

**UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
BUREAU FOR HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE**

**PVO CHILD SURVIVAL GRANTS PROGRAM
GUIDELINES FOR MID-TERM AND FINAL EVALUATIONS
CS-15, 1998-2002**

**OFFICE OF PRIVATE AND VOLUNTARY COOPERATION
DECEMBER 1999**

OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION

The strategic objective of USAID's Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation, within the Bureau for Humanitarian Response (BHR/PVC) is *the increased capability of BHR/PVC's PVO partners to achieve sustainable service delivery*. With USAID's emphasis on managing for results, program evaluations have become less descriptive and more evidence based. BHR/PVC has assisted PVOs to strengthen their program monitoring and to document program achievements so that PVOs can provide credible evidence of achievements and results.

A Core Evaluation Practices

BHR/PVC's evaluation policies reflect a commitment to a set of core evaluation practices that over the years have proved to be critical elements in building PVO capacity to monitor and evaluate field programs. These practices have emerged through lessons learned from the programs implemented by our PVO partners.

- ◆ **Evaluations are joint activities** and truly effective learning experiences involve all the partners. BHR/PVC, the PVOs, their local partners, and other stakeholders usually participate in program evaluations. The participatory nature of the evaluation process encourages problem analysis and development of solutions by project staff and partners.
- ◆ **Good program design** is the foundation for documenting achievements. Programs that have successfully documented their achievements have clearly stated objectives, valid indicators and a realistic method for measuring change over the life of the program. The establishment of accurate baseline data is a critical element in tracking change.
- ◆ **Commitment to the use of data** contributes to the most successful programs. Such projects demonstrate strong staff commitment to action planning based on the regular review of performance data.
- ◆ **All good evaluations recognize the achievements** of the project and staff and document innovative activities highlighting promising practices or new approaches.

B. Purpose of the Monitoring and Evaluation System.

The BASICS publication, "Child Survival BASICS — Monitoring an Evaluation: Tools for Improving Child Health and Survival," (Quarterly Technical Newsletter #5, Spring 1998), defines monitoring and evaluation as "collecting and analyzing information that is accurate and reliable and can be put to practical use".

- ◆ Monitoring involves plotting progress in meeting implementation goals or measuring outputs and process.
- ◆ Evaluation takes a broader perspective, determining if the course is the best one – or assessing overall outcome or impact.

In the PVO Child Survival Grants Program, monitoring and evaluation provides program managers, local partners and USAID with a clear understanding of how the PVO program is functioning; evidence of results that have been achieved, and the importance of these achievements to the design and implementation of future programs. The Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) describes the monitoring system the PVO intends to use. The

evaluations take place at the program mid-term and end, and differ from each other in focus and in the kinds of information they provide:

- ◆ **the mid-term evaluation** focuses on the process of program implementation. This evaluation uses data and information from the program’s monitoring system to (a) assess progress in implementing the DIP; (b) assess progress towards achievement of objectives or yearly benchmarks; (c) assess if interventions are sufficient to reach desired outcomes; (d) identify barriers to achievement of objectives; and (e) to provide recommended actions to guide the program staff through the last half of the program.
- ◆
- ◆ **the final evaluation** is focused on (a) assessing if the program met the stated goals and objectives; (b) the effectiveness of the technical approach; (c) development of the overarching lessons learned from the project; and (d) a strategy for use and communication of these lessons both within the organization and to other partners.

C. The Evaluation Audience

The possible “audiences” for the information from the program evaluations include the local partners, the PVO, USAID, both BHR/PVC and Missions, as well as other stakeholders. However, while BHR/PVC and its partners share similar evaluation objectives, the information needs of each partner are different.

While the BHR/PVC’s Child Survival Division monitors the performance of the individual programs, the division also must consolidate information across all programs to report to senior level agency managers and congressional interest groups about the effectiveness of the PVO child survival programs. Results reporting by BHR/PVC is intimately linked to resource allocation and thus clearly presented program results, with supporting evidence, are key to continued funding of the PVO Child Survival Grants Program.

Throughout these guidelines text boxes like this one identify BHR/PVC’s information needs. These questions are linked to BHR/PVC’s strategic plan and indicators. It is important that these questions are incorporated in the evaluation SOW and responses appear in the evaluation report.

D. The Evaluation Process

- ◆ **Participation:** BHR/PVC encourages participation from PVO headquarters and field program staff, representatives from project partners, government health service personnel and community members in planning and conducting the evaluation. Representatives from other PVOs, USAID mission staff and other stakeholders may be invited.
- ◆ **Developing the SOW:** The PVO is responsible for developing the Statement of Work (SOW) for the evaluation team. While these evaluation guidelines identify a core set

of components to be addressed, the PVO tailors the evaluation to its needs, with questions that are specific to the program. The information needs and evaluation questions of the primary partners should also be integrated into the evaluation SOW. BHR/PVC does not need to approve the evaluation SOW.

- ◆ Team Composition: The evaluation Team Leader, who serves as the lead author and editor of the evaluation report, should be someone who is not employed by, or otherwise professionally associated with the concerned PVO or the specific child survival program. The PVO should identify a candidate for the Team Leader position and propose this person to BHR/PVC for approval prior to the evaluation. The CORE Group, CSTS, and several PVOs have developed databases of good, proven evaluators of PVO child survival programs. Other team members may include people selected from within the PVO, its partners, and other organizations. *If your PVO has identified other good evaluators, please add the person's name to the databases maintained by CSTS and the CORE Group!*

THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

The mid-term evaluation provides an opportunity for all project stakeholders to take stock of accomplishments to date, and to listen to the needs of beneficiaries at all levels – mothers, other community members and opinion leaders, health workers, health system administrators, local partners, other organizations, and donors. The mid-term evaluation provides a chance for the project staff to benefit from the viewpoint of an external consultant, acting as an evaluation process facilitator. Other PVOs and resource persons may also be invited to participate in the evaluation process.

I The Evaluation Report

The mid-term evaluation report shall address each of the points listed below. If any of these items is not discussed in the report, please provide an explanation. Except for the summary, repetitious sections may be cross-referenced.

1. Summary

Provide a brief (1-2 pages) executive summary of the report that includes:

- description of program and objectives
- main accomplishments of the program
- overall progress made towards achieving program objectives.
- main constraints, problems, and areas in need of further attention.
- a summary of capacity-building effects of the program.
- prospects for sustainability.
- priority recommendations that have resulted from this evaluation.

2. Assessment of Progress Towards Achieving Program Objectives

The DIP presented in the first year is the official workplan of the program. This section of the mid-term evaluation report provides a clear picture of how well the program is implementing the workplan, what challenges it will face in the remaining time, recommendations for addressing those challenges and for building on its successes. The outline below provides guidance to the evaluation team for examining the program's technical child survival interventions and cross cutting approaches.

A. Technical Approach

- ◆ A brief overview of the project, including objectives, location, technical interventions/focus areas, and general program strategy. (More detailed documentation may be provided in the annexes.)
- ◆ A progress report by intervention area. This section describes:
 - activities related to specific interventions as proposed in DIP
 - progress toward benchmarks or intermediate objectives
 - the effectiveness of the interventions
 - changes in the technical approaches discussed in the DIP with rationale.
 - special outcomes, unexpected successes or constraints
 - next steps

- ◆ New tools, innovative approaches the program is using; operations research or special studies that may have been conducted; and how the data/information have been used, and what actions were taken.

B. Cross Cutting Approaches (*address each section as applicable*)

This section discusses progress on approaches that cross technical intervention areas, and have, or will have, an impact on project objectives. These are activities that may or may not have been articulated specifically in the DIP, but have emerged as critical activities in the program. In discussing cross cutting activities, please expand on the impact of such activities on the program. Examples of cross-cutting approaches include behavior change strategies, community mobilization, partnership building, training (e.g. negotiations, agreements achieved, linkages formed), outreach strategies, advocacy or community awareness building strategies, strengthening information management systems. The evaluation team may discuss any other cross cutting activities that may be pertinent to the program. Also include modifications and explanations/rationale for such modifications, as well as cross-cutting activities added to the work plan.

Discuss progress made in relation to objectives and targets, methods and approaches used, timing, key participants, geographical scope of activity, technical areas covered, etc. Describe how activities have had:

- ◆ an effect/impact on the program
- ◆ the lessons learned to date
- ◆ links to future activities

The following are specific questions for several cross-cutting approaches.

(1) Community Mobilization

- What kinds of community mobilization activities have been undertaken by the project?
- To what extent has the community responded to these?
- How have these activities been used to refine program implementation plans?
- What kinds of barriers exist to prevent members of the community from benefiting from the program, and how have these been addressed?
- What impact do factors such as security, politics, roads, mass media, theater group issues, etc. have on program implementation?

(2) Communications for Behavior Change

- Is the program's approach to behavior change appropriate and effective?
- Are the messages technically up-to-date? Have any essential messages been omitted?
- How are the effects of the behavior change activities being measured? What tools are used and are the tools appropriate and effective?
- Who uses the data gathered regarding the effects of behavior change activities? How have communities used these data to reinforce or promote other behavior changes?

(3) Capacity Building Approach

- Discuss the progress made in implementing the capacity strengthening plans outlined in the DIP. This may include plans for the PVO, the public sector partners, NGOs and/or community-based partners.
- Discuss how this progress affects the project's vision of and plans for sustainability as described in the DIP. Use the questions below to guide your assessment of the project's capacity building strategies.

Strengthening the PVO Organization

- Describe progress towards achieving the capacity building objectives, indicators and targets.
- Describe the approaches and tools used to assess capacity and comment on the appropriateness of the tools to measure change in capacity over the life of the program.
- Include a description of activities related to organizational capacity building within the PVO at HQ and in the field.
- What indications do you see at this point that the program has increased organization capacity?

Strengthening Local Partner Organizations

- Discuss the organizational capacity building efforts with the local partners and which ones are the main participants in capacity building activities.
- Briefly discuss the actual roles and responsibilities of each of the local partners and any changes that have occurred since these were articulated in the DIP.
- Describe the outcomes of any assessment, formal or informal, conducted at the outset of the project to determine the organizational capacities of your local partners.
- How have the organizational capacities of the local partner changed since the beginning of the project? What factors/interventions have most contributed to those changes?
- What are the primary challenges this project will face in further building the capacities of its partners?

Health Facilities Strengthening

- Are the health facility strengthening activities of the program appropriate and effective?
- What tools does the program use for health facility assessments? Are the tools appropriate and effective?
- Discuss linkages between these facilities and the communities?

Strengthening Health Worker Performance

- What is the approach to strengthening health worker performance?
- Has this been effective?

- What tools has the project used to assess performance and are they appropriate and effective for measuring change in the program timeframe?
- How have assessment results been used to improve the quality of services?
- How is the program addressing the gaps between performance standards and actual performance?

Training

- Discuss the training strategy, and its effectiveness.
- What is the progress made towards objectives?
- What evidence is there that suggests that the training implemented has resulted in new ways of doing things, or increased knowledge and skills of the participants?

(4) Sustainability Strategy

- What is the progress to date in meeting the sustainability objectives articulated in the DIP?
- Has the groundwork for the exit strategy been laid with project staff and local partners in the first two years of the project
- What approaches has the project implemented to build financial sustainability-- (e.g., local level financing, cost recovery, resource diversification, corporate sponsorships
- What does the beneficiary community say about sustaining project services through alternative funding sources at the close of the project?

3. Program Management

This section provides an overall discussion of program management issues – at HQ, within the field program, with partners and the community. The objective is to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the support systems, i.e., planning, financial, information, & personnel management, supervision, training, logistics, etc. The aim is to identify specific ways in which the management support systems can function better.

A. Planning

- What groups have been involved in program planning?
- Is the work plan submitted in the DIP on schedule?
- Are the program's objectives understood by, all staff, local level partners, and the community?
- Do all parties have a copy of the program's objectives and the monitoring and evaluation plan?
- To what extent are program monitoring data used for planning and/or revising program implementation?

B. Staff Training

- How effective is the process for continual improvement in the knowledge, skills and competencies of the program's staff, including needs assessment, training methods, content of training and follow-up assessment?
 - How is trainee performance in new skill areas monitored?
 - Are adequate resources dedicated to staff training?
- C. Supervision of Program Staff
- How effective is the process of directing and supporting staff so that they may effectively perform their duties? Include an assessment of supervisory leadership, methods, style, training, work planning and problem solving.
 - Are the numbers, roles, workload of personnel and frequency of supervisory visits appropriate for meeting the technical and managerial needs of the program?
- D. Human Resources and Staff Management
- Discuss the program's personnel management system.
 - Are key personnel policies and procedures in place, and are there job descriptions for all positions in the PVO – headquarters, field program and partners collaborating on the project?
 - Describe the morale, cohesion and working relationships of program personnel and how this impacts program implementation.
 - Describe the level of staff turnover in the program and its impact on program implementation. If this is an issue, what are the current strategies for staff retention?
 - What plans does the project have for facilitating its staff's transition to other paying jobs when the project ends?
- E. Financial Management
- Discuss the management and accountability for program finances, budgeting, and financial planning for sustainability of both the program and local NGO partners.
- F. Logistics
- What impact have logistics (procurement and distribution of equipment, supplies, vehicles, etc.) had on the implementation of the program?
 - What logistics challenges will the program face during the remainder of the program?

G. Information Management

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a system in place to measure progress towards program objectives? • Is there a systematic way of collecting, reporting and using data at all program levels? • Does the program use data to inform management decision-making? • Discuss the purpose, methods, findings and <u>use</u> of any assessments (mini surveys, focus groups, etc.) conducted by the program. |
|--|
- How effective is this system? What types of data are generated? What is the frequency and method(s) of data analysis? Who is involved in collection and analysis of data
 - Describe the extent to which the program is using and supporting other -existing data collection systems (i.e. government).

H. Technical and Administrative support

- Discuss types and sources of external technical assistance the program has received to date, and how timely and beneficial this assistance has been.
- What are the anticipated technical assistance needs of the program in the upcoming two years?
- Discuss PVO/headquarters and regional support of the field program. Approximately how much time has been devoted to supporting this program?

4. *Other Issues Identified by the Team*

Discuss additional issues identified by the team during the course of the evaluation.

5. *Conclusions and Recommendations*

This section presents the main conclusions based on this mid term evaluation. It should outline the recommendations for USAID/BHR/PVC, the program staff and collaborating partners for the next 2 years of the program.

6. *Results Highlight*

One page “results highlight” [“Tear-out sheet”]

If appropriate, provide a one-page description of some element of the program, with supporting data, that would make a good stand-alone communication piece for the PVO or USAID to distribute, or to post on the office web page.

II. **The Action Plan** (to be completed by the PVO team)

Developing an action plan for implementing the recommendations that emerge from the mid-term, by coming together, is a major window of opportunity for both partnership and stakeholder capacity building. Sustainability is best achieved when the practice of stakeholders periodically reexamining work and procedures is institutionalized, and by identifying what is working well, where unexpected problems arise or where new

approaches or systems are tried. The importance of encouraging local actors to examine situations, prioritize needs, and use creative problem solving to improve their well-being cannot be overstated. In addition to the lessons learned and expressed by local stakeholders, the opportunity to have an exchange of ideas with others who have wide involvement with child survival activities in different places potentially makes the mid-term evaluation a pivotal learning experience. While the mid-term evaluation highlights the progress made towards results to date, documents innovative approaches and promising practices, uncovers areas of challenge where more attention or new approaches would be useful, evaluates concerns and suggestions of stakeholders at all levels and considers the incorporation of new ways of doing things, *the resulting Action Plan should be carefully constructed with high participation and consideration of many viewpoints and adopted by the vast majority of stakeholders.*

III. Attachments

1. Baseline information from the DIP

For this section, copy the requested information from the stated sections of the approved DIP and indicate if substantial changes have been made since approval of the DIP.

a. Field Program Summary:

From Section A of the DIP, copy the table "Estimated Program Effort and USAID funding by intervention" and the table "Program Site Population: Children and Women".

b. Program Goals and Objectives:

From Section D of the DIP, cite the Program Goals and Objectives including information on measurement methods and major planned results.

c. Program Location:

From Section E of the DIP, copy the information about program location, and the groups to whom program activities are addressed, as well as information about existing health infrastructure.

d. Program Design:

From Section G of the DIP, briefly describe the program design.

e. Partnerships:

From Section I of the DIP, copy the information about partnerships with the public sector, NGOs and community based organizations.

f. Health Information System:

From Section L of the DIP, describe the program's proposed health information system and the mechanism for program monitoring.

2. Team members and titles

3. Assessment methodology

Provide a brief discussion of the assessment methods used by the mid-term evaluation team to assess essential knowledge, skills, practices, and supplies of health workers and facilities associated with the program.

- 4. List of persons interviewed and contacted**
- 5. Diskette with an electronic copy of the report in MS WORD**
- 6. Special reports**
If appropriate, include special reports or analyses produced by the program

THE FINAL EVALUATION

The final evaluation provides an opportunity for all program stakeholders to take stock of accomplishments, and to listen to input or feedback from all types or levels of beneficiaries, including women and children and their families, other community members and opinion leaders, health workers, health system administrators, local partners, other organizations and donors. The final evaluation includes the comparison of baseline and final data; elaborates the lessons learned from the model or implementation approach; identifies promising practices and opportunities for scale-up, replication or use of the approach in a broader context. The final evaluation offers yet another opportunity for the program to benefit from the outside viewpoint of a consultant.

I. The Evaluation Report

The final evaluation report shall address each of the following elements. If any of these items is not covered by the evaluation, please explain why. Except for the summary, redundant sections may be cross-referenced.

1. Summary

Provide a brief (1-2) page executive summary of the report that includes:

- Brief description of program and objectives
- Main accomplishments of the program.
- Highlights from the comparison of the baseline and final survey.
- Priority conclusions that have resulted from this evaluation.

2. Assessment of Results and Impact of the Program

The DIP, presented in the first year of the program, is the official work plan of the program. The outline below provides guidance for the evaluation team for examining the program's technical child survival interventions and cross-cutting approaches across those interventions.

A. Data Summary Chart

Construct a chart containing baseline and final data for all of the program objectives/indicators

B. Results – Technical Approach

- Provide a brief overview of the program approach--- objectives, location, intervention mix, general program strategy. More detailed documentation may be provided in the annexes.
- Present results by intervention area.
- Discuss the results of the program as measured by comparison of the baseline and final survey.
- Describe factors affecting achievement of program objectives.
- For objectives not fully achieved, discuss contributing factors.
- For each intervention, what are the main lessons learned?
- Discuss special outcomes, unexpected successes or constraints

- If the program is continuing, describe how will the lessons learned be applied to future activities.
- Discuss any new tools or approaches that the program developed or used; operations research or special studies that were conducted, and how findings will be used.

C. Results - Cross Cutting Approaches (address each section if applicable)

This section discusses results of approaches that cross intervention areas. These are activities that may or may not have been articulated specifically in the DIP, but have emerged as critical activities in the program. In discussing cross cutting activities, discuss the impact of the activities on the program and how the information will be used in future activities.

Examples of cross-cutting approaches include behavior change strategies, community mobilization, partnership building activities (e.g. negotiations, agreements achieved, linkages formed), training, outreach strategies, advocacy or community or awareness building strategies, strengthening information management systems. The evaluation team may discuss any other cross cutting activities that were pertinent to the program. Also include modifications and explanations/rationale for those modifications, and crosscutting activities added to the work plan.

The following are specific questions for several crosscutting approaches.

(i) Community Mobilization

- How effective was the approach for community mobilization?
- Were the objectives met for community mobilization?
- What lessons were learned for future community mobilization efforts?
- Is there demand in the community for program activities to continue? How was this measured?
- What are the plans for sustaining these activities once the program closes?
- Are the sustainability plans realistic?

(ii) Communication for Behavior Change

- How effective was the approach for communication and behavior change?
- Were the behavior change objectives met?
- What were the lessons learned?
- How will these behaviors be sustained once the program closes?
- Are the sustainability plans realistic?

(iii) Capacity Building Approach

Discuss the capacity strengthening results of this program. This may include how the program improved the capacity of the PVO, the public sector partners, NGOs and/or community-based partners. Use the questions below to guide your assessment.

Strengthening the PVO Organization

The external reviewer and the PVO will assess the capacity building effects this program had on the overall organization – US based headquarters as well as field operations. This may require a visit by the external reviewer to the PVO headquarters.

- How has this grant improved the capacity of the PVO to design, implement and evaluate effective child survival programs?
- Have effects of this grant influenced other programs operated by the PVO?

Strengthening Local Partner Organizations

- Discuss organizational capacity building with the local partners
- Describe the outcomes of any assessment, formal or informal, conducted at the outset of the program to determine the organizational capacities of local partners. (These were not required under CS XV, but may have been performed.)
- How have the organizational capacities of the local partner changed since the beginning of the program? What factors/interventions have most contributed to those changes?
- What are the lessons learned in capacity building of local partners?

Health Facilities Strengthening

- How effective was the approach for improved management and services at health facilities?
- What tools did the program use for health facility assessments? Were the tools effective for measuring change?
- What were the lessons learned?
- What are the plans for sustaining these activities once the program closes? Are the sustainability plans realistic?
- Discuss linkages between these facilities and the communities.

Strengthening Health worker performance

- How effective was the approach for strengthening health worker performance?
- Were the performance objectives met?
- What were the lessons learned?
- What are the plans for sustaining health worker performance once the program closes?
- Are the sustainability plans realistic?
- Were the tools used to assess the results of improving health worker performance sensitive enough to measure change over the life of the program?
- Did the program address the gaps between performance standards and actual performance?

Training

- How effective was the training strategy?
- Were the training objectives met?
- What evidence is there that the training strategy has resulted in new ways of doing things, or increased knowledge and skills of the participants?
- What were the lessons learned?
- What are the plans for sustaining these activities once the program closes?
- Are the sustainability plans realistic?

(iv) Sustainability Strategy

- Were the sustainability goals and objectives that were articulated in the DIP met?
- What is the status of the phase over plan, and is it on schedule? After the program, will there be any continuing technical and management assistance?
- Have the approaches to build financial sustainability-- (e.g., local level financing, cost recovery, resource diversification, corporate sponsorships) been successful?
- How has the program built demand for the services and is the community sufficiently engaged to influence how services are delivered?

3. Program Management

This section provides an overall discussion of program management issues, at HQ, within the field program, with partners and with the community. The objective is to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the management support systems, i.e., planning, teamwork and communication, financial management, information management, personnel management, supervision, training, logistics, etc. The aim is to identify specific ways in which the management support systems contributed to or hindered program implementation.

Planning

- How inclusive was the program planning process and what effect did this have of the implementation process?
- To what extent was the DIP work plan practical? Based on the PVO and its partner's experience with this program, what could be added to the DIP preparation and review process that would have strengthened implementation?
- What were the gaps in the DIP and how were they addressed by the program staff?

Staff Training

- What change is there in the knowledge, skills and competencies of the program and partner's staff? Is there evidence that the staff has applied these skills both within the program and in another context?
- Were adequate resources dedicated to staff training?

- What are the overall lessons learned about building the capacity of program staff?

Supervision of Program Staff

- Was the supervisory system adequate?
- Is the supervisory system fully institutionalized and can it be maintained?
- Is there evidence that the program's approach to strengthening supervisory systems has been adopted beyond the program?

Human Resources and Staff Management

- Were essential personnel policies and procedures in place to continue the program operations that are intended to be sustained?
- Describe the morale, cohesion and working relationships of program personnel and how this affected program implementation.
- Describe the level of staff turnover over the life of the program and the impact on program implementation.
- Were plans developed to facilitate staff transition to other paying jobs at the end of the program?

Financial Management [to be completed with the field staff and lead evaluator]

- Discuss the adequacy of the PVO's and partners' financial management and accountability for program finances and budgeting. If the project budget was adjusted, explain why. Do the program implementers have adequate budgeting skills to be able to accurately estimate costs and elaborate budgets for future programming?
- Are adequate resources in place to finance operations and activities that are intended to be sustained beyond this cooperative agreement?
- Was there sufficient outside technical assistance available to assist the grantee and its partners to develop financial plans for sustainability?

Logistics

- What impact have logistics (procurement and distribution of equipment, supplies, vehicles, etc.) had on the implementation of the program?
- Is the logistics system sufficiently strong to support operations and activities that are intended to be sustained?

Information Management

- How effective was the system to measure progress towards program objectives?
- Was there a systematic way of collecting, reporting and using data at all program levels? Cite examples of how program data was used make management or technical decisions.
- Is the program staff sufficiently skilled to continue collecting program data/information and to use it for program revisions or strengthening?

- Did the program conduct or use special assessment, mini survey focus groups etc. to solve problems or test new approaches? Give examples of the research, use of data, and outcome.
- To what extent did the program strengthen other existing data collection systems (i.e. government)?
- Do the program staff, headquarters staff, local level partners, and the community have a clear understanding of what the program has achieved?
- How have the program's monitoring and impact data been used beyond this child survival program?

Technical and Administrative Support

- Discuss types and sources, timeliness, and utility of external technical assistance the program has received to date.
- What assistance did the program need that was not available? How could PVO headquarters and/or USAID better plan for the technical assistance needs of PVO programs?
- Discuss PVO/headquarters and regional technical and managerial support of the field program. Approximately how much time has been devoted to supporting this program?

Management Lessons Learned

- List the overall management lessons learned.

4. Other Issues Identified by the Team

- Discuss additional issues identified by the team during the course of the evaluation.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

- This section presents the main conclusions based on this final evaluation.
- Based on the data from the baseline and final assessments, presented in the summary chart, discuss whether the objectives were met, and your conclusions regarding the success of the program in meeting its objectives
- Describe the most important achievements, constraints and other factors affecting program performance.
- Outline the lessons learned.
- Present any recommendations for USAID/BHR/PVC, the program staff and collaborating partners regarding future work or directions.

PVO headquarters should present a short section on how they intend to use the lessons learned and communicate this information to the broader development community.

6. Results Highlight**One page “results highlight” [“Tear-out sheet”]**

If appropriate, provide a one-page description of some element of the program, with supporting data, that would make a good stand-alone communication piece for the PVO or USAID to distribute or to post on the office web page. This might be an aspect of the program that was particularly successful and deserves further documentation.

II. ATTACHMENTS**1. Team members and titles****2. Assessment methodology**

Provide a brief discussion of the assessment methods used by the final evaluation team to assess essential knowledge, skills, practices, and supplies of health workers and facilities associated with the program.

3. List of persons interviewed and contacted**4. Diskette with electronic copy of the report in MS WORD****5. Special reports**

If appropriate, include special reports or analyses produced by the program