evaluation/
Australia Aid Agency (AusAID)	http://www.ausaid.gov.au/
Canada International Development Agency (CIDA)	http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/perfor-e.htm
Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA)	http://www.um.dk/en/servicemenu/
Department for International Development (DFID), UK	http://www.dfid.gov.uk/
Development Gateway (Aid Effectiveness Section)	http://www.developmentgateway.org/
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)	http://www.ebrd.com/projects/
European Commission (CEC)	http://europa.eu.int/comm/europeaid/evaluation/
Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG)	http://www.ecgnet.org/
Finnish International Development Agency (FINNIDA)	http://global.finland.fi/english/
Germany Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)	http://www.bmz.de/de/english.html
IFAD	http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/
Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)	http://www.iadb.org/
International Monetary Fund	http://www.imf.org/external/np/ieo/
Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs	http://www.mofa.go.jp
JICA (Japan)	http://www.jica.go.jp/english/evaluation/
Norway Ministry of Foreign Affairs	http://odin.dep.no/ud/engelsk/
OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation	http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/
SDC, Switzerland	http://www.sdc.admin.ch/
SIDA, Sweden	http://www.sida.se (in Swedish)
UN Interagency Working Group (UNIAWG)	http://www.uneval.org/
UNDP	http://www.undp.org/eo/
USAID	http://www.dec.org/partners/eval.cfm
WorldWide Evaluation Information Gateway	http://www.policy-evaluation.org/

PUBLICATIONS

General texts

Chelimsky, Eleanor and Shadish, William R., eds, 1997, Evaluation for the 21st Century: A Handbook, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications

A group of renowned evaluators explore topics such as: what makes evaluation different from other disciplines; the links and differences between the evaluation and the auditing professions; which activities have priority in evaluation; new methodological approaches to doing evaluation; the issues of advocacy versus truth in evaluation; and evaluating programmes versus empowering people to evaluate their own programmes.

Dale, Reider, 1998, Evaluation Frameworks for Development Programmes and Projects, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications

This analysis of the evaluation of organized development work explores all the major issues and aspects of evaluation, chief among which are context, perspectives, methods and management.

Earl, Sarah, Carden, Fred and Smutylo, Terry, 2001, Outcome Mapping: Building Learning and Reflection into Development Programs, Ottawa, IDRC publications, International Development Research Centre

This publication explains the various steps in the outcome mapping approach and provides detailed information on workshop design and facilitation. Outcome mapping shifts from assessing the products of a programme to focus on changes in behaviour, relationships, actions, and activities in the people, groups, and organizations it works with directly.

Guba, Egon G. and Lincoln, Yvonna S., 1989, Fourth Generation Evaluation, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications

Fourth-generation evaluation represents a monumental shift in evaluation practice. The authors highlight the inherent problems faced by previous generations of evaluators – politics, ethical dilemmas, imperfections and gaps, inconclusive deductions – and blame reliance on the scientific/positivist paradigm for failure. They show how fourth generation evaluation solves persistent problems in programme evaluation, comprehensively describe the differences between the positivist and constructivist paradigms of research, and provide a practical plan of the steps and processes in conducting a fourth-generation evaluation.

ISNAR, 2002, Learning about Capacity Development Through Evaluation. Perspectives and Observations from a collaborative network of national organizations and donor agencies, The Hague, International Society for National Agricultural Research

This publication is based on a Midterm Review and Synthesis Workshop for the project Evaluating Capacity Development in Research and Development Organisations. It presents emerging lessons regarding capacity development and its evaluation. It then identifies major constraints to the greater use of evaluation and suggests future for the project and participating organizations.

Mayne, John and Zapico-Goñi, Eduardo, eds, 1999, Monitoring Performance in the Public Sector: Future Directions from International Experience, New Brunswick, Transaction Publishers

This publication focused on the public sector and is based on experiences derived from comparative analysis in different countries. It explains why there is interest in performance monitoring in a given setting, why it has failed or created uncertainties, and identifies criteria for improving its design and use.

Owen, J.M with Rogers P.J.,1999, Program Evaluation: Forms and Approaches, Second Edition,.

Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications (International edition)

This book offers a practical introduction to evaluation for beginners and practitioners. It shows how to identify appropriate forms and approaches, using an original framework. The authors examine the role of evaluation in program development, and offer techniques for involving stakeholders in the planning process and for disseminating the evaluation findings. They use references to recent research and international examples.

Rossi, Peter H., 1999, Evaluation: A Systematic Approach, Sixth Edition, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications

The book that has been a benchmark in evaluation has been updated to include the latest techniques and approaches, as well as guidelines for how evaluations should be tailored to fit programmes and social contexts. Contents include: Programmes, Policies and Evaluation \ Tailoring Evaluations \ Identifying Issues and Formulating Questions \ Assessing the Need for a Program \ Expressing and Assessing Program Theory \ Monitoring Program Process and Performance \ Strategies for Impact Assessment \ Randomized Designs for Impact Assessment \ Quasi-Experimental Impact Assessments \ Assessment of Full-Coverage Programs \ Measuring Efficiency \ The Social Context of Evaluation.

Russon, Craig and Russon, Karen, Editors, 2000, The Annotated Bibliography of International Programme Evaluation, Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishers

With chapters from Africa, Asia, Australasia, Eastern and Western Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Middle East, and North America, this bibliography is an attempt to tap into the rapid growth of the evaluation profession. Each chapter contains a short introduction describing the state of the art of evaluation in the region. References in each chapter contain information about authors, title, source, keywords, and description.

UNDP, 1997, Results-oriented Monitoring and Evaluation: A Handbook for Programme Managers, United Nations Development Programme, Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning

This publication is a manual for a large-scale project evaluation system. Part One presents the conceptual and operational framework for monitoring and evaluation. It is intended to promote a greater understanding of key concepts. Part Two offers UNDP managers guidance on the application of the monitoring and evaluation concepts presented in Part One. While the publication is aimed specifically at a UNDP audience it may also be of use to larger-scale evaluation programmes.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 1998, W.K. Kellogg Foundation Evaluation Handbook, Battle Creek, Kellogg Publications, http://www.wkkf.org/Pubs/Tools/Evaluation/Pub770.pdf

This handbook provides a framework for thinking about evaluation as a relevant and useful programme tool.

General Research Texts

Anderson, Gary A, 1998, Second Edition, Fundamentals of Educational Research, London, Falmer Press

This book provides a succinct, clear and easy-to-read overview of the research process, types of research and data collection techniques. It gives sufficient detail to permit researchers to define, develop and conduct a successful research project. Examples provided relate to educational contexts but are of value to other areas of social science research.

Patton, Michael Q., 2002, Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods, Third Edition, Thousand

Oaks, Sage Publications

The completely revised and updated edition of this methodological classic provides practical, comprehensive and strategic guidance on qualitative design, purposeful sampling, interviewing, fieldwork, observation methods, and qualitative analysis and interpretation while integrating the extensive qualitative literature of the last decade.

Types of Evaluation

Fetterman, David M., 2000, Foundations of Empowerment Evaluation, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications

Employing both qualitative and quantitative methodologies, empowerment evaluation is the use of evaluation concepts, techniques, and findings to foster improvement and self-determination. The author explores its background and theory and goes on to present the three steps of empowerment evaluation: establishing a mission statement about a programme; taking stock; and charting a course for the future, while using case studies to highlight these steps in practice.

Jackson, Edward T., ed., 1998, Knowledge Shared: Participatory Evaluation in Development Cooperation, Bloomfield, Kumarian Press

This book provides analysis on the theory and practice of participatory evaluation around the world.

Lusthaus, Charles & al., 2002, Organizational Assessment: A Framework for Improving Performance, International Development Research Centre, Ottawa and Inter-American Development Bank, Washington, D.C.

The publication offers a methodology for diagnosing organizational strengths and weaknesses. It examines all aspects of organizational performance, including the enabling environment, institutional capacity, management, financial viability and staff motivation. It also reviews the methodological issues involved in carrying out an assessment, ranging from the choice and framing of questions to data collection and analysis, the question of who "owns" the assessment and the reporting of results.

Nagel, Stuart S., 2002, Handbook of Public Policy Evaluation, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications

This Handbook deals with many aspects of public policy evaluation including methods, examples, studies, professionalism, perspectives, concepts, trends, substance, theory, applications, dispute resolution, interdisciplinary interaction and bibliographies. A variety of insights and alternative perspectives on systematic policy evaluation, as well as ideas and applications dealing with win-win policy evaluation, are brought together in this resource.

Patton, Michael Q., 1997, Utilization-Focused Evaluation: The New Century Text, Third Edition, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications

Patton's book focuses on ways to make evaluations more useful, by focusing evaluation choices, options and decisions and using appropriate methods. It also discusses the realities and practicalities of utilization-focused evaluation.

Pawson, Ray and Tilley, Nicholas, 1997, Realistic Evaluation, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

The book is devoted to the articulation of a new evaluation paradigm, which seeks greater validity and utility from the findings of evaluation studies. The authors call this new approach 'realistic evaluation'. The book offers a complete blueprint for evaluation activities, running from design to data collection and analysis to the synthesis of findings across programmes and onto the realization of research into policy.

Technical Topics

Fowler, Floyd, 1995, Improving Survey Questions Design and Evaluation, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications

What is a good question? Although there are several potential sources for error in survey data, the validity of surveys is dependent upon the design of the question asked. This book shows how to word and format questions that will evoke the kind of answers for which they are designed and how to evaluate empirically survey questions.

Lyons Morris, Lynn, Freeman, Marie E. and Taylor Fitz-Gibbon, Carol, 1988, How to Communicate Evaluation Findings; Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications

Evaluation is only of use if its results are communicated to users and stakeholders. This volume demonstrates how this is done. The authors argue that communication needs to take place throughout the evaluation process. The importance of maintaining a variety of channels of formal and informal reporting mechanisms is shown. The need to tailor the medium and the message for intended audiences and uses is also stressed.

Mohr, Lawrence B.,1996, Impact Analysis for Program Evaluation, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications

The first edition included integration of multiple regression with evaluation design, and offered systematic ways to select the proper goals for single- and multiple-outcome evaluations. This edition has been revised to cover new issues and to clarify further the concepts used in impact analysis. New features include: expanded coverage and explanation of quasi-experiments; a section on impact analysis theory; a section on the use of qualitative research for impact analysis; expanded coverage of significance testing for programme evaluation; an explanation of why the comparative-change design is better than an ex-post-facto design from the standpoint of causal inference; and a clarification of the effects of volunteering or self-selection.

Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 1991, Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance.

This set of principles gies the views of the members of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) on the most important requirements of the evaluation process based on current policies and practices as well as donor agency experiences with evaluation and feedback of results.

Sanders, James R., 1994, The Program Evaluation Standards: How to Assess Evaluations of Educational Programs, Second Edition, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications

The second edition of this volume is the result of an extensive review process by the Joint Committee of the original Standards for Evaluations of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials published in 1981. The 30 standards are divided into four groups corresponding to the attributes of fair programme evaluation – utility; feasibility; propriety; and accuracy. In this new edition original standards have been combined and others added, with new case illustrations featuring applications of the standards to reform efforts in a diverse range of settings including schools, universities, law, medicine, nursing, business and social service agencies. Taken as a set, the Standards provide a working philosophy for evaluation which will lead to useful, feasible, ethical and sound programme evaluation.

Sonnichsen, Richard C, 1999, High Impact Internal Evaluation: A Practitioner's Guide to Evaluating and Consulting Inside Organizations, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications

This book shows how to effectively use internal evaluation to determine a business or program's effectiveness, efficiency, economy and performance.

Stecher, Brian and Davis, W.Alan, 1988, How to Focus an Evaluation, Thousand Oaks, Sage publications

Changes in the initial stages of the evaluation process over the last decade are reflected in this book. It recognizes that deciding what to evaluate is a complex negotiation process that involves the methodological predisposition of the evaluator and the client, client needs, the nature of the programme and the constraints surrounding the evaluation. It outlines five models that characterize different methodological approaches and considers how each may contribute to the focusing process.

U.S. General Accounting Office, 1998, Performance Measurement and Evaluation: Definitions and Relationships, United States General Accounting Office, Program Evaluation and Methodology Division, available through http://www.gao.gov/special.pubs/gg98026.pdf

Describes and explains the relationship between two common types of systematic programme assessments: performance measures and programme evaluation

U.S. General Accounting Office, 1992, The evaluation synthesis, Washington, D.C., United States General Accounting Office, Program Evaluation and Methodology Division (GAO/PEMD-10.1.4), available through http://161.203.16.4/t2pbat6/146601.pdf

Provides an overview of synthesis evaluation, including its strengths and limitations.

U.S. General Accounting Office,1991, Designing evaluations, Washington, D.C., United States General Accounting Office, Program Evaluation and Methodology Division, available through http://161.203.16.4/t2pbat7/144040.pdf

Provides a systematic approach to designing evaluation that takes into account the questions guiding a study, the constraints evaluators face in conducting it, and the information needs of its intended users.

U.S. General Accounting Office, 1991, Using structured interview techniques, Washington, D.C., United States General Accounting Office, Program Evaluation and Methodology Division. Available through http://161.203.16.4/t2pbat7/144388.pdf

This paper discusses how GAO evaluators should incorporate structured interview techniques when appropriate to performing their work. It explains when these techniques should be used and what steps should be followed. Overall, it describes techniques for designing a structured interview, for pre-testing, for training interviewers, and for conducting the interviews.

U.S. General Accounting Office, 1990, Case Study Evaluations, Washington D.C., United States General Accounting Office, Program Evaluation and Methodology Division, available through http://161.203.16.4/t2pbat22/132683.pdf

The paper presents an evaluation perspective on case studies, defines them and determines their appropriateness in terms of the type of evaluation question posed. It also describes six applications of case study methods, including the purposes and pitfalls of each method.

U.S. General Accounting Office, 1990, Prospective Evaluation Methods: The Prospective Evaluation Synthesis United States General Accounting Office, Program Evaluation and Methodology Division, available through http://www.gao.gov/special.pubs/pe10110.pdf

This paper focuses on a systematic method for providing the best possible information on, among other things, the likely outcomes of proposed programs, proposed legislation, the adequacy of proposed regulations or top-priority problems. The paper uses a combination of techniques that best answer prospective questions involving the analyses of alternative proposals and projections of various kinds.

IUCN – The World Conservation Union

Founded in 1948, The World Conservation Union brings together States, government agencies and a diverse range of non-governmental organizations in a unique world partnership: over 1000 members in all, spread across some 150 countries.

As a Union, IUCN seeks to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable.

The World Conservation Union builds on the strengths of its members, networks and partners to enhance their capacity and to support global alliances to safeguard natural resources at local, regional and global levels.

This publication is also available on the IUCN Evaluation Website – http://www.iucn.org/themes/eval/methods.htm

For additional hard copies in English, French or Spanish, please contact:
Nancy MacPherson
IUCN – The World Conservation Union
Rue Mauverney 28
CH-1196 Gland
Switzerland
Tel: +41 (22) 999 0271
Fax: +41 (22) 999 0010
Email: evaluation@iucn.org