



BIFAD

Board for International Food and Agricultural Development

OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 9

**Bifad Evaluation Strategy and Action Plan
for Country Projects**



May 1986

Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523

PREFACE

The Occasional Paper series offers BIFAD an opportunity to circulate papers, reports and studies of interest to those concerned with development issues and the relationship between AID and the broader Title XII community.

This study was undertaken to provide a basis for arriving at recommendations and a plan of action for BIFAD's role in monitoring and evaluating Title XII country projects. This study and recommendations were endorsed by the Board at its meeting on May 13-14, 1986.

We believe the study, recommendations, and plan of action will be useful to university and AID evaluators and project officers in planning evaluations. It outlines BIFAD's anticipated role in the evaluation processes and the assistance it may be able to provide.

PREVIOUS ISSUES OF OCCASIONAL PAPERS

- No. 1: Tomorrow's Development Professionals: Where will the Future Come From? December 1980
- No. 2: The World Food Problem and BIFAD: The Need for Production and Research, December 1980
- No. 3: Economic Incentives for University Faculty Serving Overseas, December 1980
- No. 4: American Agricultural Research: Its Role in Agricultural Development Abroad, March 1981
- No. 5: The Implementation of Principles for Effective Participation of Colleges and Universities in International Development Activities, May 1981
- No. 6: U.S. Development Assistance Policy: Middle Income Countries, April 1983
- No. 7: Building Colleges of Agriculture in Africa, May 1986
- No. 8: Staffing of University Contracts for Title XII Country Projects, May 1986

BIFAD'S PRESENT ROLE IN COUNTRY PROJECT EVALUATIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

by

Bonni van Blarcom, Consultant

and

Jiryis S. Oweis,
BIFAD/Staff

May 1986

1900

1901

1902

1903

1904

1905

1906

1907

1908

1909

1910

1911

1912

1913

1914

APPROVED BIFAD EVALUATION STRATEGY FOR COUNTRY PROJECTS
AND
APPROVED PLAN OF ACTION FOR THE NEXT YEAR

APPROVED STRATEGY

The Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) has responsibility for monitoring and evaluating Title XII programs. BIFAD should take a more active role in this area aimed at improving Title XII project performance. Toward this objective BIFAD will undertake the following activities in relation to Country Projects:

1. BIFAD will establish an Information Feedback System which provides information on "lessons learned" from Title XII project experience. The system will include the following elements:
 - o Monitoring projects and the use of BIFAD's "good offices" to resolve project difficulties,
 - o Monitoring Title XII project evaluation results,
 - o Efforts to inform universities and other interested parties of major findings and recurring problems and "lessons learned" from the review of Title XII project evaluations, and
 - o Efforts to be kept informed of analysis performed by AID's Bureau of Program and Policy Coordination (PPC) germane to Title XII projects and relevant AID project experience.

2. BIFAD will participate in AID's evaluation system. Participation will include the following elements:
 - o Contribution to the scope of work of individual Title XII project evaluations,
 - o Assistance in identifying and procuring team members to evaluate Title XII projects,
 - o Encouraging the inclusion of individuals from Title XII institutions on AID project evaluations, not specifically Title XII projects, and
 - o Participation as appropriate in AID's central evaluation functions.

3. BIFAD will encourage and facilitate the Title XII community's involvement in the evaluation of Title XII projects. BIFAD will encourage and facilitate the universities to:
 - o Use an internal monitoring system in their Title XII projects to provide for an annual review of project progress, as well as documentation of project activities, and decisions regarding the project, and
 - o Take the initiative and actively contribute to the AID evaluation process.
4. BIFAD will bring to the attention of AID's Administrator any policy issues dealing with evaluation that BIFAD has identified as requiring attention.
5. BIFAD will evaluate special issues of concern to Title XII projects, as required.
6. The Chairman will assign to each member of BIFAD specific countries or areas, with expectations that each through personal visits and other means, will focus on the monitoring and evaluation of programs in the assigned countries or areas.

APPROVED PLAN OF ACTION FOR THE NEXT YEAR

Learn from Past Experience

Task 1

Prepare and distribute the first annual report of the Information Feedback System. The task will include the collection review and analysis of all Title XII project evaluation reports undertaken by AID over the last year. Review the reports for identified issues/problems.

The report summarizing the review and analysis will include 1) information on issues/problems, 2) AID's CDIE one page summary of the evaluation, 3) summary information available on Title XII project performance, and 4) information on "lessons learned" from the review of Title XII projects and those brought to the attention of BIFAD.

Prepare for and Assist in Future Evaluations

Task 2

Prepare briefing/training material on how best the university can contribute to AID's evaluation process.

Task 3

Assist in the evaluation of Title XII projects. This task will include:

- a. Become informed of all upcoming Title XII evaluations planned for Title XII projects (Review mission evaluation schedules for the year,)
- b. Inform the mission during Program Review Week of BIFAD's interest in assisting the mission in the evaluation of the Title XII project to be evaluated in the next year, and
- c. Inform the AID project manager and the Title XII university involved of BIFAD's interest in assisting the evaluation process.

Task 4

Recommend to the AID Administrator that a policy be established that Title XII interests will be considered in all Title XII project evaluations. (This will facilitate BIFAD staff involvement in AID's evaluation of Title XII projects.)

Task 4

Recommend to the AID Administrator that a policy be established that Title XII interests will be considered in all Title XII project evaluations. (This will facilitate BIFAD staff involvement in AID's evaluation of Title XII projects.)

CONSULTANTS REPORT

May 1986

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of BIFAD or AID.

THE
OFFICE OF THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF NEW YORK
ALBANY

IN SENATE
JANUARY 10, 1906

REPORT

OF THE

FORWARD

This report reviews BIFAD's evaluation responsibilities, comments on BIFAD's present monitoring and evaluation activities, and offers recommendations for future activities: namely, to develop an information feedback system, encourage AID to improve its evaluation system, and encourage more university involvement in evaluations.

This report is the product of 50 days of work dispersed over the period July 1985 to January 1986 and included the following activities:

- o reviews of documents and discussions with individuals involved with past efforts in formulating BIFAD's evaluation role;
- o interviews with Title XII university representatives, Title XII project staff (particularly those recently involved with AID project evaluations), individuals from AID and the university community who serve on the Joint Committee on Agricultural Research and Development (JCARD), as well as other BIFAD staff (see Appendix II for complete list of individuals consulted);
- o reviews and summaries of responses from AID mission directors and university presidents regarding their ideas and comments on the role of BIFAD in evaluation of Title XII projects;
- o discussions of AID's evaluation system and the authors proposed ideas with AID's evaluation staff in the regional and central bureaus;
- o discussions with professional evaluators, who have had experience with AID's evaluation system, ideas for improving AID's evaluation of Title XII projects;
- o analysis of the rating of all projects evaluated in 1984 to compare how Title XII projects fared with all other AID projects; and
- o reviews of Title XII project evaluations submitted to Washington in 1984 and 1985.

The authors wish to express their gratitude to the numerous individuals from the BIFAD Staff, AID and university community who contributed to this report.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to express their appreciation to individuals in the Title XII and AID community who provided the many valuable suggestions and comments on the draft of this document.

In addition, the authors wish to thank Carmen Naranjo and Denise Murray for their secretarial support.

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AID/IG	Agency for International Development's Inspector General
BIFAD	Board for International Food and Agricultural Development
CDIE	Center for Development Information and Evaluation, AID
GAO	General Accounting Office
IG	Inspector General
JCARD	Joint Committee on Agricultural Research and Development
MUCIA	Midwestern Universities Consortium for International Activities, Inc.
NASULGC	National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges
PACD	Project Activity Completion Document
PES	Project Evaluation Summary
PID	Project Identification Document
PP	Project Paper
PPC	Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, AID
RDO/C	Regional Development Office for the Caribbean
SOW	Scope of Work
Title XII	Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

BIFAD'S PRESENT ROLE IN COUNTRY PROJECT EVALUATIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

by Bonni van Blarcom, Consultant and Jiryis S. Oweis, BIFAD/Staff

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report discusses BIFAD's evaluation and monitoring mandate in relation to country projects, comments on BIFAD's present limited role in monitoring and evaluation activities, and offers recommendations for future activities. Approaches to implement the recommendations are provided in the appendices.

The Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) has responsibility for monitoring and evaluating Title XII programs, projects and proposals. This responsibility is mandated by Congress and is described in the BIFAD Charter. BIFAD staff in the Country Project Division have focused their efforts on contributing to the project proposal evaluation process, and have only been involved in AID's project evaluation system on an ad hoc basis.

Present BIFAD monitoring and evaluation activities include the development of a project status information data base, use of BIFAD's "good offices" to facilitate the resolution of project difficulties, and limited participation in AID's project evaluation system.

Participation in AID's evaluation system, when requested, has included the development of Title XII project evaluation agendas, the identification of technical assistance to serve on evaluation teams, actual participation in project evaluations, and assisting in the formulation and implementation of special AID program evaluations.

AID has a well developed evaluation system, but implementation of AID evaluation guidelines, rules and regulations varies widely. After extensive discussion with individuals in the university and AID community, and review of many of the 38 Title XII project evaluations submitted to Washington in the last two years, the authors find that 1) evaluations suffer for lack of resources, 2) more project progress could be achieved with the use of internal annual reviews, 3) there is a lack of evaluation follow-up, and 4) more university contractor involvement in the evaluation process is warranted.

The authors make a number of recommendations in the report. The central six recommendations follow:

Recommendation One: BIFAD should establish an Information Feedback System which provides information on "lessons learned" from Title XII project experience.

The system should include the following elements:

- o Monitoring Title XII projects and helping resolve project difficulties,
- o Monitoring Title XII project evaluation results,
- o Keeping informed of analysis performed by AID's Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination (PPC) germane to Title XII projects and relevant AID project experience,
- o Informing universities and other interested parties of major findings, successful results, recurring problems and other "lessons learned" from the review of project evaluations, and
- o Close examination of special issues identified by BIFAD.

Recommendation Two: BIFAD should continue to participate in AID's Evaluation System.

Participation in AID's evaluation system should include the following elements:

- o Contribution to the Scope of Work of individual project evaluations,
- o Assistance in identifying and procuring team members to evaluate Title XII projects,
- o Encouraging the inclusion of individuals from Title XII institutions on AID project evaluations, not specifically Title XII projects, and
- o Participation as appropriate in AID's central evaluation functions.

The authors suggest that a greater emphasis be placed on evaluation in BIFAD's work, providing for the development and use of an information

feedback system and efforts to improve the role of university contractors in the evaluation process.

Recommendation Three: BIFAD should encourage the university community to be more actively involved with the Title XII project evaluation process.

BIFAD should encourage the Title XII university community to:

- o Use an internal monitoring system in their Title XII projects to provide for an annual review of project progress, as well as documentation of project activities, and decisions regarding the project, and
- o Take the initiative and actively contribute to the evaluation process.

Recommendation Four: BIFAD should participate actively at a high policy level to improve AID's evaluation system.

BIFAD should encourage AID to:

- o Provide more resources for project evaluations or if resources are not available, to undertake fewer evaluations.
- o Provide for an internal annual review process in each Title XII project.
- o Develop a system to insure that efforts are made to implement accepted recommendations from project evaluations.
- o Actively work with university project staff in undertaking evaluations of Title XII projects.

Recommendation Five: BIFAD should evaluate issues of concern to Title XII projects, as required.

BIFAD's evaluation role should be focussed on contributing to and using the extensive evaluation system established in AID, but BIFAD should also evaluate any issues of concern to Title XII projects as it deems necessary.

Recommendation Six: BIFAD should adopt and implement a plan of action for its involvement in country project evaluations.

This report recommends a number of activities which provides opportunities for universities to learn from the past experience of the Title XII community and for BIFAD to prepare and assist in future evaluations.

BIFAD'S PRESENT ROLE IN COUNTRY PROJECT EVALUATIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FORWARD.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	iv
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. BIFAD's Monitoring and Evaluation Responsibilities.....	1
B. Past Efforts to Formulate BIFAD's Monitoring and Evaluation Role.....	3
II. BIFAD'S PRESENT MONITORING AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES.....	4
A. Monitoring Activities.....	4
B. Assistance in AID's Evaluation Activities of Title XII Projects and Proposals.....	7
III. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	9
A. Establish an Information Feedback System.....	9
B. Continue to Participate in AID's Evaluation System.....	13
C. Encourage Universities to Take the Initiative and Actively Work With AID in Project Evaluations	13
D. Work to Improve AID's Evaluation System.....	15
E. Undertake Evaluations as Required.....	19
F. Recommended Plan of Action.....	19

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I	Chronology of Activities Related to Title XII Evaluation Initiative.....	22
APPENDIX II	List of Individuals Consulted.....	25
APPENDIX III	List of Evaluations of Title XII Universities Projects Submitted to Washington During 1984 and 1985	27
APPENDIX IV	1984 Title XII Project Evaluations with Project Success Rated in Four Categories.....	30
APPENDIX V	Approaches to Implement Recommendations.....	32
APPENDIX VI	AID's Recommended Format for an Evaluation Scope of Work.....	41

BIFAD'S PRESENT ROLE IN COUNTRY PROJECT EVALUATION AND
SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

I. INTRODUCTION

This section reviews BIFAD's responsibilities in the area of monitoring and evaluation of Title XII activities, and the efforts made to date to fulfill these responsibilities with regards to Title XII projects. ^{1/} A chronology of activities related to Title XII evaluation is provided in Appendix I. This report focuses on the evaluation of country projects alone; it does not examine other BIFAD programs.

A. BIFAD's Monitoring and Evaluation Responsibilities

Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and the BIFAD Charter specify the responsibilities of BIFAD in the area of evaluation. Specifically, Section 298 "General Authority", states that the Board's duties with respect to monitoring and evaluation include:

"Participating in the formulation of basic policy, procedures, and criteria for project proposal review, selection, and monitoring...

Reviewing and evaluating agreements and activities authorized by this title and undertaken by universities to assure compliance with the purposes of this title...

Assessing the impact of programs carried out under this title in solving agricultural problems in the developing nations...

Reviewing and evaluating memorandums of understanding or other documents that detail the terms and conditions between the Administrator and universities participating in programs under this title...

Further guidance is given on BIFAD evaluation responsibilities in the BIFAD Charter. The charter, when revised in 1982, sought to make the evaluation charge manageable by emphasizing a "selective approach." It was not intended that BIFAD would be involved in the evaluation of all Title XII activities. This reflects BIFAD's capabilities, availability of staff and other constraints.

^{1/} Title XII projects refer here to agriculture, rural development, nutrition and forestry projects implemented by Title XII universities.

BIFAD's responsibilities, as outlined in the charter include the following:

"Participate (on a selective basis) directly, and through its subordinate units, as an integral part of the Agency's system of designing, approving, implementing, and evaluating Title XII programs and projects...

"Participating in the evaluation of selected projects as agreed upon with the country missions concerned...

"Reviewing proposals for Agency university strengthening programs, assessing these programs and recommending changes as needed."

Specific responsibilities are given to BIFAD staff. The last two responsibilities listed above are included in the tasks of the BIFAD Staff, as well as the task of "assessing progress in selected programs, recommending changes as needed."

JCARD responsibilities, as listed in Attachment A of the BIFAD Charter, are the following:

"JCARD . . . obtains advice from the university community on the design and evaluation of country and sub-regional programs. . ."

". . . JCARD's major responsibilities will be to provide advice and assistance to the Board, AID and the universities through participating in AID's evaluation and assessment process, in order to gauge the utilization, impact, development relevance and general effectiveness of Title XII programs under way, and suggesting any program changes needed. . . ."

BIFAD's responsibility in the area of evaluation has been highlighted by comments from the AID Administrator. Early in 1982 he requested "Standards of Performance" for use in evaluating university projects. In January 1985 he asked BIFAD's help in (a) "defining much better what excellence is" with respect to a standard of performance, and (b) "taking another close look at what universities do well and what they don't do well." The Administrator's views were reinforced by those of the then Agency Counselor, Frank Kimball, with a suggestion that BIFAD establish a program review and evaluation system which:

- assesses university performance in Title XII projects,
- identifies common or recurring problems,
- disseminates evaluation results, and information on problems, and
- identifies and recommends solutions to problems.

B. Past Efforts to Formulate BIFAD's Monitoring and Evaluation Role

The issue of university performance and BIFAD's role in evaluating university work has been of increasing concern to BIFAD over the last few years. In response to the AID Administrator's request for BIFAD involvement in this area BIFAD and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) set up a Task Force to explore the issue of "Standards of Performance." Two papers were developed: one by William Siffin of Indiana University presented ideas for the design and application of performance standards; another by Ralph Smuckler of Michigan State University expressed ideas on the Standards of Performance and suggested a means to measure the long-term impact of technical assistance.

After deliberation and consideration of these two papers, the Standard of Performance Task Force agreed in July 1982 to a plan of action with two phases. In the short term, the "Statement of Principles for Effective Participation in International Development Activities" developed by NASULGC in 1979 was to be expanded. These principles were intensively elaborated upon, and were endorsed and published by NASULGC in June 1983.

In the longer term, the "Statement of Principles" were to be incorporated into the existing AID evaluation process as guidelines in the evaluation of universities' performances. The authors found no evidence of these principles being incorporated into AID's evaluation process. Some efforts have been made in the Title XII community to incorporate these principles into Title XII projects (examples are given in section three of this report), but a great deal of work remains to bring these principles into full usage.

Over the last two and one-half years a number of activities have been undertaken. Efforts to include BIFAD in the improvement of the AID evaluation system and in guiding special studies have been successful. PPC involves BIFAD in its consultations on special impact evaluations, evaluation workshops and conferences on issues of special concern to Title XII. Items currently on PPC's agenda include agricultural services, integrated rural development, hill agriculture, technology transfer, higher education, and participant training. PPC has also included BIFAD in the AID Program Evaluation Committee, an informal intra-agency group of officers concerned with evaluation.

As a result of the efforts described above and contact with AID evaluation officers, BIFAD is now considered an actor at the working level in the AID process in developing, improving, and refining Agency evaluation procedures.

Prior to this report, the last significant evaluation activity undertaken under BIFAD auspices was the report prepared by Jane Roth, "BIFAD: Title XII Programs and Evaluations, June 1985." This is a good background report which compiles information on Title XII activities and briefly describes the evaluation procedures in place for each of the Title XII programs (collaborative research support program, international agricultural research centers, strengthening grant program, memorandum of understanding program, contracts and cooperative agreements, and technical support to missions.)

There are many tasks BIFAD can undertake to pursue its responsibility in evaluating Title XII activities. The next section reviews BIFAD's present monitoring and evaluation activities which have developed from the efforts of the past two years. Section III provides recommendations for future activities.

II. BIFAD'S PRESENT MONITORING AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

BIFAD's present monitoring activities include various ad hoc efforts such as the development of a project status information data base, and use of BIFAD's "good offices" to facilitate the resolution of project difficulties. Participation in AID's evaluation system, when requested, has included the development of Title XII project evaluation agendas, the identification of technical assistance specialists to serve on evaluation teams, actual participation in project evaluations, and assisting in the formulation and implementation of special AID program evaluations. A discussion of each of these elements follows.

A. Monitoring Activities

1. A Project Status Information Data Base

BIFAD has developed a project status information data base, a summary of which is provided to Title XII universities annually. The data base provides information for the required annual report to Congress, and is distributed to Title XII representatives and individuals from AID's regional bureaus.

The data base includes information on the dates of scheduled and completed evaluations 2) project number, 3) stage of project development, 4) contract number, 5) amount of contract, 6) the university(ies) implementing the project and 7) country location. Efforts are made to update this information semi-annually.

In the Fall of 1985 a questionnaire was sent to Title XII university representatives requesting that they supply updated project information. Information provided by the universities comprise the majority of the data base, while BIFAD staff continue to collect information from other sources on "pending projects", those projects for which no contract has been signed.

2. Formal Communication with the Missions and Universities

For the past couple of years the BIFAD Chairman has communicated directly with USAID mission directors and Title XII university presidents regarding Title XII project performance. In July 1985 the Chairman of BIFAD, Dr. E. T. York, sent a letter to them requesting comment on BIFAD's efforts to develop a formal evaluation plan, extended an invitation to use BIFAD's "good offices" to help address at an early stage any serious problems with Title XII projects, and asked that the missions and universities keep BIFAD informed of any noteworthy accomplishments or significant difficulties being experienced in the implementation of USAID projects.

BIFAD hopes that through such communications it will be kept updated on the problems of designing and implementing Title XII projects from the perspective of two major stake holders, the university and the field mission. Their comments regarding BIFAD's evaluation role are summarized here. Other issues and problems of Title XII projects reported from these sources, are not the focus of this report, and therefore not discussed here.

a. Field Mission Responses

In general, the USAID mission directors, Aid representatives, AID affairs officers, and agricultural development officers reported that they were pleased with BIFAD's efforts to strengthen the lines of communication between BIFAD, the field missions and the universities, and noted the assistance provided to missions by BIFAD. A number noted their intentions of using BIFAD's offices to address any problems in the future.

Specific suggestions raised by the USAID mission directors included the following:

- i. The need to avoid redundancy of other evaluation/monitoring efforts when developing a BIFAD evaluation plan.
- ii. The possible benefit from BIFAD representation on evaluation teams.

- iii. The role BIFAD can play in assisting in the selection of advisors and consultants.
- iv. BIFAD can provide its observations and insights about U.S. university work in support of the mission's program directly to the field mission.
- v. BIFAD should help establish guidelines for evaluating Title XII projects. BIFAD should consider including in these guidelines the following: team leaders should be tenured staff, universities should make every effort to organize an office with some continuity and responsibility for their overseas operations.
- vi. For their overseas operations, universities should not unjustifiably increase the salary base of technical advisors.

For mission directors' comments regarding project performance see the memorandum "Summary and Highlights of Responses to E.T. York's, Letter 7/31/85 Requesting Comments on BIFAD's Evaluation Role".

b. University Responses

A number of university presidents and other interested university officials applauded BIFAD's efforts to develop a formal evaluation plan. Many of the twenty-seven university responses included comments on accomplishments and difficulties with AID projects; these are summarized in a separate BIFAD memorandum. Comments specifically on evaluation issues follow:

- i. "The design and implementation of effective monitoring and evaluation processes by BIFAD that can take into account the dynamic nature of development and of the activities and capabilities of the participating institutions can be very worthwhile. These monitoring and evaluating procedures can provide feedback in an iterative way to allow recognition of 'lessons learned' that may suggest changes for the improvement of the project."
- ii. It is beneficial to have the same people evaluate the project at the mid-term and final evaluations.
- iii. "There is sometimes a feeling of frustration on the part of the universities because of the lack of clearly defined procedures for input of their opinion, concerns, and needs into the AID system. Hopefully the forthcoming evaluation method will provide such a conduit."
- iv. "I am happy to endorse the Board's reinforcement of the existing monitoring and evaluation systems, and to support you [BIFAD] in this endeavor."

3. Use of BIFAD's "Good Offices"

As mentioned above BIFAD has formally extended an invitation to all field missions and Title XII universities for the use of its good offices to help address at an early stage problems that might jeopardize the success of a project. On numerous occasions BIFAD staff has proved to be extremely effective as a liaison between field missions and universities.

In one instance a university was highly concerned about the delay in receiving host country clearance for its technical advisors to enter the country, although each of the advisors had been approved initially. The university began to have doubts on the field mission's intentions for the project, and did not believe the mission's story of host-country delays. After BIFAD staff explored the issue, it was discovered that the host-country legislative body had not approved legislation for the activities in which the technical advisors would be engaged, and it appeared that the field mission also was concerned over the delays. Reporting of this information to the university helped ease the concern of the university.

BIFAD assistance also benefits the field mission. In one case a field mission wanted to cancel a project due to its inability to accept a chief-of-party. With BIFAD's assistance a new chief-of-party was found and the project continued.

B. Assistance in AID's Evaluation of Title XII Projects

1. Identification of Technical Assistance Specialists for Evaluations

Field missions often contact BIFAD staff to help in assembling an evaluation team, as well as in developing issues to be examined in an evaluation. An example of this is the recent contact from USAID/Zaire regarding the Applied Agricultural Research and Outreach project. The Project Officer contacted BIFAD staff regarding the scheduled April 1986 evaluation which the mission wanted the Title XII community to do. She requested BIFAD assistance with locating talent and information on the possible contracting mechanisms. Other recent examples where field mission staff requested BIFAD assistance are the evaluation of projects in Peru, (in 1984 and 1985) the agricultural education project in Botswana, and the farming systems project in Swaziland.

2. Service on Evaluation Teams

Field missions have specifically requested BIFAD members and staff to serve on evaluation teams. In the past few years a BIFAD member,

Dr. Duane Acker, served on the evaluation team of the farming systems project in Swaziland, BIFAD staff members, Dr. John Stovall, served on the evaluation team of the agricultural research project in Morocco, Dr. Jiryis Oweis served on the U.S. education programs evaluation team in Jordan, and Dr. Fred Hutchinson, former BIFAD director served on the CIAT evaluation team.

3. Formulation and Implementation of Special AID Evaluations

BIFAD is requested frequently to contribute to special AID evaluations, such as impact evaluations. Mr. Fred Johnson, a BIFAD staff member, was involved intimately with AID's study of assistance to agricultural research institutions and led the Tunisia case study evaluation team. Dr. Frank Fender, a former BIFAD staff member, helped define the study focus of the impact of AID's assistance to LDC higher education agricultural institutions. BIFAD has also contributed to the study of AID's experience with agricultural services by providing the services of former staff member, Mr. Myron Smith.

4. Development of Project Evaluation Agendas

AID is in the process of developing a generic evaluation scope of work to be used as a base for all AID project evaluations (See Appendix VI). BIFAD staff are working with PPC in devising this scope of work. The focus of their contribution is to improve the contractor's role in the evaluation process.

The idea of developing a generic scope of work for Title XII projects or standard questions for Title XII projects was discussed among BIFAD staff, PPC personnel, and individuals in the university and was discarded. The problem is to identify questions which are applicable to the wide range of Title XII projects.

The central evaluation concern of the Title XII community may be stated in the following question: Is the process working effectively to establish long term linkages between the U.S. university community and host country institutions for the application of science to solve food and nutrition problems? This question has two components:

Is the Title XII community's scientific expertise being effectively utilized to build institutions and for channeling the development assistance experience back into teaching and research in a cumulative and systematic fashion?

Is the process leading to the involvement of developing country colleagues in a continuing and sustained academic and scientific worldwide network?

To include these concerns in a generic scope of work is difficult. A specific question that will capture the long-term collaborative relationship aspect is whether this project is building long-term links between the U.S. university community and host country institutions.

It is also difficult to encapsulate other aspects of the Title XII concept into specific evaluation scope of work questions. For example, how does one delineate the complexity of providing the development assistance, research and teaching experience to the host country. Attempts to encapsulate this aspect into a SOW question results in general, broad questions, such as whether project activities are feeding into the host country research and educational system.

For an evaluator to translate Title XII concerns into a task of examining an agricultural research/education/extension project, the question becomes whether the project is helping build host country institutions. That is, whether the project is achieving its goals, a generic question of most evaluations.

The attempt to capture some of Title XII concerns into an evaluation scope of work for individual projects is redundant; these concerns are already incorporated into the AID evaluation process. To determine whether Title XII projects in general are achieving their objectives would require examining these projects as a group.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Establish an Information Feedback System

Recommendation One: BIFAD should establish an Information Feedback system which provides information on "lessons learned" from Title XII project experience.

The information feedback system should include the following elements:

- o Monitoring projects and the use of BIFAD's "good offices" to resolve difficulties,
- o Monitoring Title XII project evaluation results,
- o Efforts to be kept informed of any analysis performed by PPC germane to Title XII projects and relevant AID project experience,
- o Efforts to inform universities and other interested parties of major findings and recurring problems from the review of project evaluations, and
- o Close examination of special issues identified by BIFAD.

1. Monitor Projects

BIFAD should monitor troubled projects more closely and continue to use its "good offices" to facilitate the resolution of issues. BIFAD should keep informed of any major difficulties in Title XII projects and offer its services in their resolution. Also BIFAD should increase its efforts to obtain information promptly on the results of project evaluations.

2. News of "Lessons Learned" from AID Projects

Of particular interest to the Title XII community are comments regarding AID's experience in agricultural development and agricultural technology transfer. A summary of the relevant sections of a report recently released by AID's Center for Development Information and Evaluation (PPC/CDIE), Lessons Learned from AID Program Experience in FY 1984; A Review of the Year's Project Evaluation and Audit Reports, World-Wide should be shared with the Title XII community.

The report examined 308 AID 1984 project evaluation and audit reports to identify problems and trends, successes and failures common to the missions. The objective was to determine what issues existed, as well as how the evaluators explained the results. The report focused on five major issues: 1) compatibility of project objectives with host country environment, 2) project effectiveness in the institutionalization and human resource development process, 3) project adequacy in design and implementation, 4) degree of project "sustainability" after AID's support systems have been removed and 5) the transfer of technology.

3. Occasional Performance News of Title XII Activities

An example of information that should be collected and reported to the universities is the recently completed analysis comparing Title XII projects with all AID projects.

There are various opinions on the relative "success" or "failure" of Title XII projects in relation to other AID projects. No objective study has ever compared the number of Title XII "successes" or "failures" with other projects, but the report Lessons Learned from AID Program Experience in FY 1984 provides some basis for comparison of Title XII projects with AID's project portfolio.

This Lesson Learned study released by AID/PPC, and completed by Mr. Robert E. Culbertson and associates of Development Associates, Inc., is based on the review of completed project evaluation reports from USAID Missions, central bureaus and the Inspector General's office.

In preparing the report "the analyst developed a checklist and a rough measure of the degree to which the project was encountering difficulties related to the (four central) issues." These thoughts were recorded for each of the 211 projects coded, and each project given a numerical score for each of the central issues: 1) compatibility with the host country environment, 2) institutional and human resource development capabilities, 3) project design and implementation problems, and 4) sustainability.

BIFAD staff identified the seventeen Title XII project evaluations reported in 1984 and, using the data provided in the annex of the Lessons Learned report, performed separate calculations to compare the performance of Title XII projects with that of the AID project portfolio evaluated in 1984. For details on the rating of each Title XII project see Appendix VI.

The analysis indicates that Title XII projects perform as well as, or better than the average project in AID's portfolio. This is particularly true for projects designed under the Collaborative Assistance Mode, where universities are intimately involved in the design of the project. See Table 1 below.

Title XII university projects scored better overall, as well as in two of the four ranked categories: project's effectiveness in the institutionalization process and project's "sustainability" after cessation of external assistance. In those projects where the university had a large role in developing the project, (i.e. under the Collaborative Assistance Mode), the projects were ranked as being even more successful in the two areas of strength. Title XII project's fared less well in the adequacy of the design and implementation of the project, and less well in the compatibility of the project with the host country environment.

4. Annual Report of Title XII Project Evaluations

BIFAD should be aware of the results of Title XII country project evaluations. Obtaining information on the reasons contributing to project success or failure is just as important as knowing about Title XII project performance. Copies of the evaluations should be obtained and summarized on an annual basis. The major findings, recurring problems and any "lessons learned" should be noted and reported annually.

Nearly 30 Title XII projects are evaluated, by one entity or another annually. In 1984, 17 Title XII mission funded mid-term or final evaluations were reported to Washington, in 1985 21 were reported. General Accounting Office (GAO) and AID's Inspector General's (IG) Audit Office also examine Title XII projects.

IG usually examines 5 to 10 Title XII projects annually. The GAO has authority to investigate all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement and application of public funds, and is interested in

Table I. RANKING OF PROJECTS ACCORDING TO A REVIEW OF 1984 AID EVALUATION REPORTS, 1984

	<u>All AID Projects</u> ^{1/}	<u>Title XII Projects</u>	
		<u>All Projects</u> ^{2/}	<u>CAM</u> ^{3/}
Compatibility (10) ^{4/}	8.1	7.4	7.7
Institution Building (10)	7.3	7.8	8.9
Project Design and Implementation (10)	6.6	6.2	6.0
Sustainability (10)	<u>7.3</u>	<u>7.4</u>	<u>8.4</u>
Total ^{5/} (40)	28.5	28.7	31.0
Converted to Percentage	71%	72%	79%

^{1/} Rankings summary as reported for 211 projects

^{2/} As tabulated by the authors. See Table 2, Appendix IV for individual project ratings

^{3/} Collaborative Assistance Mode

^{4/} Each of the four criteria were ranked using a ten point scale

^{5/} Calculated by averaging all total individual scores

Source: Numeric data presented in Lessons Learned from AID Program Experience in FY 1984, AID/PPC/CDIE, October 1985

improving the effectiveness of U.S. government funded programs. Their examinations of Title XII are usually program oriented, not focused on projects. The last major GAO audit of Title XII was in 1981.

Options and operational procedures to establish an information feedback system are provided in Appendix V.

B. Continue to Participate in AID's Evaluation System

Recommendation Two: BIFAD should continue to participate in AID's evaluation system.

BIFAD provides a valuable service to the AID and Title XII university community by providing assistance in locating technical talent to serve on evaluation teams, by assisting in developing evaluation agendas, and by serving on evaluation teams. BIFAD should continue to provide these services not only for evaluating Title XII projects, but for involving the Title XII community in evaluating other AID agricultural projects and programs.

Participation should include the following elements:

- o Assistance in developing a generic evaluation scope of work for Title XII projects,
- o Contribution to the scope of work of individual project evaluations,
- o Assistance in identifying and procuring team members to evaluate Title XII projects,
- o Encouragement to include individuals from Title XII institutions on AID project evaluations, not specifically Title XII projects, and
- o Participation as appropriate in AID's central evaluation functions.

C. Encourage Universities to Take the Initiative and Actively Work with AID in Project Evaluations

Recommendation Three: BIFAD should encourage the Title XII university community to become more actively involved with the Title XII project evaluation process.
BIFAD should encourage the Title XII community to:

- o Use an internal monitoring system in their Title XII projects to provide for an annual review of project progress, a record of project activities and decisions regarding the project, and
- o Take the initiative and actively contribute to the evaluation process.

1. Use an Internal Monitoring System

The importance of documenting project activities over time has been highlighted by many individuals. At the Title XII regional seminars this year, one of the major "lessons learned" presented by both Harold Matteson of New Mexico State University and Howard Massey of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University was that projects need to provide for a "project institutional memory," so that when evaluations are undertaken to assess project progress, there is documentation of decisions made to change project direction.

This idea has been expressed frequently both within the university and AID community. One variation of this is the suggestion made by Ralph Smuckler of Michigan State University that an individual be assigned quarter time to a project to act as a project historian.

2. Contribute to the Evaluation Process

BIFAD should encourage the Title XII university community to offer their suggestions to the missions regarding upcoming evaluations. Universities can offer suggestions on any issue of importance to them. Many missions welcome contributions. In one Title XII project, the field mission designed the project so that the university orchestrated the evaluation.

Among the issues which might be addressed are the following:

- o The type of expertise to be included on the evaluation team;
- o The content of the evaluation team scope of work;
- o The provision of a "resource person" from the U.S. university campus to the evaluation team;
- o Evaluation team contact with the university backstop officer, and preferably, on site in the United States;
- o A verbal debriefing for the project staff in country of the evaluation team prior to its departure;
- o The opportunity to review the draft evaluation particularly for factual errors omissions, and the tone of the report; and
- o The inclusion of the university's response to the evaluation in the report, as an annex, but preferably in the body of the report.

There are many examples of universities' taking the initiative and becoming more involved in the evaluation process; Among them, is the preparation by University of Hawaii at Manoa and Cornell University for the mid-term evaluation of the South Pacific Region Agricultural Development Project.

Preparation started with an internal review of the project by the universities to become fully aware of the project's progress, to document benefits and to note the reasons for any difficulties in the project's implementation. The University of Hawaii assisted in writing the scope of work, selecting the academic disciplines and individuals which would serve on the team, contacted evaluation team members and arranged for the team to visit the Hawaii and (at least one team member) the Cornell campuses. Briefing papers on the results of the internal review were prepared for the evaluation team, as well as arrangements made, and executed for the evaluation team to debrief the project staff prior to departure.

D. Work to Improve AID's Evaluation System

Recommendation Four: BIFAD should participate actively at a high policy level to improve AID's evaluation system. Improvements in the system should include:

- o More resources for project evaluations. If more resources are not available, fewer evaluations should be undertaken.
- o The provision for an internal annual review process.
- o A system to insure efforts are made to implement those recommendations from project evaluations which missions accept.
- o Close partnership with the universities in undertaking the evaluation of their projects.

1. AID has a Well Developed Evaluation System but Implementation Varies Widely

Of all the international development agencies, AID has one of the most developed evaluation systems. Evaluations are carried out by field missions, bureaus, the inspector general's office (program audits), and central and regional bureau. Guidelines are established for project

evaluations in Handbook 3, an evaluation handbook exists, each field mission has a designated evaluation officer and a central office (office of Evaluation in PPC) is responsible for the evaluations process. This office provides policy guidance and methodological and procedural materials on evaluation, coordinates the impact evaluation, and offers technical assistance on evaluation to the agency.

The authors have served on five evaluation teams, have reviewed many of the 38 Title XII project evaluations in 1984 and 1985, and consulted more than 40 individuals in the university and AID community on their experiences with AID project evaluations. We conclude that, as well developed as is AID's evaluation system, the conceptual framework and organizational structure does not translate into a system producing quality project evaluations. The differences in the purposes for undertaking evaluations, the evaluation team's degree of preparation, AID's participation, and the amount of resources devoted to the evaluation all contribute to the varying quality of evaluations.

2. Evaluations are Undertaken for Various Reasons

Evaluations were undertaken for many reasons: 1) to complete the requirement as described in the project paper, 2) to fulfill the perceived need to have external evaluation recommendations to develop a follow-on project, 3) to use an outside evaluation team report as leverage with the host country government to achieve changes, 4) to obtain the talent of outside expertise to advise on technical matters, and 5) to assess progress toward the stated project objectives given the changing environment.

The authors feel that the primary reasons for project evaluations should be the assessment of project progress toward the stated goals, identification and resolution of any project difficulties, and reassessment of project direction. Whatever the evaluation purpose, it should be clearly identified in the evaluation report.

3. Evaluations Suffer from the Lack of Resources

The opinion was often heard from both the AID and university communities that sufficient time was not provided for an evaluation team to become sufficiently familiar with the project, provide insightful recommendations, nor produce a quality report.

The evaluation period of projects reviewed ranged from two and a half weeks to eight weeks (and a continual evaluation process over a few years), from a three to a seven person evaluation team, from sufficient time and resources to visit project sites to only being able to review

documents and interview individuals in the capital city. Two AID officers indicated that for evaluations of short duration (two to three weeks) the result is often an evaluation report supporting the views of the mission and little more.

Evaluation team preparation varied from teams which had a week long pre-trip workshop and the time to visit and interview individuals backstopping the projects in the states, to teams with very little preparation.

The quality of the evaluation reports varied widely, in terms of substantive content and format. To produce a good quality report requires good evaluators, but given that there were few complaints raised on the quality of evaluation team members, other reasons account for poor reporting. One reason is the lack of time and resources required for the job. This is often a contributing factor to the poor format of an evaluation report. Many do not have clear reasoning with well defined recommendations, documented findings and easy-to-read format including a table of contents and summary.

4. More Project Progress Could be Achieved with the Use of Annual Reviews.

It was frequently noted in evaluation reports, and in discussions with individuals involved in project evaluations, that by the time of the mid-term evaluation, many problems had become intractable making resolution more difficult. Early identification could make resolution more probable and provide for more project success.

An example where annual reviews have been incorporated into a project is the Caribbean Agricultural Extension Project, Phase II. The evaluation process in this project is a model of how the evaluation process can be a constructive tool for project progress. The following is a short description of the process reported by the contractor to BIFAD:

The independent, external evaluators were selected jointly by the U.S.A.I.D. (RDO/C) and the contractors (MUCIA, University of the West Indies, and the University of Minnesota). The evaluators were selected at the very beginning of the project and then worked with project staff, U.S.A.I.D., and local officials to design a useful, practical evaluation which would be ready when major decisions needed to be made on the future of the project. Program staff based their annual workplan, monthly and quarterly reports, and staff meetings on the evaluation design. Criteria for project success (operationalized in the evaluation plan) were kept constantly before project staff and local participants. As the evaluation fieldwork was being done, rapid feedback of findings permitted program changes to be made on a timely basis to correct deficiencies. The evaluation report has been widely

circulated among and used by Caribbean agricultural officials. One of the principal features of the report is use of multiple methods and a variety of sources of information about various aspects of the project to get at project strengths and weaknesses in development areas traditionally very difficult to assess: i.e., institution building and agricultural extension.

5. There is Insufficient Evaluation Follow-up

Insufficient follow-up to project evaluations is hard to document given the inability of the authors to talk with project officers in the field. However, it was reported by a number of university staff members that they have experienced delays by the field mission in following the accepted recommendations of the evaluation. Only in the USAID/Egypt mission did the authors find a system that monitored the implementation of evaluation recommendations.

6. More Contractor Involvement in Evaluations is Warranted

University contractors' participation in evaluations is important. They have background information that may not be available from other sources, and frequently pose issues which they want addressed in evaluations.

Both the university and AID community benefit from the universities' increased participation in the evaluation process. There has been a trend toward more internal and mixed evaluation teams over the last couple of years. Historically, evaluations were frequently completed solely by externally staffed evaluation teams. Of the 17 Title XII evaluations reported in 1984 9 were undertaken by external evaluation teams, 5 by mixed teams, and 4 by internal teams.

Robert Huesmann, now Mission Director in Swaziland, noted the pros and cons of including university staff in the evaluation team:

The principle should be established that every team evaluating a university implemented project should include a key individual from the home campus, either as a full member of the team or as an observer. This practice would be applicable in collaborative or standard, AID direct or host country contracts. The disadvantages of not including a responsible campus individual on the team are evident from evaluations on which this has not been done. For one thing, the rationale for certain decisions and the reasons why certain conditions exist are hardly ever available to pick-up evaluation teams. The resultant reports suffer from a lack of perspective, if not accuracy. Secondly, to the extent that facts are overlooked or misjudged, findings poorly stated or

recommendations impractical or wrong, the evaluation will be contested and will lack credibility and usefulness. One advantage of home campus participation is an in-depth look at what is going on in the field, and hence a better understanding of how home-office decisions and support have affected the field operations, either for better or worse. One might expect this to lead to better decisions and better support. Another advantage is the opportunity for the presumably myopic home-campus individual to profit from the fresh perspectives of the off-campus team members.

There may be some cases in which AID or a host country institution may specifically not want a campus person on an evaluation team. The reasons for this position usually will prove to be based more on the perceived capability or attitudes of individuals than on the principle of participation. In such cases, an acceptable alternative participant can usually be identified.

E. Undertake Evaluations as Required

Recommendation Five: BIFAD should evaluate issues of concern to Title XII projects as required.

BIFAD's evaluation role should be focussed on contributing to and using the extensive evaluation system established in AID, but BIFAD should also evaluate any issues of concern to Title XII projects as it deems necessary.

Further discussion of these recommendations along with specific approaches to implement them are located in Appendix V.

F. Recommended Plan of Action

Recommendation Six: BIFAD should adopt and implement a plan of action for its involvement in country project evaluation.

The following recommended plan of action is based on the acceptance of the central five recommendations of the report as reported in the Executive Summary. The time required to implement these five recommendations could vary between one-quarter to full time use of one individual, dependent on the degree of involvement. The following suggestions are based on the premise that only one-quarter to one-half time of an individual or individuals will be available. BIFAD should undertake four tasks in the next year. They are as follows.

A. Learn from Past Experience

Task 1

Prepare and distribute the first annual report of the Information Feedback System. The task will include the collection, review and analysis of all Title XII project evaluation reports undertaken by AID over the previous year.

The report summarizing the review and analysis will contain AID's Center for Development Information and Evaluation one page summary of the evaluation and information on successful results, issues and problems, Title XII project performance, and other "lessons learned".

B. Prepare for and Assist in Future Evaluations

Task 2

Prepare with AID briefing/training material on how to make the best use of universities in AID's evaluation process.

Task 3

Assist in the evaluation of Title XII projects. This task will include:

- a. Reviewing field mission evaluation schedules for the year and keeping informed of all evaluations planned for Title XII projects,
- b. Informing the field mission during Program Review Week of BIFAD's interest in assisting the mission in the planned evaluation of the Title XII project, and
- c. Informing the AID project managers and the Title XII universities involved of BIFAD's interest in assisting and participating in the evaluation process.

Task 4

Recommend to the AID Administrator a policy for considering Title XII interests in all Title XII project evaluations. (This will facilitate BIFAD staff involvement in AID's evaluation of Title XII projects.)

BIFAD staff should continue with the other evaluation activities it is pursuing (described in section II of the report) on an ad hoc basis, dependent on the time available.

BIFAD'S PRESENT ROLE IN COUNTRY PROJECT EVALUATIONS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I	Chronology of Activities Related to Title XII Evaluation Initiative.....	22
APPENDIX II	List of Individuals Consulted.....	25
APPENDIX III	List of Evaluations of Title XII Universities Projects Submitted to Washington During 1984 and 1985	27
APPENDIX IV	1984 Title XII Project Evaluations with Project Success Rated in Four Categories.....	30
APPENDIX V	Approaches to Implement Recommendations.....	32
APPENDIX VI	AID's Recommended Format for an Evaluation Scope of Work.....	41

Appendix I

CHRONOLOGY OF ACTIVITIES RELATED TO TITLE XII
EVALUATION INITIATIVE

1. "Statement of Principles for Effective Participation in International Development Activities" by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) (1979)
2. GAO Study "AID and Universities Have Yet to Forge An Effective Partnership To Combat World Food Problems" notes need of AID with BIFAD assistance to take stronger policy and management actions to improve university performance. (October 1981)
3. AID Administrator's Request to BIFAD for "Standards of Performance" for use in evaluating work of universities in the implementation of AID funded Projects (early 1982)
4. BIFAD/NASULGC Task Force (with AID participation) set up to explore "Standards of Performance" (early 1982)
5. William Siffin (Indiana University) Proposal on "Standards of Performance for Evaluating U.S. University Involvement in Implementing AID Projects" presents ideas for the design and application of performance standards. (May 1982)
6. Ralph Smuckler (Michigan State University) Memorandum on "Standards of Performance" concerning measurement of long term impact of technical assistance. (July 1982)
7. Standards of Performance Task Force's Plan of Action focused on elaborating the 1979 draft "Statement of Principles" by NASULGC and on incorporating these principles into AID's existing project evaluation process, which the task force recognized to be in need of amendment for a fair and accurate assessment of Title XII type activity. (July 12, 1982)
8. AID Administrator's Policy Directive on Title XII acknowledges existence of NASULGC "Statement of Principles" and notes that BIFAD/NASULGC Task Force has been set up to establish "Standards of Performance for use in evaluating the work of universities in the implementation of AID funded projects." Furthermore, this official Policy Determination No.4, which was initially distributed via a worldwide cable, promised that the Standards of Performance would be transmitted to the field when completed. (October 5, 1982)

9. "Basic Principles for College and University Involvement in International Development Activities", extensively elaborated upon as called for by the Task Force on Standards of Performance, was endorsed and published by NASULGC. (June 1983)
10. Potential Elements of a JCARD Evaluation Strategy, a study commissioned by BIFAD, was done by Michael Brazzel of U.S.D.A.'s Extension Service Office of Program Development, Evaluation, and Management Systems. This report concentrated not on the substance of an evaluation, but rather on the mechanisms for conducting an evaluation, with special reference to information sources. This document was reviewed by JCARD. (October 28, 1983)
11. AID Agricultural Sector Council deliberation on JCARD examination of scope of work for evaluation of Title XII projects. (November 22, 1983)
12. AID Administrator's Remarks to the BIFAD requesting the Board's help in (a) "defining much better what excellence is" with respect to a standard of performance, and (b) "taking another close look at what universities do well and what they don't do well Their comparative strength, by and large, is not long-term management of projects that don't involve substantial ongoing conceptual research work." (January 5, 1984)
13. Frank Kimball, Agency Counselor, Comments on "AID Observations on University Managed Title XII Contracts". He notes common themes, perceived problems and recommends an evaluation system within BIFAD.
14. BIFAD Staff (Country Programs Division) held preliminary discussions with evaluation personnel in the World Bank, USDA and in AID. It gathered extensive documentation on evaluation from these organizations. (January-February 1984)
15. Dr. Marcus Ingle of the University of Maryland's newly established International Development Management Center agreed with BIFAD Staff to develop a seminar on project management and implementation to strengthen project performance. (mid March 1984) Two workshops scheduled for Fall 1985 and Spring 1986, both workshops are to include a segment on "Implementation and Evaluation."
16. Ms. Priscilla Boughton, Deputy Executive Director of BIFAD/Staff, in close liaison with JCARD laid out an "Overall Approach to Evaluation" in concert with the deliberations of AID's Agricultural Sector Council. (June 1984)

17. Cable developed to send to missions planning evaluations of projects implemented by Title XII universities requesting information on a number of BIFAD concerns. Issues raised were considered to be too general by regional bureaus and the cable was never sent. (July 1984)
18. Jane Roth's "BIFAD: Title XII Programs and Evaluations" report received (June 1985) and reviewed by JCARD in August 1985. The report, a good background document, compiles information on Title XII activities and briefly describes the evaluation procedures in place for each of the Title XII programs. JCARD found that the number of alternatives for evaluation presented and a "model" for BIFAD's approach to evaluation were not clearly presented and overall not acceptable.
19. E. T. York Requested Comments from the Title XII University and AID Community on BIFAD's evaluation role.
20. Bonni van Blarcom's draft on "Proposed Strategy for BIFAD's Involvement in Evaluating Title XII Country Project Performance" received, (July 1985) revised and reviewed by JCARD Executive Committee (March 1986) and JCARD (April 1986).

Appendix II

LIST OF INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED

JCARD Members

Francille Firebaugh, Ohio State University
Francis Moncada, AID/SER/AAM
Hugh Popenoe, University of Florida
John S. Robins, (Former) AID/S&T/FA
Dwight Steen, AID/LAC/DR
Marcus Winter, AID/AFR/TR

Members of Title XII University Community

Warren Brandt, Auburn University
Jim Collom, Purdue University
Leroy Davis, Southern University
Duane Everett, South Dakota State University
William Flynn, MUCIA
Richard Guthrie, Auburn University
Peter Hartman, Florida A&M
Fred Hitzhusen, Ohio State University
Jim Kirkwood, Fort Valley State College
William Levin, SECID
Gary Mathis, Texas Tech
James Oxley, Colorado State University
Edwin Oyer, Cornell University
Edwin Price, Oregon State University
Paul Roberts, Michigan State University
Woods Thomas, Purdue University
Edward Vickery, SECID
Delane Welsch, University of Minnesota
Scott Wittier

Professional Evaluators and AID Evaluation Staff

Joan Atherton, AID/PPC/PDPR/IP
Cindy Clapp-Wincek, AID/AFR/DP
Jack Frances, AID/LAC/DP
Jane Roth, Professional Evaluator
Bill Stoeckle, AID/LAC/DP
Nena Vreeland, AID/PPC/CDIE/PPE
Judy Wills, AID/ANE/DP
Mike Zak, AID/PPC/CDIE/PPE

(continued)

BIFAD Staff and Others in the AID Community

Priscilla Boughton, Former BIFAD/S

Marshall Brown, AID

Winfrey Clarke, BIFAD/S

Dale Harpstead, BIFAD/S

Reginald Howard, AID/RIG/A/W

W. Fred Johnson, BIFAD/S

Robert W. Kleis, BIFAD/S

William Miner, BIFAD/S

John Ottke, AID/RIG/A/W

John Rothberg, BIFAD/S

John Shields, Former BIFAD/S

John Stovall, BIFAD/S

APPENDIX IIILIST OF EVALUATIONS OF TITLE XII UNIVERSITY PROJECTS SUBMITTED
TO WASHINGTON DURING 1984 AND 1985

1984

AFRICA BUREAU

<u>COUNTRY</u>	<u>PROJECT NUMBER</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>REPORT DATE</u>	<u>DATE REC'D IN WASH.</u>
Botswana	633-0074	Botswana Agricultural College Expansion	07/11/84	07/31/84
Zimbabwe	613-0209	Ag Sector Asst Prog	07/05/84	09/07/84
Senegal	685-0205	Casamance Regional Development	04/05/84	07/31/84
Zambia	611-0075	Ag Training, Planning and Institutional Devel	03/06/84	?
Zambia	611-0201	Ag Devel Research and Extension - ZAMARE	11/23/83	01/26/84
Regional	622-0002	Seychelles Food Crops Research	03/19/84	09/28/84

ASIA BUREAU

Sri Lanka	383-0049	Ag Ed Devel	12/07/83	01/09/84
Sri Lanka	383-0041	Paddy Storage & Processing	08/30/84	09/18/84

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN BUREAU

Dominican Republic	517-0127	Human Resources Devel	02/22/84	04/06/84
Ecuador	518-0032	Rural Tech Transfer Sys	03/05/84	04/06/84
Jamaica	532-0059	Fish Prod Sys Devel	09/82	06/26/84
Peru	527-0192	Research, Extension and Education	05/14/84	06/12/84

NEAR EAST BUREAU

Egypt	263-0070	Major Cereals	02/28/84	09/18/84
Yemen	279-0052	Ag Devel Support Prog	01/18/84	?
Morocco	608-0145	Range Mgmt Improvement	04/84	08/16/84
Morocco	608-0160	Agronomic Institute	01/12/84	09/18/84
Tunisia	664-0316	Institute National Agronomique de Tunisia Faculty Development	11/83	09/18/84
Tunisia	664-0312.7	Rural Potable Water Sub-project	03/01/84	09/18/84

1985

ASIA/NEAR EAST BUREAU

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Report Date</u>	<u>PPC/E</u>
Bangladesh	388-0051	Ag Research II	07/84	?
Egypt	263-0017	Egypt Water Use & Mgmt	03/85	03/85
Egypt	263-0027	Rice Research & Training	09/84	11/14/84
Egypt	263-0132	Irrigation Mgmt Sys (Structural Repl) Irrigation Mgmt Systems	12/18/84	?
Pakistan	391-0467	Irrigation Systems Mgmt	03/85	?
Philippines	492-0356	Farming Systems Eastern Visayas	05/85	
Portugal	150-0001	Technical Cons & Training Grants	07/84	07/09/84
Thailand	493-0308	Northeast Rainfed Agr Dev	07/85	?
Thailand	493-0317	Ag Planning	06/84	?
Tunisia	664-0312.8	CTRD (Range Dev)	07/84	09/28/84
Yemen	279-0052	Ag Dev Supp - Poultry		09/30/84

LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN BUREAU

Dominican Republic	517-0126	Natural Res Mgmt	07/84	01/29/85
Dominican Republic	517-0127	Human Res Dev	05/85	06/14/85
Regional	538-0068	Carib Ag Extension II	10/84	?

AFRICA BUREAU

Botswana	633-0221	Ag Tech Improvement	?	12/06/84
Burkina Faso	686-0221	Ag Human Res Dev	?	08/15/84
Liberia	669-0135	Agricultural Research & Extension	?	01/03/84
Mali	688-0207	Agricultural Off	03/30/84	11/23/84
Rwanda	696-0112	Fish Culture	01/85	07/10/85
Tanzania	621-0119.01	Farmer Trng & Production	07/84	08/29/84
Regional	698-393	Semi-Arid Food Grains	09/03/84	?

Source: Compiled from data presented in Lessons Learned from AID Program Experience FY 1984, AID/PPC/CDIE and information from Nena Vreeland, AID/PPC/CDIE/PPE

Appendix IV

TABLE 2

1984 TITLE XII PROJECT EVALUATIONS WITH PROJECT SUCCESS RATED IN FOUR CATEGORIES

<u>COUNTRY</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>Report Date</u>	<u>Cost to U.S. (Mil. \$)</u>	<u>Life of Project</u>	<u>Int. or Ex. Eval.</u>	<u>Interim or Final</u>	<u>Rated Factors</u>	<u>Score (Max:40)</u>	<u>Design Mode</u>
<u>Africa</u>									
Botswana	Botswana Agri. College Expansion (633-0074)	07/11/84	8.4	'78-86	Mix	Final	9 10 8 10	37	
Senegal	Casamance Regional Development (685-0205)	04/05/84	23.7	'78-86	Ext	Int	4 5 3 5	17	SUM
Seychelles	Seychelles Food Crop Research (622-0002)	03/19/84	1.5	'81-84	Int	Final	3 1 6 0	10	SUM
Zambia	Agriculture Training, Planning and Inst. Dev. (611-0075)	03/06/84	9.7	'80-86	Int	Int	8 9 6 8	31	CAM
Zambia	Agriculture Development, Research, and Extension ZAMARE (611-0201)	11/23/83	12.5	'80-85	Mix	Int	8 8 8 8	32	SUM
Zimbabwe	Agricultural Sector Asst. Program (613-0209)	07/05/84	4.5	'82-89	Ext	Int	9 9 8 9	35	SUM
<u>LATIN AMERICA</u>									
Dominican Republic	Human Resources Development System (517-0127)	02/22/84	5.0	'81-84	Ext	Int	5 6 4 5	20	
Ecuador	Rural Technology Transfer (518-0032)	03/05/84	10.3	'80-87	Ext	Int	6 10 7 10	33	CAM
Jamaica	Fish Production System Development (532-0059)	09/02/84	4.1	'79-83	Mix	?		no data	SUM

<u>COUNTRY</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>Report Date</u>	<u>Cost to U.S. (Mil. \$)</u>	<u>Life of Project</u>	<u>Int. or Ex. Eval.</u>	<u>Interim or Final</u>	<u>Rated Factors</u>	<u>Score (Max:40)</u>	<u>Design Mode</u>
<u>LATIN AMERICA</u>									
Peru	Research, Extension and Education (527-0192)	05/14/84	11.0	'80-85	Ext	Int	8 7 5 5	25	SUM
<u>Asia and Near East</u>									
Egypt	Major Cereals (263-0070)	02/28/84	30.0	'67-82	Ext	Int	9 8 6 8	31	CAM
Morocco	Range Management Improvement (608-0145)	04/84	5.0	'81-85	Ext	Int	5 8 3 3	24	CAM
Morocco	Agronomic Institute (608-0160)	01/12/84	9.7	'80-84	Mix	Int	10 10 10 10	40	CAM
Sri Lanka	Paddy Storage Processing (383-0041)	08/30/84	4.8	'78-84	Ext	Final	6 5 8 5	24	?
Sri Lanka	Agricultural Education Development (383-0049)	12/07/83	7.5	'77-85	Mix	Final	10 10 5 10	35	Open Prcc.
Tunisia	Rural Potable Water Subproject (664-0312.7)	03/01/84	2.2	'80-85	Ext	Int	8 8 5 8	29	CAM
Tunisia	Institute National (664-0316)	?	5.8	'79-86	Ext	Ext	9 9 9 9	36	?
Yemen	Agricultural Development Support, (279-0052)	01/18/84	11.0	'79-83	Ext	Int	8 9 5 7	29	CAM

Source: Compiled from data presented in Lessons Learned from AID Program Experience FY 1984, AID/PPC/CDIE

Appendix V

APPROACHES TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

	<u>Page</u>
Discussion of Operational Procedures to Implement Recommendations.....	33
A. Activities to Implement Recommendation One.....	33
B. Activities to Implement Recommendation Two.....	35
C. Activities to Implement Recommendation Three.....	39

DISCUSSION OF OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

This section discusses the central three recommendations and some of the available options to implement them. Other recommendations are not discussed.

A. ACTIVITIES TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATION ONE

(Recommendation One: BIFAD should establish an Information Feedback System which provides information on "lessons learned" from Title XII project experience.)

Activity 1: Monitor Projects with Difficulties and Use BIFAD's "Good Offices" to Resolve Project Difficulties

- Approach a: Maintain a project status information data base on basic project information.
- Approach b: Communicate annually with missions and universities indicating BIFAD's willingness to assist in resolving any significant problems.
- Approach c: Work informally with university staff, AID mission personnel and Washington backstop officers to monitor and resolve project difficulties.
- Approach d: Attend the regional ADO conferences to learn of projects' progress and any significant difficulties.

BIFAD staff should participate in regional ADO conferences to follow the performance of Title XII projects. This informal means of information sharing can work towards further collaboration between USAID field missions and BIFAD. Various objectives can be met: dates of upcoming evaluations can be secured, a working relationship regarding any problems that arise in Title XII projects can be discussed, and agreement to include some of BIFAD concerns in the evaluation process can be addressed.

Activity 2: Monitor AID Project Evaluation Results

- Approach a: Establish sources to provide information on upcoming evaluations.
- Approach b: Establish a system to receive evaluation results.

Continue to receive evaluation reports circulated by PPC. A log should be kept of all reports received and cataloged according to country, type

of project, and university(ies) involved. Keeping a cross-referenced record of project evaluations enables an easy access to their review when similar projects are to be evaluated.

Approach c: Contact evaluators of Title XII projects for their comments on the evaluation.

Personal contact is helpful in building information on evaluations. Many items which do not make it into the report may be helpful to know for future evaluations. To track down evaluators is a time consuming task and should be done selectively.

Approach d: Follow up an evaluation with the university team in the field to obtain their feedback on the evaluation.

The experience and perspective of those having been evaluated is unique and can contribute to the learning process. They may reveal some disappointments on the process which may be corrected in future evaluations, and they may offer some suggestions for future teams.

The team may be overburdened with work to respond to such a request for information, and may be slow in responding. On the other hand, the team may welcome an opportunity to vent their concern about the evaluation.

Activity 3: Be informed of analysis performed by PPC germane to Title XII projects and relevant AID project experience.

Approach a: Keep informed of relevant PPC publications.

Approach b: Note any major publications (other than PPC's) reviewing AID's project experience.

Activity 4: Inform Universities and other Interested Parties of Major Findings, Recurring Problems and "Lessons Learned" from Review of Project Evaluations.

Approach a: Use the BIFAD Briefs to report occasional news on Title XII performance.

Approach b: Prepare and distribute an annual report containing a discussion of the major findings, recurring problems, and any "lessons learned" from reviewing project

The approach to project evaluations are so diverse that, although each mid-term evaluation is required to have a "Lessons Learned" section (in the Project Evaluation Summary), the quality and applicability of comments varies widely.

Summarizing the "Lessons Learned" sections of the standard project evaluation report format for Title XII universities may yield interesting information, but the probability is that little will be valuable.

Activity 5: Close examination of Special Issues Identified by BIFAD

Much experience lies in the minds of those in BIFAD and at the universities. This experience should be collected and shared with others when special concerns are identified as requiring attention.

B. ACTIVITIES TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATION TWO

(Recommendation Two: BIFAD should continue to participate in AID's evaluation system.)

Activity 6: Assist in Developing a Generic Evaluation Scope of Work for Title XII Projects

The following approaches are possible, but the authors do not believe that this activity is practical.

Approach a: Establish a working group under JCARD to develop a generic evaluation SOW for Title XII projects.

Approach b: Work with PPC in appending questions to the generic AID SOW now under development.

Activity 7: Contribute to the SOW of Individual Project Evaluations

Approach a: Review Project Paper, Project Agreement (PROAG) and contract for specific guidance on the focus and details for the project evaluation.

It is useful to know what was planned for the evaluation when the project was designed by reviewing the basic project documents (PP, contract and PROAG) for specific guidance on the intended focus of the evaluation. Each project paper is required (according to policy established in Handbook 3) to have an evaluation plan with "essential elements" which allow the "1. measurement of progress toward planned targets; 2. determination of why the project is or is not achieving its planned targets, and 3. determination of whether the project purpose continues to be relevant to the country's development needs." Many of these elements

including the project targets, progress indicators, and planning assumptions are delineated in the logframe of the project paper. In addition to these elements, it is also required that the evaluation plan "spell out the actual arrangements for (the) evaluation." (Source: AID Handbook 3)

Furthermore, each PROAG is required to have a section on an evaluation program. In most cases, this will be the wording contained in the PP. Depending on the care with which the document was drafted, it may or may not include details on what issues should be considered in the evaluation.

Reviewing the basic project documents for each project can be a time consuming affair if the documents are not readily available. If BIFAD project files contain all the basic documents, then a quick review of the documents should not require much effort and may reveal useful information. Obtaining copies from the contracts office is a time consuming task.

There is often a significant difference between what is required in project documents and what is provided. Even if copies are located, they may not render much guidance. Most documents have the standard paragraph on evaluations; they note that an evaluation should be done half-way through the project and another at the end.

If guidance is offered, sufficient resources may not be available for the evaluation activities suggested or the suggested activities may not be appropriate. For example, the use of a farmer survey to learn of a technology adoption rate is not a cost effective exercise if it is intended to measure the impact of a small portion of a project's activities. Also, many of the issues that are likely to arise in the development of a project, are not foreseen at the design stage and, consequently are not identified for examination or review in an evaluation.

In conclusion, if the basic project documents are easily available, then the relevant evaluation sections should be reviewed. It is not worth a great deal of effort to locate them as most do not contain valuable guidance

Approach b: Establish sources to provide information on upcoming evaluations.

It is important to have information on what evaluations are to occur in the near future. The Bureau for Policy and Program Coordination (PPC) compiles a list of all scheduled agency evaluations. Title XII university projects can be identified on this list.

In the last year, PPC has sent BIFAD this list. It contains the project title, country, type of evaluation (regular, special, impact) and date of scheduled evaluation. This information is a routine printout from PPC's files and should be available on a continual basis.

The information received from PPC is probably the most complete in the agency. Unfortunately, this information may be out of date and may not

be comprehensive. As PPC combines information from each bureau and mission, it is dependent on each bureau to inform it that an evaluation is scheduled. Approximately 60% of scheduled evaluations do not occur in the year they are scheduled. Although the PPC list may not provide the most accurate information, it is the most comprehensive available, and is worth reviewing.

Another option to obtain information is to contact the backstop officers in Washington (technical backstop, project backstop, and evaluation officers). The technical and project backstop officers often know of upcoming evaluations as the field missions frequently use Washington to procure evaluation talent.

Approach c: BIFAD can suggest to the mission issues to be examined during a Title XII project evaluation.

Based on BIFAD's knowledge of the project, BIFAD can request the mission (via a letter or cable) to include issues it has identified and some generic Title XII concerns in the evaluation scope of work.. This is the most direct way to influence the evaluation agenda. BIFAD can also request from the mission the scope of work for review. Being able to get a hold of the scope of work from the mission may not be easy. The SOWs are frequently not prepared to the last minute and are often not sent to Washington.

Approach d: Inform missions of BIFAD's desire to contribute to Title XII project evaluations.

A letter to the missions informing them of BIFAD's increased concern over it's mandate to monitor the evaluation of Title XII projects, and its interest in being used as a resource for Title XII project evaluations. Missions with Title XII projects could be requested to supply BIFAD with information on when their Title XII projects are scheduled for evaluation. This approach establishes a link with the primary actor in initiating Title XII country projects, particularly in the increasing decentralization of AID management.

Approach e: Inform individual evaluation team members about the Title XII concept and any known project concerns.

Approach f: Encourage the inclusion in all PPs of projects designated Title XII a standard paragraph to assist in evaluating these projects.

A standard paragraph could include wording to the nature that BIFAD should be contacted for their input in the evaluation, that the universities in the U.S. which are backstopping the project should be

contacted, that a number of special concerns should be addressed. If the project is being designed in the Collaborative Assistance Mode (CAM) BIFAD should contact team members and request that this paragraph be included. For projects not undertaken under the CAM, it may take a great deal of effort to have the paragraph included in each PP as it passes through the agency. As more authority is being delegated to the field, this option becomes more difficult. BIFAD should request an agency decision to have a standard paragraph included in all Title XII projects. An agency decision would institutionalize BIFAD's concern, and set the stage for future BIFAD involvement.

Approach g: Encourage the university (which has won a contract) to include a paragraph addressing Title XII concerns in the contract's evaluation provision.

An attempt to work with the university at an early stage on the evaluation issue, encourages the institutions to think down the road to start preparation for evaluations. Inclusion of a paragraph in the PROAG institutionalizes BIFAD concerns for the project and sets a process in motion for future project review and evaluation.

Activity 8: Assist in Identifying and Procuring Team Members to Evaluate Title XII Projects

A good understanding of Title XII will enable a better orientation to an evaluation. Individuals familiar with Title XII, who have had experience in evaluations, know the AID evaluation process and are technically competent will make good team members. BIFAD should try and assist in identifying and procuring evaluators, as well as educating them about Title XII if they are unfamiliar with this provision.

Approach a: Develop a roster of evaluators to be used when requests are received to identify evaluation team members.

Just as the Registry of Institution Resources contains information on university abilities, a system could be developed to keep track of qualified individuals able to take part in evaluations. An article placed in BIFAD NEWS could alert the university community of this need. BIFAD will be better able to influence team composition if they are prepared to suggest individuals. Much effort should not be made to develop a roster, as interest may exceed demand, and false hopes may be raised.

Approach b: Encourage BIFAD, BIFAD staff, and JCARD members to participate on evaluation teams when requested and available.

Approach c: Refer to universities or university consortia any request BIFAD receives for the identification of evaluation team members.

Activity 9: Encourage the inclusion of individuals from Title XII institutions in AID project evaluations, not specifically Title XII projects.

Approach a: Develop a roster of evaluators to be used when requests are received to identify evaluation team members.

Approach b: Assist in preparing Title XII university staff by educating them on AID's evaluation process.

Activity 10: Participate in AID's Central Evaluation Functions

Approach a: Participate on the evaluation policy committees.

Approach b: Contribute to PPC evaluations of issues germane to Title XII.

BIFAD should continue to be involved in the undertaking of special studies of on issues germane to Title XII. It should also encourage PPC to undertake special studies, including the impact of Title XII projects or the type of activities usually undertaken by Title XII universities. BIFAD should take advantage of the available Agency resources to work on its behalf.

C. ACTIVITIES TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATION THREE

(Recommendation Three: BIFAD should encourage the Title XII university community to become more actively involved with Title XII project evaluations.)

Activity 11: Encourage universities to include more internal monitoring in their projects to provide a record of project activities and decisions as well as project progress.

Activity 12: Encourage universities to take the initiative and actively work with AID in project evaluations.

The universities have an obvious stake in the evaluation process. The more they are able to become involved in the process, the more they are able to benefit from the evaluation. They are able to identify some issues to be examined, ask for individuals with specific expertise to assist in technical issue resolution, and work with the mission and host country to involve all relevant actors including the university backstop officer.

BIFAD can encourage the universities' involvement in several ways. They can contact the university and alert them of their ability to influence the process, provide them with information on the evaluation process and work with them in identifying concerns to be addressed in the evaluation.

One approach is to develop training materials for use as a one-day workshop on evaluations. This can be included in the Implementation and Evaluation Courses, as well as one-day events. The important aspect is to present information on actual Title XII experience with suggestions on how to contribute to the evaluation process.

To assist in this area, BIFAD could prepare a small report on the AID evaluation process and how the universities can contribute to having their needs met during this process. This topic could be discussed at the regional seminars, and in the implementation and evaluation workshops.

Activity 13: Encourage universities to include high level university staff in the project review process.

A recent study commissioned by BIFAD on the history of university strengthening in Africa identified the involvement of high level university staff as a factor contributing to a projects success.

AID's RECOMMENDED FORMAT FOR AN EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK

Name of Country (USAID) or Office (AID/Washington)
Sponsoring the Evaluation

Title of Project or Program
(or Title of Proposed Evaluation Report)

EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK

I. ACTIVITY (PROJECT/PROGRAM) TO BE EVALUATED:

Identify the activity that will be evaluated. For example, if one or more A.I.D. assisted projects are to be evaluated, state the project number, title, cost, life-of-project dates, and most recent PACD for the project or projects to be examined. Modify appropriately if the evaluation is to cover a program, or only selected components of one or more projects.

II. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION:

Specify the planning, programming or implementation reason for the evaluation, and the specific agencies which are expected to use the results of the evaluation. Provide information on the following questions: To what uses will the evaluative information be put (e.g., upcoming decisions or longer-term planning needs requiring this information)? When will the information be needed to enable its practical use? Who are going to be the immediate users of the findings and recommendations? Are there other anticipated users?

Refer to appropriate project or program monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan(s), or program documents such as CDSS or Action Plan.

Indicate whether or not the evaluation was planned for in the current Annual Evaluation Plan.

III. BACKGROUND:

The sponsoring Mission or office should outline in no more than two pages a brief history to date of the activity to be evaluated, and what is generally agreed upon by A.I.D. and the borrower/grantee as the present status of the activity (i.e., what has happened, what the activity is achieving).

Include names of key organizations and individuals involved in the activity (spell out acronyms of organizations).

IV. STATEMENT OF WORK:

State in explicit, empirical terms the questions that the users of the evaluation need answers to, and state that the evaluators have to focus their investigations on the questions, and are expected to provide answers to the questions.

State between five and ten primary questions (no more) and indicate their priority to the user. Expand on these essential questions by identifying subordinate questions or issues. Questions should be based on, and go beyond, what is already known about the status of the activity to be evaluated -- don't waste the time of the evaluators in covering old ground (that is, leave up to the evaluators the extent which they believe it may be useful to examine earlier events and assumptions).

State that the evaluators will be required to provide in a final report the following:

- their findings (i.e., the "evidence");
- their conclusions (i.e., their interpretation of the evidence and their best judgment based on this interpretation);
- their recommendations based on their judgments

Require the evaluators to distinguish clearly between their findings, their conclusions (that is, their interpretations and judgments), and their recommendations.

A listing of specific, explicit questions, together with an indication of priorities, is crucial for getting a report that tells the intended users what they need to know. A scope of work that merely says: "The evaluation team shall address the following subjects -- matters, concerns, issues -- or the extent to which a project has achieved its inputs, outputs, purpose and goal" is likely to produce a rambling evaluation report that fails to pinpoint the aspects of the project most needing attention and to provide useful information.

V. METHODS AND PROCEDURES:

This section of the scope of work should identify the design and data collection methodologies that will be used. This can be clarified by the sponsoring Mission or office by obtaining the advice of an evaluation specialist familiar with both current state of the art in evaluation and the practical circumstances in which the evaluation will take place.

The methods and procedures must also take into account the funds budgeted for the evaluation.

The design selected for the evaluation, the associated procedures, and the cost, are based primarily on the questions asked by the users. The conceptualization, or research plan, for an evaluation is likely to vary from case to case. In A.I.D.'s experience, however, there are some practical matters that can be taken care of through a scope of work, and still allow for the flexibility that evaluators will need. These are:

- duration and time phasing of the evaluation (e.g., whether one or more team members, including an evaluation specialist, should be available in advance for preparatory work, or later to see the report through its final drafting);
- any requirement for team members to work a six-day week
- national holidays, working hours, communications/travel problems, and language problems that may affect the team's activities; note availability of local translators;
- availability and location of data that may be useful in measuring changes or impacts in the area addressed by the project or program; list documents that team members should receive and be familiar with before the team begins its investigation (provided by the Mission or the office);
- characteristics of the beneficiary population that may affect interviewing procedures (e.g., gender, ethnic group, homogeneity);
- an estimated division of time spent between research and interviews in the U.S., in-country capital city interviews and document review, field site visits, and analysis and report writing. Note any hardship or rigorous conditions (health, climate, roughness or travel, field site living conditions) that may affect the selection of team members;
- other administrative/logistical support to be provided by the sponsoring Mission or office (if not otherwise included in the PIO/T);
- state whether all or a portion of the scope of work is appropriate for small 8 (a) minority and women owned firm contract.

VI. COMPOSITION OF EVALUATION TEAM:

The composition of the evaluation team should flow from, rather than determine, the statement of work. Too often, the user selects team members on the basis of qualifications related to the technical aspects of the project or program, when such individuals lack the skills needed to design and carry out an evaluation. Especially for a major project or program, an evaluation specialist should be included on the team. When extensive field work in rural areas is envisioned, or when economic issues are a focus, include such specialists as development anthropologist, rural sociologist, development economist or political economist. At all times, seek a multi-disciplinary team, and one that includes an appropriate male/female balance. Identify language requirements, if any.

Indicate the team composition in terms of representation by the host-country borrower/grantee, host country's external contractor, beneficiary groups, USAID, Bureau, U.S. external contractor, U.S. implementing contractor. As a general rule:

-- The team for a final or ex-post evaluation should not include the USAID staff, host country agency personnel, members of the project design team, or contracted U.S. organization technical team who are directly managing and implementing the project or program. There are just too many potential conflicts of interest. On the other hand, these people should be used as major sources of information, and as sounding boards for the team's analysis. (U.S. contractors implementing projects are, of course, encouraged to carry out their own self-evaluations, but these do not substitute for an AID-sponsored evaluation).

-- The team for an interim evaluation should preferably include individuals directly involved, or at least persons representing their interests. They can gain a great deal from interaction with external evaluators on the team during the evaluation process, and in turn can help the latter understand the objective of the project or program as currently defined. The team can work out among themselves interviewing procedures that avoid the problem of the effects on interviewees of the presence of official project staff.

Specify the skills, background and experience that the team leader should have.

Describe the team members' roles and responsibilities (e.g., "the team leader will be responsible for preparation the final report", etc.), especially if special kinds of technical analysis will be required.

VII. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS:

1. Format of the report. State that the evaluation team should prepare a written report containing the following sections:

- Basic Project Identification Data Sheet. (See outline that follows);
- Executive Summary. No more than three pages, single spaced. (See outline that follows);
- Table of Contents;
- Body of the Report. The report is to include a description of the country context in which the project or program was developed and carried out, and provide the information (evidence and analysis) on which the conclusions and recommendations are based. It is ~~is~~ advisable to specify the general length of the body of the report (e.g., no more than 40 pages), and allow the evaluators to include details in appendices or annexes.
- The report should end with a full statement of conclusions and recommendations. Conclusions should be short and succinct, with the topic identified by a short subheading related to the questions posed in the Statement of Work. Recommendations should correspond to the conclusions; whenever possible, the recommendations should specify who, or what agency, should take the recommended actions;
- Appendices. These are to include at a minimum the following:
 - (a) The evaluation Scope of Work;
 - (b) The pertinent Logical Framework(s), together with a brief summary of the current status/attainment of original or modified inputs and outputs (if these are not already indicated in the body of the report);

(c) A description of the methodology used in the evaluation (e.g., the research approach or design, the types of indicators used to measure change of the direction/trend of impacts, how external factors were treated in the analysis). Evaluators may offer methodological recommendations for future evaluations;

(d) A bibliography of documents consulted.

Other appendices may include more details on special topics, and a list of agencies consulted.

If the Mission or office wants the evaluation team to draft the abstract for the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary, this requirement must be included in this section.

2. Submission of Report. The Scope of Work should specify both what portion or version of the report (e.g., a preliminary draft) will be presented to the sponsoring Mission or office upon completion of the field portion of the evaluation, and when the final draft will be submitted to the sponsor for formal review. If a Mission intends to include other host country or the AID/Washington Bureau in a review of a preliminary draft, additional time will have to be built into the Scope of Work to encompass this process. The Scope of Work should state that the evaluation team leader will be responsible for seeing the report through to a timely, professional completion. If all or a portion of the evaluation report is to be translated by the evaluation team (i.e., under their contract to the sponsor), specify those portions.

3. Debriefing(s). Specify the timing and audience(s) for debriefings by the evaluation team or team leader.

VIII. FUNDING:

Estimate the cost of the evaluation, and state how the cost will be met (e.g., project funds, PD&S funds, other resources).

BIFAD

MEMBERS

Dr. E.T. York, Jr. - Chair
Dr. Duane C. Acker
Dr. Warren J. Baker
Honorable Paul Findley
Dr. Benjamin F. Payton
Mr. L. William McNutt, Jr.
Dr. Jean Kearns

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Dr. R.W. Kleis
BIFAD

U.S. Agency for International
Development
Washington, D.C. 20523
(202) 647-9048

or

