PN-ABJ-657

IQC

Evaluation and Development Information Methods IQC

Managing a P.V.O. Grant Evaluation: A Manual for Project Officers

Prepared by:

Gordon Appleby
Development Institutions Specialist

and

John Zarafonetis
Evaluation Specialist

for

the United States Agency for International Development,
Center for Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance,
Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation (FVA/PVC)

A contract between the U.S. Agency for International Development and the Academy for Educational Development, Contract No. PDC-0085-I-00-9061-00.

AED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

ANNEXES:

I. INTRODUCTION

A. The Users of and the Purpose for this Manual

This evaluation manual is written for FVA/PVC project officers who carry out performance assessments of private and voluntary organizations' (PVOs') project activities that are partly funded by A.I.D. The manual focuses on how to develop a scope of work, which is the guiding document for every evaluation.

Although PVOs implement their projects, FVA/PVC project officers are ultimately responsible for the successful completion of the grants and agreements in their portfolios. Evaluations--which are scheduled, formal opportunities to review the success achieved and the obstacles confronted in project implementation--provide an important occasion to assess progress and to re-emphasize specific lines of development. The project officer must, therefore, take an active part in the definition of any evaluation in order to ensure that the review meets his or her supervisory needs and Agency requirements, as well as those of the PVO involved.

This manual may prove more useful to newer project officers who have had fewer opportunities to write scopes of work and to guide evaluations through their course. More experienced personnel--not only in FVA/PVC but throughout A.I.D.(particularly those officers involved with PVOs)--may nonetheless find guidance in this manual. For, although the examples used here pertain to the FVA/PVC portfolio, the points those examples illustrate are in fact general.

This manual provides a set of guidelines only. Policy and regulations change over time. Therefore, even after reading this manual, one may still need to consult with fellow project officers over a particular point. Further, when in doubt, one must consult the A.I.D. Evaluation Handbook (see Annex 2), which reference supercedes this manual, the FVA evaluation officer, or the USAID Center on Development Information and Evaluation (PPC/CDIE).

B. Organization of the Manual

This manual is structured in terms of the sections that appear in a complete scope of work. That is, the manual will take up, in order:

- o Presenting the aims and background of the grant
- o Defining the substantive work of the evaluation
- o Composing the evaluation team
- o Scheduling its activities
- o Suggesting research methods

- o Defining the report criteria
- o Budgeting, and
- o Follow-through activities.

The final chapter reviews the preparation of a scope of work (SOW)[1] in abbreviated terms.

Because project officers often provide direct guidance to evaluation teams on what information to collect and how to collect, analyze, and present it, this manual includes an annex on evaluation methods. Annex 1 aims both to familiarize project officers with the evaluation research process and to provide evaluators with a suggested, proven approach.

Annex 2 lists useful reference works for the design of SOWs and evaluations. These are supplementary materials, for this manual is intended to provide sufficient detail for the creation of a complete scope of work.

C. FVA/PVC Policy on Evaluation

FVA/PVC funds PVOs on a variable match basis. In effect, FVA/PVC usually "buys into" or contributes to an existing PVO program, be it through a grant or a cooperative agreement. The basic aim of FVA/PVC is to strengthen the recipient PVOs both in their internal administration or management and in their implementation of field activities.

Evaluation in FVA/PVC differs from that in other A.I.D. offices because of the unique relationship between FVA/PVC and its recipient organizations. FVA/PVC provides assistance to PVOs in the conduct of the latter's programs while most other offices contract firms or individuals to implement the offices' program or project. Evaluation in FVA/PVC is, therefore, a collaborative endeavor--a partnership--throughout the entire process. This is true even though, depending upon the type of evaluation being carried out, either FVA/PVC or the PVO may take the lead in defining the scope of work.

The definition of the scope of work for the evaluation is, therefore, a joint responsibility of FVA/PVC and the PVO. The determination of key questions for the evaluation, the staffing of the evaluation team, and the scheduling of its activities are all done in close consultation with the PVO. The evaluation collects information for both FVA/PVC and the PVO. And, the follow-through on the evaluation is a mutual responsibility of the

---

[1] It is worthwhile to point out the distinction between two potentially confusing concepts: the scope of work (SOW) and the statement of work. The scope of work is the overall document that defines and guides an evaluation; it has various component parts, as indicated in Secton 3.5 of the A.I.D. Evaluation Handbook, Supplement to Chapter 3 of Handbook 3: Project Assistance. (These component parts are the chapters of this manual.) By contrast, the statement of work is the section of the scope that states what questions will be addressed by the evaluation team. The statement of work is, therefore, the key section for defining just what matters will be assessed in the evaluation.

FVA/PVC project officer and key PVO staff.

Nonetheless, when evaluation requires an independent assessment, as is usually the case for final evaluations, the FVA/PVC project officer must take the lead in defining the scope of work. The notion that PVOs alone are responsible for their programs--and therefore that the donor has at most only a very limited right to evaluate the program--has no validity because public monies are being spent to further the PVO program. The project officer has a professional responsibility to account for the use of these funds. Monitoring and evaluation <u>must</u> provide information about the use of grant resources and track progress toward the developmental and institutional purposes of the grant as defined by the goal, purpose, and output statements of the grantee's Logical Framework.

In short, that evaluation in FVA/PVC is a mutual responsibility of both this office and the PVO does not obviate the responsibilities of the project officer to ensure a fair and impartial review of project activities.

D. Types of Evaluation and Their Utility

An evaluation is an independent assessment of how well program strategies and project goals and objectives are being achieved by the PVO implementor. Evaluation is similar to, but different from, monitoring. Monitoring is an ongoing activity to track the use of inputs, the production of output objectives, or even the effects of a project, and is most often done by the PVO staff. By contrast, evaluation is a one-time review to assess project effectiveness, and is usually done by persons not associated with the project.

FVA/PVC normally undertakes two types of evaluations, mid-term and final. The two types are distinguished largely by timing. The mid-term evaluation is carried out about half-way through the life of the project, and the final evaluation is conducted near the end of the project. (A final evaluation must not be confused with an impact evaluation in the strict sense of the term. Impact evaluation assesses the benefits of a project to the targeted participants or institutions; this may be a part--but not the exclusive focus--of the final evaluation in PVC.)

In practice, the distinction between a mid-term and a final evaluation is not clear-cut. Because of its scheduling, a mid-term evaluation is typically used to assess implementation progress to date in order to adapt to previously unforeseen conditions (e.g., unmet logical framework [logframe] assumptions), and thereby achieve the project purposes by the end of the activity. Also, mid-term evaluation can review and recommend changes in built-in monitoring systems that gather data useful for evaluation at a later stage.

By contrast, a final evaluation should, in theory, assess the extent of overall success. It often seeks to assess achievement of "higher objectives" spelled out in the project's logframe, that is, purpose objectives and the effects on beneficiaries. While final evaluations do attempt to do that, they are in practice often another mid-term evaluation, an additional process assessment of outputs that are intended to produce long-term impacts. This occurs because the "final" evaluation is often (and correctly) used in FVA/PVC as evidence for whether to continue the project under a follow-on grant or activity.

Furthermore, under current FVA/PVC practice, PVC usually allows the PVO to undertake the mid-term evaluation itself, thus determining necessary mid-course corrections. The final evaluation, however, is usually the responsibility of the FVA/PVC, with the project officer taking the lead in defining the SOW and hence in guiding the evaluation. (See Figure 1 for an outline of the usual differences between mid-term and final evaluations.)

The FVA/PVC strategy toward evaluation is pragmatic. As long as most grants and agreements run for only three years, there is little need for formal evaluation every other year: it often takes a year or longer to implement the recommendations of an evaluation. Also, limited staff does not allow supervision of evaluations of every project with such frequency. With five-year grants, however, the project officer should play an active role in both the mid-term and the final evaluation because the spacing between evaluations is sufficient for significant action to occur.

The differences between mid-term and final evaluations aside, formal evaluation is useful for several reasons. For the PVO, it helps focus attention on progress to date, as documentation is compiled and the review is organized. For FVA/PVC project officers, who usually know which grant activities are going well and which are not, an evaluation forces both the <u>independent, systematic</u> collection of information on project activities and the analysis of the impact of those activities. This information not only can confirm interpretations, but also enables comparisons of performance across implementors.

Finally, an evaluation provides an opportunity to further meaningful collaboration between the FVA/PVC project officer and key PVO staff. Together, they must decide on the nature of the evaluation--what substantive questions must be investigated, the composition of the evaluation team, and the schedule of the team's activities. By collaborating on these matters, the project officer and his/her counterparts in the PVO can significantly deepen their working relationship.

E. The Scope of Work as the Design for an Evaluation

The key document for an evaluation is the scope of work (SOW). The SOW both guides and shapes the evaluation. As written by the FVA/PVC project officer in collaboration with the PVO counterpart, the scope of work should:

- o sketch the history of the project to be evaluated
- o lay out the major questions for the evaluation team
- o identify basic project documentation

- define the expertise that composes the evaluation team
- schedule the team's activities
- indicate data collection methods and procedures
- delineate the structure of the final report
- budget for those activities

As implemented by the evaluation team, the SOW also defines the information to be collected and structures the presentation of the final report.

In brief, the SOW is the fundamental document for an evaluation. A clear, concise SOW can greatly assist an evaluation team in producing a more useful report. There are, to be sure, many other elements in a successful evaluation, but the scope of work is the initial and primary document that in fact controls the entire process.

Figure 1:

Modal Patterns of Mid-term and Final Evaluations (Five Year Grants)

	General Purpose	Timing	Evaluation Leadership	Funding	Team
Mid-term Evaluation	Implement-tation progress; Assessing program assumptions; Mid-course corrections	Complete in third year of grant	PVO with PVC con-currence	In grant	Usually PVO staff
Final Evaluation	Achievement of outputs and purposes	Complete in fifth year of grant, in time for subsequent grant renewal	PVC with PVO con-currence	In grant or from PVC evaluation funds	Usually done by external evaluators in collabora-tion with PVO staff

II. WHEN TO SCHEDULE AN EVALUATION

II. WHEN TO SCHEDULE AN EVALUATION

This chapter will cover the types of evaluations, and the uses and scheduling of each type. The scheduling of team activities in the U.S. and abroad will be covered in a later section, Step 3: Scheduling the Evaluation Activities.

A. Uses of Each Type of Evaluation

Routine project monitoring--including field visits by FVA/PVC project officers--is the most common form of evaluation, and plays an important role in forging good working relationships between PVO personnel and FVA/PVC. Monitoring does not disrupt work schedules of grantee staff because it is built into daily and monthly reports. Monitoring allows problems to be identified before they become serious. And monitoring acts as a powerful stimulus to PVO staff by allowing them to see the results of their work and change their strategy when needed.

Strong monitoring, however, cannot replace formal evaluations. The mid-term evaluation provides an opportunity to review actual progress in achieving the proposed outputs, purposes, and goal of the grant. It can help resolve issues that were identified during the initial planning process but that could not be resolved until implementation had proceeded to a specific stage. It can help identify when a PVO's monitoring system is inadequate and, therefore, not alerting headquarters on a timely basis to problems in the country field programs. The results of an evaluation are often useful when considering requests for additional funding, or when planning the next phases of a grant. Finally, when done collaboratively, a mid-term evaluation can help identify important issues to be added to the dialogue between FVA/PVC and the PVO grantee.

Final evaluations do all that <u>and</u> they provide the opportunity to determine project impact, that is, the difference that the grant made in the lives of the intended beneficiaries. This is the time to assess the chances for sustainability, replicability, intended or unintended results, and participation. A final evaluation provides an opportunity to assess how A.I.D. support has strengthened the grantee institutionally and how greater managerial expertise translates into clearer programmatic focus and more effective project implementation abroad.

A final evaluation can also improve the overall effectiveness of the grantee by helping staff make decisions about which activities or programs to expand, how to improve training, and how best to use its available human and financial resources. Also, the role of the final evaluation is to document the experience gained and the lessons learned for use in the design of future activities. Indeed, in this way, the final evaluation can help identify trends (either successes or problems) so that FVA/PVC can continue--or, if need be, redesign--the directions of its grants program.

B. Timing of Evaluations

As has been mentioned, evaluations are usually done half-way through the life of the project and again just before the project ends.

FVA/PVC grants and cooperative agreements usually run for three years, so that the mid-term evaluation is done early in project year (PY) 2 and the final evaluation in PY 3. When the grant or agreement runs for five years, the evaluations would be scheduled for PYs 3 and 5.

The scheduling of the evaluations for new grantees, by contrast, could vary from this timetable. Because FVA/PVC provides funds to functioning organizations, new grantees will already have financial and managerial systems in place. Nonetheless, a headquarters management review at the end of PY 1 (or the beginning of PY 2) would provide an opportunity to assess whether the PVO has the managerial systems and personnel necessary for the implementation of the proposed field program. (The FVA/PVC project officer should participate in this review.) Any deficiencies in management could then be remedied early in the grant period. The final evaluation, which would cover field activities, would be scheduled as usual for PY 3.

It is important to note that this sequencing of evaluations can be varied, depending upon circumstances. Final evaluations might be scheduled so that the report is available for FVA/PVC deliberations over grant renewals or, if possible, before the PVO begins to write its new grant proposal. Conversely, evidence gleaned from routine monitoring that indicates unusual difficulties might warrant scheduling an evaluation earlier than usual. The only general point that can be made in this regard is that circumstances will dictate when, within the usual timeframe, an evaluation will be carried out.

One final point: **planning and implementing an evaluation can take as long as six months.**

This time is necessary for several reasons. It takes time to define the scope of work collaboratively with the PVO. It takes time to find the right specialists for the evaluation--and the sooner they can be contacted, the better. (Consultants' time tends to be scheduled about three months in advance, so it is difficult--though not impossible--to field a qualified expert for a mission that is supposed to begin the day after tomorrow.) Finally, the PVO needs this amount of time in order to schedule its staff so that they will be available to the evaluation team when needed. Staff commonly request vacations six to eight months in advance, and may have to cancel or postpone vacation plans if an evaluation is planned at the last minute. In short, for better results, plan well ahead.

III. STEP 1:

PRESENTING THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE EVALUATION

III. STEP 1: PRESENTING THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE EVALUATION

Every scope of work begins with an overview of the history of the grant, the purpose of the project, and the purpose of the evaluation.

A. The History of the Grant

The history of the grant states whether this is a new or a follow-on project, and, in the latter case, what were the durations and purposes of any preceding grants. This paragraph also contains the official project number of each grant, its duration, and whether a mid-term and/or final evaluation was conducted.

B. The Purpose of the Project

This section presents the purpose of the grant. The statement can be taken directly from the grant agreement or the project logframe. The statement of purpose can state generally what was to be accomplished under the grant; however, a detailed listing of activities will appear in the statement of work. This section should note whether institutional strengthening of the PVO itself was an explicit aim of the grant.

C. The Purpose of the Evaluation

Finally, the introduction notes the purpose of the evaluation. This statement makes clear whether the evaluation is a mid-term or final assessment, and presents cogently the uses to which the evaluation will be put.

The background section of the scope of work is simply an introductory statement. It should be succinct and kept brief--no more than a page in most instances.

ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE:
INTRODUCTION TO THE SCOPE OF WORK

I. INTRODUCTION

The Health and Rural Development (HARD) project was signed on October 1, 1987 by FVA/PVC and the Private Voluntary Organization (PVO). The project has an effective life of three years, with an end-of-project (EOP) of September 30, 1990. A mid-term evaluation was carried out in March 1989; this final evaluation is to be completed just before the EOP and in time for the review of any follow-on grant request.

PVO has had two previous three-year cooperative agreements. The first, a health project, ran from 1981-1984; the second, a rural development project, ran from 1984-1987. Both of these projects were evaluated at mid-term and at completion.

GOAL AND PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

The goal of the HARD project is to improve the standard of living and quality of life of villagers.

The current HARD project is a compilation of successful activities under the previous two grants. HARD aims to improve the quality of health care for at-risk populations (women of child-bearing age, children under five, and the elderly) through an integrated rural development program in selected rural areas.

The grant agreement also provides for technical assistance to PVO for strengthening headquarters and field office management, financial accounting and reporting, and monitoring field operations.

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

This final evaluation will assess the extend to which PVO has achieved or surpassed the stated objectives of the HARD project, both for institutional strengthening and for field-level project implementation. An important aim of this evaluation is the extent to which institutional strengthening has contributed to improved implementation of field projects.

The findings of the evaluation will be considered in the review of any proposal for a subsequent grant.

IV. STEP 2:

DEFINING THE QUESTIONS FOR THE EVALUATION (THE STATEMENT OF WORK)

IV. STEP 2: DEFINING THE QUESTIONS FOR THE EVALUATION (THE STATEMENT OF WORK)

The determination of the major questions to be addressed by the evaluation team is the most important section of a SOW. The statement of work section determines what the evaluation team will review, it influences the composition of the team, and strongly shapes what the team will write about in the final report. A clear, well-thought-out delineation of the major questions is, therefore, key to the SOW and to the evaluation itself.

Different people may hold different views of what the important questions are. The FVA/PVC project officer is properly most concerned with the achievement of the stated purposes of the project, including institutional strengthening. The PVO staff may wish to consider other matters also. Any differences should be discussed with the PVO and their concerns accomodated to the extent possible.

Agreement is more readily obtained by restricting discussion to the terms of the grant agreement and accompanying PVO proposal, which are the controlling documents for the definition of the central issues. The grant agreement is the legal contract between FVA/PVC and the PVO. That agreement, along with the PVO proposal, states the purposes of the grant and the activities to be undertaken during the grant period. The agreement or contract is, therefore, the basic reference document for determining the range and scope of the evaluation.

A. The Importance of the Logframe in Defining the Evaluation Questions

The logframe provides a thumbnail sketch of the project. Here, in summary form, appear: the goal and purpose of the project, the inputs and expected outputs, as well as the verifiable indicators and the basic assumptions of the project. The logframe will also indicate whether the activity involves field implementation only or whether, as is usually the case with FVA/PVC agreements, the project also has an institutional strengthening component.

The <u>goal</u> is a broad statement of what is to be accomplished overall. It is a lofty statement that transcends the particular project. In other words, the goal is an end-result that is larger than the specific project. For example, the goal of a project might be "to improve the quality of life for rural people." The particular project will contribute to achieving the ultimate goal, but the project alone cannot bring about the condition stated there. (Attainment of the overall goal of a grant is always conditioned by a set of major assumptions that must hold, or the project will not succeed.)

The purpose of a project is the specific objective or objectives to be attained. To continue the present example, the purpose of a project might be "to improve access to potable water supplies for rural people in a specified area." In other words, the purpose states the specific objectives that will be achieved by the project in order to help achieve the overall goal. These are expressed in terms of improvements in production, in the capability of beneficiaries, in the conditions of life of the beneficiaries, or a combination of these measures.

The outputs of a project are the activities the project will actually undertake. For example, a project might intend to build a specified number of wells, organize a specified number of water-user groups, and hold a specified number of training sessions in organizational or financial management.

Grants and agreements that have an institutional strengthening component typically have a number of other sorts of outputs. For example, the PVO will have agreed to hold a specified number of conferences, training sessions, or seminars. It will have agreed to produce a specified number of case studies, training manuals, or vocational guides. It will have agreed to hire a specified number of staff at specific levels within the organization for a stated period, usually the life of the project. (In addition, it will have agreed to carry out a specified number of local development projects each of which benefits a specified number of people.)

The inputs of a project are the financial and technical resources made available for the creation of the outputs. Such inputs might include dollar amounts for additional personnel at headquarters or at the field offices, for training manuals or courses, or for case studies and regional conferences.

The logical framework also requires that some form of objectively verifiable indicators be defined to indicate the purpose, outputs, and inputs of the project, and what the status of those indicators will be at the end of project activities. These verifiable indicators typically include: routine project monitoring records, enumeration of outputs, records of government agencies, records of related donor programs, and the like.

Finally, the last column in the logframe requires that any assumptions required for the project to be successful must be spelled out. The notion here is that the inputs provided will create the outputs desired, the outputs will enable achievement of the project purpose, and achievement of that purpose conduces toward attainment of the project goal. Where an assumption does not hold, the logical chain will be broken, and the project will fail to some extent. For example, the project may require inputs from the recipient government, in addition to those provided by project funding. Without the government input, the outputs will have to be modified in degree or type.

In brief, the logframe defines the goal and purpose of the project and lists the expected outputs, along with the verifiable indicators for each. Because the logframe succintly details the project in this way, it provides a basic outline for defining the areas of investigation for the evaluation team.

The substantive subsections of the SOW, as discussed below, are: Institutional Strengthening Activities, Field Implementation, and Other Questions.

B. Institutional Strengthening

Institutional strengthening is typically an integral part of FVA/PVC grant agreements. Where institutional strengthening is not explicitly listed as a project activity, the nature of project activities can provide a guide as to whether the PVO's organizational structure and operation lie within the scope of work of the evaluation team.

A grant that provides funds for local implementation activities only--be they vaccination campaigns or rural development initiatives--cannot be considered to have an institutional strengthening component.

By contrast, a grant agreement that provides assistance to the PVO in the definition and development of its field program clearly contains an institutional strengthening component. Such assistance can be channeled in various ways:

a) Funds may be provided for additional staff at headquarters in the sectors of grant activity;

b) Funds may be provided for conferences or seminars for in-service training of PVO personnel; or,

c) Funds may be provided for the implementation of a monitoring and evaluation system.

If any of these types of activities are to be undertaken, the grant may be assumed to have an institutional strengthening component.

In terms of the SOW, an evaluation that will consider institutional strengthening must state what organizational deficiencies had been identified at the time the grant agreement was signed, what actions the PVO agreed to undertake to remedy those deficiencies, and what outcomes were expected from those actions.

C. Field Implementation

All FVA/PVC grant agreements have a major emphasis on field implementation; indeed, a basic aim of the FVA/PVC program is to further PVO work in the areas of health, rural development, agriculture, small or micro-enterprise development, natural resources management and environment. A major part of the evaluation effort, therefore, will center on the assessment of the field program.

The grant agreement and accompanying proposal explicitly list what will be done, where, in what timeframe, and with what consequences or impact. The SOW need only list each of the expected activities, its timing or sequencing, and its intended outcome.

The evaluation team must determine whether each set of activities has been carried out in a form and a manner that are in agreement with the intentions of the grant. Nonetheless, the FVA/PVC project officer may explicitly mention in the SOW questions of general concern, such as the replicability, cost-effectiveness, and sustainability of each activity. By so doing, the evaluation team is instructed to consider not only the completeness of the PVO project but also the effectiveness of that project.

Because the project officer may also have to provide guidance to the evaluation team on field methods, Annex 1 presents a series of substantive questions for each area of joint FVA/PVC-PVO activity, along with suggested approaches for collecting, analyzing, and presenting that information.

D. Other Particular Questions

Over the course of project implementation, a number of particular questions may have arisen which, although not explicitly mentioned in the original grant or proposal, are considered to impinge directly upon the success of the project.

The FVA/PVC project officer must determine what these other issues are and clearly state them in the SOW. The specific questions to be considered by the evaluation team should be mutually agreed upon by FVA/PVC and the PVO. However, it is the project officer's responsibiity to ensure that these pertinent concerns are included in the SOW.

The questions that may arise will naturally vary widely from one organization to another. All that can be said here is that, if additional concerns are to be included in the evaluation, the project officer must ensure that the concerns are truly pertinent, that they directly affect implementation of the grant agreement.

E. A Final Note

Finally, revisions are normal. It is not unusual to start out with a large number of issues and problems and later realize that there are not enough resources, skills, time, or money to carry out such a complex task. The process of narrowing the evaluation can be useful in that it focuses attention on a smaller set of key issues.

This narrowing or focussing of the evaluation SOW is tremendously important for another reason. The number of questions posed in the SOW typically results in a similar number of recommendations by the evaluation team. The more questions posed, the more likely the evaluation team will make numerous recommendations. Conversely, the fewer and more focussed the questions posed, the more likely the recommendations will be fewer in number and more focussed in content. A clear, concise SOW cannot guarantee clear, concise recommendations, but it does lead toward that end.

In brief, go back and review answers to earlier questions as the scope of work evolves. And, be to succinct: brevity and clarity are virtues.

CHECKLIST FOR DEFINING THE MAJOR QUESTIONS FOR THE EVALUATION

The statement-of-work section of the SOW will treat the following matters:

A. Institutional Strengthening Activities. If the grant has an explicit or implicit institutional strengthening component, that fact must be stated and substantiated with a listing of the activities to be undertaken in support of organizational strengthening.

B. Field Implementation Activities. The SOW here lists field activities, location and duration according to the grant agreement and accompanying proposal. Sections A and B together should comprise all headquarters and field initiatives to be undertaken during the project life by the PVO.

C. Other Particular Questions. This section contains concerns that have arisen during the course of project implementation but that are not specifically mentioned in the grant agreement or proposal, which are the controlling documents for the delineation of the scope of the evaluation. Any such additional concerns should be mutually agreed upon in advance by the FVA/PVC project officer and the PVO; however, the former has the professional responsibility of ensuring that these concerns are included in the evaluation.

D. Project Documentation. This section specifies the project documentation that the team will, at a minimum, review: grant proposal and agreement, periodic reports, field monitoring reports, and the like.

E. Project Logframe. The project logframe will be attached to the SOW, as a reference for the evaluation team.

II. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

A. INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING

The current cooperative agreement enables PVO to hire one program expert in health and one in rural development. The agreement also specifies that these individuals will write a field training manual that is based on a series of 25 case studies of on-going and completed PVO projects. This training manual will be refined during a series of seven regional seminars and workshops. The manual will then be translated into French and Spanish, and at least three other national languages.

In addition, the two program officers hired under the HARD project are charged with designing and implementing an effective system for monitoring field projects at the local level that also provides pertinent and timely information to headquarters for programmatic adjustment. This system will be in place and operative by the beginning Project Year (PY) 3.

The evaluation team will consider the following questions:

1. Has PVO hired and retained qualified program directors in the fields of health and rural development?

2. Have these directors provided needed programmatic advice at headquarters and to the field?

3. Have the requisite 25 case studies been commissioned? Further, what were the criteria for selection of the studies, and do these selection criteria ensure a coherent and representative view of PVO's program?

4. Has the training manual been written and then refined in the planned seven regional workshops? Did field personnel (village extension agents in the employ of PVO) participate in the revisions, or did national-level staff only participate in the workshops?

5. Have the program directors implemented an effective system for monitoring field projects at the local level?

B. FIELD IMPLEMENTATION

The cooperative agreement specifies that PVO will initiate five additional national programs in each of the three years of this project. Each program will comprise a minimum of 15 local projects each year that each benefit a minimum of 150 at-risk or marginalized persons. Which programs will be added each year will be decided by the program officer on the basis of a program strategy to be provided FVA/PVC by the end of PY 1. Each program is intended to improve the health status and the family finances of the targeted beneficiaries.

The evaluation team will consider the following questions:

1. Has PVO initiated five additional national programs in each of the three years of this project? If not, why not?

2. Has each national program initiated a minimum of 15 local projects each year?

3. Has each local project benefited a minimum of 150 at-risk or marginalized persons? What is the age, gender, and household-head profile of the beneficiaries?

4. What are the selection criteria for local projects? Do beneficiaries conduct an economic feasibility study, or is this done by the PVO village extension agent?

5. Has PVO provided beneficiary groups all needed training and support?

6. Are the PVO local projects carried out on a charitable or a business rationale, and are they sustainable in the longer run?

C. OTHER CONCERNS

PVO is contractually obligated to provide two semi-annual administrative and financial reports, one in January and one in June, during each of the three years of this grant. To date, FVA/PVC has received only one report per year, and this only very belatedly. Because these delays have impeded careful project monitoring, the evaluation team is directed to investigate the reasons why the reports have not been completed in time, and to suggest actions that PVO can take to remedy this deficiency.

The evaluation team will consider the following questions:

1. Why has PVO failed to meet its administrative reporting obligation?

2. What changes in staffing or reporting procedures are necessary for PVO to be able to meet its obligation?

Logical Framework for Summarizing a Project Design

Est. Project Completion: September 30, 1990
Date of this summary: September 1, 1987
Design Team:

Narrative Summary (NS)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)	Means of Verification (MOV)	Important Assumptions
Goal: **(the broader objective to which this project contributes)** To improve the standard of living and the quality of life of rural populations.	1. Increased income 2. Increased longevity 3. Decreased infant mortality	Government records	**(goal to supergoal)** Political stability in participating countries.
Purpose: **(aim or impact)** To improve the quality of health care for at-risk populations through an integrated rural development program	**EOPS (End of Project Status)** 45 economic groups are operating and investing profits in health services and additional enterprises	Project records	**(purpose to goal)** Participants will run operations, make profits, and invest them in health and other services, as well as additional enterprises.
Outputs: **(deliverables or terms of reference)** 1. 25 case studies 2. 1 training manual 3. 6,750 beneficiaries helped in economic projects 4. Strengthened institutional management	1.1 Case studies published 1.2 Trainnig manual published 1.3 45 groups of 150 members each operating economic enterprises 1.4 PVO has operational monitoring systems	Project records	**(output to purpose)** PVO staff will not change over the life of the project.
Activities: **(key clusters or work breakdown structure)** 7 regional seminars Test and install monitoring system Income-generating project training sessions at field level	**Inputs/Resources:** **(Budget)** $ 2,100,000 over three years	Project records	**(activity to output)** Funds will be available and obligated in a timely fashion

V. STEP 3:

DETERMINING THE COMPOSITION OF THE TEAM

V. STEP 3: DETERMININGTHE COMPOSITION OF THE TEAM

A. Types and Number of Evaluators

The composition of the evaluation team--the types and number of evaluators--depends upon the complexity of the evaluation and the nature of the program itself.

The types of evaluators to be included on the team depends upon the scope of the evaluation. Clearly, if the evaluation entails an assessment of institutional strengthening activities, the team should include a management specialist with significant experience with both PVOs and development projects. If the evaluation does not involve a management review, the team will be composed of technical specialists in the sectoral areas involved in the grant (e.g.,rural development, health, micro-enterprise development, natural resources management, or environment.)

The number of evaluators will be determined by the complexity of the assessment--and the language and technical qualifications implied in the selection of countries to be visited. Most FVA/PVC evaluation teams are relatively small, comprising one, two, or three specialists. (Larger teams are more characteristic of project design work, where many more technical areas must be covered more completely.) A single external evaluator can handle the entire evaluation. However, language or technical considerations often necessitate slightly larger teams, for no one individual may possess the whole range of required expertise and languages. In these cases, the guiding rule is: smaller is better because the problems of coordination and cost are both reduced.

B. Participation of PVO Staff or Consultants

As part of its policy of collaboration with PVOs, FVA/PVC usually requests that a representative of the PVO participate on the team as an integral member. Alternatively, FVA/PVC and the PVO may decide to use an independent consultant who has a long association with the grantee.

Active participation of a PVO representative in the evaluation is invaluable if the individual has a long association with the program and is technically qualified and willing to be objective. The PVO representative can bring to the evaluation an institutional memory of why certain things were or are done the way they are. That is, the representative brings balance to the evaluation and helps ensure a more accurate and fairer assessment.

However, a staff member or long-term consultant may feel a conflict of interest because he/she identifies too closely with the organization and therefore feels uncomfortable formally assessing

FIGURE 2:

Trade-Offs Between Internal and External Evaluators *

Someone From Inside	Someone From Outside
Advantages	
-- Knows the organization, its program and operations	-- May be free from organizational bias
-- Is not an adversary	-- May bring fresh perspective, insight, broader experience, and recent state-of-the-art knowledge
-- Has a greater chance of adopting/following up on recommendations	-- Is more easily hired for intensive work
-- Is often less expensive	-- Can serve as an arbitrator or facilitator between parties
-- Is familiar with A.I.D.'s evaluation procedures	
-- Doesn't require time-consuming procurement negotiations	
-- Has more opportunity to build host country evaluation capability	
Disadvantages	
-- May avoid looking for facts or forming conclusions that are negative or reflect badly on organization/ individuals	-- May not know the organization, its policies and procedures/regulations
-- Tends to accept the assumptions of the organization	-- May be ignorant of constraints on feasibility of recommendations
-- Is usually too busy to participate fully	-- May be perceived as an adversary, arousing unnecessary anxiety
-- May be constrained by organizational role conflict	-- May be expensive (unless contracted locally)
	-- Requires more time for contract negotiations, orientation, and monitoring
	-- Can't follow up on recommendations
	-- May be unfamiliar with local political, cultural, and economic environment

* From the A.I.D. Evaluation Handbook (A.I.D. Program Design and Evaluation Methodology Report No. 7, April, 1987), p. 20.

the PVO's project. This potential conflict is understandable. Its resolution is two-fold. One the PVO representative must behave professionally and not attempt to skew data collection. Two, conversely, the other team members must strive not to place the representative in the situation of criticizing his/her PVO colleagues publicly.

The choice between a PVO staff member and a long-time consultant is difficult. Preferably, the representative should be a long-term employee of the organization at headquarters, since headquarters staff not only know and understand the evolution of their program, but also can carry the evaluation recommendations forward within the organization once the report is completed. However, the organization may not be able to afford to detach a permanent employee for the required amount of time without derailing its own program activities. In such instances, a long-term consultant for the organization may be able to provide the insights and information.

C. Participation of PVO Staff in the Field

PVO field staff in national programs typically play a facilitative role for the evaluation team, but they do not usually participate actively in the evaluation. That is, they may help arrange visits to field sites and may accompany the evaluators, but do not themselves carry out any interviews or do any of the writing of the final report.

Nonetheless, in deciding on the size of the evaluation team, it is useful to keep in mind the number of people who will be visiting field sites together. For example, if there are two evaluators--one from FVA/PVC and one from the PVO headquarters--plus at least one field staff person acting as a facilitator and a driver, four persons may be stopping off in villages and talking with people. The size of the group can easily increase, if, for example, a field supervisor also accompanies the team.

As a general rule of thumb, it is much easier to interview project beneficiaries when the number of evaluators and associated personnel is kept small. Three or at most four people can descend on a village and work productively. But seven or eight people arriving in two vehicles is, quite frankly, intimidating, which can affect the openness with which the beneficiaries deal with the evaluators.

In other words, when deciding on the size and composition of the evaluation team, try to think about how many people will actually be going out together to the villages and project sites. The operative rule is: the smaller the visiting party, the better.

D. SOWs for Individual Team Members

Once the number and types of evaluators has been determined, a scope of work will be necessary for each independent consultant if FVA/PVC is contracting the individuals directly. Otherwise, these SOWs will be written by the PVO or by the firm contracted to carry out the evaluation.

Much of the consultant SOWs derives from the master SOW for the evaluation. Nonetheless, there are a number of specific matters that should be included in both versions. The following checklist and example provide a guide to the development of these SOWs.

CHECKLIST FOR TEAM MEMBERS

For each team member, the following qualifications must be specified:

- Disciplinary specialization (e.g., rural sociologist, management specialist, health education specialist, civil engineer) with required or preferred degrees.
- Minimum number of years of professional experience, with service abroad specified.
- Relevant country or regional experience.
- Required language ability, with level stated in terms of FSI standards.

ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE:
COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

III. COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team will be comprised of four specialists. Two evaluators--the team leader and the management specialist--will be independent contractors mutually agreed upon by FVA/PVC and the PVO. The other two evaluators will be PVO staff, specifically, the health and the rural development program leaders at PVO headquarters. All four specialists will travel together to all field sites, and all will work actively in the headquarters assessment, field reviews, and write-up of the evaluation.

The Team Leader will be a rural development specialist with significant prior management experience. The individual will have an M.A. (preferably a Ph.D) in rural sociology, anthropology, or other related discipline. He/she should have a minimum of 10 years of professional service in development, which will preferably include long-term work in at least one of the countries to be visited. The individual will be fluent in French or Spanish at the FSI 3 level, and have a documented ability to write and edit English fluently.

The Health Management Specialist will have either a M.P.H. or a M.B.A. He/she should have at least five years of professional experience abroad, preferably in implementing financial and management systems for PVOs at headquarters and in developing countries. The individual will speak either French or Spanish at the FSI 3 level, and have a documented ability to write English cogently. The Health Management Specialist will work under, but in collaboration with, the Team Leader and other team members.

In addition, the PVO program directors for health and rural development will participate fully in the evaluation. The Director for Rural Development will work most closely with the Team Leader, and the Director for Health with the Health Management Specialist, in assessing PVO accomplishment in the respective sectors.

V. STEP 4

SCHEDULING EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

VI. STEP 4: SCHEDULING EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

The scheduling of evaluation activities may be thought of in two steps:

- o the definition of the scope of work itself--in other words, the preparation for the evaluation; and,

- o the implementation of evaluation, which includes everything from team orientation to evaluation follow-through.

In general, the planning for an evaluation must take into account how much time everyone involved has to commit to the evaluation activities. Evaluations can be very disruptive to grantee headquarters and field staff, particularly if insufficient lead time is given. (Six months notice before the start of an evaluation is not unreasonable.) Also, in the field, evaluators typically tie up staff time and project vehicles in the conduct of the assessment. These are real concerns, and must be incorporated into the evaluation scheduling.

A. Preparing for the Evaluation

A generic calendar of preliminary activities involved with planning the scope of work for an evaluation runs from the day the grant agreement is signed until the evaluation team first convenes. The important period, however, is three to six months before the evaluation starts. The calendar of activities might look like this:

1. Once the grant has been signed

- o Verify that the grant specifies the number of evaluations to be conducted over the life of the project, the general purpose of each evaluation, and the timeframe for the evaluations.

- o Clarify which party (FVA/PVC or the PVO) has lead responsibility for each evaluation.

- o Verify that funds have been reserved for the evaluations in the grant agreement. If funds have not been reserved, the request for funds can only be made during the year that the evaluation is scheduled.

2. Six months prior to the evaluation

- o Develop with the grantee a SOW for the evaluation. Identify the key questions for the evaluation, decide upon the types of key personnel, determine in general outline the timing of the different evaluation activities and where they will take place, and draw up a list of all pertinent documents to be reviewed by the evaluators.

(In practice, the PVO initiates this activity when it is responsible for a mid-term evaluation, and FVA/PVC responds to the draft SOW developed by the PVO. Conversely, FVA/PVC typically takes the lead in defining the SOW for final evaluations, with the PVO providing input in response. Nonetheless, there can be great variation in who actually writes the initial SOW.)

- If not done by an evaluation technical assistance firm, identify the persons or firms that will be responsible for actually carrying out the evaluation and determine the modalities. (That is, determine whether FVA/PVC will contract individually with consultants or whether the Office will contract with a firm for the required expertise.) Determine what, if any, substantive role--in addition to evaluation manager--the FVA/PVC project officer will play in the evaluation. And, determine which PVO staff at headquarters and in the field will participate in the evaluation and how.

- Decide whether a facilitator for a team planning meeting (TPM) is required, and, if so, identify a facilitator or training firm for this activity. As a general rule, a facilitator is helpful if the team is more than three consultants. Smaller teams will require a planning meeting, but a facilitator is not usually necessary.

- Set the dates for the evaluation. At this point, the scheduling will only be tentative, but it is important to plot out all of the activities (see Section B, below). Be sure to take into account work schedules and special events (e.g., local holidays, grantee reporting requirements, A.I.D funding cycle). These might interfere with the evaluation, for example, because national staff are all on vacation for religious holidays.

3. Three months prior to the evaluation

- Follow up with evaluation consultants to ensure their interest and availability. (This is necessary only if FVA/PVC is itself contracting individually with the consultants. If the Office has hired an evaluation technical assistance firm, verification of the consultants' availability is the firm's responsibility.)

- Collect and organize pertinent documents and information for the evaluators, and have copies made if this is necessary. The pertinent documents will, at a minimum, include the grant agreement, all annual reports, all other required deliverables (training manuals, case studies, other reports), and any prior evaluations. Documentation for earlier, related grants may also be included, if it bears directly on the current grant.

The grantee should do the same, which may involve determining where internal monitoring and evaluation records are archived (at headquarters, regional field offices, and national or local field offices).

- Develop a tentative schedule for the evaluation, which involves two steps. First, the FVA/PVC project officer and the PVO must agree on the countries to be visited during the review. Second, either the FVA/PVC project officer or the contracted evaluation technical assistance firm--in close consultation with the PVO--must determine the overall schedule and the in-country dates.

  Perhaps the most important consideration is the selection of the country programs to be involved in the evaluation. Ensure that the countries selected have all participated in the program from the outset. Picking relatively recent country programs is helpful only if the evaluation is focussing on PVO field-headquarters management, for there will have been too little time for any real impact in local implementation projects.

  Once the countries have been selected, the overall evaluation schedule can be established. This will involve the team planning meeting/initial team briefing in Washington, D.C., the administrative management review at the PVO headquarters, the country field visits, report writing and revision, and the debriefings for FVA/PVC and the PVO.

- Work out the evaluation budget with the PVO. Verify that sufficient funds are available to carry out the evaluation at the level of effort and scope that is then planned. Determine whether the estimated costs for each activity are reasonable--that is, neither too much nor too little.

4. One month prior to the evaluation

- Plan, or review the plans, for the TPM briefing. This is the responsibility of either the FVA/PVC project officer or the PVO, depending upon who has taken the lead in the evaluation.

- The FVA/PVC project officer must notify corresponding USAID Missions and obtain clearances for the consultant team. Meanwhile, the PVO should verify that all logistic arrangements for the headquarters review and country field visits are being made.

- o Reconfirm all travel arrangements with the grantee, including visas, inoculations, passport expiration dates. This will be the responsibility of the FVA/PVC project officer only if the consultants have been contracted directly. Otherwise this is the responsibility of the evaluation technical assistance firm. (PVO staff and consultants participating in the evaluation usually have their organization take care of these matters.)

- o Check that all required project documentation is available.

B. Scheduling the Evaluation Activities

Both mid-term and final evaluations typically involve a sequence of activities. In order, the evaluation team's activities include:

- o the team planning meeting and initial FVA/PVC briefing in Washington, D.C.,
- o the PVO headquarters briefing and administrative management review (if any),
- o the country program management review and field visits to local projects,
- o the timeframe for writing up and revising the report,
- o the FVA/PVC briefing,
- o the PVO headquarters briefing, and
- o any follow-through activities.

This section will take up the first four matters; the exit or report briefings and other follow-through activities are taken up later on, in Section X, Step 8: Follow Through.

1. The Team Planning Meeting (TPM)

The formality of the initial team briefing and the employment of a planning facilitator depend upon the size of the team and the complexity of the evaluation. There is <u>always</u> a need for an initial briefing to orient the team. But, if the "team" is only a single individual, the FVA/PVC project officer can undertake the briefing him/herself. If the team is larger, it will be important to set aside three or four hours to coordinate and orient the team. As has been mentioned, if the team comprises four or more individuals--and especially if several of these consultants are not greatly experienced in the business--the TPM should be chaired by a trained facilitator.

The TPM will usefully cover the following topics:

- o Grant history and purpose of the evaluation. This includes the status of the grant and an assessment of the progress thought to have been made to date.

These explanations are the responsibility of the FVA/PVC project officer.

- o Review of SOW, section by section. This review, led by the FVA/PVC project officer or TPM facilitator, provides an opportunity to ensure that the consultants each understand their respective roles and to explain why particular matters are to be investigated during the evaluation. It also gives the consultants an opportunity to query the FVA/PVC project officer and so clarify any sections of the SOW that are not self-explanatory.

- o Review of logistical support and other arrangements. This review is led by a representative of the firm or office contracting the consultants. The review will cover all of the minutiae that can confound consultants--per diem rates for each country and city, how and where salary will be paid (monthly or upon receipt of the final report; directly or into a bank), insurance and other benefits, if any; emergency telephone numbers. The PVO representative can then explain the logistical and other arrangements have been made for the country visits. (Alternatively, in-country logistical arrangements can be discussed during the headquarters review.) This is also the opportunity to complete any unfinished paperwork and to distribute required documentation (e.g., SOS insurance cards, project documentation).

- o How to deal with unforeseen problems during the evaluation. The Team Leader should here discuss how he/she typically manages a consultant team, the allocation of responsibility among team members, and the coordinated use of standardized research instruments, and other technical matterss pertinant to the evaluation.

- o Personal issues of the individual team members, which can cover any topic of concern to a team member.

Whether a formal team planning meeting is held or whether the FVA/PVC project officer chairs a simpler briefing, the intent of the session remains the same: to orient the team to the goals of the evaluation, to explain logistics and other arrangements, to clarify all matters of concern to individual team members, and to give the team members a chance to meet each other.

2. PVO Headquarters Briefing

The PVO headquarters briefing has three purposes:

- o to orient the team to the needs and concerns of the organization;
- o to verify logistical and other support arrangements in the field; and

- to carry out the headquarters management review, if this is part of the evaluation activity.

For the evaluation team, the headquarters briefing is the first opportunity to hear from the organization how the project hasevloved, what activities have succeeded and which have had problems and why. It is also the opportunity for the team to collect much project documentation not held by FVA/PVC--and to discuss directly with the people involved in the implementation of the grant many of the details of the program.

The headquarters briefing also gives the Team Leader the chance to verify with PVO headquarters personnel the different logistical and other support arrangements--hotels, airport transfers, vehicles, equipment, field documentation, and the like.

Finally, if a management review is being carried out as part of the evaluation, the team now must begin the evaluation with a review of the organization's charter and operation. It is important for the team to recognize that this function is very different from the first two (the organization's view of project implementation and logistics)--and not allow a snafu in logistics, for example, to color their view of the organization.

3. Country Program Management and Field Review

With the PVO headquarters briefing complete, the team will undertake the field portion of the evaluation. Review of country programs usually entails two activities: interviews with country staff, and field visits to local projects.

If during the field visits the team members will be going to different countries or to different regions within a country, it is important that the Team Leader give explicit instructions (and even examples of data collection instruments) to all team members together. The aim here is to ensure that all team members ask a standard list of questions, use data collection methods correctly, and collect the information planned. (This coordination of evaluation inquiries can be a function of the TPM. Nonetheless, it is worthwhile double-checking that all evaluation team members understand the importance of asking at least the minimum set of questions.)

Field evaluation methodologies are indicated by the project officer but are the provenance of the evaluation team. The methods should be developed by the team before the evaluation actually begins, and presented to the FVA/PVC project officer for acceptance.

Suffice it here to say that, as a general rule of thumb, the time alloted for each activity is as follows:

- Management review of a field office--two or three days,
- Review of a concentrated field program--at most a week,

- o Review of a dispersed field program (or where transport is especially difficult)--a minimum of ten days.

The exact amount of time for each activity will depend upon the diversity of the program and the difficulty of travelling in the area. The SOW need only specify the number of days allowed in each country. The evaluation team, in collaboration with the PVO personnel in-country, will work out the detailed itinerary.

4. Report Timeframe

Once the field reviews are completed, the evaluation team must write up its findings and conclusions. Ten working days (two weeks, calendar time) is usually sufficient for a team to complete a draft report.

Once the draft report is near completion, the evaluation team will debrief FVA/PVC. It is best that the debriefing be provided <u>just before</u> the submission of the draft report, so that all team members are available to attend. In this way, the team will be able to present its general findings and recommendations, and will be able to provide informative summary tables and figures to structure the briefing. Should it prove necessary to schedule the briefings after the draft report is submitted, it may well be that only the Team Leader will be available.

Subsequent to the FVA/PVC briefing, the team should visit the PVO headquarters and provide the same presentation of findings. To date, this PVO debriefing has been seldom scheduled, but it does represent another aspect of collaboration with the grantee.

The draft report is submitted to FVA/PVC for its comments and, through FVA/PVC, to the PVO for its consideration. Two weeks turn-around time is usually sufficient for all parties to read, consider, and respond to the draft report. Note, however, that this period does <u>not</u> allow for review of the draft by PVO field personnel. If this is desired, the turn-around time will likely be more than a month.

FVA/PVC receives the commentary of the PVO and provides the team with its comments and those of the PVO. Excepting those instances where the evaluation is exceptionally complicated, revisions can be completed within five working days. Revisions are usually the responsibility of the Team Leader, and involve mostly the correction of factual errors. Although other team members may need to participate, the Team Leader may find that he/she must consult with those individuals by telephone or fax. The simple fact of the matter is that the turn-around time for review of the draft report means that the team will disperse upon delivery of the draft and will be very difficult to reassemble later on.

IV. CALENDAR OF EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Week 1 (6-day work week)

Day 1	Team Planning Meeting and Team Briefing, FVA/PVC
Day 2	Orientation and Logistics, PVO Headquarters
Days 3-5	Administrative and Management Review, PVO Headquarters
Day 6	Travel to Xanandu
Sunday	Rest

Week 2 (6-day work week)

Days 7-12	Review of Country Program, Xanandu
Sunday	Rest

Week 3 (6-day work week)

Day 13	Travel to Omdian
Days 14-18	Review of Country Program, Omdian
Sunday	Rest

Week 4 (5-day work week)

Day 19	USAID and PVO briefing, Omdian
Day 20	Travel to Washington
Days 21-23	Draft Report, Washington
Sunday	Rest

Week 5 (5-day work week)

Days 24-28	Draft Report, Washington

Week 6 (5-day work week)

Day 29	Team briefs FVA/PVC
Day 30	Team briefs PVO

=====================

Weeks 6-8 [The evaluation team is not involved at this time.]

FVA/PVC review of draft
PVO review of draft
Submission of FVA/PVC and PVO comments to team

=====================

Week 8-9 (5-day work week)

Days 31-35 Revision of draft report by Team Leader
Duplication of final report and delivery to FVA/PVC

=====================

Weeks 9 and following

FVA/PVC transmittal of final report to PVO
FVA/PVC and PVO agreement on action points
FVA/PVC and PVO agreement on implementation schedule

Note: PVO will be responsible for all logistical and travel arrangements for the evaluation team while in-country for field program reviews. All domestic travel and logistics, as well as international travel, will be the responsibility of the contracted evaluation technical assistance firm.

VII. STEP 5:

PROVIDING GUIDANCE ON METHODS AND PROCEDURES

VII. STEP 5: PROVIDING GUIDANCE ON METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The central methodological question in preparing an evaluation SOW, once the key questions have been determined, is how information should be collected to answer the questions. The approach to data collection should be indicated by the project officer, but is left largely to be fleshed out by the evaluation team before leaving for the field.

What data are needed and how they can be collected can be determined, in part, from the questions that the evaluation team is asked to address and from the verifiable indicators listed in the logical framework of the grant.

Where these documentary sources may be incomplete or insufficient, other approaches may be suggested. The critical factor is that the team **systematically ask a standard list of questions to all respondents**. This section provides some general guidelines for the collection and analysis of data. Annex 1 contains the usual standard lists of questions in subsectors pertinent to FVA/PVC.

A. Collecting Information

In general, try to ensure that the evaluator or evaluation team follows the following guidelines in designing data collection methods for the evaluation:

- Collect only what is needed. A major shortcoming of many evaluations is that too much information is collected to be appropriately analyzed. Any method should get to the point and not ask questions on unrelated topics.

- Avoid, when possible, highly structured questionnaires, that is, those to which the responses are already pre-coded. Many people think this is the best way to gather information. In fact, this type of questionnaire is the most technically difficult, time consuming, and expensive way to gather information.

  It is most often greatly preferable to ask a standard set of questions in the course of a 'natural' conversation. In this way, the evaluators collect similar types of information in each place and the interviewees feel much more comfortable.

- All field research methods require cultural and political sensitivity; care should be taken to ensure that appropriate perceptions are part of the result.

B. Combining Data Collection Methods

In any data collection, the objective is to document reality. Research and data collection methods are always imperfect because each method provides only part of the total picture. For example, numbers and measurements sometimes exclude the human side of a project, including the feeling and expectations of the people involved.

Conversely, qualitative data can be misleading if the people give good reports only because they are happy to have the project despite the fact that it may be having negative side effects or no impact at all on the problem. For example, agricultural productivity is up, but the increase was accomplished through the improper type and/or application of pesticides and fertilizers, thus having negative consequences in the long run.

For these reasons, the more data collection methods used, the greater the chance that the entire picture is being documented. Ideally, an evaluation would collect information on inputs, outputs, management, and impact. But, most PVOs do not have the time or resources for monitoring and evaluation on this scale. Thus, in planning a grant evaluation, attempt to have as much variety in research approach as resources allow.

C. Analyzing Information

Analyzing information gathered from the evaluation combines science and art. Analysis means looking for patterns trends, and significant facts. It also means sorting the important information from information that is less important.

How will the information be analyzed? This decision is an important part of planning an evaluation. One common failure in planning evaluations is to think only about the collection of information and wait until the data have come in before working out a system to analyze the information. At that point, it may become clear that the analysis would have been more effective or much easier had the forms been designed differently or the information presented in a different way. The more carefully the evaluation is designed--including data collection, analysis, interpretation, and use--the more effective it will be for both FVA/PVC and the PVO.

Therefore, the rule of thumb is: Plan the analysis when the evaluation is being designed. Consider whether there are sufficient resources to monitor all the indicators chosen. It may be necessary to choose fewer indicators or different data collection methods to avoid a burdensome or complex analysis.

Also, whether quantitative and qualitative, the information for an evaluation should be replicable. That is, another team going to the same area and using the same methods and questionnaires should come up with basically the same information and conclusions. Anecdotal information is useful, and can be telling. But programmatic decisions must be based on a solidly documented, factual foundation.

V. PROJECT METHODS

A. Project Documentation

In the conduct of the evaluation, the team will review, at a minimum, the following documentation:

- Project Proposal
- Project Grant Agreement
- Required Periodic Reports
- Case Study Reports and Other Deliverables.

B. Project Personnel Interviews

In addition, the team will seek first-hand information from the headquarters and the field about the project. This will involve gathering information using a variety of methods that the project officer may specify or require to be specified before departure, such as:

- Key informant interviews with persons at headquarters and in the field who are most knowledgeable about particular project matters

- Small surveys using open-ended interview schedules with beneficiaries

- Direct observation of project facilities and activities

- Focus group interviews with beneficiaries (that is, interviews with beneficiaries who share a similar characteristic such as gender, age, or marginality).

VIII. STEP 6:

DEFINING EVALUATION REPORT PARAMETERS

VIII. STEP 6: DEFINING EVALUATION REPORT PARAMETERS

Project officers want and need evaluation reports whose results are fed back in ways that benefit the PVO and its intended beneficiaries. This section defines the parameters of the evaluation reports. The issues covered in this section include: debriefings (i.e., providing feedback); the final report format; and report distribution.

A. Debriefings (providing feedback)

The evaluation team can provide critical feedback on two different occasions: once the field program has been reviewed but before departure from country (in-country debriefings); and to FVA/PVC and the PVO once the final report is in draft.

1. In-country Debriefings.

The evaluation team can debrief both the USAID PVO officer and the officers and staff of the PVO national and regional field offices.
The Team Leader should, as a matter of courtesy, contact the USAID PVO officer upon arrival in country. The Team Leader should inquire whether the PVO officer or any other person at the Mission wishes a briefing on the purpose and itinerary of the evaluation team. At that time, the Team Leader should inquire as to whether the PVO officer or other USAID officials desire an exit debriefing. If so, the Team Leader should schedule time with those officers a day or two before departing country.

The team can also present its preliminary findings to the PVO staff in country. The insights and interpretations from these meetings are often invaluable in writing the report. This approach also serves to ease any tension among the staff that arises out of not knowing the findings (and how they might be affected) until well after the report comes out.

In both instances, it is imperative that the team emphasize the <u>preliminary</u> nature of the findings and avoid discussing any conclusions and recommendations. Findings and opinions may shift over time, particularly in the write-up process, and it is unfair to unwittingly mislead people. The operative rule is simply that the team remain as open and honest as possible, recognizing that preliminary interpretations may change over time.

2. Headquarters Debriefings

Both FVA/PVC and PVO headquarters warrant debriefings once the final report is available in draft. The FVA/PVC debriefing is traditional. This is the opportunity for the team to present its findings, conclusions, and recommendations. This is <u>not</u>, however, the opportunity for the team to read its report in its entirety. Rather, with the Team Leader guiding the discussion for the group, the team should present only highlights of its findings. Usually, it is important to provide copies of key figures and tables from the report as a guide to the discussion. Also, it is important to remember that because this is the only opportunity that the A.I.D. personnel at the briefing will have to query the team personally, the discussion should be led by the senior FVA/PVC officer in attendance.

Although desirable, a PVO headquarters briefing is seldom incorporated into the evaluation schedule. This oversight must be remedied because the headquarters staff are responsible for implementing the evaluation's recommendations. Thus, the team has a responsibility to present its findings and conclusions directly to the interested PVO officials. Again, the team should only highlight findings and conclusions, and the meeting should be directed by the senior PVO official in attendance for the simple reason that this is <u>their</u> opportunity to discuss and rebut the various evaluation recommendations.

It is the responsibility of the team or the Team Leader to incorporate all key considerations made during these discussions into the final report, based on the consensus of the team. Even where a point is rejected for some reason, it is usually helpful to note in the report the difference in view. A footnote is usually sufficient for this purpose.

B. Report Format

To begin with, four guiding principles should be adhered to in preparing the evaluation report.

One, to be effective, the evaluation report must be concise. Usually, 50 to 60 single-spaced typewritten pages (not including appendices) is enough to convey all the needed information. Forty pages would be better still. As a result, any necessary background documents or lengthy discussions of issues should be put in appendices.

Two, to be useful, the evaluation report must be informative. It must include enough--and only enough--background information about the country, the communities visited, and the project to support the conclusions and recommendations. Readers need context, but they do not need or want to endure a history or ethnography of the entire project.

Three, to be credible, the information collected must follow a standard list of questions derived from the issues listed in the SOW. Even though it may not be possible to do a random survey for statistical analysis, the team must strive to ask the same questions the same ways in each place. Further, tables and figures often help readers "see" the gist of the evaluation argument.

Four, to be readable, the evaluation report must eliminate technical terms and acronyms to the greatest extent possible. Define terms and acronyms (if they must be used) the first time they are used. And, keep them to a minimum.

These four simple rules will help ensure the usefulness of the report. To help ensure comparability, evaluation reports should all follow a basic format, including the following sections:

Title Page	The title page should give the name and project number, the names and titles of the consultants, and note whether this is a mid-term or final evaluation and who commissioned it, as well as the date of the final report.
List of Acronyms	Acronyms are an unavoidable fact of project life. The report authors should strive for the irreducible minimum. When a report contains only commonly known acronyms (e.g., USAID, IBRD, UNDP), the list of acronyms may be eliminated. When a report contains a number of mysterious acronyms (e.g., abbreviations of Ministry units), these <u>must</u> be listed at the front of the report as a guide to the reader.
Executive Summary	The Executive Summary is a synthesis of the entire report. It should be no more than five pages in length. This is usually enough space to describe the background of the grant and the methodology of the evaluation, as well as the major findings, recommendations and required follow-through actions. Importantly, the number of major recommendations must be limited and carefully prioritized. An unordered list of a hundred major and minor recommendations diffuses attention and almost guarantees that the recommendations cannot be implemented.
Table of Contents	Follow standard rules, listing all appendices, figures, maps, and tables.

The Main Body of the Report

The structure of the main body of the report is the responsibility of the evaluators, and the SOW need only mention the main text or main report as a section of the evaluation. Nonetheless, for reasons of completeness, the suggested sections of the main report are detailed below.

Introduction and Background	This section gives an overview of the setting and of grant activities. This section answers the following questions: Why was the grant awarded? What are its goals and methods? What are the aims of the evaluation? Much of this section will repeat the context provided in the SOW itself.
Methodology	This section answers the question: How was the information that the conclusions were based upon gathered? The section should discuss how the projects visited were selected, what questions were asked, etc.
Findings and Conclusions	The SOW can provide a structure for reporting the evaluation results, if the substantive discussion of the major questions for the evaluation is reasonably detailed. In that instance, the team answers each question in turn. (Sometimes the order of questions may be changed because of the logic of the evaluation argument, but all questions must be answered.) In general, the team will for each question discuss the importance of the question, present its findings (in tabular form, if possible), and draw its conclusions and recommendations.

REQUIRED APPENDICES

Appendix 1: The Scope of Work for the Evaluation

Appendix 2: Evaluation Team Itinerary

Appendix 3: Individuals Consulted During the Evaluation (which will include names and titles)

Appendix 4: References Cited (or consulted)

Other appendices may include maps and country case studies.

Once the evaluation report has been accepted, the FVA/PVC project officer is required to complete the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary Form. (The evaluator or team may be assigned the task of completing the abstract and the detailed summary portions of the form. This should be stipulated in the scope of work under Reporting Requirements.)

C. Distributing the Report

When planning an evaluation, funds must be set aside for the duplication and distribution of the report. Copies of the report should be sent to the USAID Missions that participated in the evaluation. Also, two copies of the evaluation should be submitted to CDIE within sixty days of receipt of the final report.

The PVO will have received copies of the report, and is responsible for forwarding copies to its field offices. Similarly, it is the decision of the PVO to share the report with the communities visited during the evaluation; in practice, this is seldom, if ever, done.

ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE:
REPORT FORMAT

VI. REPORT FORMAT

The presentation of the final report should follow the basic outline below.

Title Page
List of Acronyms (if necessary)
Executive Summary (under 5 pages)
Table of Contents (with Annexes, figures and tables)
Main Report (organized in accord with the list of evaluation questions provided in Section A of this SOW)

Annexes

Annex 1:	Scope of Work
Annex 2:	Evaluation Team Itinerary
Annex 3:	Individuals Contacted
Annex 4:	References Consulted
Annex 5:	(As needed)

The report will be concise (no more than 50 to 60 single-spaced, typewritten pages) and to-the-point.

The draft evaluation report will be provided to FVA/PVC within ten working days of the team's return to the United States. The team will debrief FVA/PVC first and then the PVO once the draft report is near completion. Upon submission of the draft report, FVA/PVC and the PVO will have two weeks to review and comment upon the draft. These comments will be submitted in writing to the Team Leader for revision in the final report. The Team Leader, in consultation with the other team members, will submit ten copies of the final evaluation report, in English, to FVA/PVC within five working days of receipt of the commentary.

[The following is optional, at the discretion of the FVA/PVC officer.] In addition, the team will complete the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary Report form, which will appear at the front of the evaluation, before the Executive Summary.

IX. STEP 7:

BUDGETING THE EVALUATION

IX. BUDGETING THE EVALUATION

A. Financing Evaluations

An evaluation that involves the review of headquarters administration and management and of two country programs by two independent consultants can easily cost $50,000. As a general rule, therefore, five percent of the total project funds, or a minimum of $50,000, should be reserved for evaluation at the time the grant agreement is negotiated with the PVO.

FVA/PVC uses several mechanisms to fund evaluations. Sometimes the funds are actually reserved in the grant agreement itself. Although included in the agreement, these funds are effectively under the control of the FVA/PVC project officer for the exclusive use of evaluation; these funds are under no circumstances available to the PVO for general programmatic purposes.

Alternatively, FVA/PVC has recourse to an evaluation technical assistance firm, which can undertake evaluations and, at the same time, take care of all of the logistic and administrative details of carrying out an evaluation. In this situation, the project officer is still responsible for defining the scope of work collaboratively with the PVO. The evaluation technical assistance firm is, in effect, simply providing a service.

If funds have not been reserved in either of these ways, the project officer will have to develop a budget as part of the Project Implementation Order/Technical (PIO/T) and request funds from the FVA/PVC allocation. The budget for the PIO/T would be identical to that developed for the SOW itself. This section therefore reviews the items that must be budgeted for in an evaluation.

B. Budgeting for an Evaluation

Every evaluation budget must include all costs that will be incurred in support of the assessment. These costs include:

<u>Consultants</u>

Salaries:	The documented daily rate for each consultant times the total number of days that the consultant will work. (Calculate six workdays when the consultant is abroad.)

DBA and SOS Insurance:

Some firms take out DBA insurance for all employees; this is usually an overhead expense.

Some USAID Missions <u>require</u> that any consultant arriving in that country have SOS insurance and provide the policy number to a Mission employeeon arrival. SOS insurance is based on the number of days the consultant is abroad; rates can be obtained from Charles Wright Company in Washington, D.C.

These items cost approximately four per cent of the consultants salary, pro rated for the amount of time the person will be travelling. That is, for a consultant with an annual salary of $40,000 per annum who will be travelling for one month abroad, these costs would tctal $133.33 ($40,000 times 4% divided by 12).

<u>Travel</u>

International:

The round-trip coach (or where applicable, business class) air fare from the consultant's home base to the field sites, including stop-overs in Washington, D.C., for consultation with FVA/PVC and at the PVO headquarters for consultation there both on the way out and on the way back. [The first consultation in each place is a briefing for the consultant or team; the second is the debriefing in FVA/PVC and in the PVO headquarters.]

In country:

Many PVOs run their country programs on shoestring budgets and may have neither the resources nor the equipment to facilitate the evaluator(s) visit. If PVO headquarters staff indicate that a vehicle will not be available for the evaluation team, include funds for car rental and insurance or, at a very minimum, taxi fares.

<u>Per Diem</u>	For each consultant, the maximum allowable daily rate times the number of days that he/she will be in each city or area.
<u>Team Planning Meeting</u>	Any costs associated with the initial briefing of the evaluation team, including room rental, facilitator salary, or hiring a TPM firm.
<u>Miscellaneous Costs</u>	
Communications/Postage:	A small sum ($100-200) to cover emergency telephone calls and postage to mail the reports.
Office Rental:	Large teams may require a space where people can meet, either to coordinate on their findings or to interview beneficiaries or others. PVOs normally can accommodate these needs in their own offices. Alternatively, one can budget an extra hotel room, usually a suite for the Team Leader. Under most circumstances, however, this is not a necessary expense for a FVA/PVC evaluation.
Report Duplication:	Determine a photocopy cost per page times the number of pages (presumably not more than 100 pages, including all annexes), and multiply by the number of copies required in the contract.
<u>Overhead</u>	If the evaluation is being let to a firm, it will be necessary to budget for overhead costs. Some firms calculate overhead on labor only; others calculate overhead on total cost. Thus, stated overhead rates are not immediately comparable. A rule of thumb: overhead rates vary from 20 to 30 per cent at a minimum up to well over 100 percent; 70 to 80 percent of total costs might be a fair average for this cost.

Unallowable Expenses

Materials and Equipment:	Some consultants will ask to rent a laptop computer. However, a consultant should have with him/her the basic tools of the craft, which now includes a laptop. Also, consultants are expected to purchase materials (e.g., paper and pencils) out of their own funds.
Informant Costs:	Although some consultants provide small gifts to informants (e.g., candy for the children who congregate around interviews), all interviewees are project beneficiaries, who should require no further inducement.
Research Assistants:	Research assistants are seldom used in FVA/PVC evaluations because the PVO has field personnel in place who can perform this service.

ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE:
BUDGET WORK SHEET

VII. BUDGET WORK SHEET

	Rate	Days	Total	
<u>Salary</u>				
Consultant 1	$250	35	$8,750	
Consultant 2	200	30	6,000	
Subtotal				$14,750
<u>DBA and SOS Insurance</u>				
Consultant 1	4%	15	150	
Consultant 2	4%	15	120	
Subtotal				270
<u>Travel</u>				
International:				
Consultant 1				
Washington to Xanandu			2,500	
Xanandu to Omdian			1,000	
Omdian to Washington			2,000	
Consultant 2				
Home to Washington and return			750	
Washington to Xanandu			2,500	
Xanandu to Omdian			1,000	
Omdian to Washington			2,000	
Subtotal				11,750
In-country:				
Car Rental, Xanandu (one week)			750	750

	Rate	Days	Total	
<u>Per Diem</u>				
Consultant 1				
Washington	$127	0	$0	
Xanandu	90	8	720	
Omdian	100	6	600	
Consultant 2				
Washington	127	15	1,905	
Xanandu	90	8	720	
Omdian	100	6	600	
Subtotal				$4,545
<u>Team Planning Meeting</u>			750	750
<u>Miscellaneous Costs</u>				
Communications and Postage			150	
Office Rental			0	
Report Duplication ($.07/page, 100 pp, 10 copies)			70	
Subtotal				220
Subtotal of All Costs				**33,035**
Overhead (at 42% of all costs)				13,875
GRAND TOTAL				**$46,910**

X. STEP 8:

FOLLOWING-UP

X. STEP 8: FOLLOWING UP

The basic aim for carrying out an evaluation is to help managers improve performance and hence the effectiveness of the grant program. The evaluation process, therefore, is not complete until action has been taken on the recommendations of the evaluation report.

The PVO is typically allowed 10 days to respond to the draft evaluation report. The evaluation team then makes those revisions it deems worthy.

If the activity is to continue--that is, a mid-term realignment of the project is anticipated or a follow-on project is planned in the case of a final evaluation--the FVA/PVC project officer will draw up a list of recommendations to be implemented by the organization. This list, which includes actions, party responsible, and timeframe, constitutes the first step in the implementation of the evaluation recommendations.

The PVO, of course, should respond to this list of required actions. Its response might include:

- either agreement to full or partial implementation of the recommendations including timeframe and who has responsibility for each action; or
- a well-justified rejection of the recommendation, along with an alternative plan to accomplish the same result.

Once FVA/PVC has received and accepted the evaluation team's final report, all follow-through activities are the sole responsibility of the FVA/PVC project officer. To be sure, the PVO may, with its own funds, hire any or all of the evaluation team members for subsequent technical assistance. However, in such instances, the former evaluation team members have an informal responsibility to inform the FVA/PVC project officer. Similarly, in those instances where the PVO requests voluntary assistance from a former evaluation team member, the individual should consult with the respective FVA/PVC project officer.

Except for these instances, however, evaluation team members have no responsiblity, formal or otherwise, for any actions to be taken as a consequence of the evaluation. This is entirely the responsibliity of the FVA/PVC project officer and his/her counterparts in the PVO.

XI. CONCLUSION:

THE FINISHED SCOPE OF WORK

XI. CONCLUSION: THE FINISHED SCOPE OF WORK

The Scope of Work (SOW) for an evaluation is one of the most important elements of an evaluation and requires the particular attention of everyone involved to eliminate delays and misunderstandings before and after aN evaluator or evaluation team begins work or a contract is awarded. Extra time spent on the SOW is often repaid many times over in reduced difficulties in the field and in an improved final report.

For the evaluator, a good SOW directs attention to the key issues and problems of the grant. For the grantee, a good SOW provides a clear understanding of the intent of the evaluation and allows coordination of resources and personnel in support of the evaluation. For the FVA/PVC project officer, the SOW provides an opportunity to think through the problems or concerns that have arisen in implementation and, thus, to help overcome these difficulties.

The key to drafting a SOW is to be detailed and specific. Here, the parts of a SOW are simply listed.

Activity to be evaluated and purpose of the evaluation
Statement of work
Composition of the evaluation team
Scheduling of team activities
Guiding research methods
Reporting requirements
Budget
Project Logframe

More detail on each element follows:

1a. <u>Activity to be evaluated</u>. Identify the activities to be evaluated. This would include the name, number, dates, and funded amounts of the grant.

1b. <u>Purpose of the evaluation</u>. Specify the reason(s) the evaluation is needed, key management issues to be addressed, and how the evaluation results, findings, and recommendations will be used.

2. <u>Statement of work.</u> Cite the specific questions the evaluation is to address. Avoid vague terminology. Specify that the evaluation report should not only provide answers to these questions but provide conclusions and recommendations. In addition, the report is to provide lessons learned that may have emerged from the analysis.

This section also specifies certain procedural matters, such as:

- o a six-day work-week when abroad
- o any preparatory work in the U.S.
- o social or cultural factors that may influence interviewing procedures
- o logistics and communications

3. Composition of the evaluation team. Specify requirements for language proficiency, areas of technical competence, previous in-country or sub-regional experience.

4. Scheduling. This section details where the team will be, for how long, and with what purpose. In-country visits to local projects, however, do not need to be specified; only the countries to be visited.

5. Defining research methods. Specify the documents to be reviewed by the team, and suggest appropriate research methods. Note specifically whether the team must submit its preliminary lists of standard questions for FVA/PVC review before departure from the U.S.

6. Reporting Requirements. Specify reporting requirements including desired length of the report and due dates for draft and final versions. A recommended report outline is a standard part of every SOW. The outline also specifies the required appendices, which may include:

   - o the SOW
   - o the list of documents consulted
   - o the list of individuals and agencies contacted

   Other appendices may be specified, if desired (e.g., maps, case studies).

7. Budget. A budget will have to be prepared for the evaluation, even though it may not be attached to the SOW.

(Follow-up activities are not included in the scope of work for the evaluation team because these activities are the responsibility of the FVA/PVC project officer and the PVO staff rather than of the evaluation team.)

8. Logical Framework. The final part of the SOW is usually the logframe for the project, which is taken from the grant agreement and appended to the SOW.

ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE:

SCOPE OF WORK
HEALTH AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
FINAL EVALUATION

I. INTRODUCTION

The Health and Rural Development (HARD) project was signed on October 1, 1987 by FVA/PVC and the Private Voluntary Organization (PVO). The project has an effective life of three years, with an end-of-project (EOP) of September 30, 1990. A mid-term evaluation was carried out in March 1989; this final evaluation is to be completed just before the EOP and in time for the review of any follow-on grant request.

PVO has had two previous three-year cooperative agreements. The first, a health project, ran from 1981-1984; the second, a rural development project, ran from 1984-1987. Both of these projects were evaluated at mid-term and at completion.

GOAL AND PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

The goal of the HARD project is to improve the standard of living and quality of life of villagers.

The current HARD project is a compilation of successful activities under the previous two grants. HARD aims to improve the quality of health care for at-risk populations (women of child-bearing age, children under five, and the elderly) through an integrated rural development program in selected rural areas.

The grant agreement also provides for technical assistance to PVO for strengthening headquarters and field office management, financial accounting and reporting, and monitoring field operations.

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

This final evaluation will assess the extend to which PVO has achieved or surpassed the stated objectives of the HARD project, both for institutional strengthening and for field-level project implementation. An important aim of this evaluation is the extent to which institutional strengthening has contributed to improved implementation of field projects.

The findings of the evaluation will be considered in the review of any proposal for a subsequent grant.

II. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

A. INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING

The current cooperative agreement enables PVO to hire one program expert in health and one in rural development. The agreement also specifies that these individuals will write a field training manual that is based on a series of 25 case studies of on-going and completed PVO projects. This training manual will be refined during a series of seven regional seminars and workshops. The manual will then be translated into French and Spanish, and at least three other national languages.

In addition, the two program officers hired under the HARD project are charged with designing and implementing an effective system for monitoring field projects at the local level that also provides pertinent and timely information to headquarters for programmatic adjustment. This system will be in place and operative by the beginning Project Year (PY) 3.

The evaluation team will consider the following questions:

1. Has PVO hired and retained qualified program directors in the fields of health and rural development?

2. Have these directors provided needed programmatic advice at headquarters and to the field?

3. Have the requisite 25 case studies been commissioned? Further, what were the criteria for selection of the studies, and do these selection criteria ensure a coherent and representative view of PVO's program?

4. Has the training manual been written and then refined in the planned seven regional workshops? Did field personnel (village extension agents in the employ of PVO) participate in the revisions, or did national-level staff only participate in the workshops?

5. Have the program directors implemented an effective system for monitoring field projects at the local level?

B. FIELD IMPLEMENTATION

The cooperative agreement specifies that PVO will initiate five additional national programs in each of the three years of this project. Each program will comprise a minimum of 15 local projects each year that each benefit a minimum of 150 at-risk or marginalized persons. Which programs will be added each year will be decided by the program officer on the basis of a program strategy to be provided FVA/PVC by the end of PY 1. Each program is intended to improve the health status and the family finances of the targeted beneficiaries.

The evaluation team will consider the following questions:

1. Has PVO initiated five additional national programs in each of the three years of this project? If not, why not?

2. Has each national program initiated a minimum of 15 local projects each year?

3. Has each local project benefited a minimum of 150 at-risk or marginalized persons? What is the age, gender, and household-head profile of the beneficiaries?

4. What are the selection criteria for local projects? Do beneficiaries conduct an economic feasibility study, or is this done by the PVO village extension agent?

5. Has PVO provided beneficiary groups all needed training and support?

6. Are the PVO local projects carried out on a charitable or a business rationale, and are they sustainable in the longer run?

C. OTHER CONCERNS

PVO is contractually obligated to provide two semi-annual administrative and financial reports, one in January and one in June, during each of the three years of this grant. To date, FVA/PVC has received only one report per year, and this only very belatedly. Because these delays have impeded careful project monitoring, the evaluation team is directed to investigate the reasons why the reports have not been completed in time, and to suggest actions that PVO can take to remedy this deficiency.

The evaluation team will consider the following questions:

1. Why has PVO failed to meet its administrative reporting obligation?

2. What changes in staffing or reporting procedures are necessary for PVO to be able to meet its obligation?

III. COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team will be comprised of four specialists. Two evaluators--the team leader and the management specialist--will be independent contractors mutually agreed upon by FVA/PVC and the PVO. The other two evaluators will be PVO staff, specifically, the health and the rural development program leaders at PVO headquarters. All four specialists will travel together to all field sites, and all will work actively in the headquarters assessment, field reviews, and write-up of the evaluation.

The Team Leader will be a rural development specialist with significant prior management experience. The individual will have an M.A. (preferably a Ph.D) in rural sociology, anthropology, or other related discipline. He/she should have a minimum of 10 years of professional service in development, which will preferably include long-term work in at least one of the countries to be visited. The individual will be fluent in French or Spanish at the FSI 3 level, and have a documented ability to write and edit English fluently.

The Health Management Specialist will have either a M.P.H. or a M.B.A. He/she should have at least five years of professional experience abroad, preferably in implementing financial and management systems for PVOs at headquarters and in developing countries. The individual will speak either French or Spanish at the FSI 3 level, and have a documented ability to write English cogently. The Health Management Specialist will work under, but in collaboration with, the Team Leader and other team members.

In addition, the PVO program directors for health and rural development will participate fully in the evaluation. The Director for Rural Development will work most closely with the Team Leader, and the Director for Health with the Health Management Specialist, in assessing PVO accomplishment in the respective sectors.

IV. CALENDAR OF EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

<u>Week 1</u> (6-day work week)

Day 1	Team Planning Meeting and Team Briefing, FVA/PVC
Day 2	Orientation and Logistics, PVO Headquarters
Days 3-5	Administrative and Management Review, PVO Headquarters
Day 6	Travel to Xanandu
Sunday	Rest

<u>Week 2</u> (6-day work week)

Days 7-12	Review of Country Program, Xanandu
Sunday	Rest

<u>Week 3</u>	(6-day work week)

Day 13	Travel to Omdian
Days 14-18	Review of Country Program, Omdian
Sunday	Rest

<u>Week 4</u>	(5-day work week)

Day 19	USAID and PVO briefing, Omdian
Day 20	Travel to Washington
Days 21-23	Draft Report, Washington
Sunday	Rest

<u>Week 5</u>	(5-day work week)
Days 24-28	Draft Report, Washington
<u>Week 6</u>	(5-day work week)
Day 29	Team briefs FVA/PVC
Day 30	Team briefs PVO

====================

<u>Weeks 6-8</u> [The evaluation team is not involved at this time.]

FVA/PVC review of draft
PVO review of draft
Submission of FVA/PVC and PVO comments to team

====================

<u>Week 8-9</u> (5-day work week)

Days 31-35 Revision of draft report by Team Leader
Duplication of final report and delivery to FVA/PVC

====================

Weeks 9 and following

FVA/PVC transmittal of final report to PVO
FVA/PVC and PVO agreement on action points
FVA/PVC and PVO agreement on implementation schedule

Note: PVO will be responsible for all logistical and travel arrangements for the evaluation team while in-country for field program reviews. All domestic travel and logistics, as well as international travel, will be the responsibility of the contracted evaluation technical assistance firm.

V. PROJECT METHODS

A. Project Documentation

In the conduct of the evaluation, the team will review, at a minimum, the following documentation:

- o Project Proposal
- o Project Grant Agreement
- o Required Periodic Reports
- o Case Study Reports and Other Deliverables.

B. Project Personnel Interviews

In addition, the team will seek first-hand information from the headquarters and the field about the project. This will involve gathering information using a variety of methods that the project officer may specify or require to be specified before departure, such as:

- o Key informant interviews with persons at headquarters and in the field who are most knowledgeable about particular project matters

- o Small surveys using open-ended interview schedules with beneficiaries

- o Direct observation of project facilities and activities

- o Focus group interviews with beneficiaries (that is, interviews with beneficiaries who share a similar characteristic such as gender, age, or marginality)

VI. REPORT FORMAT

The presentation of the final report should follow the basic outline below.

Title Page
List of Acronyms (if necessary)
Executive Summary (under 5 pages)
Table of Contents (with Annexes, figures and tables)
Main Report (organized in accord with the list of evaluation questions provided in Section A of this SOW)

<u>Annexes</u>

Annex 1:	Scope of Work
Annex 2:	Evaluation Team Itinerary
Annex 3:	Individuals Contacted
Annex 4:	References Consulted
Annex 5:	(As needed)

The report will be concise (no more than 50 to 60 single-spaced, typewritten pages) and to-the-point.

The draft evaluation report will be provided to FVA/PVC within ten working days of the team's return to the United States. The team will debrief FVA/PVC first and then the PVO once the draft report is near completion. Upon submission of the draft report, FVA/PVC and the PVO will have two weeks to review and comment upon the draft. These comments will be submitted in writing to the Team Leader for revision in the final report. The Team Leader, in consultation with the other team members, will submit ten copies of the final evaluation report, in English, to FVA/PVC within five working days of receipt of the commentary.

[The following is optional, at the discretion of the FVA/PVC officer.] In addition, the team will complete the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary Report form, which will appear at the front of the evaluation, before the Executive Summary.

VII. BUDGET WORK SHEET

	Rate	Days	Total	
Salary				
Consultant 1	$250	35	$8,750	
Consultant 2	200	30	6,000	
Subtotal				$14,750
DBA and SOS Insurance				
Consultant 1	4%	15	150	
Consultant 2	4%	15	120	
Subtotal				270
Travel				
International:				
Consultant 1				
Washington to Xanandu			2,500	
Xanandu to Omdian			1,000	
Omdian to Washington			2,000	
Consultant 2				
Home to Washington and return			750	
Washington to Xanandu			2,500	
Xanandu to Omdian			1,000	
Omdian to Washington			2,000	
Subtotal				11,750
In-country:				
Car Rental, Xanandu (one week)			750	750

	Rate	Days	Total	
<u>Per Diem</u>				
Consultant 1				
Washington	$127	0	$0	
Xanandu	90	8	720	
Omdian	100	6	600	
Consultant 2				
Washington	127	15	1,905	
Xanandu	90	8	720	
Omdian	100	6	600	
Subtotal				$4,545
<u>Team Planning Meeting</u>			750	750
<u>Miscellaneous Costs</u>				
Communications and Postage			150	
Office Rental			0	
Report Duplication ($.07/page, 100 pp, 10 copies)			70	
Subtotal				220
Subtotal of All Costs				**33,035**
Overhead (at 42% of all costs)				13,875
GRAND TOTAL				**$46,910**

Logical Framework for Summarizing a Project Design

Est. Project Completion: September 30, 1990
Date of this summary: September 1, 1987
Design Team:

Narrative Summary (NS)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)	Means of Verification (MOV)	Important Assumptions
Goal: (the broader objective to which this project contributes) To improve the standard of living and the quality of life of rural populations.	1. Increased income 2. Increased longevity 3. Decreased infant mortality	Government records	(goal to supergoal) Political stability in participating countries.
Purpose: (aim or impact) To improve the quality of health care for at-risk populations through an integrated rural development program	**EOPS** (End of Project Status) 45 economic groups are operating and investing profits in health services and additional enterprises	Project records	(purpose to goal) Participants will run operations, make profits, and invest them in health and other services, as well as additional enterprises.
Outputs: (deliverables or terms of reference) 1. 25 case studies 2. 1 training manual 3. 6,750 beneficiaries helped in economic projects 4. Strengthened institutional management	1.1 Case studies published 1.2 Trainnig manual published 1.3 45 groups of 150 members each operating economic enterprises 1.4 PVO has operational monitoring systems	Project records	(output to purpose) PVO staff will not change over the life of the project.
Activities: (key clusters or work breakdown structure) 7 regional seminars Test and install monitoring system Income-generating project training sessions at field level	**Inputs/Resources:** (Budget) $ 2,100,000 over three years	Project records	(activity to output) Funds will be available and obligated in a timely fashion

ANNEX 1

DEFINING INDICATORS FOR THE COLLECTION OF USEFUL INFORMATION

ANNEX 1:
DEFINING INDICATORS FOR THE COLLECTION OF USEFUL INFORMATION

This annex is included for new project officers or those project officers who have little experince conducting or managing evaluations. It stands to reason that the more a project officer knows about evaluation, the more effectively he/she can direct an evaluation that will be useful to him/her, FVA/PVC, and the PVO. Those with experience in evaluation should skip this section and might wish to consult Annex 2: Documents Consulted for more information on evaluation.

A. Choosing Indicators

Choosing the right indicators is one of the most difficult steps in designing an evaluation. This step requires some creativity in deciding what the indicators are and how to measure them. It may take the evaluator or the evaluation team several attempts before coming up with the best design for the needs.

An indicator is an observable or measurable unit of change. Indicators are similar to symptoms which indicate an illness. For example, if a person has a fever accompanied by aches and pains, the fever and aches and pains are symptoms, or indicators, that the person is ill.

In evaluation it is necessary to identify the indicators of the project. Some symptoms are more obvious than others. Project indicators also vary in the degree to which they can be observed. For example, increased crop yields are a clear quantitative indicator of agricultural productivity and fewer children suffering from malnutrition is a clear indicator of improved nutrition. Such quantitative indicators are also more consistent from project to project.

What about indicators of increased self-esteem, more successful group dynamics, or increased opportunities for women? The measures of success on such qualitative goals are difficult to identify. These measures are often specific and different from project to project.

Some indicators are very difficult to measure, whether they are quantitative or qualitative. For example, the obvious indicator of the effectiveness of a family planning project is reduced birth rates, but measuring such rates would be difficult. To accurately measure the effectiveness of this indicator it would be necessary to have a large number of women in a project, a similar number of women who are not in the project for comparison, and data collected over several years. Such a complicated evaluation system is usually beyond the resources of PVOs. For this reason, it is important that the evaluators choose indicators which can be monitored through data collection methods appropriate to the resources available.

Because each PVO is unique and each country and community in which the PVO works has its own special circumstances, the following represent only some suggestion of questions and indicators which may be helpful in managing an evaluation. In preparing the SOW it may be useful, or at times appropriate, for the project officer to consult this list or select other issues and indicators that match the objectives of the grant in order to ensure that the evaluation is well planned.

B. Institutional Strengthening Questions

- o What is the PVO's progress towards institutionalization?
- o Does the grantee's portfolio of activities make sense?
- o Does the grantee have and utilize a monitoring and evaluation system?
- o Does the grantee have a program officer or someone else who is responsible for providing policy direction to the field?
- o How does the PVO make programmatic decisions?
- o What are the grantee's criteria for selecting
- o participating countries?
- o What was the grantee's range of activities before the
- o grant was awarded?
- o Where are the documents essential for evaluation?

C. Income-generating Project Questions and Indicators

- o Ability to calculate profit
- o Separation and maintenance of working capital
- o Regular use of records
- o Ability to analyze records to make business decisions
- o Effective policies and methods for debtor control
- o Ability to set prices
- o Marketing strategy
- o Setting and implementing practical business plans
- o Depreciation
- o Integration of enterprises with other local economic activities.

D. Health Project Questions and Indicators
(Note: Child Survival projects have standard guidelines)

- o Household characteristics and demographics
- o Number of people benefitting from project services
- o Causes (etiology)
- o Treatments

- o Regular record keeping
- o Use of health resources
- o Quality of services
- o Training of service providers
- o Education and outreach events form mothers, children, etc.
- o Courses held
- o Improved diet
- o Morbidity rates
- o Incidence of malnutrition

E. Agriculture Project Questions and Indicators

- o Number of farmers in the project
- o New crops/varieties
- o Effectiveness of extension efforts
- o Increased value of production
- o Acres planted
- o Post harvest records
- o Market studies
- o Access to means of production
- o Return on labor
- o Other commerce Credit fund activity
- o Average monthly visits per farmer by project staff

F. **Environment and Natural Resources Management Project** Questions and Indicators

- o Number of workshops held for adults, youth, school programs
- o Number of pamphlets, slide presentation produced
- o Number of hectares reforested
- o Number of seedlings produced
- o Number of seedling planted
- o Plant survival rates
- o Number of people trained in workshops
- o Number of hectares put under community management

ANNEX 2:

DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Agency for International Development. Evaluation Handbook. A.I.D.Program Design and Methodology Report No. 7. Washington, D.C.: A.I.D.,April, 1987.

Agency for International Development. Design and Evaluation of A.I.D.-Assisted Projects. Washington, D.C.: OPM, November 1980.

Agency for International Development Guidelines for Data Collection, Monitoring, and Evaluation Plans for A.I.D.-Assisted Projects. Program Design Methodology Report No. 9. Washington, D.C.: A.I.D.,April, 1987.

Agency for International Development. "Guidelines for Monitoring and Evaluating Child Survival Programs in Developing Countries". Washington, D.C.: A.I.D./FVA/PVC, July, 1990.

Anderson, Mary B. "Generic Questions For PVO Evaluations". Washington, D.C.: A.I.D./FVA/PVC, January, 1983.

PACT. Monitoring and Evaluating Small Business Projects, A Step by Step Guide for Private Development Organizations. New York, N.Y.: PACT, 1987.

World Bank. Guidelines for the Design of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems for Agriculture and Rural Development Projects. Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1989.