

PN-ABN-739  
12/1/92

**DRAFT**

## Lessons Learned about Evaluation in the Organizational Development Process

Barbara Seligman and Nancy Murray

Family Planning Management Development Project  
Management Sciences for Health  
400 Centre St.  
Newton, MA 02158  
(617) 527-9202

October 1992

**DRAFT**

# Table of Contents

<b>I. Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>II. The Evolution of an Organizational Development Project</b> .....	2
A. History of FPMT/FPMD .....	2
B. Theoretical Underpinnings of FPMD .....	2
C. FPMD's Operationalization of Organizational Development Theory .....	4
1. <u>Intervention Points</u> .....	4
2. <u>Stages of Development</u> .....	4
<b>III. Evaluation Research and Family Planning Organizational Development</b> .....	6
B. Constraints to Evaluation .....	8
<b>IV. FPMD's Stakeholder Approach to Evaluation</b> .....	10
B. Operationalizing the Evaluation Framework using the Stakeholder Approach .....	11
<b>V. Conclusions and Recommendations</b> .....	12

## I. Introduction

This paper explores approaches to evaluating the effectiveness of management interventions in strengthening family planning organizations in the developing world. Improved measurement of the impact of interventions will lead to a better understanding of how interventions affect organizational change and, ultimately, will result in more optimal programming of scarce resources.

The paper begins by describing the evolution of the USAID- funded Family Planning Management Development (FPMD) Project and the lessons that have been learned about organizational development during the nearly seven years of the project's existence. Here the underlying rationales for the project's approach are discussed, as well as how the project's theoretical orientation shapes the interventions chosen. Next we consider the constraints involved in carrying out evaluation research, both in general, and in the case particularly of an organizational development project. These constraints are theoretical, methodological, and operational in nature. They explain, in good measure, the relative neglect of a systematic and more impact-oriented approach to the design and evaluation of organizational development interventions. The paper then focuses on the Family Planning Management Development (FPMD)<sup>1</sup> project's efforts to overcome these constraints by integrating evaluation into all stages of the project cycle rather than waiting until the end of the activity, and by adopting a "stakeholder" model for the design and implementation of evaluation activities.

FPMD's experience suggests that evaluation research has the potential to break new ground with respect to our understanding of the linkages between management interventions and organizational change<sup>2</sup>. By helping to advance the state of systematic learning in the field, the project hopes to make a real contribution to the development of successful and sustainable family planning programs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Family Planning Management and Development Project, Contract No. DPE-3055-C-0051-00), funded by the Agency for International Development, Office of Population, Division of Information and Training (R&D/ POP/IT) from 1990-1995.

<sup>2</sup> The project's evaluation objectives are two-fold: (1) to develop measures of the effectiveness of selected management approaches and interventions at the level of the organization and, where relevant, on the quality of services provided by the organization; and (2) to help organizations build evaluation into their own management systems so that they are better equipped to identify their management needs and to specify effective management solutions.

## II. The Evolution of an Organizational Development Project

### A. History of FPMT/FPMD

The Family Planning Management Training (FPMT) project<sup>3</sup>, the precursor of the Family Planning Management Development Project, was originally designed to provide training in management techniques for managers in family planning organizations in the developing world. Under FPMD emphasis is being placed on a more comprehensive **organizational development** approach for increasing the effectiveness of family planning organizations. The project defines organizational development as:

...a long-range effort to introduce planned change, based on a diagnosis shared by members of the organization, which preferably involves all, but sometimes only parts, of the organization. (Benavente and Seligman, 1992).

This broader emphasis is a result of the realization under FPMT that formal training is only one of a range of interventions necessary to make family planning organizations more efficient and to lead to long term improvement in the delivery of family planning services. Training often affects only the participating individuals, since too frequently the environment they return to does not allow them to use their training productively. FPMD's principal departure from its predecessor, FPMT, therefore, lies in the breadth of its mandate, which has given the project considerable flexibility to explore new approaches to strengthening the management of family planning organizations. This broadened mandate is at once both an opportunity as well as a risk, to the extent that there is potential for failure when testing unproven approaches.

### B. Theoretical Underpinnings of FPMD

As discussed in great depth by Hage and Finsterbusch (1987), a vast literature exists for **organizational development and change** that has grown out of three different disciplines: 1) social psychology or **organizational development**; 2) the sociology of organizations or **organizational theory**; and 3) **management research** or organizational design (See Table 1).

The different approaches tend to focus on different performance problems, intervene at different levels of the organizations, and rely on different tactics for their interventions. The **organizational development (OD)** tradition most often focuses on performance problems perceived to be related to human resources: individual morale and motivation; individuals' goals and objectives; and teambuilding. People, either as individuals or in groups, are seen as the driving force behind organizational performance. The interventions used by OD practitioners therefore, are targeted at the internal processes of the organization. Such components of the system as job descriptions, employees' attitudes and expectations, intergroup relations, and the "climate and culture" of the organization are addressed. Commonly used tactics include group problem solving, data discussion groups, etc. (Hage and Finsterbusch, 1987).

---

<sup>3</sup> Contract No. DPE-30390C-00-5075-00), funded by the Agency for International Development, Office of Population, Division of Information and Training (R&D/ POP/IT) from 1985-1990.

**Organizational theory (OT)**, on the other hand, takes a more macro-level approach to organizational change, focusing on organizational effectiveness and efficiency in performance. It can be a somewhat academic focus, with applied issues of how to change organizations less prominent than the observation of organizational behavior and interorganizational comparisons. When interventions are undertaken at all, they tend to focus on such things as the structure of the organization, its environment, or the interactions between structure and human resources, or structure and the environment. The tactics utilized reflect the more abstract nature of this approach, and include restructuring, and change by decree. One extremely important contribution of this approach has been in the area of data collection methodologies and in the development of indicators for measuring/monitoring organizational change. (Hage and Finsterbusch, 1987).

**Organizational Design or Management Research (MR)** is quite similar to OT in that it believes that organizational structure is closely linked to performance. The two literatures define structure somewhat differently however. MR places a strong emphasis on planning and strategy for organizational effectiveness. It shares with OD however the belief that employee motivation is also extremely important in maximizing performance. The tactics utilized to motivate employees however, differ from the more emotive/emotional ones used by OD and tend to be more financial in nature. MR usually changes components of the system, addressing such elements as divisional and departmental structures, lines of authority and responsibility, and managerial practices.

While there are important differences between the three orientations, the lines of distinction between the three disciplines are blurring somewhat over time as each approach has come to borrow from the other (Hage and Finsterbusch, 1984). FPMD's approach to organizational change is probably best described as a hybrid of the **organizational development** and the **management research** approaches. The project has provided technical assistance in strategic planning and other managerial approaches; but also uses many of the techniques of OD to resolve personnel morale and motivation issues. The management research approach does assert itself strongly however thorough FPMD's view that improvements in an organization's effectiveness are more likely to occur if interventions take place at multiple levels of the organization (Seims et al., 1991; Benavente and Seligman, 1992) (Brinkerhoff, 1991 citing Hage and Finsterbusch, 1987).

## C. FPMD's Operationalization of Organizational Development Theory

### 1. Intervention Points

The FPMD project has adopted a general model for organizational development that identifies four levels of intervention within a given organization as well as four stages of development that organizations pass through. The key points of intervention are borrowed from the corporate management literature and are considered critical components in a systems approach to organizational development. This analytic model of the organization provides the foundation for FPMD's organizational analysis (Vriesendorp et al., 1989); Benavente and Seligman, 1992). The key intervention levels may be classified as the following broad categories:

- (1) the mission, or policy in public sector institutions, that provides the rationale, sets boundaries, and establishes a framework for defining goals and objectives ("why are we here?");
- (2) the strategy, defined as the approach to achieving objectives or to addressing other programmatic implications of the mission ("how will we get there?");
- (3) the structure, which refers to the distribution of responsibilities and the establishment of a network of interactions for implementing strategies within the organization ("who does what?"); and
- (4) the systems and subsystems, or the operational components of the organization. An organization acting toward the achievement of objectives can be analyzed as a system of components interacting to produce some effect that no one of them could produce by itself; these components are subsystems.

As mentioned previously, FPMD believes that impact of any single intervention is maximized when concurrent interventions are carried out at other levels of the organization.

### 2. Stages of Development

Under FPMT, the project attempted to define rationales for understanding organizational change based on the project's experience with different NGO and public sector organizations (see Vriesendorp, 1989). These rationales assume that organizations are in a continual state of change. The prototypical family planning organization begins as a fragile ("emergent") organization and ultimately evolves into a state of maturity, characterized by sustainability<sup>4</sup> and resilience to fluctuations of internal and external environments. The intermediate stages of "growth" and "consolidation" describe most of the organizations with which FPMT and FPMD have worked (see Table 2). Organizations at each stage of development are typically characterized by the status of their management components:

---

<sup>4</sup>. Sustainability is defined by FPMD in terms of an organization's ability to: (1) expand the delivery of uninterrupted and high-quality services; (2) adapt to its external environment; and (3) increase its control over resources.

**Emergence:** At this stage an organization typically lacks a clear mission, is still trying to formalize its strategies, frequently is very dependent on a single leader, has only a very elementary structure, and very basic systems. Typically, few services are provided and those that exist depend largely on external resources. While some changes can take place at the structural and systems level, they may be rendered insignificant since the organization does not have the vision or direction to support them. In order to move beyond this stage, an organization needs to clarify its mission and better define its strategies. It also needs to expand its planning capabilities, to set clear objectives, define the resources needed to achieve these objectives, and reach the appropriate balance between existing and needed resources by learning to use planning tools.

**Growth:** These organizations are typically in a rapid state of expansion driven by external resources. While an organization at this stage typically has more clearly articulated objectives and goals, and increased capabilities in developing strategies to achieve them, the organization's structure can become increasingly inadequate for meeting the growing demands placed on it. Thus, structural development is probably the most important intervention at this stage. This can include expansion and/or alteration of the formal organizational design, but it is more than that. Often the positions shown on the organizational chart need to be clarified. Means of communication and feedback between these positions need to be developed. Lines of accountability need to be further defined. The decision-making process and leadership style often need to be refined. All these improvements allow the organization to achieve a more complex division of labor and to have more control over its service delivery sites. Changes at the mission and strategy level will continue but with a less intense effort. Also, some changes can be introduced at the systems level to the extent they are consistent with the definition and functioning of the structure.

**Consolidation:** At this stage, most of the managerial initiative takes place at the systems level. Growth in devices during the preceding stage produces a need for organization, coordination, and control of service and support activities. This is achieved through an upgrading of systems. More complex training, supervision, finance, information, logistics and service delivery systems are often necessary.

**Maturity:** Organizations at this stage are characterized by the ability of their management to adapt the mission, strategies, structure and systems to changes in the external or internal environment.

Clearly, not all organizations pass through all of these stages nor do they necessarily experience these stages in the order that they are described for the "prototype". An organization in the "growth" or "consolidation" stage is not necessarily more effective than one in the "emergent" stage, although one would hope so. "Maturity" represents something of an ideal condition, although it may not be achieved in the same manner by all organizations.

### III. Evaluation Research and Family Planning Organizational Development

FPMD's technical interventions are expected to have a direct impact on family planning organizations in terms of their management effectiveness<sup>5</sup> as well as to either directly or indirectly affect the quality of services provided by the organization. Because of the number of intervening variables however, it is nearly impossible to establish direct connections between management interventions and demographic change. By helping to expand and improve the quality of family planning services though, management interventions are expected to lead to higher continuation and reduced drop-out rates at the family planning program level, which may indirectly affect the demographic situation of a given country.<sup>6</sup> Figure 3, "Evaluation and Levels of Impact", summarizes FPMD's evaluation approach and the relationships between project interventions and different levels of impact.

(Figure 3: Evaluation and Levels of Impact)

In the organizational development context, evaluation can serve many functions. In the classic interpretation, program evaluation measures whether or not desired changes have resulted from a given intervention (Snyder *et al.*, 1980, p.433). Clarity of objectives and definition of terms, and opportunities for fine-tuning are also important potential contributions of evaluation if incorporated from the planning process through to the measurement of impact.

Snyder *et al.* (1980) illustrate the cyclical or systemic view of evaluation adopted by FPMD. In the diagram (see [Figure 1](#)), each stage in the cycle describes a theoretically discrete phase of evaluation that corresponds to a stage in the development and implementation of an intervention (*ibid.*, p.436). In this way, each stage informs the next and allows for ongoing feedback in program implementation. This iterative vision of the role of evaluation is also shared by other organizations involved in the evaluation of donor-funded technical assistance activities in the field of family planning who reject the notion of simply end-of-project evaluation. For an in-depth discussion of evaluation of family planning programs in general, (Garcia-Núñez (1991)).

The first phase of the evaluation cycle, sometimes called the context evaluation, or needs assessment phase examines the operating context of the organization. (Snyder *et al.*, 1980; Brewer, 1983; Garcia Núñez, 1991).). In the case of organizational development, areas of weakness, or performance problems are identified, as well as areas of strength (Brinkerhoff, 1991). This phase provides a baseline measure of key aspects of organizational performance which can be followed over time. FPMD has developed [Needs Assessment Guidelines](#) that consider the principal features of organizations in terms of

---

<sup>5</sup> "Management Effectiveness" or "Organizational Effectiveness" are typically cited as the goals of management interventions. While there is a fair amount of disagreement on how organizational effectiveness should be defined, FPMD tends to use a construct of organizational effectiveness that defines multiple domains of effectiveness. Thus, effectiveness in the domain of team-building could be defined in terms of satisfaction and growth of individuals in the organization. Within the same organization, effectiveness in planning and supervisory interventions could be defined in terms of staff productivity and cost measures. Ultimately, effectiveness for family planning organizations means increasing use of contraceptives and ultimately reduction of fertility rates, at "acceptable" levels of efficiency.

<sup>6</sup> See Tsui *et al.*, 1992 for a discussion of the need for greater understanding of how management issues affect the ability of family planning programs to achieve their desired effects among target populations (eg. increasing contraceptive prevalence and ultimately reducing fertility).



the key intervention levels: mission and strategy, structure and systems and the different organizational outputs and outcomes which can be measured and improved upon. (Benavente and Seligman, 1992).

FPMD's analogue to the input evaluation stage described in the model is the Management Development Plan (MDP). FPMD's most important activities are based on Management Development Plans which outline project objectives, activities, expected results and measurable indicators of their achievement. This document is one of the most important products developed during the evaluation cycle; however, it is also one of the most time-consuming to prepare and dependent on the total participation of the client organization and FPMD regional division staff in addition to the FPMD evaluation unit. For this reason, it has been impossible to develop MDPs for all FPMD interventions.

The next stage in the cycle, process evaluation, serves the purpose of keeping project staff, donors and members of the organization informed of the extent to which the subproject is operating as designed. Thus far, FPMD has designed and begun such evaluation plans for subproject activities: (1) the Upazila Initiatives Project (UIP), a community level family planning management project in Bangladesh; (2) management assistance provided to three NGOS (FPAK, CHAK and MKOMANI) and to the population coordinating body, NCPD, in Kenya; and (3) strengthening of supervision in the MOH in Burkina Faso. All three evaluation plans call for the collection of baseline information for indicators, which are being updated periodically over the course of each of the subprojects. A monitoring and evaluation system designed for the project's publication series, "The Family Planning Manager", would also fall into the process evaluation classification.

Summative evaluation, which addresses "whether or not a specific program has had the desired effect on the... problem it was designed to alleviate" (Brewer, 1983) is regarded as the essence of evaluation research. For FPMD this is understood to mean members of client organization(s) and project staff taking stock of the effectiveness and efficiency of organizational development interventions. This point in the evaluation cycle is playing an increasingly important role as subprojects approach their completion dates. FPMD's MDP's, baseline data collection, and process evaluations all provide the basis for this stage in the evaluation cycle.

The final stage of the evaluation process, policy evaluation, concerns the generalizability of results for the program. In this context, FPMD is examining the Bangladesh UIP project in which several models of community management of family planning activities are being applied. The most successful models will be replicated in other areas of Bangladesh.

Policy evaluation is also expected to advance the project's theoretical framework of stages of organizational development. FPMD's framework sets forth a number of hypotheses regarding the relative impact of different kinds of management interventions in organizations at different stages of development that will be tested over the course of the FPMD project.

## **B. Constraints to Evaluation**

As the evaluation cycle illustrates, evaluation potentially informs every step of the development of a program or project. However, FPMD has found that many constraints exist that limit the degree to which this potential is actually realized. These constraints are theoretical, methodological and operational in nature, although the operational (which often are also political) seem to be the most serious.

### **■ Theoretical constraints**

The focus of evaluation of organizational development interventions is on improving our understanding of how to promote desired institutional change, and the circumstances under which particular management interventions or approaches contribute to improvements in organizational effectiveness. Because so many of the tools used in organizational and management development are grounded in Western social theories, the theoretical mechanisms for explaining how an intervention works are fairly widely accepted in the developed world. What is less well understood, however, is the extent to which the assumptions on which these management approaches are based can be generalized to the varied settings and institutions with which FPMD works.

The universal validity of management concepts and models has been questioned. For example, Hyden and Leonard (Hyden, 1983) have shown how organizational decision-making in East African settings departs from Western models, especially with respect to nonformal learning processes. Similarly, assumptions about organizational roles may not be universally valid. One example is the definition of a manager as someone who is held accountable for the outputs of others and for coordinating and motivating a team capable of producing those outputs. However, in settings where unquestioning obedience to authority is a deeply embedded cultural trait, accountability often takes on a somewhat different meaning. Rather than being perceived in terms of responsibility for the output of others -- and hence, for getting the job done -- accountability may be interpreted as a manager's duty to preserve the power and influence of the most senior person in the institution (Blunt, 1990. p.303). The underlying assumptions of management theory concerning a manager's ability to influence the allocation of work and rewards, and to choose who works for him/her are often ill-suited to the realities faced by many public sector managers, especially those in the developing countries, who have little direct control over their subordinates (ibid, p.303).

### **■ Methodological constraints**

The literature on the methodological constraints to evaluation research is particularly well-developed. A number of methodological or technical issues related to evaluation research have been pointed out. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 1) Findings are often limited to a single investigation because multiple trials are very expensive and difficult to arrange. (Brewer, 1983; Wood, 1988)
- 2) Difficulties exist in implementing rigorous experimental designs. For example, organizations may not see the value of withholding the intervention from some of its staff. (Bosma, 1991; Punnett, 1988)

3. Evaluation tends to produce evidence that comes in the form of degrees of effect, thus necessitating subjective interpretation. (Brewer, 1983)
- 4) Uncertainty exists about the relevant time frame for evaluation activities. That is, when to evaluate? Especially with new interventions, the time horizon needed to realize a measurable effect may not well understood. (Wright et al., 1988)

#### ■ Operational Constraints

In addition to the theoretical and methodological constraints that confront evaluation research, there are a host of what FPMD terms "operational issues" or political constraints to evaluation. These constraints can often be traced to differences between the traditional roles and objectives of the actors involved in the evaluation process. (Wright et al., 1988; Suchman and Gurel (cited by Gaspar, 1989)).

Often, the roles of the project manager and evaluator are most likely to find themselves in conflict (see Figure 2 and Gaspar, 1989). While the stereotypes listed do not characterize any single relationship between a project manager and an evaluator, they mention the priorities typically defined for each of the roles and illustrate how these may lead to conflict.

The manager tends to have high stakes in the success of the project or intervention, and is often threatened by evaluation. On the other hand, the evaluator is, by virtue of his/her training, skeptical and, as a result, predisposed to making negative criticisms. While the manager looks internally to the project and the implementing organization for rewards and recognition, the evaluator tends to look to external peer groups for recognition of his/her work. Finally, the project manager may place highest priority on implementing the project, while the evaluator encourages reflection on the project's approach and the validity of its underlying assumptions.

In this dynamic, the donor is important to the extent that he/she determines the stakes associated with the evaluation findings. Project staff, may either facilitate or hinder evaluation activities, although theirs is a secondary role (Gaspar, 1989).

The operational or political dynamics associated with program and project evaluation, and to lesser degree the theoretical and methodological constraints discussed earlier, contribute to what Gaspar terms "pathologies of project assessment" or what we refer to here the "pathologies of project evaluation". These can manifest themselves at all stages of the evaluation cycle.

According to Gaspar's summarization of Suchman, when called upon to evaluate, a number of lines of defense may be invoked. If the defense tactics fail, the resulting compromise is the "pseudo-evaluation." Finally, if the evaluation is negative, undesirable results are rationalized.

The lines of defense for avoiding assessment that are most commonly heard include (1) that the program/project is long-range and therefore, its effects cannot be measured at this time; (2) that the instruments available to measure the effects are not sensitive enough to capture the full effect of the program/project; (3) that efforts to measure the effects would disturb implementation -- for example, by introducing a Hawthorne effect (Gaspar (1989); Bosma (1991)).

Pseudo-evaluation is another pathology of program or project evaluation. Common examples include: (1) the "eye-wash", in which the evaluation activities focus only on those aspects of the project that look good; (2) the "white-wash", where program/project shortcomings are covered up; (3) the "submarine", in which case the program/project is torpedoed regardless of its worth. This kind of pseudo-evaluation contributes to the negative perception of the evaluator as a hostile critic. (4) the "posture", in which case the evaluation is used to make the project look good, and makes no contribution to understanding of how the project might be improved (in effect, nothing is learned about the project); (5) postponement of the evaluation in order to seek out more facts about the project; (6) substitution, usually an attempt to cloud over or disguise shortcomings by shifting attention to some less relevant, but defensible aspect of the project. (Gaspar, 1989).

In the event that negative evaluation findings are encountered, they may be rationalized by calling for a "baptism", or an ex-post facto redefinition of the target beneficiary group. In the case of control studies, the explanation may be that those most in need of the program or project's interventions were in the control group or that the control group received other kinds of attention. The absence of significant results may be explained as result of weak application of the program/project-- with a conclusion that there should therefore be a more vigorous application. Alternatively, an expert may be called upon to assure the donor that negative results notwithstanding the program/project is in competent hands and should continue as is. (Gaspar, 1989).

The negative interpretation of evaluation on the part of project managers is sometimes perpetuated by evaluators, who may too readily look for inadequacies or shortcomings in an effort to establish their "objectivity". The skepticism about the objectivity of a positive evaluation, especially one that is undertaken internally, is balanced against the incentives for managers to rationalize negative evaluation findings. FPMD has sought to encourage a balance between the different and, occasionally conflicting, interests involved in evaluation. This approach, which we call a stakeholder model, while less "objective" than other approaches, brings together the various stakeholders in designing and implementing the evaluation. (see Brinkerhoff (1991) and Wright et al. (1988) for some discussion of different stakeholders and how they should be taken into consideration.)

#### **IV. FPMD's Stakeholder Approach to Evaluation**

Developed by the National Institute of Education in the late 1970's, "stakeholder-based evaluation" was designed to minimize the many barriers encountered by those attempting to evaluate programs. (Beryk, Brewer). The approach is based on the realization that evaluation plans, in order to be implemented, must be responsive to all groups with an interest in the program: funding agencies, policy makers, community organizations, and program staff. These individuals or groups often represent sources of "tangible or intangible resources" to the program, which are necessary in order for it to continue to survive, and must thus be taken into account (Brinkerhoff, 1991). Often the evaluator must compromise some of the items on his/her agenda, either in terms of methodological rigor, or comprehensiveness, or even in terms of the phrasing of questions to be used in the evaluation instruments in order to satisfy some of the stakeholders. Thus, the stakeholders are given the opportunity to participate in planning all aspects of the evaluation, from design to the data collection and interpretation. In this way, the model attempts to assure the relevance of the results to all the stakeholders.

## **B. Operationalizing the Evaluation Framework using the Stakeholder Approach**

Evaluation activities are presently underway for three FPMD subprojects, including two of the project's largest and most longstanding activities, the Upazilian Initiatives Project in Bangladesh and various subprojects in Kenya. The third evaluation activity is being carried out in Burkina Faso.

These activities are based on the stakeholder approach that explicitly acknowledges the different agendas and interests involved in any evaluation effort. The UIP evaluation plan was developed in collaboration between FPMD evaluation and program staff with added input from donors and host country counterparts. The Kenya evaluation will also involve all stakeholder groups -- FPMD resident advisors, technical advisors, evaluation unit staff, donors, host country counterparts -- in planning the evaluation design, data collection and analysis. While this model maximizes the politicization of evaluation research, it may be the only feasible approach for carrying out a project supported evaluation.

In Bangladesh, FPMD's Dhaka and Boston offices have working closely with the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MOHFW) on the Upazila Initiatives Project (UIP), which is designed to strengthen the Government of Bangladesh's FP system through decentralization of planning and supervisory activities, and community participation. FPMD's technical and financial assistance for the UIP is a continuation of work begun under FPMT. The project implementation letter (PIL) authorizing the present funding of the project explicitly identifies 10 areas to be examined by an external midterm evaluation team. The PIL requirement has thus provided the impetus for the project to move forward with a comprehensive evaluation effort in the UIP. The evaluation plan for the UIP corresponds to the process and summative evaluation cycles identified in Figure 1, "The Evaluation Cycle". The evaluation plan calls for a study to verify contraceptive prevalence rates in the project area so as to better determine the project's demographic impact at the end of the current funding cycle ("summative"). However, the baseline information is being collected at mid-cycle, and will be updated at regular intervals to allow measurement of intermediate organizational and service delivery effects.

An evaluation plan was recently developed for FPMD's activities in Kenya, which were initiated under FPMT. The evaluation plan calls for in depth studies of the impact of MIS and FMIS interventions on the effectiveness of the information and financial systems of the three NGOs and one public sector institution. The plan also calls for a retrospective analysis of the impact of earlier and on-going management interventions directed at structural and strategy level changes in one NGO (FPAK) and a public sector institution.

In Burkina Faso, FPMD has recently launched a subproject directed at strengthening the supervisory system for FP workers in the MOH. A baseline study has also been designed and is scheduled to be fielded beginning in July. The intervention is limited to technical assistance and training activities focused on supervision. The evaluation plan, which was developed as part of the scope of work for the mission buy-in, outlines an in-depth study of the MOH's supervisory system.

## V. Conclusions and Recommendations

FPMD has made important advances in developing instruments that will help systematize the project's approach to carrying out needs assessments and organizational diagnoses. These instruments are meant to be used by project staff to help FPMD staff and clients to agree on indicators of success of different management interventions and to help them through the different stages of the evaluation cycle.

FPMD's attempts to introduce systematic evaluation in the context of an organizational development project strengthens the foundation for optimal programming of scarce resources. Evaluation has a potentially important contribution to make to the project at all stages of implementation, beginning with the needs assessment and continuing through project design and implementation. However, potentially debilitating operational constraints face internal project evaluation. The project's efforts to adopt a stakeholder model for evaluation, while compromising some of the scientific "objectivity" of the findings, seems to minimize the political constraints inherent to internal project evaluation.

While it is premature to talk about specific changes in FPMD strategy that have been informed by evaluation findings, the hope is that systematic use of the project's Needs Assessment and Management Development Plan Guidelines followed by the periodic collection of information on the key indicators will help the project increase the impact and cost-effectiveness of its management interventions. In this context, FPMD's evaluation activities are expected to contribute to maximizing use of scarce program resources, both in terms of technical interventions and approaches as well as in terms of institutionalizing evaluation within the management systems of family planning organizations.

**TABLE 1**  
**Highlights of Organizational Development, Organizational Theory,**  
**and Organizational Design Change Strategies\***

Theory/ Elements	Organizational Development (OD)	Organizational Theory (OT)	Management Science/Research (MR)*
1. Fundamental Assumptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Organizations should provide personal growth and development for staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Structure affects performance and outputs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Organization's structure determines performances and outputs</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Organizations should encourage openness and collaboration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Values of dominant coalition affect performance and outputs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Strategy of dominant coalition determines performance and outputs</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Organizations should encourage the expression of feelings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Environment limits organizational structures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Environment limits how organizations are structured</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Organizations that improve human fulfillment also tend to be productive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ People who lose status or power resist organizational changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The greater the differentiation, the more important is integration</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The more exposure to change the more acceptance of it</li> </ul>	
Theory/ Elements	Organizational Development (OD)	Organizational Theory (OT)	Management Research (MR)*
2. Major Concepts, Variables, and Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Maslow's hierarchy of human needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Division of labor, complexity, and concentration of specialists</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Strategic Planning, culture and goals</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Skill variety, task significance, job autonomy and feedback</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Centralization, hierarchy of authority, and supervision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Product, functional, and matrix departmentalization</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Fiedler's contingency theory of leadership; Blake and Mouton's grid</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Communication and compliance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Span of control and managerial roles</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Team building, laboratory training, and encounter groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Technology, routineness, and task scope</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Conflict resolution techniques</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Groups, group problem solving, and risk-taking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Personnel size and budget size</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Control technologies: budgets, inventories, MBO, and PERT</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Intergroup relations, competition, and conflict</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Environmental complexity, uncertainty, and change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Environmental uncertainty, complexity and volatility</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Climate and culture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Environmental richness, leanness, and cooperation/ competitiveness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Galbraith's work on information handling</li> </ul>

\* Source: Hage and Finsterbusch

TABLE 1 (continued)

Theory/ Elements	Organizational Development (OD)	Organizational Theory (OT)	Management Research(MR)*
3. Intervener Target: Closing the Gap in the Following Performances and Outputs	■ Clarity of goals and roles	■ Innovation in technology, services, or products	■ Success and profits
	■ Motivation and commitment	■ Effectiveness in terms of quantity and quality	■ Efficiency and productivity
	■ Collaboration and team building	■ Efficiency and productivity	■ Conflict reduction and integration
	■ Job satisfaction and employee attitudes	■ Morale, absenteeism, and turnover	■ Morale, absenteeism, and turnover
Theory/Elements	Organizational Development (OD)	Organizational Theory (OT)	Organizational Design (MR)*
4. Change Points: Components of the System Usually Changed	■ Job design	■ Structure	■ Divisional structure and departments
	■ Employees' attitudes	■ Coordination/ Control Process	■ Lines of authority and responsibility
	■ Group Processes	■ Inputs	■ Managerial processes or functions & subsystems
	■ Climate and culture	■ Environment	■ Morale, absenteeism, and turnover
	■ Role expectations		
Theory/Elements	Organizational Development (OD)	Organizational Theory (OT)	Organizational Design (MR)*
5. Nature of the Approach	■ Usual intervention level: individuals and groups	■ Usual intervention level: entire organization or environment including interorganizational relationships	■ Usual intervention level: organizationwide as in divisions and organizational departments
	■ Usual tactics of change: group decision making, T-group and sensitivity training, group problem solving, and data discussion groups	■ Usual tactics of change: restructure, decree, data collection, and group discussion	■ Usual tactics of change: decree, restructure, and group problem solving
	■ Usual method of data collection: surveys of individuals	■ Usual method of data collection: surveys of organizations rather than individuals, participant observation, and documents	■ Usual method of data collection: informant interviews and documents
	■ Usual resources involved: low costs, influence rather than power, a few trainers in group processes, a few group facilitators, and short time frames	■ Usual resources involved: personnel, money, and long time frame	■ Usual resources involved: personnel, money, and long time frame



**TABLE 2**  
**STAGES OF ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

INTERVENTION LEVELS/STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT	EMERGENCE	GROWTH	CONSOLIDATION	MATURITY
MISSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Diffuse mission statement and global goals</li> <li>■ Undefined target populations</li> <li>■ Limited number of services</li> <li>■ Lack of specific objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Mission statement directs growth</li> <li>■ Target population defined</li> <li>■ Specific objectives and goals for services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Mission expanded to consider issues of organizational sustainability</li> <li>■ Emerging capability to adjust mission, goals and objectives to changing internal and external conditions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Full capability to adjust mission, goals and objectives to changing internal and external conditions</li> <li>■ Mission reflects a stable organizational approach</li> </ul>
STRATEGIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Donor-driven</li> <li>■ Not clearly formalized</li> <li>■ Weak focus on service delivery competence</li> <li>■ Lack of planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Formal strategies that are primarily donor-driven</li> <li>■ Increased capability for planning</li> <li>■ Focus on establishing technical competence</li> <li>■ Service expansion based on the needs of the target population</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Strategies are flexible enough to ensure operationalization of mission</li> <li>■ Technical competence and quality of care given priority</li> <li>■ Emerging concern for increasing management effectiveness</li> <li>■ Quality of care becomes part of the organization's strategy</li> <li>■ Focus on gaining control over available resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Organizational capability for strategic adjustments due to changing internal and external conditions</li> <li>■ Strategies secure the achievement of objectives within a sustainable approach</li> <li>■ Significant level of control over resources (including donor's)</li> </ul>
STRUCTURE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Decision-making extremely centralized</li> <li>■ Functions not clearly defined</li> <li>■ Too dependent on one or two leaders</li> <li>■ Information monopolized by few</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Project/Program-based structure</li> <li>■ Establishment of new levels of management</li> <li>■ Improvement in the description of functions and positions</li> <li>■ Internal communication mechanisms inadequate to support growing complexity of organization</li> <li>■ Expanded decision-making base</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Structure reflects significant number of functions and complex set of interactions</li> <li>■ Decision-making relatively decentralized</li> <li>■ Existence of formal &amp; regular communication mechanisms</li> <li>■ Structure capable of supporting significant service delivery expansion</li> <li>■ Objective personnel management principles applied</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Organization has achieved flexible structure that is consistent with strategies and the volume and complexity of services</li> <li>■ Organization has capacity for structural adjustment due to changing internal and external conditions</li> </ul>
SYSTEMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Very basic and informal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Marginal progress in developing systems such as service delivery, training and logistics</li> <li>■ Growth leads to imbalance between operational demands and capability of system to respond to them</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Significant progress in finance and information systems</li> <li>■ Most systems functioning at appropriate level of complexity</li> <li>■ Systems managed and redesigned (upgraded) with organization's own resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ All systems in place and functioning at an appropriate level of complexity</li> <li>■ Systems still can integrate further advances and new technologies</li> </ul>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arygis, Chris, 1990. "Inappropriate defenses against the Monitoring of Organization Development Practice". Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, vol. 26, no.3, pp.299-312.r
- Benavente, Jaime, and Barbara Seligman, 1992. "Evaluation Framework and Needs Assessment Guidelines of Family Planning Organizations", Evaluation/MIS Unit, Family Planning Management Development
- Blunt, Peter, 1990. "Strategies for enhancing organizational effectiveness in the Third World". Public Administration and Development, vol. 10, pp.299-313.
- Bosma, John and Tim Costello. "Evaluating the Impact of Management Development Programs", presented at the Meeting for Management Evaluation, October, 1991. (National Research Institute, Inc. 1910 IDS Center, 80 South Eighth St., Minneapolis, MN 55402).
- Brewer, Marilyn B., 1983. "Evaluation: Past and Present". The Handbook of Evaluation Research: Sage Publications, Inc., Beverly Hills, Ca.
- Brown, David, 1989. "Bureaucracy as an issue in Third World Management: an African case study". Public Administration and Development, vol.9, pp.369-380.
- Cameron, Kim S. and David Whetten, eds, 1983. Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparison of Multiple Models. Academic Press, New York.
- Curtin, Leslie and Sara Seims, "The Management Implications of Community Participation in Family Planning Service Delivery". Unpublished paper, Management Sciences for Health.
- Finsterbusch, Kurt and Warren A. Van Wicklin, III, 1987. "The Contribution of Beneficiary Participation to development project effectiveness". Public Administration and Development, vol. 7, pp.1-23.
- Gaspar, D.R., 1989. "Toward a Sociology of Project Assessment", International Studies of Management & Organization, Vol. 19, No. 1, Spring 1989, pp.28-52.
- Gurel, Lee, 1983. "The Human Side of Evaluating Human Services Programs: Problems and Prospects", The Handbook of Evaluation Research: Sage Publications, Inc., Beverly Hills, Ca.
- Hage, Jerald and Karl Finsterbusch, 1984(?). Organizational Change as a Development Strategy: Models and Tactics for Improving Third World Organizations. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, CO.
- Hulme, David, 1989. "Learning and not learning from experience in rural project planning". Public Administration and Development, vol. 9 pp.1-16.
- Hyden, 1983. No Shortcuts to Progress. Univ. of California Press, Berkeley.
- Jones, Merrick L., 1989. "Management Development: An African Focus", International Studies of Management and Organizations, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 74-90.
- Kerrigan, John E., and Jeff S. Luke, 1987. Management Training Strategies for Developing Countries, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., Boulder, CO.
- Korten, David, 1987. "Third Generation NGO Strategies: A Key to People Centered Development". World Development, vol.15, pp.145-159.
- Leonard, 1977.

Punnett, Betty Jane, 1988. "Designing Field Experiments for Management Research Outside North America". International Studies of Management and Organization, vol XVIII, no.3, pp.44-54.

Seims, Sara, Leslie Curtin and Susanna Binzen, 1991. "Providing Effective Management Assistance: Six Keys to Working with Family Planning Organizations in Developing Countries". Paper presented at the American Public Health Association annual meetings, Atlanta, GA, November.

Sen, Biswajit, 1987. "NGO Self-Evaluation: Issues of Concern". World Development, vol. 15, pp.161-167.

Seror, NN, 1988. "Cross-Cultural Organizational Analysis: Research Methods and the Aston Program". International Studies of Management and Organization, vol. XVIII, no.3, pp.31-43.

Smith, Ken and Martin Gannon, 1987. "Organizational Effectiveness in Entrepreneurial and Professionally Managed Firms", Journal of Small Business Management, July.

Snyder, Robert, Charles S. Raben and James Farr, 1980. "A Model for the Systematic Evaluation of Human Resource Development Programs", Academy of Management Review, Vol. 5, No.3, pp 431-444.

Vriesendcrp, Sylvia, Laurel Cobb, Saul Helfenbein, Judith Levine, and James Wolff, Jr., 1989. "A Framework for Management Development of Family Planning Program Managers". Paper presented at the 117th Annual Meeting of the American Public Health Association, Chicago, IL, October 24, 1989.

Wood, Donald, 1988. "Bridging the Gap between Researcher and Practitioner". International Studies of Management and Organization, vol. XVIII, no.3, pp.88-98.

Wright, Lorna, Henry Lane, and Paul Beamish, 1988. "International Management Research: Lessons from the Field". International Studies of Organization and Management, vol. XVIII, no.3, pp.55-71.