

**SCOPE OF WORK FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION OF USAID/EL
SALVADOR'S STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE NO. 2 - BROAD BASED ECONOMIC
GROWTH INCREASED**

OBJECTIVE:

The objective of this evaluation is to assess USAID/El Salvador's broad-based economic growth program to document the results of the program strategy, provide Mission management with the information needed to make or improve resource allocation decisions, and inform strategic planning for the next Program Operations Document (long-term strategy). In particular, the program will be analyzed to determine a) results to date and interim, process indicators that suggest whether the program activities will or are leading to the anticipated results; b) the validity of the internal logic of the strategy and its completeness; c) the feasibility of achieving the objectives and targets given factors internal and external to the program; and d) recommended changes in the strategy, objectives, targets, and/or indicators.

A secondary objective is to test tools and approaches to conducting evaluations that focus on strategic objectives and supportive elements. The results are expected to be useful to other USAID Missions as well as USAID/El Salvador.

BACKGROUND:

USAID Missions in sustainable development countries have developed strategic plans to guide the allocation of USAID resources. Strategic objectives are established with clearly defined indicators determined to be achievable within a 5- to 8-year timeframe. Intermediate results, called program outcomes, are identified as being necessary for achievement of the higher-level strategic objective. USAID will take responsibility for achieving them in concert with its development partners. Often, but not always, Missions have explicitly identified the critical assumptions about what other elements are necessary and sufficient to produce the expected results.

USAID resources are directed at project and non-project assistance, policy dialogue and donor coordination. These activities are designed to obtain the expected results articulated in the program logframe. If factors internal or external to USAID-supported activities are shown significantly to affect progress toward achievement of the results, then USAID and its development partners ought to be aware of the risks so that a decision can be made whether to proceed, perhaps by reorienting human and financial resources, or to change course by revising the strategy.

ECONOMIC GROWTH STRATEGY, ACTION PLAN 1995-96:

USAID/El Salvador's Action Plan for FY 1995-FY 1996 contains five interrelated Strategic Objectives: (1) transition from war to peace; (2) broad-based economic growth; (3) enduring democratic institutions with broad-based participation; improved quality with equity in health and education; and (5) improved environmental and natural resource management. Success

in achieving the second objective -- the subject of the evaluation described by this scope of work -- is important for achieving all of the other objectives. For example, a rapidly growing economy that is broad-based will facilitate the incorporation of demobilized combatants into the economic life of the country and will strengthen public support for democratic institutions. It will also provide the resources necessary to make major progress in improving the quantity and quality of health and education services and in addressing environmental problems.

The Mission has identified four indicators for measuring progress toward achievement of its strategic objective of broad-based economic growth: (1) percentage of the population with at least one of four basic needs unsatisfied; (2) percentage of the population living in poverty; (3) percentage of the population living in extreme poverty; and (4) index of per capita GDP.

Four program outcomes, each with its own set of indicators (between two and five), will determine progress toward achievement of the strategic objective: (1) creation and maintenance of an appropriate economic and social policy framework; (2) increased private investment; (3) increased exports; and (4) increased employment.

SCOPE OF WORK:

The evaluation will focus on the broad-based economic growth strategic objective and its specific elements. It will address the following questions:

A. Program Strategy

1.) Is the program strategy as articulated in the program logframe (ie S.O. Program Tree), internally logical and complete? To answer this question the evaluators will determine whether a) the relationships between various elements of the framework, including those at the activity level, are logically consistent; b) the strategic objective and program outcomes have been stated in precise and operational terms; and c) the indicators directly measure the relevant element.

2) Have all necessary and sufficient conditions for achieving the Program Outcomes and Strategic Objective been identified? Specifically, have all major factors, both internal and external to the program, been identified? For example, have critical assumptions been identified? Have factors affecting women's participation and benefit been identified?

3) Is the strategic objective within the manageable interest of USAID, and are the results expected at the program-outcome level directly attributable to USAID efforts in concert with its development partners?

4) Is the program's logic still valid externally? The answer will be derived by assessing whether a) the broad-based economic growth program is consistent with the overall country strategy; b) the nature or severity of the development problem has changed, c) there is a common commitment and understanding as well as importance given to the program by key parties, and d) the importance initially attached to the development problem has changed.

B) Implementation

- 1) Have changes occurred since the development of the strategy in the necessary and sufficient conditions for achieving the Program Outcomes and the Strategic Objective? Do any of these changes raise questions about achieving the expected results? Have any new factors intervened that seriously impede (or are likely to impede) achievement of the intended results? Are the assumptions about factors which lie outside of USAID's span of direct control being adequately monitored formally or informally? Did any of these changes cause the Mission to revise its original indicators of Program Outcome and/or the Strategic Objective?
- 2) Are the data on indicators valid (measure what they are intended to measure) and reliable (both in terms of the source and consistency in the manner in which they are collected)?
- 3) What have been the unanticipated results and ramifications of USAID-supported activities that are not reflected in the unilinear construct of the strategic program? Are there any negative elements that should be mitigated?
- 4) Has actual performance at the program-outcome level corresponded to "planned performance," i.e. were the targets met? What evidence is there to demonstrate that the achievements are directly attributable to the USAID-sponsored effort? If the targets have not been met, why not and what should be done?
- 5) Are projected levels of achievement for strategic objective indicators being met? What is the relationship between actual performance at the program outcome level and progress in achieving the strategic objective indicator targets? What analytical tools can be used to establish this relationship?
- 6) How are data formally and informally gathered for this strategic program being used by USAID and its development partners to manage for results? What improvements might be made to use data more efficiently and effectively?
- 7) Are gender-disaggregated data appropriate to the strategy being collected, analyzed, and utilized to improve performance?

C. Conclusions

Is the program progressing satisfactorily? If not, what recommendations can be made for corrective actions and adjustments to (1) reallocate human and financial resources within the existing program, or (2) revise the program itself (including program outcomes and indicators)?

METHODS AND PROCEDURES:

A. USAID/El Salvador Role and Responsibilities

USAID/El Salvador will identify staff members to participate in the evaluation and ask its development partners to designate participants. These individuals may be asked to a) provide information to the evaluation team members, b) participate in the information-gathering and analysis portion of the evaluation, or c) be a full member with writing responsibilities. A control officer will be designated by the Mission. The ECON office commits approximately 15 person-days of staff time to the effort. The PRO Office commits between 15-20 person-days of staff time. The Mission shall also establish a committee of key stakeholders who will be asked to review the scope of work, brief the team members, provide information, and review the draft evaluation report.

B. PPC/CDIE/PME Design and Utilization of Customized Tools

PPC/CDIE/PME through its PRISM Project will design customized tools, (questionnaires, matrices, charts/tables, etc.), to assist the evaluators in collecting the information necessary to answer the questions above. These may include, for example, a tool for testing the program's external logic, or a tool to assess if a strategic objective is within the manageable interest of USAID. The tools will be reviewed by and explained to the consultants. PPC/CDIE/PME through its PRISM Project will also provide two consultants (see qualifications statement below).

C. Advance Work by Consultant Team

Prior to their trip to El Salvador, the consultants shall have:

- reviewed the USAID El Salvador Action Plan for FY 1995-1996 and three previous years, project assessments and evaluations, and other key documents;
- assessed the internal logic of the program (question 1 in the Strategy Component above), taking into account the assessment done by PPC/CDIE/PME; and
- held meetings with key people in LAC Bureau and PPC/CDIE.

D. In-Country Activities of Consultant Team

In El Salvador, the evaluation team members will review relevant documents; analyze and assess program performance data; and interview program and project staff whose projects contribute substantially to attaining the Strategic Objective, selected USAID staffers, GOES and other counterparts, and members of the Strategic Objective Team. The evaluators will use existing performance results data and will not be expected to be involved in primary data collection on indicators.

E. Consultant Workplan

After the conclusion of one full week in country, the consultants shall present to USAID/El Salvador for approval a workplan for completing the program evaluation. This workplan will outline in detail the evaluation methodology incorporating any proposed modifications, and elaborate in detail the customized tools to be used by the consultants. The workplan will provide USAID/El Salvador with the opportunity to comment and provide suggestions to the consultant team on both the methodology as well as the tools. The approved workplan will be incorporated into the contract scope of work, and will guide the continued implementation of the program evaluation.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS:

The evaluation team will be expected to submit to the Mission a written draft, including findings, conclusions and recommendations, prior to the departure of the consultants. A final draft, reflecting Mission comments, will be submitted to the Mission within 15 working days of the consultants' departure. The consultant evaluation specialist will be responsible for the final report.

The report is expected to contain: an executive summary (up to 4 pages), the main report (up to 25 pages), and annexes. Detailed supportive evidence is expected to be contained in the annexes. The main report will include a) a summary of the findings, b) conclusions and c) recommendations. In addition, the report will include a section on methodology used, lessons learned and insights gained in regard to methodology, suggestions about conducting future evaluations that focus on strategic objectives and their supportive elements, and recommendations for revising or modifying evaluation tools.

LEVEL OF EFFORT:

The level of effort of the two consultants shall be a total of 60 person days. Below is an illustrative breakdown:

Preparation	3 days x 2 people = 6
Travel	2 days x 2 people = 4
In-country	18 days x 2 people = 36
Report Preparation	8 days x 2 people = 14

The Mission shall provide the consultants with adequate office space, access to computer printers and, to the extent possible, local transportation.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Two consultants will form the core of the evaluation team. Between the two, the following substantive areas will be covered:

Both consultants:

- Familiarity with USAID's program performance measurement system.
- Ability to read in Spanish.
- Experience evaluating USAID programs or projects.

At least one consultant with each of the following:

- Ability to communicate in Spanish.
- PRISM evaluation expertise including first hand knowledge of the USAID/El Salvador program and strategic framework, if possible. (Individual with this expertise will serve as the Team Leader).
- Economist with expertise in:
 - macroeconomics, especially in developing countries
 - structural adjustment and stabilization programs, particularly in LAC region
 - background in poverty analysis, especially in context of structural adjustment programs
 - strong econometric/statistical background
- Rural Development specialist with experience in:
 - agricultural economics/agricultural production
 - microenterprise
- Other areas of interest:
 - trade and investment
 - decentralization
 - gender analysis

The evaluation specialist should possess a PhD with at least 7 years' experience evaluating USAID programs or projects, at least half of that experience in areas relevant to this study. The second consultant should also have a PhD plus 7 years of experience in areas directly relevant to this scope. In either case a Master's degree may be acceptable if combined with additional significant experience which is directly relevant to this scope of work.