

A Guide for the Planning and Conduct of IUCN Strategic Reviews

For IUCN Managers and Review Teams



REVIEW GUIDE



Developed by the IUCN Monitoring and Evaluation
Initiative with Universalia Management Group

IUCN
The World Conservation Union

A Guide for the Planning and Conduct of IUCN Strategic Reviews

For IUCN Managers and Review Teams

**Developed by the IUCN Monitoring and
Evaluation Initiative with Universalia
Management Group**

2004

The designation of geographical entities in this book, and the presentation of the material, do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IUCN concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of IUCN.

This publication has been made possible in part 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, United Kingdom.



Copyright: © 2004 International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources

Reproduction of this publication for educational or other non-commercial purposes is authorized without prior written permission from the copyright holder provided the source is fully acknowledged.

Reproduction of this publication for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without prior written permission of the copyright holder.

Citation: Adrien, Marie-Hélène, MacPherson, Nancy. *A Guide for the Planning and Conduct of IUCN Strategic Reviews*, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. iii + 51 pp.

ISBN: 2-8317-0870-2

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

Photographs by: IUCN Photo Library © Jim Thorsell

Edited by: Peter Hulm

Produced by: IUCN Monitoring & Evaluation Initiative

Translated by: Amalia Thaler

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

Available from: evaluation@iucn.org

Contents

Introduction	1
1. What is a Strategic Review?	2
1.1 Definition and Scope	2
1.2 Purpose	2
1.3 Unit of Assessment	2
1.4 Framework for Organizational Assessment	2
1.5 What and Who Triggers a Strategic Review?	3
1.6 Characteristics of a Strategic Review Process	3
1.7 Composition of the Strategic Review Team	4
1.8 Resources and Timeframe	4
1.9 Users of the Results	5
1.10 Limitations of the Strategic Review Process	5
2. Planning a Strategic Review	6
2.1 Terms of Reference	6
2.2 Clarifying the Issues to Explore	6
2.3 Using the Framework to Identify Issues and Questions	7
2.4 Asking the Right Questions	8
2.5 Identifying Proper Indicators	9
2.6 Identifying Sources of Data	10
2.7 What Methods Do We Need to Use to Collect Data?	11
2.8 How to Determine the Composition of the Review Team	13
2.9 Clarifying Roles and Responsibilities of Team Members	13
2.10 Evaluation Matrix	14
2.11 Workplan/Schedule for the Review	15
3. Collecting the Data Effectively	15
3.1 Developing or Adapting Data Collection Instruments	15
3.2 Using An Appropriate Dissemination Strategy	16
3.3 Data Entry for Questionnaires	16
4. Conducting Appropriate Data Analysis	17
4.1 The Importance of Data Triangulation	17
4.2 Making Sense of the Data	17
4.3 Sorting the Data	18
4.4 Using a Debriefing Session to Analyze the Data Collected	18

Contents

5. Reporting the Results of Strategic Reviews	19
5.1 Know Your Various Audiences	19
5.2 The ABCs of a Good Written Report	20
5.3 Using the Report to Implement Change	20
5.4 From the Report to an Action Plan	20
5.5 Effective Monitoring of the Action Plan	21

Exhibits

Exhibit 2.1 Examples of Key Questions	8
Exhibit 2.2 Examples of Types of Indicators	9
Exhibit 2.3 Strengths and Limitations of Data Collection Methods	12
Exhibit 2.4 Example of Evaluation Matrix	14
Exhibit 2.5 Possible Format for the Review Workplan	15
Exhibit 2.6 How to Ensure High Return Rates	16
Exhibit 2.7 Possible Format For An Action Plan	21

Appendices

Appendix I – Identifying Performance Aspects	22
Appendix II – Identifying Factors that Affect Performance	23
Appendix III – Sample Evaluation Matrix from BRAO Strategic Review, 2002	26
Appendix IV – Using Group Techniques for Data Collection	33
Appendix V – Using Interviews for Data Collection	37
Appendix VI – Using Questionnaires for Data Collection	41
Appendix VII – Sample IUCN Questionnaires and Protocols	48
Appendix VIII – Entering scaled questionnaire data in MS Excel	50

Acronyms

BRAO	Regional Office for West Africa
EARO	Regional Office for Eastern Africa
EMG	Executive Management Group
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IUCN	World Conservation Union
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
PPG	Programme and Policy Group
TORs	Terms of Reference

Introduction

IUCN undertakes annual Strategic Reviews which focus on key issues and questions related to the performance of organizational units such as Regional Offices, Global Thematic Programmes or Commissions.

Based on experience since 2001 of conducting Strategic Reviews in IUCN, this document provides guidance for IUCN M&E staff and programme managers in planning and managing Strategic Reviews. The guide provides an overview of the expected steps in the review process and provides tools, ideas and tips on the things “to do” or “not to forget”. It also provides examples of data collection instruments (questionnaires and interview protocols) that have been used in past reviews, and that can be adapted for future Reviews.

The guide is a “work in progress,” intended to benefit from the ongoing experience of the IUCN staff and consultants who undertake Strategic Reviews. Accordingly, it will be updated regularly on the basis of feedback and comments from Review Team members and IUCN managers.

The Guide has been prepared by Marie-Hélène Adrien and Simon Thibault of Universalis Management Group with Nancy MacPherson, Head of the IUCN Monitoring and Evaluation Initiative.

This main body of the guide:

- provides the **definition** of Strategic Reviews in IUCN;
- clarifies their **scope** and purpose;
- identifies the **composition** of the Review team, resources, and other general characteristics of this type of Review; and
- describes the **phases** of a Strategic Review process, which include planning, data collection, data analysis, reporting and the implementation of recommendations.

The appendices include:

- **tools** to assist with the planning stage of the Review, such as an example of an organizational assessment framework, and evaluation matrix
- **tips** for preparing the data collection instruments, implementing some of the most common data collection methods, and preparing presentations on findings; and
- **examples** of data collection instruments that can be adapted for future Reviews.

1. What is a Strategic Review?

1.1 Definition and Scope

As stated in the IUCN Evaluation Policy approved by Council in 2001, a Strategic Review is a selective evaluation or review of a project, programme, organizational unit or policy undertaken at the request of the Director General, IUCN senior management or the IUCN Council.¹ Since 2001 a series of annual Strategic Reviews has been undertaken, initially of regional and country programmes, and more recently of global programmes and Commissions.

1.2 Purpose

A Strategic Review examines **key strategic issues** related to the rationale, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and financial viability of a unit in order to make conclusions about its performance. This type of Review is conducted at the request of the IUCN Director General or the Director (Global Programme). Their request may be triggered by specific concerns about the performance of the unit and by questions raised in annual programming and budgeting cycles.² Strategic Reviews are designed to assess performance and identify areas of improvement. The Review results are used to make key decisions about the future of an organizational unit – its rationale, focus, content, location, scope, direction, and levels of resource allocation. Strategic Reviews, in this sense, differ from in-depth technical programme Reviews in that they seek to answer higher order strategic questions and they look at both organizational as well as programmatic performance.³

1.3 Unit of Assessment

Strategic Reviews in IUCN initially focused on the organizational and programmatic components of IUCN Regional Offices. Increasingly however the approach and methodology is being used for Reviews of country programmes, global thematic programmes, large projects and Commissions. The framework for Strategic Reviews seeks to identify organizational issues that may influence the overall performance of the unit, including the implementation of its programme.

We should note, however, that it is usually not possible to assess all of the components in a Regional Office within the time frame and budget that IUCN can usually make available for Strategic Reviews. Many Regional Offices are comprised of several layers such as the Regional Office itself, country offices, and regional and country thematic programmes and project offices. In order to make the best use of scarce time and resources, a Strategic Review should focus on the most important issues related to the overall functioning and performance of the regional programme. These are the issues that need to be fully understood in order for management to make decisions about the unit's future direction.

1.4 Framework for Organizational Assessment

IUCN uses a framework and model for organizational assessment that was developed by IDRC (International Development Research Centre) and Universalia in 1999. The framework provides IUCN senior managers and Council with:

¹ The IUCN Evaluation Policy, Approved by the IUCN Council at its 55th Meeting, 28-30 October 2001, p.5.

² IUCN Evaluation Policy, op. cit., p.5.

³ IUCN M&E Initiative, A Framework to Guide Strategic Reviews in IUCN, Draft for Review by Senior Management and PDG, December 2000, p.1.

- an agreed set of performance aspects and questions;
- a systematic way of collecting data from multiple stakeholders in order to draw conclusions and make judgments and strategic decisions in a transparent and defensible manner; and
- a framework around which to report on performance at the organizational level.

Elements of the framework include:

- a set of key performance aspects within which an organizational unit is expected to perform to higher standards (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, financial viability and impact);
- a set of key factors – capacity, motivation and external context - that affect performance in each of the above areas;
- key Review questions that relate to these areas; and
- a transparent process of data collection and stakeholder involvement to answer the key Review questions, generate findings and reach conclusions about the performance of the unit.⁴

The set of key performance aspects and factors affecting organizational performance are described in Appendix I and Appendix II.

1.5 What and Who Triggers a Strategic Review?

Typical issues that have triggered Strategic Reviews include questions or uncertainties related to the mandate, financial viability or location of an office or a programme, its relationship with members, donors and other partners. In these cases, senior management may request that a Strategic Review be undertaken, or the Review may be self-initiated by a Regional Director or Head of a Programme to obtain feedback from key stakeholders on their perception of the performance of an office.

1.6 Characteristics of a Strategic Review Process

Strategic Reviews in IUCN are based on the elements of internal peer review processes. While the primary purpose of a Strategic Review is to support improvements in the performance of the unit in question, a secondary purpose is to strengthen the capacity of IUCN managers to undertake internal evaluations and reviews.

Principles of the Review process include those detailed in the IUCN Evaluation Policy, including:

- **support for an evaluative culture** – a way of thinking and a way of acting;
- **results-oriented accountability** – seeking to improve the delivery of IUCN’s work and the achievement of the Mission;
- **ownership** - sustained involvement in, and ownership of the evaluation process contributes to better planning, decision-making and strategy formulation at all levels;
- **quality control** – reflecting best practice standards in evaluation;
- **partnerships** involving multiple stakeholders - those affected by the outcome of an evaluation have a right to be involved in the process;
- **transparency** – clarity of purpose, questions and intended uses of the results of the Review;
- **accessibility** – making the results of reviews accessible to staff and other key stakeholders;

⁴ IUCN M&E Initiative, A Framework to Guide Strategic Reviews in IUCN, op. cit., p.1.

- **ethicality** – providing due regard for those involved in the review as well as those affected by the review;
- **impartiality** – fair in the examination of the strengths and weaknesses, and guarding against distortions caused by personal feelings and biases;
- **credibility** – of design, methodology and data collection based on internationally recognized best practice standards for evaluation;
- **utility** – serving the information needs of the intended users.

1.7 Composition of the Strategic Review Team

Based on peer review practice, IUCN Strategic Review Teams typically include a senior IUCN manager as Review Leader, a mid-level technical IUCN programme manager and an external consultant. Generally the team is small in size (usually no more than three people). However, it can be larger depending on the size of the region or programme, the scope of the data collection and the complexity of the issues. For example, in the BRAO Strategic Review senior IUCN managers and experts from other regions joined the Review Team to support specific parts of the Review and to stimulate cross-regional exchanges.

M&E staff and consultants support the process by ensuring that the terms of reference (TORs) and methodology are sound, including the design of data collection tools and interview protocols, and that Review Teams are provided with coaching in various aspects of Review process as needed. In some cases the M&E unit will provide data collection support.

The Reviews need to carry the full authority of IUCN senior management to ensure that recommendations are credible and acted on. Review team members should be senior staff people who command respect and credibility among the IUCN programme components (regions, Commissions, thematic) and the IUCN Council. External consultants can also play an important role on Review teams to provide a more independent view when donors need an external assessment to respond to specific concerns about the performance of a regional office or global thematic programme, and for intensive support for data collection and analysis.

1.8 Resources and Timeframe

Evaluation in IUCN is relatively new and evolving in terms of its institutional support and resource allocation. A modest level of resources is allocated for Strategic Reviews each year. A typical budget for a Strategic Review is in the range of CHF 30-50,000, depending on the scope and geographic coverage of the Programme. This covers the direct costs of the Review (travel, field expenses, M&E methodology, data support and translation), but does not include the cost of IUCN staff time. This is the minimum level of resources required to do an adequate and credible job of a Review of a Regional Office or Global Thematic Programme.

The minimum time to implement a Strategic Review is three to four weeks including intensive data collection, desk and fieldwork. The total time required to plan, implement, manage and report on a Review is between six weeks and four months.

IUCN senior staff members on the Review team invest a significant level of effort in the exercise, and therefore need to be free from other commitments. Often, the mid-level programme staff and the external consultant are more deeply involved in the fieldwork than the senior manager who leads the Review Team, since demands on senior managers are such that their available time for field work is limited.

One of the major limitations of the Strategic Review peer review process in IUCN is that managers have limited backup staff resources to allow them to step out of their responsibilities to serve adequately on a Strategic Review team.

1.9 Users of the Results

There is a range of users and uses of a Strategic Review. The users include:

- IUCN's Director General, IUCN Council and/or Bureau, who use the Reviews for decision-making related to the rationale, focus, content, location, direction and viability of IUCN units, and for annual reporting on performance to the IUCN Council;
- IUCN senior management, in particular the Director General and the Director of the Global Programme, for regular oversight of the performance of IUCN offices and programmes world-wide;
- the Head, the Director or Coordinator of the unit reviewed, for improvement of management and programme systems and the delivery of results;
- Staff of the unit, for improved understanding of the performance of the unit, and for improved delivery of results; and
- Members of the Union, in their governance role as overseers of the Global Programme and performance of the Union, exercised at World Congresses.⁵

Because there are so many potential users, it is important to clarify the purpose of the specific Review being conducted (understanding what triggered it) and the audience (who commissioned it and who will be the primary user). These two elements can help in determining the focus of the study, the tone, the scope or level of detail required.

1.10 Limitations of the Strategic Review Process

There are several limitations of the Strategic Review process as it is currently implemented in IUCN:

- The capacity-building benefits of the peer review process are often limited because the senior IUCN managers leading the Review have inadequate time to fully participate in Review processes, and even less time for coaching and training sessions that could enhance their Review skills.
- The scope of data collection and analysis is limited by the modest amount of time and resources available to undertake Reviews. While the M&E Unit tries to ensure that the data collection strategy is representative of all key stakeholders (staff, members, partners, donors) and credible in size, this is a challenge in regions that have hundreds of members and multiple languages in which the Review must be conducted within a short period.
- Internal reviews and self assessments are often considered to be less independent and less objective than external reviews. This is an inherent limitation of internal reviews and not specific to the IUCN Strategic Reviews.

⁵ Ibid, pp.1-2.

2. Planning a Strategic Review

A Strategic Review is comprised of five major stages: planning (also called the preparatory stage), data collection, data analysis, reporting, and change implementation. This section deals with the first stage.

Once the decision has been made to commission a Review, the planning stage begins. Good planning is critical to the success of the Strategic Review. The planning of a Review should encompass the elements that we have noted below. These are not meant to be prescriptive, but to highlight the elements that need to be considered in order to facilitate subsequent stages and to ensure that the Review is thorough and successful. The following elements are usually developed by the M&E staff in consultation with those commissioning the Review and with the managers of the unit being reviewed:

- Terms of Reference;
- An Evaluation Matrix, including the evaluation issues to be explored, the key questions, and the sources of data to answer the questions;
- Appropriate methods and tools for collecting the data;
- Composition of the Review team;
- Roles and responsibilities of Review Team members;
- Management of the Review; and
- Schedule or work plan for the Review process.

2.1 Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference (TORs) provide the parameters for the Review. The recommended basic core components of the TORs include (but are not limited to) the following:

- context for the Review
- rationale and purpose for the Review
- review issues and questions
- key stakeholders for the Review
- proposed methodology
- review team
- workplan/schedule
- level of effort of each team member
- estimated cost
- appendices (including Evaluation Matrix)

2.2 Clarifying the Issues to Explore

Strategic Reviews are commissioned by senior management to answer questions and concerns related to issues of relevance, effectiveness, financial viability, location of a Unit, etc. In developing the Terms of Reference and Evaluation Matrix, M&E staff and the Review Team should clarify with senior officers the major issues to be addressed to ensure that the key issues and concerns are well understood and to ensure that a Review is the right tool to employ. If management and leadership issues are of concern to senior management, it is suggested that perhaps a staff performance appraisal process may be a more appropriate tool than a Strategic Review.

2.3 Using the Framework to Identify Issues and Questions

Strategic Reviews examine both organizational and programmatic performance. To understand both of these dimensions, it helps to use the framework for organizational performance referred to in Section 1.4 as a way to visualize the elements of organizational performance identify and to identify performance issues and the factors that affect performance. Appendix I and Appendix II provide a framework adapted to IUCN from the IDRC / Universalia framework for organizational assessment.

Organizational Performance

The team should identify the organizational performance issues that are critical for assessing the unit's performance. IUCN recommends that the managers commissioning the Review consider issues of effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, financial viability and impact, which are commonly acknowledged as being key performance issues for an organizational unit. Appendix I explains how these performance aspects can be contextualized in IUCN by providing examples of the kinds of questions that could be asked about each of them. In general, however, these terms can be understood as:

- **effectiveness:** the degree to which the IUCN unit can move towards the attainment of its mission and meet its objectives;
- **efficiency:** the degree to which the IUCN unit uses its resources optimally to achieve its goals or objectives;
- **relevance:** the degree to which the mission, goals, programmes and projects of a unit in IUCN have remained valid to its key stakeholders and constituents;
- **financial viability:** the IUCN unit's capacity to secure a diversified inflow of financial resources; and
- **impact:** the planned or unplanned consequences, within and outside the IUCN unit, resulting from the unit's activities.

To further explore these performance issues, the Review team may want to look at three factors that have a profound impact on organizational performance. First, the unit's **capacity**, which is determined by its strategic leadership, human resources, financial management, organizational processes, programme management, infrastructure and institutional linkages. Second, the **motivation** of the unit's staff, which is influenced by factors such as the history, mission, culture, incentives and rewards of the unit and the larger organization. Finally, the unit's **external environment**, which is shaped by the political, economic, technological, socio-cultural, administrative and legal context as well as by external stakeholders. Appendix II provides one way of looking at these factors in the context of IUCN.

Programmatic Performance

At the programmatic level, the Review Team should look more closely at a selection of the unit's project and/or programme interventions with regard to thematic biodiversity-conservation and sustainable development. While it is not possible for a Strategic Review to do an in-depth technical programme Review, it can sample programme results, compare the programme portfolio against the situation analysis to identify significant gaps in programming, and can look at the results of project and programme evaluations. The Review Team should focus on those programmes and projects of most significance to the region, and those that pose the greatest risk to IUCN (financially, programmatically or to its image and reputation).

2.4 Asking the Right Questions

Once the performance issues for the Review are clear, the Review Team must define key questions about those issues. The questions should highlight areas that need special attention if the issue is to be adequately analyzed. This is a very important task. By identifying the right questions, you will greatly facilitate the definition of indicators and data collection. More importantly, it will ensure that the team has adequately addressed the issues.

As you begin to identify the key questions, bear in mind that there are different types of questions – known as descriptive, normative, or impact questions – that have different implications for your data collection methods.

- **Descriptive questions:** These require descriptive information about specific conditions or events. The answers describe what is happening now.
- **Normative questions:** Such questions require you to compare an observed outcome with an established standard or expected level of performance. The answers describe what should be done.
- **Impact questions:** Such questions require analyses of whether observed conditions or events can be attributed to programme operations. The answers describe cause-and-effect relationships.⁶

In most cases, a mix of these types of questions will help draw out the information that is needed to assess the performance issue.

The following table provides a sample of key questions concerning the issue of efficiency. When writing these questions, you should always keep in mind **the information you need to shed light on the performance issues**. Appendices I and II provide examples of key questions for the five performance aspects and factors affecting performance that were discussed above.

Exhibit 2.1 Examples of Types of Questions

ISSUE	KEY QUESTIONS	TYPE OF QUESTION
Efficient use of resources	How were funds allocated this year?	Descriptive question
	Were funds disbursed according to standard budget procedures?	Normative question
	Was the planned budget appropriate to the needs of the organization?	Impact question

Depending on the financial resources that are available for the evaluation, prioritizing your set of questions may be important. In prioritizing, you may wish to consider:

- whether or not the question can be answered with the resources available;
- the importance of answering this particular question, given the overall purpose of the Review; and
- maintaining a balance of questions that respond to different stakeholders' interests or priorities.

The goal is to develop questions that can realistically be answered within the scope and limitations of the Review, and those that will be most useful to the key stakeholders of the Review. Questions that you do not need to answer or cannot afford to answer should be dropped. It is useful to remember the rule of differentiating between 'need to know' and 'nice to know' when making these choices.

⁶ Ibid, p.21.

2.5 Identifying Proper Indicators

An indicator is a measuring device that allows you to clarify and measure a concept. It is a quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, reflect changes, or help assess performance. Indicators also clarify what type of information will help answer the key questions for the Review.

- Quantitative indicators are “numeric representations” of a concept (for example, the number of IUCN staff trained in a workshop on wetlands management).⁷
- Qualitative indicators are less tangible and usually represent people’s views or perceptions in a given situation (e.g. perceptions of staff on the usefulness of the training on wetlands management in their work).

The following example based on a fictitious organization further illustrates the difference between these two types of indicators.

Exhibit 2.2 Examples of Types of Indicators

QUESTION	INDICATOR	TYPE OF INDICATOR
What is the impact of the “Women in Action” research centre in Mali regarding the advancement of gender equality concepts in the country in the past three years?	Number of articles on gender equity by the research centre published over the past three years	Quantitative indicator
	Number of copies on gender equity disseminated by the research centre over the past three years	Quantitative indicator
	Number of people who read the research’s centre’s publications on gender equity over the past three years	Quantitative indicator
	Perceptions of major gender equality specialists in Mali on the impact of the research’s centre publications on the level of awareness on gender equity issues in Mali over the past three years	Qualitative indicator
	Perceptions by Women’s NGOs promoting gender equity issues in Mali on the impact of the research centre’s publications on regarding the level of awareness	Qualitative indicator

Some indicators may be more difficult to assess than others depending on the resources of the Review team. For the quantitative indicators, for example, it is much easier to assess the number of articles published by the research centre than to assess the number of people that have read the research centre’s publications. However, the latter statistic is perhaps a better indicator of the potential societal impact of the centre since it is more illustrative of the organization’s audiences. As noted above, qualitative indicators often are based on people’s perceptions of situations or events and are useful for capturing the variety of impacts on people.

⁷ Ibid, p.22.

2.6 Identifying Sources of Data

Documents and people are the two primary sources of information needed to answer the questions that are posed and to track the indicators identified in the previous section.

Internal and External Documents

Documents are always an important source of information in IUCN Strategic Reviews and are a good starting point in the data collection process.

Useful documents may include:

- Intersessional Programme Plans
- Strategic Plans
- Situation Analysis
- Annual Workplans
- Annual Progress Reports
- Quarterly monitoring reports
- Financial reports, audits
- Programme and project documents (proposals, plans)
- Reports to donor agencies
- Evaluation reports
- Media articles

People as Data Sources

The unit's stakeholders should be included in the Review process. The challenge for the Review team is to identify whom to involve and how to involve them.

The answers to the following questions can help determine who should be involved:

- What do you need to know? Whose views and experiences would be relevant?
- Who takes decisions about the unit?
- Who will be expected to act on the decisions?
- Who could benefit from the experience of analyzing problems together?
- Whose active support is essential for the success of the unit?
- Who is likely to feel threatened by the possibility of changes to the unit?⁸

A note about access to data sources:

- Do we have appropriate access to the main stakeholders we would like to include?
- Do we have appropriate access to key documents?
- Do we have appropriate access to key facilities?

The main stakeholders for Strategic Reviews typically include the staff of the unit, IUCN members, partners, government representatives, local project representatives and donors. In addition the vertical and horizontal linkages of units with other regional programmes, Commissions, and global thematic

⁸ These questions are drawn from Lisa Gosling and Mike Edwards, *Toolkits: A Practical Guide to Assessment, Monitoring, Review and Evaluation*, Save the Children, 1995, p.15

programmes are important to consider. The Review may also want to include a sample of Regional Directors, Programme Coordinators, and global or regional thematic coordinators and Commissions representatives.

2.7 What Methods Do We Need to Use to Collect Data?

Planning for a successful Review also requires selecting the most appropriate and feasible method for collecting data. Each of the methods that IUCN typically uses in its Reviews has its strengths and weaknesses. These should be identified and discussed with key Review stakeholders and the Review team should look at ways of being able to minimize the effects of each method's potential weaknesses.

Principal Methods Used in Strategic Reviews

Document Review

This involves identification of written or electronic documents containing information on issues to be explored. As noted in section 2.6, the documents can include Annual reports, project/programme plans or evaluations, strategic plans, etc. It is important for the team to discuss which documents will fit the questions that are being asked in the Review. The team then Reviews the documents and identifies relevant information. They must keep track and cite the information retrieved from the documents.

On-site Observation

This method provides an on-site account of what is going on in a specific setting. This can be an organizational setting such as staff meetings, regularly scheduled meetings with partners, etc. A project site visit can help the Review team understand the context in which projects or programmes take place and evolve. It also provides an opportunity to gain insights into the culture of the unit, especially if people are reluctant to participate in the interview process. However site visits are not always possible due to limitations of time and distance to field sites.

Questionnaires

These are printed or electronic questions distributed to a predetermined group of people by mail, fax, or email. If the team uses this method, it is important to include time to pilot test the tools developed/adapted to ensure that the language and the flow of the questions to improve the quality of the tool and likelihood of it being understood by respondents. The Review team should identify the group or sample and establish beforehand what it will consider to be an adequate response rate (usually more than 50% in the case of IUCN Strategic Reviews). For tips on the development and use of questionnaires, please see Appendix IV – Using Group Techniques for Data Collection.

Group Techniques (Interviews, Focus Groups, Facilitated Workshop)

Group interview: Interviewing a group of people together (3-15) provides access to the knowledge of several people at once. This method involves a group discussion of a predetermined issue or topic led by a facilitator (in person or through teleconferencing).

Focus group: A small group of people (5-10) with specialist knowledge, interest, or who share a particular characteristic, is invited to discuss specific topics in detail. In the session, participants are asked to respond to a series of predetermined questions. However, they are not expected or encouraged to work toward consensus or rethink their views, but simply to state what they believe. Focus groups can also be used to clarify specific topics that can then be discussed by a larger group.

Facilitated workshop: In the context of a Strategic Review, it may be useful to schedule a short workshop to conduct a SWOT Analysis – an assessment of the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats facing the unit. Such a workshop could include brainstorming and prioritizing issues to be examined in the Strategic Review.

For tips on using group techniques, please see Annex IV.

Individual Interviews

Using an interview guide called a protocol, the interviewer asks the respondent questions in either face-to-face meetings or by telephone. In Strategic Reviews, interviews may be conducted with a selected number of partners, members, donors, or staff. The decision to conduct interviews may be based on:

- The pre-selected key informants that you feel it is best to interview, rather than sending a questionnaire, so that you are sure to take their perspective into account;
- Matters of protocol – for example, it is more appropriate to interview high-ranking government officials rather than send them questionnaires; and
- Issues that emerge from the results of more a broadly distributed questionnaire and may indicate the need for follow-up interviews with key stakeholders.

For tips on conducting interviews, please see Annex VI.

Strengths and Limitations of Each of these Methods

The table below highlights some of the strengths and limitations of each of the data collection methods that are typically used in a Strategic Review or for that matter any evaluation.

Exhibit 2.3 Strengths and Limitations of Data Collection Methods

METHOD	STRENGTHS	LIMITATIONS
Questionnaire survey	<p>Highly efficient for data collection with a large population of respondents</p> <p>Lends itself to quantitative analysis</p> <p>Cost efficient and timely</p> <p>Many people are familiar with such a tool</p> <p>Respondents can provide comments in their own words</p>	<p>Low response rate if no active follow up</p>
Interviews	<p><i>Face-to-face meeting:</i></p> <p>Allows for in-depth information gathering</p> <p>Allows for in-depth analysis and pursuit of details geared to each respondent</p> <p>Shows value placed on individual subject</p> <p>High response rate</p> <p><i>Phone interview:</i></p> <p>Has many of the above advantages, at lower cost</p>	<p><i>Face-to-face meeting:</i></p> <p>Careful planning of questions required</p> <p>Validity of interview requires skilled interviewers</p> <p>May lead respondent to say things to please</p> <p>Data is often difficult to analyze in ways that give clear indications</p> <p>Logistically difficult to arrange, expensive and time consuming for all parties</p> <p><i>Phone interview:</i></p> <p>Some may find it intrusive (this can be lessened if interview is pre-arranged)</p>

METHOD	STRENGTHS	LIMITATIONS
	Allows for interviews to be conducted when stakeholders are dispersed geographically Permits rapid coding of responses on paper or computer	Difficult for the interviewer to maintain the respondent's attention for an extended period
Group techniques	Group synergy maximizes recall Highlights diversity of perspective Provides rich qualitative perspective Group process can enhance underlying attitude A large number of people can be reached in a short time	Skilled facilitator required Does not lend itself to quantification Are not good for revealing sensitive information Requires extensive question planning and logistics planning
On-site observation	Provides eye-witness account Allows comparison of words and deeds Sensitive technique when used by a trained observer Occurs in a natural setting	May create artificial situations May give inadequate sampling of observed events Is costly in time and personnel May reflect observer bias
Document Review	Good source of general background information May bring to surface issues not noted by other means Is economical Is unobtrusive	Information may be out of date, not applicable, disorganized or unavailable Can be biased because of "selective survival" of information May require extensive research efforts

2.8 How to Determine the Composition of the Review Team

This is a critical aspect of the planning phase. In selecting the team, it is important to consider the skills and perspectives that each team member will bring to bear on the issues to be addressed in the Review, including the right mix of qualitative and quantitative skills, programme/technical expertise, participatory process experience, evaluation expertise, etc.

The Review team should be balanced in terms of the internal and external perspectives that each member brings. It can be composed exclusively of IUCN staff or combine internal and external Reviewers. In making this decision it is important to consider both cost and quality-of-results implications. If you include an external consultant, it will require more financial resources, but may improve the objectivity of the analysis, reduce bias, etc.

IUCN recommends that Strategic Review teams be comprised of an IUCN senior manager (Regional Director, Head of Thematic Programme) as Team Leader who is supported by a mid-level IUCN programme manager and by an external consultant who brings complementary skills. Both the mid level programme managers and the consultant are expected to support extensive data collection and analysis.

2.9 Clarifying Roles and Responsibilities of Team Members

IUCN's senior programme managers (Regional Directors, Heads of Thematic Programmes) play a strategic role by providing guidance and leadership to the team and overseeing the general quality of the Review. He or she may be more involved in the conceptual stage of defining the issues, questions, and

overall approach for the Review. Regional Directors and Heads of Thematic Programmes are likely to spend less time in the field gathering and analyzing the information than the other team members.

The mid-level programme manager and external consultant, on the other hand, will play a greater operational role, focusing on logistical and analytical matters such as questionnaire dissemination, interviews, data analysis and reporting.

It is possible that a Review team member fulfils both the strategic and operational role. What is important to keep in mind in preparing for the Review is that certain responsibilities take precedence over the others at different phases in the process. For example, conceptual responsibilities will prevail in the planning and reporting phases whereas operational responsibilities will be more crucial during data collection and analysis.⁹

2.10 Evaluation Matrix

The evaluation matrix provides a way of capturing and organizing the information from many of the steps in this planning stage – from identifying performance issues for the Review to deciding on the appropriate data collection methods. The following table is an example of an evaluation matrix. It presents a performance issue, related questions to draw out the specific information we want about the issue, indicators, data sources and the proposed data collection method.

For a more detailed example, see the evaluation matrix of the BRAO Strategic Review that is included in Appendix III.

Exhibit 2.4 Example of evaluation matrix

PERFORMANCE ISSUES	QUESTIONS	INDICATORS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHOD
Effectiveness of the Unit's Programme	What are the specific outputs delivered by the Programme?	Programme outputs	Programme plans describing outputs or deliverables	Document Review
	To what extent are these outputs contributing to Programme objectives / results?	Programme stakeholder perceptions of the contribution of outputs to Programme objectives	Partners, Staff	Questionnaire
	To what extent is the Programme making a contribution to conservation and sustainable development in the region?	Programme stakeholder perceptions of the contribution to conservation and sustainable development in the region	Members, Donors Situation analysis	Questionnaire and Individual interviews Analysis of Situation Analysis and Programme data

⁹ For more information on the above ideas, see: Charles Lusthaus, Marie-Hélène Adrien, Gary Anderson and Fred Carden, *Enhancing Organizational Performance: A Toolbox for Self-Assessment*, IDRC, Ottawa, 1999, p. 10.

2.11 Workplan/Schedule for the Review

The Review plan should indicate how the work will get done in a specified period. It will detail the tasks, products, timing, and responsibilities for completing the different phases of the Review.

Exhibit 2.5 Possible format for the Review workplan

PHASE	TASK OR ACTIVITY	PRODUCT	DATE	RESPONSIBLE TEAM MEMBER
2	Develop data collection instruments	Questionnaire	May 18	JF
		Focus-group protocols	May 27	AMR

3. Collecting the Data Effectively

The findings and conclusions of the Review will depend on the systematic collection and analysis of a variety of information. The purpose of being systematic is to understand the issues fully and not from a single perspective.¹⁰ If the data collection is effective, then the Review Team is more likely to be able to provide a balanced view—drawn from different sources—of the issues at hand.

3.1 Developing or Adapting Data Collection Instruments

All of the data collection methods described in Section 2.7 require tools or instruments to facilitate the process. The Review team is responsible for their design. This Guide provides some tips in Appendix IV that can help with this process.

In addition, examples of questionnaires and protocols used in previous Reviews are included in Appendix VII. While these existing questionnaires provide a starting point for the team, they will need to be adapted to the particular issues and questions that have been identified for the Review.

The evaluation matrix described in the previous section provides the fundamental input for developing or adapting tools for a specific Review context.

Using a Participatory Approach in Instrument Development

One of the roles of the Review team is to determine the best way to go about preparing data collection instruments. Questionnaires and protocols can benefit greatly from feedback that is provided by a large number of stakeholders (regional managers, country managers, Review team members, M&E Facilitator, etc.). Broad consultation ensures that the questions, issues, and language used are appropriate to the distinctiveness of the region. Yet such a process requires energy and time. The Review team must be willing to follow-up on the consultation process, identify the emerging consensus on items in the instruments, and integrate comments. Using a participatory approach can double the amount of time that is needed for developing the instruments. This should be built into the work plan and schedule for the Review.

Communicating with stakeholders

Before getting started on data collection, it is important to communicate with stakeholders:

- Notifying them on the *why* of the Review.
- Letting them know *when* it will happen.
- Making sure they know *what* is expected of them.

¹⁰ Louisa Gosling with Mike Edwards, *Toolkits: A Practical Guide to Assessment, Monitoring, Review and Evaluation*, Save the Children, 1995, p. 39.

3.2 Using an Appropriate Dissemination Strategy

A dissemination strategy refers to the way in which the Review team decides to distribute and to collect the data. This strategy must be carefully planned and take into account language, timing, technology, cultural and other issues that may affect whether or not people can be reached and whether they will engage in the Review process.

Exhibit 3.1 How to ensure high return rates

METHOD	TIP
Interviews	<p>Schedule them in advance.</p> <p>Confirm appointment a day prior to the interview.</p> <p>Confirm another appointment if there is a cancellation.</p>
Questionnaires	<p>Send explanatory note in advance.</p> <p>Have a high-level member of the organization send the questionnaire.</p> <p>Ensure appropriate follow-up via phone call or personal visit by someone from the organization.</p>

3.3 Data Entry for Questionnaires

Once all the questionnaires have been collected, the first step in data entry is to code the questionnaires by assigning an “ID” number to the questionnaires that will allow you to refer to them further if needed later in the data analysis process. In most cases a simple Excel spreadsheet programme will provide the functions required to organize the information from these coded questionnaires, produce statistics, and to generate the graphs that are needed to analyze the data. In Appendix VIII, we provide some general tips on how to design a basic database and input the data using Microsoft Excel. Once the data has been entered, this programme will also allow you to generate charts that are helpful in analyzing the data.

Data entry and chart generation tasks are usually not done directly by members of the Review team so it is important to budget and plan for in-house or external data entry support. It is also important to complete the data entry tasks as quickly as possible in the Review process so that the Review Team can see the issues and trends arising from the data collection.

4. Conducting Appropriate Data Analysis

After collecting data, the information must be described, analyzed, interpreted, and a judgment made about the findings. This process can be complicated and there is ample literature on research and evaluation methods that cover this in greater detail. In the following sections, we highlight the most important things for you to consider as you enter this stage.

It is important to make sure to allocate enough time for data analysis, especially when there is a large amount of qualitative information.

4.1 The Importance of Data Triangulation

It is important for the team to reduce inconsistencies and confirm results by drawing on more than one source. This means gathering the views of more than one group and trying to collect more than one type of data. By collecting data from at least three different sources, you “triangulate” data. This is an important standard in data collection and stronger interpretation can be made from information drawn from several different sources.

4.2 Making Sense of the Data

Before becoming deeply engaged in the analysis of the data, it is useful to look at all the information you have and assess whether or not it meets other standards, such as:

- **Is the information reliable?**
Reliability refers to consistency in measurement. Will our instruments have provided the same answers even if they were administered at different times or in different places? In order to assess reliability, you may want to ask whether the timing of the interviews, or some other local condition, could have unduly influenced the way stakeholders responded to items on the questionnaire. When looking at the qualitative information gathered during the Review, it is important to note if all team members reach the same conclusion. Would people who are not on the team reach the same conclusion?
- **Is the information valid?**
This refers to the extent to which the data collection methods and instruments measure what they were supposed to measure – did they capture the intended information? Validity complements reliability and refers to the extent to which what we measure reflects what we expected it to measure. In the case of Strategic Reviews, it is important to consider the *internal validity* of the data measures, which relates to issues of truthfulness of responses and accuracy of records, for example. It is also important to ask about the *external validity*, or generalizability of the results, when data is collected from a sample instead of an entire population. For example, are the results obtained from a sample of 10 partner organizations similar to the results of all 30 partners in the region?¹¹
- **Is there sufficient information?**
The Review team will want to consider whether or not there are enough responses to questionnaires, interviews, etc. to analyze and come to conclusions.
- **Is there contradictory information?**
Do documents and interviews, for example, reveal different situations? Is there a need for additional study in order to corroborate the finding?
- **Are there standards to compare with?**
In some cases, there are organizational standards that the team may want to use in order to make

¹¹ Gary Anderson, *Fundamentals of Educational Research*, Falmer Press, London, 1995.

comparisons. For example, the IUCN Evaluation Policy recommends that 3-5% of project and Programme budgets be allocated for monitoring and evaluation. This could be a parameter for assessing whether or not the unit is on track in terms of adequate resourcing for the monitoring and evaluation function.

4.3 Sorting the Data

The evaluation matrix should be used as a framework for sorting questionnaire data around the original issues and questions of the Review. You will find that the actual questions you have asked in questionnaires and interviews may give you data to address more than one question or issue from the matrix. By constantly referring back to the questions you need to answer (in the matrix), you can keep sight of your objective even with the massive amount of information that you now have to deal with.

It is helpful to keep in mind the following three points when sorting the data:

- **Look for patterns**
Examining interview notes, observation notes, or questionnaire results for patterns and themes involves categorizing your notes into recurring topics that seem relevant to the Review's key questions.¹²
- **Code the data**
As noted in the section on data entry, if you code your data you can review it later with original-source verification. Code confidentially – to respect the confidentiality you offered your interviewees – but make the codes useful. For example, you might code managers as M1, M2, etc. and donors as D1, D2, etc. to help keep track of sources.
- **Weight the data**
Weight your data to take into account how many interviewees gave you the same answer, whether the information is confirmed across different stakeholder groups, and whether it is confirmed or denied by external sources.

4.4 Using a Debriefing Session to Analyze the Data Collected

One step that has proven extremely valuable in the Strategic Review process is a debriefing session in which the Review team presents preliminary findings and engages colleagues in a collective analysis and discussion of the data and findings. The feedback from these discussions is then integrated in the final report by the Review team.

The presence of senior managers from other regions at the debriefing can stimulate and enrich cross-regional exchanges and debates on the findings of the Review.

¹² W.K. Kellogg Foundation, *Evaluation Handbook*, Battle Creek, 1998.

5. Reporting the Results of Strategic Reviews

The current process used for reporting the results of Strategic Reviews in IUCN is as follows:

1. A debriefing session is held at the end of the Review process led by the Review Team, with the programme managers and staff, to discuss preliminary findings and issues emerging from the Review. This takes place prior to the preparation of the final report.
2. A final draft report is submitted by the Review Team leader at the same time to both the Head of the programme under review and to Director General and/or Director Global Programme.
3. If highly sensitive management or personnel issues arise from the review process, the Review Team Leader writes a confidential management letter to the Director General and/or Director Global Programme outlining the issues and if appropriate, recommendations. To the greatest extent possible all the results of a Review should be included in the final report, reserving the option of a management letter only for extreme circumstances.
4. Comments on the draft report are received from the programme managers on the draft report.
5. A final report is prepared by the Review Team and submitted simultaneously to the programme manager and the Director General and/or Director Global Programme.
6. A presentation is made to the Executive Management Group (EMG) by the Review Team Leader on the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Review. The EMG may request additional information of the Review Team at this stage.
7. The Strategic Review report is finalized and sent to all key stakeholders.
8. The final report is submitted to the M&E office to include in the IUCN Evaluation Data Base, along with an abstract for the IUCN Evaluation Website.
9. Targeted presentations of the results are made to key audiences such as the IUCN managers in other regions, the PPG (Programme and Policy Group) and other management-focused groups.

The following sections provide tips for improving the way that Review results are reported.

5.1 Know Your Various Audiences

Effectively conveying the Review results to different diverse audiences requires specific knowledge of the role that different groups plays in the programme under review or in the management or governance structure of the Union (Congress, Council, Regional or National Committees).

The Review team needs to understand the expectations of staff, Council, donors, members, partners, etc. in communicating the results of the Review and tailor the presentation of results accordingly. In any of the presentations, we recommend that you use graphs and charts in order to present data.

5.2 The ABCs of a Good Written Report

Even though the Review team may report on their findings in different ways, the formal written report is the major output or product of the Strategic Review. It becomes the official record of what happened during the process and of the judgments that were made. While the Review team should develop a structure that makes sense for the specific context, they should also strive for consistency in reporting evaluations and reviews across the Union. Thus, we recommend that the report include the basic components noted in the text box at right.

There are a few other important standards in IUCN reporting that the Review team will need to double check:

- Does the report address the main evaluation issues as stated in the TORs?
- Are the findings presented clearly supported by data?
- Are the conclusions or judgments that are made clearly based on the findings?

Also remember to keep the main body of the report to a reasonable length (30-50 pages at most) to make it a more readable document. Appendices can be used to provide supplementary graphs or other information.

Recommended Table of Contents of a formal Review Report

- Executive Summary
- Table of Contents
- List of Acronyms
- Introduction
- Purpose of the Review
- Regional or Programme context and description
- Review issues and questions
- Methodology
- Findings
- Conclusions and Recommendations
- Action Plan
- Appendices – TORs, evaluation matrix, data collection instruments

5.3 Using the Report to Implement Change

Strategic Reviews take time and resources and should be regarded as a valuable tool for managing change. Managers have the responsibility to ensure that the results of the Review are used to improve performance.

The Executive Management Group or the Director Global Programme will require an Action Plan from the senior managers responsible for the Programme under review. If appropriate, the staff and key stakeholders of the programme should be convened to develop an action plan and mechanisms for monitoring its implementation.

5.4 From the Report to an Action Plan

In developing the Action Plan, it is important for stakeholders to consider several steps. A possible format for the plan is provided below.

- **Identify the recommendations that can be implemented**
Strategic Reviews can generate a number of recommendations for regional management and staff, headquarters, and other units. These need to be assessed by the relevant stakeholders to assess the feasibility and timeline for implementation. They should also be prioritized. It may not be possible to invest an equivalent amount of time and resources in all of the recommendations during the same period.
- **Identify the managers responsible for implementing those recommendations**
In order for change to be implemented, it must have a “champion”, or someone who is driving the process, within the organization. In developing the action plan, it is critical to identify who will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of each of the recommendations that have been prioritized.

- **Identify the action steps required to implement**

Each recommendation will require a series of action steps in order to move it forward. Stakeholders will need to brainstorm the action steps.

- **Establish a time line for implementation**

The next step is to identify milestones and a timeframe for completing the actions.

Exhibit 5.1 Possible format for an Action Plan

RECOMMENDATION FROM THE REVIEW	ACTION STEPS TO IMPLEMENT	RESPONSIBLE	MILESTONES	TIME FRAME
1. Recommendation	Action 1 Action 2 Action 3	Who takes the lead?	What are key products or changes that will help us track progress in implementation?	When will these milestones be achieved?

5.5 Effective Monitoring of the Action Plan

Implementing the Review recommendations should become part of the workplan of the programme or unit. Progress on implementation should become part of the regular quarterly monitoring and reporting process.

It is important for stakeholders to be aware of the accountabilities for implementing the Review and to receive periodic updates on progress.

Appendix I – Identifying Performance Aspects

PERFORMANCE ASPECT	KEY QUESTIONS (QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN SELECTED AS EXAMPLES FROM THE ENHANCING ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS TOOLBOOK AND CAN BE ADAPTED)
1. Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How relevant is the Unit's work in relation to the Union's KRAs and KEGO? How relevant is the Unit's work in relation to its constituents or stakeholders needs? Does the Unit's work represent cutting edge thinking in conservation and development? What is the credibility of the Unit within and outside IUCN? What is its influence within and outside IUCN?
2. Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well is the Unit's programme linked to the IUCN Mission, Vision, KRAs, Strategy (KEGO)? How well has the Unit done in meeting its annual and strategic plans? What are the main reasons to justify the differences between planned results and those achieved? How well has the Unit done in linking and achieving its results with the IUCN Quadrennial Programme KRAs? What are the main reasons to justify the differences between those planned and those achieved? How well has the Unit responded to unexpected and unplanned events? How well has the Unit integrated new thinking from across the Union, and innovation from other sources? How well has the Unit worked with other parts of the Union – regionally and globally?
3. Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well has the Unit managed resources (staff, funding, time)? How has it used the core funds received (to invest in new processes, to fund routine operations, risk capital, matching funds, etc.)? What is its ratio between technical and support staff? How efficient are work practices and procedures?
4. Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Unit know what impact it has had? How has this been measured or assessed? What is the impact of the Unit within and outside IUCN? What are the major impact milestones of the Unit?
5. Financial viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How adequate is the level of funding of the Unit in relation to its programme's expected outcomes? How broad is the funding base of the Unit, both in number and variety of funding sources and in the amount obtained from each source? How dependent has the Unit been on IUCN core funds (unrestricted and restricted) in the last three years? Why? How well has the Unit done in securing external (non IUCN) financial support for its activities? Why has it succeeded or failed in getting external support? How is this related with the Unit's relevance and impact? Has the Unit been able to keep expenses within budget in the last three years? Has the Unit been forced to cut staff because of financial constraints?

Appendix II – Identifying Factors that Affect Performance

FACTOR	KEY QUESTIONS
1. Capacity	<p>Strategic leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Unit have a strategic plan to guide its work? Who participated in its elaboration? Is it aligned with the overall IUCN strategy? Is it known to and supported by the members or constituents of the unit? Is it used regularly for decision making? Is there a process in place for monitoring the implementation of the strategic plan? How effective is senior staff in carrying out a strategic leadership role? How participatory is the leadership style of the Unit? Do the leadership and management of the Unit understand and use 'niche' management to help achieve results? Does the leadership / senior management ensure that the Unit undertakes regular situation analysis in order to make strategic choices about its programme and the institutions with which it works? What governance bodies or mechanisms are in place and how well do they function (national or regional member advisory committees, or equivalent)? What internal review and organizational development processes are in place and what impact are they having? <p>Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the structure of the Unit (management, decision-making) facilitate or hinder the Unit in achieving its results? Are roles and responsibilities clearly defined? Are there adequate linkages or opportunities for linkages when needed across programmes and projects? Is decision-making clearly defined and decentralized appropriately? Do staff have the authority to set agendas and act accordingly? <p>Programme planning and management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do staff at different levels receive proper guidance from the managers in the Unit? Are the programmes and projects linked to other IUCN units and Programmes? (integration – horizontal and vertical) What is the involvement of members and Commissions in the implementation of the programme? How innovative are the programmes and projects? Did programmes and projects deliver the committed products on time? Does the Unit have the appropriate resources and management systems and structures to effectively deliver its planned programme? <p>Human resources management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well do staff profiles fit programme and project needs? Are there incentives in place to support good performance and career advancement? What behaviours are supported by incentives? Is there a training programme for the staff? Is the working environment adequate? Is there a gender balance mechanism in place and is it used effectively?

FACTOR	KEY QUESTIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there unresolved issues of equity of pay? • Is there an ombudsman or SLC function? Is it used? • Are there appropriate staff recruitment and orientation procedures in place? • Is there an effective and supportive staff appraisal system in place and being used? • How well are staff being managed, supervised and mentored? <p>Financial resources management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an explicit financial strategy or business plan? • Is there an appropriate budgeting mechanism? Is it participatory? • Do managers at different levels receive timely and accurate financial information? • Are project resources spent on time? • Is there an auditing mechanism in place? What are its results? • Are financial services being effectively provided to sub-units (e.g. projects)? <p>Monitoring and Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are staff trained and skilled in monitoring and evaluation? • What types of M&E processes are in place – for purposes of learning, accountability, control? • Which programmes and processes are doing M&E? Are there major gaps? • How do M&E results feed into reporting and decision-making? <p>Infrastructure and administration support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the offices and equipment (vehicles, computers) adequate to deliver the expected results – and are they managed well? • Is the communication technology (information management, internet, phone lines) adequate to support effective delivery of the programme? <p>Other capacity factors to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process management – Are problem solving processes in place and do they work to the satisfaction of staff? • Inter-institutional linkages – Does the Unit work well with partners, donors and other organizations?
2. Motivation	<p>History and purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the milestones in the history of the Unit? • How has the Unit evolved over time? • Is there a clear sense of purpose in the staff? Is that purpose consistent with the IUCN Mission? <p>Culture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the main characteristics of the Unit as perceived by different groups within and outside the Unit and how do such characteristics affect the Unit's performance? • How is staff morale? • What is the level of commitment of staff and managers? <p>Incentives and rewards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the staff perception of the incentive mechanisms? • How do the staff perceive the status of the unit regarding their own interests and career? • How do the staff perceive the level of equity within the Unit ?

FACTOR	KEY QUESTIONS
3. External Context	<p>Stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who are the key stakeholders for the Unit? • How do the stakeholders value the Unit's products and services? • How responsive has the Unit been to its stakeholders' needs and requests? • Who are the Unit partners in delivering work? How do they perceive the partnership with the Unit? (Value-added?) • Who are the Unit competitors? Why are they competitors and not partners? Are they taking over the Unit's niche? Why? • How do donors and funders perceive the value of the Unit's products and services? • How is the Unit affected by donor trends in funding? • How does the political and socioeconomic environment affect the Unit? • How is the Unit affected by the administrative and legal environment of the country, region?

Appendix III – Sample Evaluation Matrix from BRAO Strategic Review, 2002

Introduction

EVALUATION ISSUES	QUESTIONS	SOME PROPOSED INDICATORS	PROPOSED DATA SOURCES	PROPOSED DATA COLLECTION METHODS (TOOLS)
1) The relevance and rationale of the BRAO Programme in relation to the sustainable development (people and ecosystems) issues and trends in the region.	1.1 What are the major sustainable development issues of the region affecting people and ecosystems?	Major sustainable development issues identified in IUCN & BRAO documents Convergence of sustainable development issues of the region affecting people and ecosystems described in BRAO documents with perceptions by programme stakeholders on these issues.	BRAO documents National Office Directors/Chiefs BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Documents Review Individual or group interviews
	1.2 What is the relevance of the BRAO programme against these issues?	Convergence of the BRAO programme with major development issues of the region.	BRAO documents National Office Directors/Chiefs BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Documents Review Individual or group interviews
	1.3 What is the rationale of the BRAO programme against these issues?	Alignment of the rationale of the BRAO programme with major development issues of the region.	BRAO document describing rationale National Office Directors/Chiefs BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Documents Review Individual or group interviews
	1.4 What is the significance of the BRAO programme against these issues?	Satisfaction of programme stakeholders with regards to the significance of the BRAO programme against these issues?	National Office Directors/Chiefs BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Individual or group interviews

EVALUATION ISSUES	QUESTIONS	SOME PROPOSED INDICATORS	PROPOSED DATA SOURCES	PROPOSED DATA COLLECTION METHODS (TOOLS)
	1.5 Is BRAO addressing the right issues in the context of the mission of IUCN? (Right issues = issues of significance in terms of conservation and sustainable development of the region)	Alignment of BRAO mission with mission of IUCN Global Programme Perceptions by programme stakeholders on whether or not BRAO is addressing the right issues in the context of the mission of IUCN.	IUCN & BRAO mission statements National Office Directors/Chiefs BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Documents Review Individual or group interviews Questionnaire
	1.6 Is BRAO addressing the right issues in the context of IUCN's comparative advantages?	Satisfaction of programme stakeholders on whether or not BRAO is addressing the right issues in the context of the comparative advantages of IUCN.	National Office Directors/Chiefs BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Individual or group interviews
	1.7 Is BRAO addressing the right issues in the context of the strategy of IUCN?	Satisfaction of programme stakeholders on whether or not BRAO is addressing the right issues in the context of the strategy of IUCN.	IUCN statement on strategy National Office Directors/Chiefs BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Documents Review Individual or group interviews
	1.8 What are the new opportunities and/or areas of work for BRAO that are not currently considered in its programme?	Programme stakeholders' views of new opportunities and/or areas of work for BRAO that are not currently considered in its programme.	National Office Directors/Chiefs BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Individual or group interviews
	1.9 What is the rationale (if any) for BRAO not having a presence (country office) in large parts of West Africa (Nigeria, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, Benin, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Gambia, Cape Verde, Togo, Ghana, Guinea Conakry)?	Views of programme stakeholders on the rationale for BRAO (if any) for not having a presence (country office) in large parts of West Africa.	National Office Directors/Chiefs BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Individual or group interviews Questionnaire

Guide for Conducting Strategic Reviews

EVALUATION ISSUES	QUESTIONS	SOME PROPOSED INDICATORS	PROPOSED DATA SOURCES	PROPOSED DATA COLLECTION METHODS (TOOLS)
2) The effectiveness of the programmatic components of the IUCN Regional Programme for West Africa:	2.1 What is the evolution and development of the IUCN West Africa Programme over time (strategy, focus, outputs, outcomes)?	Comparison of previous & current of BRAO strategy, focus, outputs & outcomes. Programme stakeholders' views on the evolution and development of the IUCN West Africa Programme over time in terms of its strategy, focus, outputs & outcomes.	BRAO documents on previous and current strategy, focus, outputs and outcomes National Office Directors/Chiefs BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Documents Review Individual or group interviews
	2.2 What are the major policies, agreements, procedures etc. developed or influenced by this programme?	Written and anecdotal evidence on major policies, agreements, procedures etc. developed or influenced by BRAO. Programme stakeholders' observations on the major policies, agreements, procedures etc. developed or influenced by this Programme.	BRAO documentation on major policies, agreements, procedures etc. developed or influenced by BRAO programme National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Documents Review Individual or group interviews Questionnaire
	2.3 What are the specific outputs supplied by the programme?	Programme outputs.	BRAO document describing programme outputs	Document Review
	2.4 Does the programme represent leading edge thinking in conservation and sustainable development?	Programme stakeholders' views on whether or not the programme represents leading edge thinking in conservation and sustainable development.	National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Individual or group interviews Questionnaire
	2.5 Is BRAO a recognized leader in conservation in West Africa?	Programme stakeholders' views on whether or not BRAO a recognized leader in conservation in West Africa.	National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Individual or group interviews Questionnaire
	2.6 Is it addressing the most significant issues in the region?	Satisfaction of programme stakeholders on whether or not BRAO is addressing the most significant issues in the	National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners	Individual or group interviews Questionnaire

EVALUATION ISSUES	QUESTIONS	SOME PROPOSED INDICATORS	PROPOSED DATA SOURCES	PROPOSED DATA COLLECTION METHODS (TOOLS)
		region.	Donors	
	2.7 Are the activities and outputs delivered on time, on budget?	Planned and actual dates of activities and outputs delivery. Evidence of cost-effectiveness of BRAO activities and outputs. Programme stakeholders' satisfaction regarding the timely delivery of BRAO activities.	BRAO documentation on BRAO activities and outputs delivery Financial statements on current activities National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Document Review Questionnaire
	2.8 Are the outputs of the programmes being used to bring about the desired outcomes (changes in individuals, communities and organizations)?	Written and anecdotal evidence that programme outputs are used to bring about desired outcomes.	BRAO documentation on programme outcomes National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Documents Review Individual or group interviews Questionnaire
	2.9 Does the staff have the skills, knowledge and ability to learn from experience?	Programme stakeholders' views that IUCN staff have the skills, knowledge and ability to learn from experience.	National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Individual or group interviews Questionnaire
	2.10 Do the Regional Programme components have a coherent set of projects throughout the region?	Programme stakeholders' views that the Regional Programme components have a coherent set of projects throughout the region.	National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Individual or group interviews
	2.11 Given the above assessment, what recommendations can be made for future development of the BRAO Programme?	Recommendations for future development of the BRAO Programme.	National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Individual or group interviews Questionnaire

Guide for Conducting Strategic Reviews

EVALUATION ISSUES	QUESTIONS	SOME PROPOSED INDICATORS	PROPOSED DATA SOURCES	PROPOSED DATA COLLECTION METHODS (TOOLS)
3) The extent to which the BRAO organizational model is appropriate, effective, efficient and financially viable, i.e. the strategy, structure and management of the regional, country and project offices.	3.1 Describe the current organizational model of BRAO	Organizational chart.	Document on BRAO organizational chart	Document Review
	3.2 Is the spread and reach of the current organizational structure appropriate for the region? (in some countries, not others)	Programme stakeholders' satisfaction on the spread and reach of the current structure appropriate for the region.	National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Individual or group interviews Questionnaire
	3.3 Is the network of offices (the current model) fostering the development of a strong regional programme that is programmatically and financially sound?	Quality of data that BRAO generates regarding the cost-effectiveness of Programme activities. Programme stakeholders' satisfaction on whether the network of offices is fostering the development of a strong programme that is programmatically sound.	Financial records of BRAO. Earlier evaluation or audits. National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Document Review Individual or group interviews Questionnaire
	3.4 What is the current BRAO Strategy? Is it programmatically and financially sound?	Current BRAO strategy. Evidence from recent evaluations or audits that the programme is financially sound. Evidence of the cost-effectiveness of BRAO recent and current activities. BRAO stakeholders' views that the strategy is (or isn't) financially sound.	Financial records of BRAO. Recent evaluation or audits. National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Document Review Individual or group interviews. Questionnaire

EVALUATION ISSUES	QUESTIONS	SOME PROPOSED INDICATORS	PROPOSED DATA SOURCES	PROPOSED DATA COLLECTION METHODS (TOOLS)
	3.5 What are the organizational and institutional capacities developed by the BRAO Regional Programme? Are they important? Sustainable?	Written and anecdotal evidence of organizational and institutional capacities developed by the BRAO regional programme. Programme stakeholders' views on whether or not these organizational and institutional capacities are important & sustainable.	Material on BRAO organizational and institutional capacities National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Document Review Individual or group interviews Questionnaire
	3.6 How efficient and effective is the governance of BRAO?	Written and anecdotal evidence of efficient & effective governance at BRAO (sound strategic leadership, sound structure, etc.)	Document on BRAO governance National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Document Review Individual or group interviews. Questionnaire
	3.7 How efficient and effective is the management of BRAO?	Written and anecdotal evidence of: Sound HR management (training, professional development, proper guidance, realistic workload etc.); Good office internal and external communication; Sound managerial leadership Presence of performance Reviews or self-assessment, etc.	BRAO documentation on related items National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Document Review Individual or group interviews Questionnaire

EVALUATION ISSUES	QUESTIONS	SOME PROPOSED INDICATORS	PROPOSED DATA SOURCES	PROPOSED DATA COLLECTION METHODS (TOOLS)
	3.8 How efficient and effective is the operational structure of BRAO?	Written and anecdotal evidence of effective regional planning and programming; efficient implementation of activities, etc.	BRAO document on operational objectives, financial records, etc. BRAO documentation on these items National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Document Review Individual or group interviews Questionnaire
	3.9 How can the current model be strengthened?	Programme stakeholders' views on how the current model can be strengthened.	National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Individual or group interviews Questionnaire
	3.10 Are there alternative business models that should be considered?	Programme stakeholders' views on alternative business models.	National Office Directors BRAO staff Members & Partners Donors	Individual or group interviews Questionnaire

Appendix IV – Using Group Techniques for Data Collection

Group Techniques

The following list provides an overview of the procedure:

- Define the purpose.
- Develop the questions.
- Arrange a schedule.
- Set up the groups.
- Conduct the sessions.
- Record the data.
- Analyze the data.
- Present the findings.

Develop the Questions

Plan for 5-10 questions. Effective group questions are carefully defined. They:

- are always open-ended (none of these are to be yes-or-no questions);
- are qualitative rather than quantitative in orientation (they ask about perceptions and feelings, rather than about facts or numbers);
- never ask “why” directly;
- have many imbedded probes; and
- allow for process concerns as well as content.

Set up the group

Successful groups for data collection comprise people who:

- share some common characteristic (such as being staff, partners, members);
- have diverse experiences (intact groups don’t work);
- represent diverse perspectives; and
- number between 6 and 12 people.

Arrange a schedule

- Allow 2 hours per group.
- Do not give breaks.
- Do not fill time (session ends when you have extracted the data).

Arrange the groups

- Arrange seating in a circle for good eye contact; and
- Position moderator and assistant moderator or recorder at opposite ends of the seating arrangement – for a different perspective.

Conduct the sessions

Content

Opening

- Introductions
- Clarify duration of session
- Clarify guidelines
 - Keep responses confidential; and
 - Encourage positive and negative perspectives

Major questions

- Ask questions according to your guide; and
- Use probes.

Questions to ask yourself

- What else do I need to ask to understand this person's perspective?
- Am I hearing everything I need to understand?
- What does all this mean when seen collectively?
- How do I bring out real feelings?
- How much time is left?

Summary

- Summarize the main points that emerged; and
- Perhaps ask an overall wrap-up question, such as “Is the programme generally effective?”

Conclusion

- Thank the group for their participation.
- Let people in the group know what the next steps in the process will be.

Technique

What to do

- Be innocent and empathetic.
- Engage in active listening, paraphrasing, and summarizing.
- Exert control without leading.
- Balance contributions of the dominant and silent participants.
- Ask if anyone sees any matter differently.
- Use pauses and probes effectively.

What to avoid

- Head nodding (except on an exceptional basis); and
- Agreeing (“OK,” “Yes”).

How to draw people out

- Begin with a broad question, such as “What did you think of...?”
- Ask for the opinions of participants who have not yet responded.
- Use silence – ask a question and then take enough time to look around at the group for responses.

How to cut off talkers

- Stop long-winded arguments by restating the two opinions and then asking other participants for any different perspectives on the issue.
- Use the “Cop” – hold up your palm to stop someone.
- Pat the arm of a big talker next to you.
- Avoid eye contact with a dominant talker.
- Try saying “How about letting someone else go first?” “Hold that thought, we haven’t heard from Joe yet,” “Yes, you already mentioned that,” or “I get the feeling that others would like to be heard”.
- Create a major distraction and then restart the discussion.

Record the data

Tape-recording

- Advantage – a complete record is made of the data
- Disadvantage – it is time-consuming to listen to the tape

Techniques

- Inform the participants and obtain permission.
- Use an unobtrusive recording device.
- Use tapes long enough not to have to change tapes in the middle of the discussion.

Written record

- Notes should be taken even if the session is tape-recorded.
- Make a note of the tape position (counter) from time to time in the margin of your notes, so that specific points can be located easily on the tape.
- Notes should be taken by an assistant moderator, not the moderator.
- Make notes continuously, to avoid giving cues to participants about the value of their contributions.
- Underline points that seem to be significant.
- You might predefine categories and organize a page of your notebook to accommodate comments in the anticipated categories.

Observer comments

- Make notes on things you think of during the session: important themes, ideas for the next group session, rephrasing of questions, etc. Identify these as your thoughts.

Analyze the data

Steps

- Type up significant commentary from the rough notes and record the speakers' names if possible.
- Cut and paste comments into themes (with computer or scissors).
- Order the comments within the themes into sub themes.
- Arrange the themes in order of importance.
- Edit the themes:
 - to eliminate redundancy;
 - to ensure comments are not one person's perspective only; and
 - to create a balanced, accurate reflection of what was actually said.
- Write a summary statement for each theme.
- Select and edit actual quotations to illustrate each theme, but:
 - Avoid extreme views;
 - Select statements that are typical;
 - Correct grammar and language usage where required.
- Conceal the identities of participants by removing names and identifying details.

Appendix V – Using Interviews for Data Collection

Interviews

Whether interviews are conducted face to face over the telephone, following certain procedures can help you to get the most out of them. These procedures are as follows:

- Determine the approach.
- Determine general and specific research questions.
- Draft the interview questions.
- Pilot test the protocol.
- Arrange a schedule of interviews (not discussed below).
- Prepare to record the responses.
- Conduct the interviews.
- Analyze interview data.

Determine the Approach

Your first step in using interviews is to decide what approach to use:

- **Key informant interview** – A key-informant interview is designed to collect data from an individual who is unique by virtue of position or experience (for example, a department head, who can represent a whole department);
- **Normative interview** – A normative interview is used to collect information from large numbers of clients (for example, by interviewing typical, individual clients).

The type of interview will determine your plan:

- **Interview guide** – A general set of questions used in an elite interview; or
- **Interview protocol** – A highly structured instrument resembling a questionnaire. (The interviewer often records the answers on the protocol.)

Determine General and Specific Research Questions

- What do you need to find out?
- What information is it essential for you to obtain from the interview? (Remember, this may be your only chance to get the information.)

Draft the Interview Questions

Some questions may be open ended, that is,

- Ask for general information; or
- Do not restrict the answer, for example, “How do you feel about ...”

Some questions may be closed, that is,

- Ask for specific information; or
- Restrict interviewee to factual answers, yes-or-no responses, or a multiple choice

Other questions can be sequenced

- Organize the questions in sections concerning major themes.

Consider your process needs

- Prepare suitable transitions from one topic to the next;
- Prepare probes and process questions; and
- Remind yourself to summarize.

Prepare introductory and concluding statements for the client. Specify:

- the purpose of the interview, its duration, and its confidentiality;
- the value of the clients contribution; and
- follow-up.

Pilot test the protocol

It is important to do a trial run of any interview. This pilot test will help you to validate:

- the content of your questions;
- the flow of topics;
- the recording technique; and
- the timing.

If you are using other interviewers, you will need several training sessions to ensure that they learn to use the protocol.

Revise your interview protocol or guide after you pilot test it with clients or train other interviewers.

Telephone interviews (NOTE: telephone interviews are probably used more in IUCN Reviews than in other organizations because of the highly decentralized nature of IUCN and the spread of offices and managers world wide across nine regions.)

- Use these for normative interviews.
- Use these only if you can't meet in person.
- Arrange time in advance – state your purpose, scope, and time required.
- For a key-informant interview conducted by telephone, fax the main questions and themes from the interview guide in advance.

Face-to-face interviews

- If possible, give priority to this method for key stakeholders.
- Arrange time and place.
- Ask that calls and other interruptions be held.
- Meet where you can really discuss issues.

Arrange a schedule of interviews

Prepare to record the responses

- Decide on a general method for recording the interview: tape-recording, writing notes.

- Organize a protocol for written responses.
- Plan to record verbal statements and to note nonverbal communication.

Conduct the interviews

It is important that you, as an interviewer, maintain control of the process as well as of the content of the interview.

Control the content

- by planning and
- by following the protocol or guide.

Control the process

- Start on the right foot – a good introduction establishes a good tone. Review the overall agenda for the interview, and set a time limit.
- Cut off answers that go on too long.
- Stay on track – lead the respondent back to your protocol questions;
- Encourage responses from more reserved interviewees
 - through the use of humour, and
 - through being willing to wait in silence; and
 - by using effective communication techniques:
 - active listening
 - openness and empathy
 - paraphrasing
 - summarizing.

Analyze interview data

Normative interviews

- Quantitative responses can be recorded and statistically analyzed.
- Qualitative responses can be analyzed for content.

Key-informant interviews

With key-informant interviews, you are trying to understand the answers to such questions as:

- What are the key views of this group of this group of clients?
- Which issues can we do something about?
- Which ones are beyond our control?
- Which views are shared by most members of this group?
- Which views differ?
- Why do some views differ? Is it the individual personality or the role, position or perspective of the person?

Some views may need to be weighted for importance; for example, some clients may be more important than others, either because they are bigger clients or because their needs are more vital. The bottom line question is what do our key clients feel about our goods and services. What does this tell us?

Tips on asking questions

Interviewers get into trouble because they violate basic rules. The following problems should be avoided:

TYPE	EXAMPLE	WHAT TO DO OR AVOID
Double-barrelled questions	Have you ever experienced burnout, and what should organizations do to prevent it?	Avoid double-barrelled questions. Ask one question at a time. Do not combine questions and expect one answer.
Two-in-one-questions	What are the advantages and disadvantages of working in this programme?	Do not combine opposite positions in one question. Separate out the parts, and things will be much clearer.
Restrictive questions	Do you think that female administrators can ever be as good as male administrators?	The phraseology of this question does not seem to admit the possibility that females might be better. Avoid questions that inherently eliminate some options.
Leading questions	Climate change is a major global issue these days. Do you think that IUCN should be doing more to address climate change?	Do not precede questions with a position statement. In this type of question, the interviewer states a view or summarizes the position of a current or recent event and then asks for a response. This tends to lead the respondent in a given direction.
Loaded questions	Would you favour or oppose damaging your health and that of others by making all IUCN offices smoke free?	Avoid questions that use loaded words and are emotionally charged.

Appendix VI – Using Questionnaires for Data Collection

Questionnaires

The following procedures are recommended for a questionnaire survey.

- Determine the major questions.
- Draft questionnaire items.
- Design the questionnaire.
- Pilot-test the questionnaire.
- Develop a data-collection strategy.
- Develop a cover letter and sent the questionnaire.
- Monitor the response.
- Analyze the data survey.

Determine the Major Questions

You should begin by understanding the major questions or issues you wish to address. These will generally be reflected in the questionnaire sections, as described below.

Typical sections

Introduction of background information

This section includes questions about your client that may be important to your analysis. It should solicit background information you need to address, such as the respondent's department, region, experience, gender, position, and experience with the supplier.

Ask only what is essential to your sub-analyses. If you don't need to know, don't ask.

Quality of goods or services received by your client

This section is the heart of the questionnaire and requires you to develop dimensions of quality that may be important. The client (respondent) then rates the quality of your outputs along these dimensions.

Other considerations

For this section, choose a title that matches other important dimensions of client service, such as "Timeliness of Delivery", "Safety", or "Environmental Responsibility."

Responsiveness, problem-solving, and client service

This set of questions will address your client's perceptions of your service. This section might be merged with the quality or other-considerations section.

These major sections of your questionnaire provide the overall outline. Once you know these major themes, you need to develop actual questions or items.

Draft Questionnaire Items

Types of questionnaire items

You must draft actual questionnaire items within each of the sections of your questionnaire. It is difficult to vary the types of questions frequently, so economize within each section by asking similar types of questions.

You will need to master six types of questionnaire items before you invent your own. Unproved alternatives are often confusing to the reader. So use unproved alternatives only after you are fully familiar with the types of items described below.

Multiple-choice item

This type of question is useful for the introduction or background-information section.

How long have you been a member of the Species Survival Commission (SSC)? (Please check one.)

☐ Less than 6 months

☐ 1-2 years

☐ More than 2 years

Fill in the blank item

Use this form when the possibilities are too numerous to list using a multiple-choice item. They work well in a mix with multiple-choice. So, they are also good in the introduction.

In which IUCN office do you work?

Rating-scale item

This type of item enables you to collect a lot of information efficiently. Rating-scale items are good for rating your goods and services.

How important is it for you to learn about:					
	Not at all				Very
a) Environmental responsibility	1	2	3	4	5

List item

This type of item provides a stronger form of feedback than a rating scale. It forces the client to identify what he or she considers important and helps the researchers to avoid the problem of people just agreeing because it is easy to check a box without feeling that it is important to them.

What aspects of your training course did you like most? Please list three of them.

Comment-on item

This type of question is another way to gain an understanding of what your client considers important. It is particularly useful for “mopping up” the concluding section.

Please write any other comments about the future direction of this programme.

Likert-scale items

The Likert scale allows the respondent to agree or disagree with a series of statements. (Note, these are statements, not questions.) The Likert scale is easy to use, if you know how, and like other rating scales it is an efficient way to collect lots of information.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
I am satisfied with my professional development (that is, I am acquiring new skills and knowledge)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There are possibilities for career advancement (that is, for increased responsibilities)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Now, try it on your own. Write your own statements for dimensions of your work unit’s outputs. Include items that are worded both positively and negatively.

1.

2.

3.

Design the Questionnaire

As you write the items, you should begin considering an overall design for your questionnaire. Follow these rules:

- Lay out items to avoid confusion.
- Use the formats shown in the examples.
- Don't allow a question to cross over two pages.
- Instruct the respondent in what you want him or her to do for each type of question.
- Number the questions consecutively.

Use a booklet

- to make it professional and facilitate completion.

Have a title and introductory explanation

- to let your clients know what you are doing; and
- to help them fill out the questionnaire properly.

Arrange the questionnaire in sections, each with a title

- to help structure the respondent's thinking; and
- to facilitate analysis.

Group similar types of items together

- Do this especially with rating-scale items.
- Fill-in-the blank and multiple-choice items can be mixed together.

Use all available space

- Try to limit the length of the questionnaire to four pages.
- Use space for comments to fill in pages.

Pilot-Test the Questionnaire

Even the best questionnaire needs testing. You might understand everything in the questionnaire, but your client may not. Here are some tips to help you test your questionnaire.

Show the questionnaire to critical colleagues

- Ask them to read it and to comment in the margin; and
- Revise the questionnaire.

Test the questionnaire with a few stakeholders

- Assemble 5-6 stakeholders;
- Ask them to complete the questionnaire in writing; and
- Discuss each question with the group.

In completing this step, ask such questions as

- Was the item clear, and could it be answered?
- Did the question hit the important aspect of the issue?
- What has been left out?
- Does the whole questionnaire enable stakeholders to really express what he or she thinks of your organization's work?

Revise again

It sounds like a lot of work. It is! Creating a good questionnaire may take a week of full-time work, even for a professional.

Develop a Data-Collection Strategy

Now you have a questionnaire ready to go! You'll need to work out a strategy for how and where to send it. The first part of your strategy is to select a sample of people who fairly represent all your clients. Prepare a list of your sample clients.

The second part of your strategy is to decide on the technology you will use to send out your questionnaire.

Standard

Questionnaires can be printed, in your office or by a printer, and mailed to respondents. Respondents fill them out and mail them back. Results are manually input into a database or statistical programme for analysis.

Optical Scanning

It is possible to print questionnaires so that they can be read by an optical scanner that picks up the responses automatically. The sample questionnaires in Appendix VII were designed to be used in this way. (Note, pictographs can be used to illustrate points.)

Electronic questionnaires

This is an electronic file that is sent to clients via e-mail. The client receives the file, completes the questionnaire on his or her computer, and sends the file back to you by e-mail.

Web based questionnaires

This requires specific computer programming input to design a computer programme that can be posted on an Internet Website. It requires the respondents to answer a short series of questionnaire on line. The responses are automatically calculated by the computer programme. Web based surveys are typically used when large sample sizes are required (hundreds, thousands) and when the questions can be kept to a minimum of quantitative questions.

Follow-up

You also need a follow-up strategy. You may need to:

- Track the number returned each day – e-mail lets you know who hasn't yet replied.
- Send a reminder two weeks after first mailing.
- Decide on corrective action if returns are poor.

When key people in each unit distribute and collect the questionnaire, pyramid networks are great, but personal networks are the best of all for getting returns.

Develop a Cover Letter and Send the Questionnaire

Each client in your sample should receive

- a cover letter;
- a professionally developed questionnaire; and
- a self-addressed return envelope, unless you use e-mail.

Cover letter

Every successful questionnaire comes with a cover letter. The letter should contain six pieces of information:

- the **purpose** of the questionnaire;
- **who** is sending it;
- **why** the respondent was selected;
- **where, how, and when** to return the questionnaire;
- **whom to contact** if there are further questions; and
- **whether** and **how** the results will be **shared**.

Monitor the Response

- Count on 4 to 6 weeks to get responses to your questionnaire.
- Use your follow-up strategy: send reminder letters or put your network into action.
- Start your analysis when responses dry up.

Analyze the Survey Data

Questionnaire analysis generally means dealing with large numbers or with a variety of numbers. This usually requires you to use statistical concepts and computers. Many simple statistics guides or programs are available to help you analyze data.

Six Steps for the Construction of Effective Questionnaires: Summary

Determine your questions

- What do you intend to find out?
- How will the information be helpful?
- Which issues will relate to the questionnaire and which are more suited to other data collection methods?

Specify your sub-questions

- List all the things you want to find out.
- Indicate those sub-questions to be included in the questionnaire.
- Refine your list.

Draft the items

- Translate the questions into items; and
- Formulate test multiple-choice, fill-in-the-blank, rating-scale, list, comment on; and Likert-scale questions and choose the most appropriate types for your situation.

Sequence the items

- Group the items into topic sections.
- Group the items by question type.
- Rewrite the items as necessary.

Design the questionnaire

- Order and number questions.
- Layout a booklet format.
- Arrange the questions on pages.

Pilot test the questionnaire

- Clarify the wording of the questionnaire with respondents.
- Group test the draft questionnaire.
- Discuss the questionnaire and retest if necessary.

Appendix VII – Sample IUCN Questionnaires and Protocols

The following questionnaires were prepared for previous Strategic Reviews and are available from the M&E Office for adaptation in new Review processes. While the questions will vary from Review to Review, there are common core questions that can assist Teams in designing new Review tools. Contact the M&E Office for copies of any of the following:

STAKEHOLDER	REVIEW FOR WHICH THE TOOL WAS DEVELOPED	LANGUAGE
Regional Directors	IUCN Strategic Review – West Africa (BRAO)	French
Regional Directors	IUCN Strategic Review - European Regional Office (ERO)	English
Regional Directors	IUCN Strategic Review – Canada Office	English
Directors of Thematic Programmes	IUCN Strategic Review – Canada	English
Heads of Thematic Programmes and Commission Focal Points	IUCN Strategic Review – ERO	English
Heads of Thematic Programmes and Commission Focal Points	IUCN Strategic Review – West Africa (BRAO)	French
Donors	IUCN Senegal Office Self-assessment	French
Donors	IUCN Strategic Review – ERO	English
Donors	IUCN Strategic Review – Canada Office	English
Donors	IUCN Strategic Review – CIS	English
Donors	IUCN Strategic Review – Pakistan	English
Donors	IUCN Strategic Review – West Africa (BRAO)	French
Members	IUCN Strategic Review – Canada	French
Members	IUCN Strategic Review – ERO	English
Members	IUCN Senegal Office Self-Assessment	French
Members	IUCN Strategic Review – Canada Office	English
Members	IUCN Strategic Review - South America Office	English
Members	IUCN Strategic Review – CIS Office	English
Members	IUCN Strategic Review – Pakistan Office	English
Members	IUCN Strategic Review – South America	Spanish
Members	IUCN Strategic Review - ERO	Spanish
Members	IUCN Strategic Review – West Africa (BRAO)	French
Members	IUCN Strategic Review - Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation	English
Members	IUCN Strategic Review - Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation	French
Members	IUCN Strategic Review - Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation	Spanish
Staff	IUCN Senegal Office – Self-Assessment	French
Staff	IUCN Strategic Review – West Africa (BRAO)	French

Staff	IUCN Strategic Review – Pakistan Staff self-assessment	English
Staff	IUCN Strategic Review – CIS staff self-assessment	English
Staff	IUCN Strategic Review – Canada staff self-assessment	English
Staff	IUCN Strategic Review – South America Office staff self-assessment	Spanish
Staff	IUCN Strategic Review – ERO staff self-assessment	English
Staff	IUCN Strategic Review – Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation	English
Partners	IUCN Strategic Review – Implementation of the Red List Programme Agreement	English

Appendix VIII – Entering scaled questionnaire data in MS Excel

Note: These are basic tips that don't contemplate disaggregating the responses by sex, category of respondent (partners, member, donor, etc.). Some additional levels of complexity could be added.

Rank	1.2	1.3	1.5	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	3.1	3.2	3.6	3.8	4.1	4.4	4.5
1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	3	6	1	2	4	2	5	4	6	6	4	3	1
4	0	3	1	7	6	4	2	2	1	1	1	4	5	6

- Number each questionnaire; this is referred to as the questionnaire ID. In the example above, 8 questionnaires were coded and the responses entered.
- Type the number of each question that includes scaled data in row 1. In the example above, our questions begin at question 1.2 and end at question 4.5.
- Number the range of possible responses of the scale within each question (record this on a master copy of the questionnaire), e.g. if in the questionnaire the scale is “agree” “neither agree nor disagree” “disagree” you will number them from 1 to 3 – agree=1, neither agree nor disagree =2 and disagree = 3.
- Input all of your data. For example, in the questionnaire with ID 1, question 1.2 answered “1”, question 1.3 answered “4”, question 1.5 answered “3”, etc.
- Input your “COUNTIF” formula underneath your data. Make sure you include the maximum rank that was included in the questionnaire. (i.e. if the scale was answered from 1-5, make sure you include COUNTIF formulas to 5) This is where Excel counts how many people answered “1”, how many people answered “2”, etc.

- Type your questions underneath all the data and link the results of your COUNTIF formulas to the corresponding question. As you can see in the above example, Question A.1 “did not meet” links to the formula in cell “B15”.
- Highlight the text in each question, one question at a time, and use the chart wizard to create a chart of your data.

Qualitative Questionnaire Data in Word

The screenshot shows a Microsoft Word document with two tables. The first table is titled "QUESTION 1.2 - OVERALL - EXPLAIN WHY:" and has 8 rows. The first column is labeled "ID" and the second column is for responses. The second table is titled "QUESTION 1.3 - COMMENTS ON ANY OF THE ABOVE:" and has 6 rows. The first column is labeled "ID" and the second column is for comments.

ID	QUESTION 1.2 - OVERALL - EXPLAIN WHY:
1.	Blah blah blah blah blah blah blah
2.	
3.	Blah blah blah blah blah blah blah
4.	
5.	Blah blah blah blah blah blah blah
6.	
7.	
8.	

ID	QUESTION 1.3 - COMMENTS ON ANY OF THE ABOVE:
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	

- Make a separate Word document for each type of questionnaire, e.g. member, donor, staff etc.
- In the Word document, make a table for each qualitative question and have a column on the left with the questionnaire ID (see example above). You will have assigned an ID # to each question in the Excel part of the data entry.
- Type the comments in each table by question beside the corresponding questionnaire ID. If respondents did not answer, leave the row blank.



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