



Final Report

REVISION OF PROGRAM DESIGN & EVALUATION SEMINAR

Submitted to:

PPC/PDRE/PE
Agency for International Development
Washington, D. C.

Contract #AID/otr-C-1387
Work Order I

March 1977

GROUP SEVEN ASSOCIATES, INC.
815 KING STREET, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314 USA (703) 548-1878

BEST AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

RECOMMENDATIONS 1

INTRODUCTION 2

ACTIVITIES 6

MATERIALS 21

APPENDICES 37

ATTACHMENTS

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to achieve an upgraded Program Design & Evaluation Seminar (PDES), G7 recommends:

1. that the evaluation component be enlarged and, to some extent, conceptually disengaged from the design component.
2. that, to that end, the series of HEPTAR Fertilizer (HFC) Evaluation Workshops be incorporated as a regular element of the PDES.
3. that participant feedback data be collected so as to complete the analysis presented in Figure 1.
4. that greater distinction be drawn in the appropriate lectures between evaluating the design of a project (i.e., the tenability of its assumptions, its internal logic, and the salience of the need the project is to meet) and evaluating the implementation of a project.
5. that an exercise be included in the appropriate design lecture to illustrate the effect of multiplicative probabilities of assumptions.
6. that PDES participant groups be constituted more homogeneously so that the level of presentation could be more appropriate for more people at any given time.
7. that the existing Role Playing Simulation Exercise be revamped to come after the four Evaluation Workshops and to simulate a post-evaluation "Mission Director's Briefing," with the various "Evaluation

Teams" presenting the outline of their reports and their recommendations for the HFC project to him and being questioned by "him," his "Program Officer" and the "Agricultural Specialist."

8. that greater emphasis be given in evaluation lectures to the practical advantages of formative (i.e., earlier) over summative (i.e., post facto) evaluations.
9. that greater recognition be incorporated in lectures of the fact that varying degrees of precision vis-a-vis evaluations may be called for at different times, depending on purpose and circumstances.
10. that specific skill objectives be specified and made clear at the beginning of each seminar. G7 identified the following list in consultation with PPC: PDES graduates will be able to:
 - review and critique designs prepared by others,
 - prepare a project design using the log frame matrix,
 - identify appropriate data collection systems,
 - specify appropriate statistical methods to be applied,
 - state rules for causality or association with the log frame,
 - make logically consistent recommendations for improving evaluation designs, and
 - specify a scope of work for an evaluation

INTRODUCTION

1. The objective of Work Order No. 1 under Contract No. AID/otr-C-1387 was to recommend and produce materials for "an upgraded Program Design and Evaluation Seminar (PDES), to be used as a vehicle for obtaining:

- A. For senior AID officials, adequate conceptual skills to supervise the effective application of AID design and evaluation methodology, and
- B. For operational staff, adequate conceptual and technical skills to design, review, and evaluate projects in accordance with Agency qualitative standards of analytical rigor."

The internal name assigned to the Work Order in Group Seven (G7) was VALSEM.

2. The elements of the Scope of Work were tasks such as: preparing, identifying, elaborating, presenting, revising, amplifying, omitting, analyzing, and delivering.
3. These work tasks were highly contingent on each other (as well as on circumstances) and thus were difficult to specify beforehand with much precision. However, close and frequent interaction between G7 project staff and PPC assured that the underlying objective of the Work Order was being served at all times.

4. As output indications for the effectiveness of VALSEM, we established rather early the schema shown in Figure 1. Some definitions:

E_{T_1} = Time one (i.e., pre-training) of existing PDES

R_{T_2} = Time two (i.e., post-training) of revised PDES

X = Mean questionnaire response

> = "greater than" at the 10% level of statistical significance

Some necessary assumptions:

- a. The participation sample to be measured in the revised PDES is closely comparable to the sample of 28 participants in the June 76 PDES on whom the "baseline" data are based.
 - b. $X_y = X_z$, i.e., their expectations are equal.
 - c. The job functions of the two samples are equal.
5. Existing PDES data has been collected and is presented in this report.

Fig. 1. VALSEM EVALUATION DESIGN

<u>Indicators</u>	Existing PDES		Revised PDES	
	E^{T1}	E^{T2}	R^{T1}	R^{T2}
Expectations	X_Y		X_Z	
Extent to which Expectations were met		X_A		X_B
Self-Perceived Skill level	X_C	X_D	X_E	X_F
Perceived Relevance to Job functions		X_G		X_H
Expected Retention		X_I		X_J

Targets

PDES revision is successful if, and to the extent that:

1. $X_B > X_A$
2. $(X_F - X_E) > (X_D - X_C)$ and $(X_F - X_E) > 0$
3. $X_H > X_G$
4. $X_J > X_I$

ACTIVITIES

1. The two G7 Research Assistants went through the PDES as participant-observers beginning April 19, 1976, thus gaining good insight into the content, the teaching methodology and the students' response and participation. (The Team Leader had attended the PDES in Fall, 1975.)
2. In close conjunction with PPC staff, a long list of potential source persons and materials were identified. Some of these were mainly for inputs to the revised outline/syllabus, others for inputs to the preparation of new seminar elements, and some for both purposes. The source persons consulted were:

William Alli	PHA/PRS
Robert Berg	PPC/PIAS
Dan Creedon	PM/MD
Judy Gilmore	PHA/PVC
Mike Guido	PM/MD
A. C. Handly	PPC/DPRE
H. C. Ladenheim	TA/PPU
William Lefes	ASIA/DP
Irving Licht	AFR/DP
Delbert Myren	AA/TA
Bill Pooler	Syracuse University
Gerald Schwab	LA evaluation staff LA/DP
Joan Silver	NE/DP
Molly Hageboeck	PCI, reference on "networking to causal process"
Joe Wholey	Urban Institute, Director of Evaluation
Irv Piliavin	Univ. of Wisconsin, Prof. of Program Evaluation
Bill Siffin	MUCIA
Peter Delp	211D Grant Advisor to Dan Creedon
Dick Blue and Jim Weaver	Development Studies Program

3. The source documents reviewed were:

AID Project Evaluation Guidelines
AID Use of Development Indicators
The evaluation of general files, 1969-1975.
"Evaluation Research, Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness,"
Carol H. Weiss, 1972.
"The Use of Social Science Techniques in Project Design," Bernstein.
An Evaluation of the Program Design and Evaluation Seminar (PDE) of the
Agency for International Development by Development Alternatives.

Seminar Redesign -- written responses
Horizontal Expansion of the AID Evaluation System by Practical
Concepts, Inc.

"Social Experimentation, A method for planning and evaluation of
social intervention," Riechen and Boruch

Evaluation Handbook, Vols. I & II

"Preliminary Design of an Evaluation Methodology Beyond the
Specific Project Level"

Report QAD-A-127, ATC, Benhart et al.

"Design and Management of a Program Evaluation" U.S. Civil
Service.

4. Sixteen formal meetings (or 1.5 meetings per month plus numerous informal contacts) were held between cognizant PPC and G7 staff from 13 April 1976 to 28 February 1977. (Specific dates are given as Appendix 1.)
5. At early meetings, the interaction options between PPC & G7 were presented and discussed as follows:

AID assigns and G7 executes.

G7 proposes -- AID accepts or rejects.

Aid proposes -- G7 critiques.

It was agreed that different role models suited different phases of the Work Order.

6. The following substantive issues were developed and discussed for guidance of VALSEM activities.

(1) Training Method vs. Content. Attention to content is PPC's first priority in upgrading the PDES; revision of training methodology, (including presentation strategy and tactics) is secondary.

(2) Behavioral Objectives vs. Intellectual Goals. Although the importance of attaining behavioral objectives is recognized, this should not be done at the cost of attaining intellectual goals.

(3) Differential Behavioral Objectives for Various Subgroups vs. the Omnibus Approach. Although G7 would like to recommend seminar division into two or three distinct yet interconnected subgroups (based on recommendations from PDES responses and interviews) this was deemed impractical and it was stipulated that the seminar would retain its present structure and focus on one general audience.

- (4) Emphasis on Lectures vs. Workshops. Although the necessity for workshop revision and expansion is recognized (many PDES respondents criticize the lack of practical training) it was stipulated that this not be done at the expense of lecture content.
 - (5) Feedback Questionnaire. G7 is to gather some participant feedback data "before and after" PDES revision as a rudimentary "evaluation."
 - (6) What Parts of the Analytic Seminar to Cull for PDES. Herb Turner will specify which, if any, parts of the analytic seminar will be incorporated in the PDES.
 - (7) AID/W vs. Mission Needs. Field needs are deemed the most important objectives to satisfy in the PDES.
 - (8) Establishing "Junction Boxes" between PPT and Log Frame. The benefits of interfacing PPT networking techniques with the log frame methodology was recognized.
 - (9) Data Analysis. Increased emphasis to evaluation design and data analysis is indicated.
7. The principal activity of this Work Order wound up to be the development of four new workshops dealing with project evaluation for incorporation into the PDES. The four workshops simulate various segments of evaluation work as follows:
- Workshop A: Evaluation Planning at the Project Paper Stage.
 - B. Formulating the Terms of Reference and Specifications for a (subsequent) Project Evaluation.
 - C. Data Collection and Analysis.
 - D. Synthesis and Evaluation Report Formulation.
8. The Heptar materials are based on an actual AID project. All names have been fictionalized and certain alterations were made to fit the sequential workshop requirements and to serve training needs. Thus, we chose a middle course between realism and pedagogy.
9. The development of the workshop materials and procedures went through several iterations consisting of: preparing materials (G7 in-house,

try-out, revision), submission to PPC, try-out on experimental subgroups in regular PDES, revision, and so on.

Tryouts were held as part of the following PDES's:

Sept. 1976
Dec. 1976
Jan. 1977

10. Progress and interim reports were submitted as follows:

Progress Reports	17 May 1976
Interim Report I	15 July 1976
Interim Report II	17 August 1976
Status Report	29 November 1976
Presentation Report	27 December 1976
Participant Feedback Report	7 February 1977
Proposed Schedule for PDES including 4 new Workshops	10 February 1977

11. The entire set of four Evaluation Workshops was pilot tested for the first time on nine Senior AID participants in the January 1977 PDES. A narrative description of those workshops is at the end of this section.
12. Participant feedback data was collected on the 28 participants in the June 76 PDES. The questionnaire is given as Appendix 2. The data were analyzed and yielded the following quantitative results:

Extent to which Expectations were met ($=X_A$ in Figure 1)

<u>No. of Trainees</u>	
Virtually Zero	0
About 20%	3
About 40%	5
About 60%	8
About 80%	7
Virtually 100%	<u>1</u>
No. of Respondants	24

Mean = X_A = 58.33%

Self-perceived skill level (=X_C and X_D in Figure 1)

Topic	Pre- Training Mean	Post- Training Mean	Perceived Growth
	X _C D	X _D	
Logical framework design	2.00 ^{1/}	2.77	+ .77
Specification for an Evaluation scope of work	2.14	2.60	+ .46
Identification of data collection methods	2.39	2.54	+ .15
Data Analysis Methodology	2.07	2.60	+ .53
Identifying verifiable indicators	2.32	2.92	+ .60
Project Performance Tracking/Networking	1.93	2.42	+ .49
Determining Association and/or Causality	2.32	2.79	+ .47
Social Impact Analysis	1.92	2.19	+ .26

Expected retention of knowledges and skills 9 months hence.

<u>No. of Trainees</u>		Mean = X _I = 73.60
Almost all	8	
About 80%	7	
About 60%	5	
About 40%	4	
About 20%	1	
Virtually nothing	<u>0</u>	
No. of Respondants	25	

The analysis on participant expectation is reported as Appendix 3.

<u>1/</u> Scale:	4	3	2	1
	Extremely Skilled	Moderately Skilled	Slightly Skilled	Rather Weak

13. In the December 1976 and January 1977 PDES, participant feedback of the pilot group was recorded on the form presented as Appendix 4. The results of the key question asking respondents to compare the experimental workshop(s) to the rest of the seminar are given here:

Comparison of G7 Workshops with Other Seminar Elements:

	<u>No. of Responses</u>		<u>Percent</u>	
	<u>Dec 76</u>	<u>Jan 77</u>	<u>Dec 76</u>	<u>Jan 77</u>
Much less useful than rest of seminar	0	0	0%	0%
+ Somewhat less useful than rest of seminar	2	1	10%	11%
Neutral	3	-		0%
Somewhat more useful than rest of seminar	7	2	35%	22%
Much more useful than rest of seminar	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>40%</u>	<u>67%</u>
TOTALS	20	9	100%	100%

Narrative Description of Workshops

Evaluation Workshop A: Parts I & II

Objective for Part I : To review, critique and reformulate, as necessary, the evaluation elements in a draft project design log frame matrix.

Time: February 1, 1977, 12:40 - 5:00

No. of Participants: Nine (plus Herbert Turner, as observer)

Methods: Lecture, Q & A, trainee participation, discussion

Procedure: In order to prime the participants for the workshop activities, Dr. Fiks opened the workshop session with a lecture on "Concepts in Evaluation." The hour-long lecture covered the following evaluation concepts: Evaluation Study Method as a Variable; Evaluation as a Comparison; Project Success as a Variable; Alternative Definitions of Success; and The Phases of Evaluation.

At 1:40, the participants were given the Heptar Background data. They were then given the "Draft Log Frame Matrix" and asked to individually critique the log frame paying special attention to columns 2 & 3 -- the Indicators and Means of Verification. The assumed time for Workshop A is September 1975. There was some discussion at this point as some of the participants felt hemmed in by having to concentrate on the two columns and preferred discussing the log

frame matrix as a whole. (Consequently, the instructor spent a great deal of time explaining the need to focus in on the Indicator and MOV columns of the log frame.) "Considerations for Evaluating the Log Frame at the Project Design Stage" was the Workshop Guide against which the participants were to critique the Draft Log Frame.

After discussing the individual and group solution to amending the draft log frame matrix, the participants were handed the Workshop Standard Solution. The group recessed at 3:40 to reconvene at 4:00 for Part II of Evaluation Workshop A.

Evaluation Workshop A: Part II:

Objective for Part II: To develop an appropriate Evaluation Plan, at the PP stage of project design, based on information learned from seminar lecture; activities of Part I of this workshop, Standard Log Frame Matrix; PPT network chart and narrative, and background information.

The participants were given 15 minutes to individually plan an evaluation(s) based on a workshop guide, "Evaluation Parameters" and the other workshop materials. At 4:15 the leader outlined the Evaluation Parameters on a flip chart and discussed the individual solutions to developing the evaluation

plan(s). The various solutions were compared and discussed, the leader then handed out the workshop Standard Solution stressing that there was no "right" solution, but rather a "standard" was necessary for continuity in the ensuing workshops. The workshop ended at 5PM.

Workshop B

Training Objective: To plan the scope of work and specify other details for a project evaluation.

Time: 1:10 - 4:40, February 2, 1977

No. of Participants: Nine (plus Herbert Turner)

Methods: Trainee participation and discussion

Procedure: The workshop opened with a 30-minute lecture by Dr. Fiks concerning a "Case History on Assumptions."

At 1:35, the participants were asked to refer to the: Standard Log Frame, Background Information, and Standard Evaluation Plan from Evaluation Workshop A. They were then given a Situation Report and divided into groups of two and threes and asked to design a detailed Scope of Work and specifications for the current, September 1978 evaluation. After reading the situation report and a brief discussion, the groups went at 2:00 to individual rooms to complete their assignments. The participants reconvened at 3:00 to discuss their findings. As with Evaluation Workshop A, their findings were compared to a "Standard Solution." The workshop ended at 4:40.

Evaluation Workshop C

Training Objective:

To collect data on specified indicators at the output, purpose and/or subgoal levels.

To analyze the verbal data and reduce the quantitative data found, as appropriate.

Time:

February 3, 1977.. The workshop started at 11:25 and lasted until 5PM.

Trainees:

Eight (senior AID employees) PDES participants.

Method:

Trainee participation, lecture, questions and answers.

Materials:

Evaluation slides, Evaluation Specifications, Complete files of HTC, MOA, Heptar USAID mission and the Heptar Meteorological Institute.

Procedure:

The workshop objectives and procedures were explained at the beginning of the session (11:25), after which the trainees formed subgroups of two and three and set about the task of collecting data on the indicators identified in the evaluation specification. Data collection took place in different rooms. At approximately 12:25, the subgroups reconvened to discuss their progress before breaking for lunch. According to the group, there were no significant problems in carrying out their task.

The subgroups were asked to resume their data collection efforts at 1:30 (after lunch) and to reconvene as a group at 3:00 to discuss their findings.

The group was also told to pay particular attention to the rain data contained in the files of the Heptar Meterological Institute, because the rain was an external factor which would be examined for significance in Workshop D. The group reconvened at 3:10 p.m. to discuss their findings. A person from each subgroup (subgroups A, B, and C) reported the findings and the workshop assistant recorded the findings on the board.

In most instances, the findings were the same; however, there were situations wherein the finding was different.

- . This was due to the different interpretations of the output statements and the output indicators.

A very good discussion evolved from this exercise. Evaluation slide "Evaluation as a Comparison" was used. At approximately 4:10, the workshop leader, Dr. Alfred Fiks, started to lecture on the use of basic statistics for determining the significance of differences in a project.

The following topics were touched and illustrated:

1. Pros and cons of the mean as an indication of average.
2. Useful characteristics of the standard deviation.
3. The chi-square test of contingency between two factors.
4. Using the t-test for interpretation of a difference between two means.

Evaluation Workshop D

Training Objective: To carry out statistical hypothesis tests.
Formulate recommendations for Phase II Project Redesign.
Write a draft evaluation report in outline form.

Time: 9:15 - noon (approximately), February 4, 1977.

Workshop Leader: Alfred Fiks

Workshop Assistant: Irene G. Miles-Prescott

Trainees: Nine (Senior AID employees) PDES participants

Method: Trainee participation, lecture, questions and answers.

Materials: Evaluation Slides, Heptar Meteorological Institute files and flip chart.

Procedure: The workshop leader explained the objectives of Workshop D and the procedures which would be followed. Afterwards, he explained that the participants were to carry out a statistical hypothesis test to determine the importance of rainfall in the decrease of wheat production. The workshop leader then explained how this was to be executed using the rainfall tables and the t-test.

Approximately forty-five minutes (9:15 - 10:00) were used illustrating how one could use the t-test to

interpret the rainfall data. After questions about the illustrations were answered, the group formed sub-groups of two and three and proceeded to answer the question of the importance of rainfall in the decrease of wheat production. The sub-groups were asked to reconvene as a group at 10:50. When the 3 sub-groups reconvened, they were asked to write on sheets of paper (which were taped to the walls around the room) their Recommendations based upon the results of the tests and the synthesis achieved in Workshop C, as well as to outline their Evaluation Report.

At 11:15 each subgroup (A, B, and C) presented their recommendations and the rationale to the entire Workshop. Attached are those recommendations and the structure, in outline form, of their evaluation report. These outlines were also discussed, compared and criticized.

The group was asked to complete a feedback questionnaire on the four workshops developed by G7. The workshop ended at approximately 12:00 noon.

MATERIALS

1. Five transparencies for an Evaluation Concepts lecture are submitted as Attachment 1.
2. Lesson scripts to accompany the above are presented at the end of this section.
3. Evaluation Workshops A, B, C, and D materials are given in Appendix 5.
4. Much material had to be "dummied up" to constitute the information pool from which trainees could collect data in Workshop C. Among the items developed were:
 - . Number of Farmers Per Size Class of Area Fertilized and Total Fertilizer Application Per Class. USEAGE -- Baseline for comparison.
 - . HFC Distribution Network
USEAGE -- To illustrate location of farmer population, and location of retail outlets.
 - . Agrochemical and Small Farm Equipment Department Procedures
USEAGE -- Operating procedures established for that particular department.
 - . Fertilizer Recommendations -- complies with indicator in log frame.
 - . Report of DAP Procurement for HFC -- indicator of top management competence in business transactions.
 - . Inventory Report (Figures) covering a 5-year period to illustrate if indicator has been achieved.
 - . Business Letters -- Heptar top management conducting business.
 - . Overall Summary of Accomplishments During Contract Period -- Baseline for comparison.
 - . HFC Fertilizer Sales by Regions -- will complement the distribution network and its shortcomings.
 - . Monthly (1) Progress Report -- of no value.
 - . Profit and Loss Statement for 27 months of HFC operation -- Baseline.
 - . Chart illustrating small wheat farmer use of fertilizer -- will verify or disprove project level indicator.
 - . Map of Distribution Network.

5. A Revised PDES Outline is given in Appendix 6.
6. Commentary on "Program Evaluation in AID: Lessons Learned," July 1976.
 - a. That document is an "attempt to summarize a few of the principles, methods, and operational lessons learned in program evaluation..."

On page 1, lines 11-13, program evaluation is defined as "the retrospective analysis of experience to see if (AID) achieved (its) stated objectives and to determine how and why it happened."

In light of Group Seven's work order with PPC to "redesign the Program Design and Evaluation Seminar" and specifically those parts pertaining to evaluation planning and implementation, we would like to submit our critique and reaction to "Lessons Learned."

- b. Definition of Evaluation. Although the discussion on evaluation is initiated by defining "program evaluation" the body of the paper repeatedly uses the term "program" interchangeably with project. We believe this confuses the discussion of evaluation as the distinction between program and project evaluation is never made. Consequently, the uninformed reader is led to believe they are synonymous while the reader familiar with evaluation concepts and implementation is confused as to the discussion of the paper.

G7 understands project evaluation to be the primary concern of AID in its Program Design and Evaluation Seminars. Program evaluation deals more with sector analysis and may incorporate various project evaluations within its scope. To date, this latter type of evaluation is done primarily by AID/W and thus is not a primary focus of the PDES or of major concern to the majority of AID officers.

PPC might be well advised to revise the definition of project evaluation as well in the beginning of the paper. Indicate that both types will be discussed and define their differences. Point out in the body of the paper where the discussion relates to program evaluation and where it relates to project evaluation, where appropriate give examples. Moreover, since there are different evaluation types within these major categories, define the types as they relate to each aspect of AID evaluation -- program and project.

c. Methodological Process and Distinction between Evaluations Types/Purposes.

Although evaluation is the theme of "Lessons Learned" a system through which an evaluation may be conducted is never defined. Mention is made of evaluation types, i.e., formative vs. summative, however the distinction of the evaluation process in these different types is never discussed. If there is no difference in the evaluation process, then it should be so stated; if, on the other hand, a difference does exist, it should be noted and the differences defined. Furthermore, the person(s)/agency responsible for the evaluation should be identified.

The discussion of different evaluation types/purposes should be so identified. Thus, on page 3, paragraph 1 would begin "Performance Evaluation. An integral element in project management is the evaluation of project performance or effectiveness. It includes...." On page 4, paragraph 2 would begin: "Impact/Significance Evaluation. A device for improving resource allocation and program management is impact/significance evaluation. It consists largely of centrally managed..." Similarly on the bottom of page 4, paragraph 3, would begin: "Ex post Evaluation..."

d. Distinction between centralized and decentralized evaluation.

Consistent with the recommendations in the preceding paragraph, the distinctions between centralized and decentralized evaluations should be spelled out. Who manages the different kinds and who is responsible for their review should also be identified.

e. Inclusion of PPT data/time element. At no time is the Project

Performance Tracking Network (PPT) system discussed. G7 believes this is a serious omission and should be included in "The Preconditions for Evaluation: The inclusion of the PPT system is important as the pre-scheduled yearly evaluations should coincide with critical points to be met in the life cycle of the project. With regard to other evaluations, it is important that the timing of the evaluation consider critical points on the PPT. The PPT incorporates an element of time not available in the log frame matrix.

f. Distinction between evaluation of log frame design and program results.

In the "Preconditions for Evaluation," six and a half pages are devoted to discussing the design of the log frame matrix. While G7 agrees with importance of good project design in helping perform good evaluations, we disagree with the amount of space devoted to the concepts of project design under the aforementioned heading. While the design of the log frame is indeed one precondition to evaluation, it most certainly is not the only one. Definitely the PPT network system should be discussed. We believe this emphasis on project design as the only precondition for evaluation helps to further the confusion between the evaluation of the log frame design and the evaluation of the project results -- two very distinct forms of evaluation. The time for discussing the evaluation of

a project design is in a discussion of log frame formulation and not in a discussion of "Lessons Learned in Program Evaluation. Moreover, this section should most certainly include information on how to evaluate a project that does not have a log frame and does not have targeted indicators.

- g. Terminological confusion -- e.g., "goal" as in goal achievement model does not equal "goal" in log frame; formative, summative and post facto evaluation; systems evaluation model.
7. An Evaluation Planning Aid was developed and is presented as Appendix 7.

PROGRAM DESIGN & EVALUATION SEMINAR

Lesson No:
Title: Evaluation Concepts



Instructor Notes

Lesson Script

One of the most straightforward definitions of what evaluation is is also one of the most expressive. We can define evaluation as: the procedures by which a project or program is studied to ascertain the extent of its success.

It is a definition which is straight forward because it is understandable even to laymen. It is accurate and expressive in that it points out that evaluation can be carried out by various procedures and it states that success is a matter of degree.

First, let us develop the last thought a little more thoroughly. Normally, we speak of projects which are successes or successful on the one hand and projects which are failures or marginal on the other hand. If one were to picture such a distribution of projects plotted as we have just characterized on a scale of success, the shape would be bimodal with a large hump at the low end of the scale representing failures and another large hump toward the high end of the scale representing the successes with few cases in between. Careful analysis would suggest, however, that how we think of projects as either successes or failures is probably due to the

PROGRAM DESIGN & EVALUATION SEMINAR

Lesson No:

Title: Evaluation Concepts



Instructor Notes

Lesson Script

anecdotal. One cannot, in general, base important decisions on evaluation results generated by such procedures.

At the highest point on the scale, we have evaluation research which requires a rigorous research design. It requires deliberate attention to the matters of validity and reliability of the measurements. It requires systematic sampling. It requires loads of quantitative data. The purpose of evaluation research is not to make recommendations to project staff, but rather is to allow for attribution and for adding to social science and economic and social development knowledge. It seeks to explain. The report of an evaluation research study should be publishable in professional journals. It may, for example, concern itself with the attempt to demonstrate whether furnishing agricultural technical advisors and establishing agricultural credit programs and facilitating fertilizer use, indeed has an effect on the standard and quality of life of small farmers in country X. Thus it would test empirically and scientifically what exists on a logical plane in the log frame. The general approach in attempting to test such an

PROGRAM DESIGN & EVALUATION SEMINAR

Lesson No:

Title: Evaluation Concepts



Instructor Notes

Lesson Script

hypothesis would require either a long-term longitudinal design, with the research study beginning during the life of a project but extending long beyond its termination, or a design which is cross-sectional in that it deals with a number of different projects with parallel input, purpose, and goal-level objectives. The hypotheses are then framed in a generic way so as to be able to utilize data from all the various projects. Clearly in the way we have defined evaluation research, it should be centrally funded, centrally organized, and centrally utilized.

The middle category, what we call here project evaluation, is the category of most general interest to international development workers. The rigor of the procedures differs from monitoring in that it is more systematic, more thorough, includes specific questions and hypotheses and reports only verified information. It differs from evaluation research in that the purpose is not adding to knowledge or explication but rather problem identification and formulation of recommendations to improve the probability of success for the project.

Transparency 2 off

PROGRAM DESIGN & EVALUATION SEMINAR



Lesson No:

Title: Evaluation Concepts

Instructor Notes	Lesson Script
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Uncover Process and Effort lines</p>	<p>function of effectiveness and the "ripple effect" so that it is also theoretically possible for small projects to achieve impact ultimately.</p> <p>The efficiency definition would require us to have a project in which the costs are commensurate with the benefits reaped, before one can claim any degree of success. The difficulties in quantifying project costs accurately (i.e., including negative costs), to say nothing of the problems in quantifying the value of planned and unplanned benefits yielded are well known. In some projects this type of evaluation is clearly more feasible than in others.</p> <p>A definition of success which deals with efforts exerted exclusively, <input type="checkbox"/> (such as in a health program, the number of beds set up or the number of man-hours of medical personnel provided) is an additional option. That definition of success fits in best with a monitoring procedure and would be insufficient, by itself, for a project evaluation or an evaluation research study. However, if we consider what is called <u>process</u> here, then we are very much in the project evaluation procedure. What is alluded to with this heading is the <u>process</u> of applying the</p>

PROGRAM DESIGN & EVALUATION SEMINAR



Lesson No:

Title: Evaluation Concepts

Instructor Notes	Lesson Script
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Uncover remainder of the transparency</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Transparency 3 off</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Transparency 4 on</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Point to B, A, or C as appropriate</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Point to E</p>	<p>inputs: How inputs are being inputted and why that process is or is not working. It is a definition of evaluation with great utility in early stages of projects when there is still time to make corrections in the process of implementing inputs.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The most frequent definition of success used in AID project evaluation is the <u>effectiveness</u> of performance of project. This requires looking primarily at the outputs and sometimes the purpose level of the designs to determine whether objectives have been reached. When success is defined in this way you are in a situation where the judgment will <u>always</u> be a comparative one. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If the evaluation focus is effectiveness, you will be comparing where your project is now</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> with where you were at the beginning;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> or where you are now with where you are supposed to be; <input type="checkbox"/> or where you are now with where some <u>other</u> group or some <u>other</u> area is now that has <u>not</u> received the presumed benefit of your intervention. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Question: Can the amount of change produced, i.e. B-A be legitimately ascribed to the project?</p>

PROGRAM DESIGN & EVALUATION SEMINAR



Lesson No:
Title: Evaluation Concepts

Instructor Notes	Lesson Script
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Transparency 4 off</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Transparency 5 on Uncover title and 1st line only</p>	<p>Answer: No, not unless observations D and E are available from a control area <u>without</u> the development project <u>and</u> either B is significantly greater than E (assuming A & D were equal at the beginning) or otherwise that B-A is a greater amount of change than is E-D. As a rule in AID projects such control data do not exist. Therefore, the issue of causality and ascription is always moot until and unless a more rigorous and costlier and lengthier evaluation research project is undertaken. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Let us turn to identifying the various time points for the AID evaluation process in general, and for a specific project evaluation. <input type="checkbox"/> We indicate here that <u>early</u> attention must be given to evaluation at the project design stage. In terms of the log frame, the evaluation considerations will be those of columns 2 and 3, namely the Indicator column as well as the Means of Verification. If these are inadequate, or unrealistic in the project design, it will make subsequent evaluations difficult. In addition to that, and still at the project design stage, some attention needs to be given in a general way to how many evaluations and at what points</p>

PROGRAM DESIGN & EVALUATION SEMINAR

Lesson No:

Title: Evaluation Concepts



Instructor Notes

Lesson Script

Uncover all of transparency

evaluator must give some thought to methods of recording and reduction of the information.

The subsequent step is to analyze and synthesize the information collected in line with the guidance provided by the terms of reference for the evaluation and aimed toward formulation of recommendations to be used by project decision makers. The resulting project evaluation report should be written lucidly and keyed, insofar as possible, to the kinds of options and decisions which await the outcome of the evaluation.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Valsem Meetings W/AID - Turner, et al

May 3 1976

June 2 1976

June 3 1976

June 24 1976

June 28 1976

July 30 1976

Aug 12 1976

Aug 18 1976

Oct 5 1976

Oct 14 1976

Nov 24 1976

Nov 29 1976

Nov 30 Zigler & G7

Jan 6 1977

Jan 13 1977

Feb 7 1977

APPENDIX 2
 GROUP SEVEN
 PDES Participant Questionnaire
 14 June 1976

Please do not sign your name to this form. (The usefulness of the conclusions from this survey will be directly related to the accuracy and candor of your answers.)

1. Right now, how skilled or unskilled do you consider yourself to be in each of the following activities? Please be candid. Mark an X in the appropriate cell.

	<u>Extremely Skilled</u> (Am able to teach others)	<u>Moderately Skilled</u> (Am able to do it without help)	<u>Slightly Skilled</u> (Can do it but need help on occasion)	<u>Rather Weak</u> (Can do it given detailed instructions)
Logical framework design				
Specification for an Evaluation scope of work				
Identification of data collection methods				
Data Analysis Methodology				
Identifying verifiable indicators				
Project Performance Tracking/Networking				
Determining Association and/or Causality				
Social Impact Analysis				

2. Right now, what do you consider to be the most serious problem(s) one has to deal with in designing a project? (If you have no idea, check here:)

- A. _____
- B. _____
- C. _____

3. Right now, what do you consider to be the most serious problem(s) one has to deal with in evaluating a project? (If you have no idea, check here:)

- A. _____
- B. _____
- C. _____

4. Hypothetically, if this seminar could be "customized" to fit the background and requirements of each participant, what would you like to get from it most?
- A. _____
- B. _____
- C. _____
5. Realistically, what (if anything) do you expect to learn in this seminar that you don't already know? (If your answer is "nothing", please check here: ☐)
- A. _____
- B. _____
- C. _____
6. How would you describe the extent, if any, of your past experience in project design?
- None Minimal Moderate Extensive
7. How would you describe the extent, if any, of your past experience in project evaluation?
- Extensive Moderate Minimal None
8. What is your present position title or major function? _____
9. Location of current work assignment (check one)
- Overseas
- AID/W
- Other (Specify) _____
10. Who is your present employer?
- AID U.S. state or local government agency
- Other U.S. Government agency Private firm
- Private voluntary agency International agency
- Other country Government Other (Specify) _____

Thank you for your cooperation. Your answers may indeed make a difference.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

APPENDIX 3

PDES Participant Questionnaire Responses

14 June, 1976

Question # 4 Overseas Subjects

Hypothetically, if this seminar could be "customized" to fit the background and requirements of each participant, what would you like to get from it most?

Subject #	A	B	C
1	No response	No response	No response
2	No response	No response	No response
3	General concept of program design and evaluation	No response	No response
4	To become extremely skilled in log frame design upon completion of this course	Upgrading design and evaluation skills	No response
5	Methodology for evaluating a program	Social impact analysis	No response

PDES Participant Questionnaire Responses

14 June, 1976

Questions # 4 AID/W Subjects

Hypothetically, if this seminar could be "customized" to fit the background and requirements of each participant, what would you like to get from it most?

Subject #	A	B	C
6	Better appreciation of world-wide and inter-regional design acceptance of the hierarchy	No response	No response
7	No response	No response	No response
8	Familiarity with required documentation	No response	No response
9	Better instruction in data collection method	Insight into program (project) design	Emphasis on project task orientation
10	Better understanding of cost and impact analysis tools	No response	No response
11	Proper evaluation methods	No response	No response
12	Design of project other than traditional "bi-lateral"	No response	No response
13	A clear understanding of program approval sequences	No response	No response
14	No response	No response	No response
15	No response	No response	No response

PDES Participant Questionnaire Responses

14 June, 1976

Question #4 continued AID/W Subjects

Hypothetically, if this seminar could be "customized" to fit the background and requirements of each participant, what would you like to get from it most?

Subject #	A	B	C
16	Establish basis for proper evaluation creiteria	No response	No response
17	Refresher information	No response	No response
18	Use of log frame	No response	No response
19	Ability to write a program without conflict	No response	No response
20	Design and evaluation techniques	No response	No response
21	Thorough training in use of log frame	Knowledge of PPT system and relationship to other project documentation	Practical experience in log frame use
22	Clear thinking on linkages within project	Some techniques on prying useful information out of project technicians	

PDES Participant Questionnaire Responses

14 June, 1976

Question # 4 "Other" Subjects

Hypothetically, if this seminar could be "customized" to fit the background and requirements of each participant, what would you like to get from it most?

Subject	A	B	C
23	Simple tools to be used by 3rd world project initiators	No response	No response
24	A logical procedure that could apply to any project or even a phase of life in any business	No response	No response
25	Familiarity with AID terminology approaches and techniques	No response	No response
26	Increased skills in making project proposals more specific and relevant	Greater understanding on how evaluation can contribute to a project well designed	No response
27	A strong program design component	No response	No response
28	Analytical techniques common to AID staff	(7) Better quality to expedite analysis function	(8) A better understanding of AID requirements

APPENDIX 4

PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK

G7 Workshop _____ December 1976

1. What you liked best about this workshop:

2. What you liked least about this workshop:

3. Suggestions for this workshop:

4. How this workshop compares with other Seminar elements so far:

- _____ Much less useful than rest of seminar
- _____ Somewhat less useful than rest of seminar
- _____ Somewhat more useful than rest of seminar
- _____ Much more useful than rest of seminar

Comments:

APPENDIX 5

EVALUATION

WORKSHOP

A

Project Design Stage

Part I

Participant Materials

Evaluation Workshop A: Part I

Objective: To review, critique and reformulate, as necessary, the evaluation elements in a draft project design log frame matrix.

Materials:

1. Workshop A, Part I: Objective/Materials/Procedure Sheet
2. Background Data: Heptar Fertilizer Project I
3. "Draft" Log Frame
4. Considerations for Evaluating Log Frame at Project Design Stage
5. "Standard" Log Frame.

Procedure: You will first read the Heptar Background Data. Then, you will receive a "Draft" Log Frame Matrix which you will critique individually against the "Considerations for Evaluating Log Frame at Project Design Stage." The group will then orally discuss the "draft" and proposed changes and reformulate the log frame based on a consensus of necessary additions, deletions, or corrections. The group solution will then be compared to the "Standard" Log Frame. Differences will be discussed.

Assumed Date:
September 1975

BACKGROUND DATA: HEPTAR FERTILIZER PROJECT I

Heptar is one of the least developed countries in the world. A land-locked nation, it encompasses roughly 250,000 square miles of substantially mountainous or arid wasteland. The soils are characteristically sterile as they are high in alkaline and calcium and low in organic matter. Consequently, they are unfavorably suited for high crop production, a problem further magnified by low or intermittent rainfall, occurring primarily in the fall and winter and averaging 10 to 15 inches.

The nation's most important industry is agriculture. The most important crop and staple diet is wheat. Primary exports are livestock, cotton, and sugar. Other important crops include corn, rice, fruits, nuts and barley. More than 80 percent of the population is directly dependent on agriculture. Thus, even though Heptar is not a heavily populated country--population estimates are 16 million with two percent annual increase--the pressure on the arable irrigated land is heavy. Per capita income is less than \$100 per year and as low as \$35 for the rural majority.

The Government of Heptar (GOH) has placed strong emphasis on becoming self-sufficient in agricultural production--especially in wheat--in order to resolve its dire social and economic predicament. The strategy has consisted of encouraging the use of, and making available, fertilizer--Di-amonium phosphate (DAP) and Urea. In 1972, after consultation and advice from international donor agencies, the Heptar Fertilizer Company (HFC) was established as the agency responsible for producing and distributing fertilizer to all parts of the country.

Additionally, HFC plans to include such agricultural products as pesticides, veterinary pharmaceuticals, and sprayers in a distribution system located in every significant farming/market area in Heptar. Moreover, the GOH is subsidizing the price of imported fertilizer to maintain a low price on the chemical fertilizer and thus encourage small farmer use. To wit, 85 percent of fertilizer sales to small farmers is financed through the Agricultural Development Bank.

As a result, fertilizer use has increased, although it is still quite low in the case of subsistence farmers (farmers who plant 10 kyahs (4.8 acres) or less with wheat). Fertilizer is, however, in such short supply that no more than five to eight percent of Heptar's irrigated land can be fertilized each year. Presently, 75 percent of the fertilizer is applied to wheat with the majority of the balance applied to sugar and cotton.

The alternative to not using increasing amounts of commercial fertilizer is the importation of wheat. However, economics are clearly in favor of increased fertilizer use over wheat imports as the cost/benefit ratio is around 3:1 in favor of increased fertilizer use.

USAID ASSISTANCE

AID's involvement in the HFC project, to begin June 1976 and end December 1978, is to assist the GOH to achieve its goal of increasing the income of small subsistence farmer families who account for 70 percent of the population. It is anticipated that increased small farmer income will be achieved through increased agricultural production, which hopefully will be a direct result of the AID project purpose--to increase small farmer use of fertilizer.

The main thrust of the project will be to build a viable, self-sustaining management system within HFC. Improved management capabilities will increase HFC's capacity to procure and distribute both domestically produced and imported fertilizer to farmers. This, in turn, should lead to increased use of fertilizer by small farmers in particular. Concurrently, this will result in higher agricultural yields as additional amounts of fertilizer are applied to the principal crops--wheat, cotton, and sugar beets.

USAID will provide the services of: three advisors for 30 months each, a number of short-term specialists, and contractor home office support as well as participant training. The three advisors and short-term specialists will work with the HFC Executive Committee and will assist in furthering the development of the business capability and efficiency of the company. Additionally, USAID has provided development loans totalling \$27 million for the importation of fertilizer.

In the past, other donor agencies assisted in establishing the management structure at HFC through loans for financing management services (from 1973 to 1975) and through advisory services grants (from 1975 to 1976). A thorough evaluation of HFC operations and performance was carried out by one of the donors in November 1975. The major findings of the evaluation led to a recommendation of additional technical assistance and management training at HFC.

THE GOVERNMENT OF HEPTAR AND HFC CONTRIBUTIONS

The GOH has taken several steps to increase the availability and consumption of fertilizer. There have been sporadic campaigns as well as long-term programs conducted by the Ministry of Agriculture's Extension Service: Fertilizer trials have been conducted, fertilizer production has been subsidized, an Urea plant has been constructed, and a fertilizer credit program has been developed with emphasis on ways to finance small purchases.

Additional GOH contribution to this project consists of:

- Subsidies to HFC operating budget
- Housing for USAID advisors
- The services of one full-time bilingual secretary to the advisory team to type 40 wpm or better
- Administrative support for the foreign advisors and their project activities including, but not limited to, office space and equipment, official transportation, office supplies, road passes, permits, visas, customs clearances for commodities, and translation services
- Trust funds administered by USAID/GOH to cover participant travel costs on government airlines and, as available, funds to pay for U.S. contractor support.

OTHER EXTERNAL SUPPORT

In the past 20 years, there has been considerable foreign assistance in Heptar. As far as fertilizer is concerned, the U.N. Development Program, the Germans, the Japanese, Russians, Iranians, Saudi Arabians, Iraqis and Kuwaitians have all made varying amounts of fertilizer available under a wide variety of concessionary terms, including grants. Such assistance is likely to continue but gradually diminish.

The World Food Program, IBRD, Agricultural Development Bank, and the UNDP have projects underway promoting agricultural credit, cooperative development, irrigation, and rural roads--projects essential to the success of the fertilizer project. However, no donor apart from the U.S. has shown any interest in fertilizer distribution, as such, and is not likely to do so in the foreseeable future. Hence, the USAID involvement.

Project Title & Number: Heptar Fertilizer Project I - #12367

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Program or Sector Goal: The broader objective to which this project contributes: (A-1)</p> <p>To increase small farmer* income.</p> <p>(*Farmers producing 10 or less kyahs (4.8A) to crops)</p> <p><u>Subgoal:</u> To increase agricultural production of small farmers.</p>	<p>Measures of Goal Achievement: (A-2)</p> <p>Beginning in 1976:</p> <p>Annual increases in small farmer purchase of:</p> <p>bicycles - 5% oxen - 3% cloth - 10%</p> <p>Annual increases in small farmer agricultural production by 1978:</p> <p>wheat - at least 3% cotton - at least 10% other - at least 5%</p>	<p>(A-3)</p> <p>USAID/GOH survey of small farmers' living accommodations: 1976, 1977 and 1978.</p> <p>Visual observations.</p> <p>Ministry of Agricultural Reports (MOA).</p> <p>GOH reports.</p> <p>Food Procurement Department Reports.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving goal targets: (A-4)</p> <p>GOH price support programs (in wheat, cotton, and sugar) for small farmers being carried out.</p> <p>Agricultural Development Bank (ADB) will continue to improve its credit program, including credit to small farmers.</p>
<p>Project Purpose: (B-1)</p> <p>To increase small farmers' annual usage of fertilizer.</p>	<p>Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End-of-Project Status: (B-2)</p> <p>1.a. Number of small farmers using fertilizer increased from 33,658 in 1974 to 65,000 in 1978.</p> <p>1.b. Amount of fertilizer sales to small farmers increased from 13,424 MT in 1974 to 24,543 MT in 1978.</p>	<p>(B-3)</p> <p>USAID monitoring of HFC operations.</p> <p>ADB reports.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving purpose: (B-4)</p> <p>No natural disasters or insect infestations.</p> <p>Other donor and GOH agricultural sector activities which impinge upon the project purpose are maintained at current levels of effort and efficiency.</p> <p>HFC plans are economically feasible for small farmer.</p>

Project Title & Number: Heptar Fertilizer Project I - #12367

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Project Outputs: (C-1)</p> <p>1. HFC is independently producing timely, comprehensive, and realistic plans.</p> <p>2. HFC operates without advisory assistance.</p> <p>3. HFC has developed a distribution network with adequate supply and marketing capability.</p>	<p>Magnitude of Output: (C-2)</p> <p>1.a. Plans for 1977 and 1978 prepared and approved before beginning of respective years.</p> <p>1.b. HFC management prepares quarterly progress targets starting June 1977.</p> <p>2. Top management is conducting international business transactions including international fertilizer procurement by September 1978.</p> <p>3.a. Delegations of authority operating effectively.</p> <p>3.b. One or more retailers in each agricultural district.</p> <p>3.c. Warehouses using orderly operational procedures including inventory systems by 1977.</p> <p>3.d. Inventory losses 0.5% of sales by end of 1977.</p> <p>3.e. Procurement at least 6 months ahead of demand by 1977.</p>	<p>(C-3)</p> <p>HFC records and reports.</p> <p>USAID monitoring of HFC operations, USAID evaluation.</p> <p>GOH reports.</p> <p>HFC records and reports.</p> <p>HFC monthly survey of distribution.</p> <p>GOH agricultural extension service records.</p> <p>USAID monitoring of HFC.</p> <p>HFC reports.</p> <p>HFC records and reports.</p> <p>HFC records and reports.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving outputs: (C-4)</p> <p>HFC remains an independent business entity in accordance with the terms of the charter.</p> <p>Small farmer participation in HFC fertilizer distribution program.</p> <p>USAID advisors terminate assistance to HFC by 1978.</p>

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

DRAFT LOG FRAME

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Life of Project: From 1976 to 1978
Total U.S. Funding _____
Date Prepared: _____

Project Title & Number: Heptar Fertilizer Project I - #12367

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Outputs (Cont'd.)</p> <p>3. (cont'd.)</p> <p>4. HFC markets other agricultural inputs.</p>	<p>3.f. Facilities and procedures at regional level adequate to support Fall 1977 sales in all five regional locations.</p> <p>4. By end of 1977, sales regularly include agricultural inputs other than fertilizer, such as pesticides, veterinary supplies, agrochemicals, seeds etc.</p>	<p>HFC records and reports.</p> <p>USAID monitoring.</p> <p>GOH records.</p> <p>HFC records and reports.</p> <p>Sales of other agricultural inputs are \$2 M by 1977 and \$2.5 M by 1978.</p>	

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Life of Project From 1976 to 1978
Total U.S. Funding _____
Date Prepared _____

AND TO BE USED IN THE
EVALUATION

Project Title & Number **Heptar Fertilizer Project I - #12367**

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS																																	
Project Inputs: (D-1)	Implementation Target (Type and Quantity) (D-2)	(D-3)	Assumptions for providing inputs: (D-4)																																	
<p><u>U.S.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advisory Services <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Management & Training b. Financial c. Marketing and Supply (to include international fertilizer procurement) 2. Short-Term Consultants <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Agro-chemicals b. Agricultural Economist c. Training Specialist d. Other 3. Home Office Backstopping Support for Offshore Fertilizer Procurement: 4. USAID Direct Participant Training <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Executive Level Mgmt Training b. Courses in fiscal, agro-chemical, inventory control, marketing, etc. 	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1976</th> <th>1977</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. a.</td> <td>12 mm</td> <td>12 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1. b.</td> <td>12 mm</td> <td>12 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1. c.</td> <td>12 mm</td> <td>12 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. a.</td> <td>6 mm</td> <td>6 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. b.</td> <td>4 mm</td> <td>4 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. c.</td> <td>2 mm</td> <td>2 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. d.</td> <td>4 mm</td> <td>6 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.</td> <td>2 mm</td> <td>2 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. a. U.S.:</td> <td>2 x 4 mm</td> <td>2 x 4mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. b. Third Country:</td> <td>13 x 4 mm</td> <td>13 x 4mm</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		1976	1977	1. a.	12 mm	12 mm	1. b.	12 mm	12 mm	1. c.	12 mm	12 mm	2. a.	6 mm	6 mm	2. b.	4 mm	4 mm	2. c.	2 mm	2 mm	2. d.	4 mm	6 mm	3.	2 mm	2 mm	4. a. U.S.:	2 x 4 mm	2 x 4mm	4. b. Third Country:	13 x 4 mm	13 x 4mm	<p>ProAg signed</p> <p>PIO/T issued</p> <p>Presence of Advisors</p> <p>USAID monitoring of the project</p>	<p>Contract advisors arrive NLT Jan 1977</p> <p>HFC budget approved</p>
	1976	1977																																		
1. a.	12 mm	12 mm																																		
1. b.	12 mm	12 mm																																		
1. c.	12 mm	12 mm																																		
2. a.	6 mm	6 mm																																		
2. b.	4 mm	4 mm																																		
2. c.	2 mm	2 mm																																		
2. d.	4 mm	6 mm																																		
3.	2 mm	2 mm																																		
4. a. U.S.:	2 x 4 mm	2 x 4mm																																		
4. b. Third Country:	13 x 4 mm	13 x 4mm																																		
<p><u>GOI:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Offices and Transportation 2. Fertilizer 3. Personnel 4. Storage 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adequate facilities, offices and transportation made available. 2. Fertilizer supplies on hand 3. Counterpart staff in-place and functioning. 4. HFC Reports. 		<p>adequate to meet existing need plus 6 months inventory stocks.</p>																																	

**CONSIDERATIONS FOR EVALUATING THE LOG FRAME
AT THE PROJECT DESIGN STAGE**

Consideration	Definition	Response	
		Yes	No
Verifiability	Are the Means of Verification readily accessible and are they adequate to determine whether or not the indicators exist and the goal, subgoal, purpose, and output(s) achieved?		
Plausibility	Do the indicators depend more on progress in the project than on unrelated factors?		
Objectivity	Could both a skeptic and an advocate of the project be expected to agree on the facts shown by the indicators?		
Independence	Are indicators at the goal, subgoal, purpose and output levels distinct from each other?		
Targetting	Are indicators explicit in magnitude, time, and if appropriate, audience and area?		
Comprehensiveness	Do the indicators adequately measure the scope of achievement?		

Project Title & Number: Heptar Fertilizer Project I - #12367

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Program or Sector Goal: The broader objective to which this project contributes: (A-1)</p> <p>To increase small farmer* income.</p> <p>* Farmers producing 10 or less kyaha (4.8A) to crops.</p> <p><u>Subgoal:</u></p> <p>To increase agricultural production of small farmers.</p>	<p>Measures of Goal Achievement: (A-2)</p> <p>Beginning in 1976:</p> <p>Annual increases in small farmer purchase of:</p> <p>Bicycles - 5% Oxen - 3% Cloth - 10%</p> <p>Annual increases in small farmer agricultural production by 1978:</p> <p>Wheat - at least 3% Cotton - at least 10% Other - at least 5%</p>	<p>(A-3)</p> <p>USAID/GOH survey of small farmers' living accommodations: 1976, 1977 and 1978.</p> <p>Visual observations.</p> <p>Ministry of Agricultural Reports (MOA), GOH Reports. Food Procurement Department Reports.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving goal targets: (A-4)</p> <p>GOH price support programs (in wheat, cotton, and sugar) for small farmers being carried out.</p> <p>Agricultural Development Bank (ADB) will continue to improve its credit program, including credit to small farmers.</p>
<p>Project Purpose: (B-1)</p> <p>To increase small farmer's annual usage of fertilizer.</p>	<p>Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End-of-Project Status:(B-2)</p> <p>1.a. Number of small farmers using fertilizer increased from 33,658 in 1974 to 65,000 in 1978.</p> <p>1.b. Amount of fertilizer sales to small farmers increased from 13,424 MT in 1974 to 24,543 MT in 1978.</p>	<p>(B-3)</p> <p>HFC Records and Reports, USAID monitoring of HFC operations. ADB Reports.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving purpose: (B-4)</p> <p>No natural disasters or insect infestations.</p> <p>Other donor and GOH agricultural sector activities which impinge upon the project purpose are maintained at current levels of effort and efficiency.</p> <p>HFC plans are economically feasible for small farmer.</p>

STANDARD LOG FRAME

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Life of Project: _____
 From 1976 to 1978
 Total U.S. Funding _____
 Date Prepared: _____

AID 1030-20 (1-77)
 SUPPLEMENT 1

Project Title & Number: Heptar Fertilizer Project I - #12367

PAGE 2

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Project Outputs: (C-1)</p> <p>1. HFC is independently producing timely, comprehensive, and realistic plans.</p> <p>2. HFC operates without advisory assistance.</p> <p>3. HFC has developed a distribution network with adequate supply and marketing capability.</p>	<p>Magnitude of Outputs: (C-2)</p> <p>1. a. Plans for 1977 and 1978 prepared and approved before beginning of respective years.</p> <p>1. b. HFC management prepares quarterly progress targets starting June 1977.</p> <p>2. a. Top management is conducting international business transactions including international fertilizer procurement by September 1978.</p> <p>2. b. HFC conducting national business transactions including fertilizer distribution independent of foreign advisors by September 1978.</p> <p>3. a. Delegations of authority operating effectively by June 1978.</p> <p>3. b. One or more retailers in each agricultural district by September 1977.</p> <p>3. c. Warehouses using orderly operational procedures including inventory systems by 1977.</p>	<p>(C-3)</p> <p>HFC records and reports. USAID monitoring of HFC operations, USAID evaluation.</p> <p>GOH reports. HFC records and reports.</p> <p>Site visits by USAID to HFC checking on fertilizer procurement and distribution.</p> <p>HFC monthly survey of distribution.</p> <p>GOH agricultural extension service records. USAID monitoring of HFC.</p> <p>HFC reports.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving outputs: (C-4)</p> <p>HFC remains an independent business entity in accordance with the terms of the charter.</p> <p>Small farmer participation in HFC fertilizer distribution program.</p> <p>USAID advisors terminate assistance to HFC by 1978.</p>

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

STANDARD LOG FRAME

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Life of Project: 1976 to 1978
From 1976 to 1978
Total U.S. Funding _____
Date Prepared: _____

Project Title & Number: Heptar Fertilizer Project I - #12367

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Project Outputs: (C-1) (cont'd.)</p> <p>3. (cont'd.)</p> <p>4. HFC markets other agricultural inputs.</p>	<p>Quantifiable Outputs: (C-2)</p> <p>d. Inventory losses 0.5% of sales by end of 1977.</p> <p>e. Procurement at least 6 months ahead of demand by 1977.</p> <p>f. Facilities and procedures at regional level adequate to support Fall 1977 sales in all five regional locations.</p> <p>4.a. Sales of other agricultural inputs are \$2 M by 1977 and \$2.5 M by 1978.</p> <p>b. By end of 1977, sales regularly include agricultural inputs other than fertilizer, such as pesticides, veterinary supplies, agrochemicals, seeds, etc.</p>	<p>(C-3)</p> <p>HFC records and reports.</p> <p>HFC records and reports.</p> <p>HFC records and reports. USAID monitoring. GOH records.</p> <p>HFC records and reports.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving outputs: (C-4)</p>

STANDARD LOG FRAME

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Life of Project: _____
 From FY 1976 to FY 1978
 Total U.S. Funding _____
 Date Prepared: _____

AID 1020-20 11-754
 SUPPLEMENT 1

Project Title & Number: Heptar Fertilizer Project I - #12367

PAGE 4

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS																																	
Project Inputs: (D-1)	Implementation Target (Type and Quantity) (D-2)	(D-3)	Assumptions for providing inputs: (D-4)																																	
<u>U.S.</u>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FY 1976</th> <th>FY 1977</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. a.</td> <td>12 mm</td> <td>12 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1. b.</td> <td>12 mm</td> <td>12 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1. c.</td> <td>12 mm</td> <td>12 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. a.</td> <td>6 mm</td> <td>6 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. b.</td> <td>4 mm</td> <td>4 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. c.</td> <td>2 mm</td> <td>2 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. d.</td> <td>4 mm</td> <td>6 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.</td> <td>2 mm</td> <td>2 mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. a. U.S.:</td> <td>2 x 4mm</td> <td>2 x 4mm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. b. Third Country:</td> <td>13 x 4mm</td> <td>13 x 4mm</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FY 1976	FY 1977	1. a.	12 mm	12 mm	1. b.	12 mm	12 mm	1. c.	12 mm	12 mm	2. a.	6 mm	6 mm	2. b.	4 mm	4 mm	2. c.	2 mm	2 mm	2. d.	4 mm	6 mm	3.	2 mm	2 mm	4. a. U.S.:	2 x 4mm	2 x 4mm	4. b. Third Country:	13 x 4mm	13 x 4mm	<p>ProAg signed</p> <p>PIO/T issued</p> <p>Presence of Advisors</p> <p>USAID monitoring of the project</p>	<p>Contract advisors arrive NLT January, 1977.</p> <p>HFC budget approved FY 1976</p>
	FY 1976	FY 1977																																		
1. a.	12 mm	12 mm																																		
1. b.	12 mm	12 mm																																		
1. c.	12 mm	12 mm																																		
2. a.	6 mm	6 mm																																		
2. b.	4 mm	4 mm																																		
2. c.	2 mm	2 mm																																		
2. d.	4 mm	6 mm																																		
3.	2 mm	2 mm																																		
4. a. U.S.:	2 x 4mm	2 x 4mm																																		
4. b. Third Country:	13 x 4mm	13 x 4mm																																		
<p>1. Advisory Services</p> <p>a. Management and training</p> <p>b. Financial</p> <p>c. Marketing and supply (to include international fertilizer procurement)</p> <p>2. Short-term Consultants</p> <p>a. Agro-chemicals</p> <p>b. Agricultural Economist</p> <p>c. Training Specialist</p> <p>d. Other</p> <p>3. Home Office Backstopping Support for Offshore Fertilizer Procurement.</p> <p>4. USAID Direct Participant Training</p> <p>a. Executive Level Management Training</p> <p>b. Courses in fiscal, agro-chemicals, inventory control, marketing, etc.</p>																																				
<u>GOH:</u>	<p>1. Adequate facilities, offices, and transportation made available.</p> <p>2. Fertilizer supplies on hand adequate to meet existing need plus 6 months inventory stocks.</p> <p>3. Counterpart staff in-place and functioning.</p> <p>4. HFC reports.</p>																																			

EVALUATION

WORKSHOP

A

Project Design Stage

Part II

Participant Materials

Evaluation Workshop A: Part II

Objective: To develop an appropriate Evaluation Plan based on information learned from seminar lecture(s), activities of Part I of this workshop, Standard Log Frame Matrix, PPT network chart and narrative, and background information.

Materials:

1. Workshop A, Part II: Objective/Materials/Procedure Sheet
2. "Standard" Log Frame (From Part I)
3. Evaluation Parameters
4. PPT Network Chart
5. PPT Network Narrative
6. "Standard" Evaluation Plan.

Procedure: Given appropriate aids and information, you will individually write down your ideas for an evaluation plan. Then, the group will discuss the various ideas and formulate a group Evaluation Plan to be part of a Project Paper. The group solution will then be compared to the "Standard" Evaluation Plan.

EVALUATION WORKSHOP A Part II - Evaluation Parameters

Specification of:	Frequency			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Date(s):				
Type(s):				
Major Hypotheses:				
Method(s):				
Data Location(s):				
Evaluator(s):				

Country:
HEPTAR

Project:
#12367

Project Title:
Management Support for HFC

Date:
April 1976

CPI Description:

<u>DATE</u>	<u>CPI</u>	<u>RESPONSIBILITY</u>
1. June 76	FY 76 Pro Ag Signed	USAID/GOH
2. Jan 77	Three advisors arrive: Management & Training, Financial, and Marketing & Supply & short-term specialists.	AID/W
3. Apr 77	FY 77 Budget	GOH
4. Apr 77	USAID/HFC conduct staff training	HFC/USAID
5. Jun 77	USAID/HFC conduct participant training	HFC/USAID
6. July 77	HFC completes international procurement with limited advisory assistance	HFC/Contractor
7. Aug 77	FY 77 Pro Ag Signed	USAID/GOH
8. Sept 77	HFC developed distribution network with adequate supply and marketing capability	HFC
9. Sept 77	HFC markets other agricultural products	HFC
10. Apr 78	FY 78 Budget approved	GOH
11. Jun 78	Written delegations of authority operating effectively	HFC
12. Jun 78	Termination of short-term specialists	USAID
13. Nov 78	HFC operates without advisory assistance	HFC
14. Dec 78	Departure USAID Advisors	USAID

STANDARD EVALUATION PLAN

Frequency: Twice

1. First Evaluation - June 1977, 6 months after the advisor's arrival. Type: Alignment, Input and Output Effectiveness, Process.

Early evaluation is necessary if the results are to be used as feedback to correct any problems that may arise. The purpose therefore will be to determine if project input and output statements are still appropriate and have been properly defined, and to evaluate input timeliness and process and determine whether output indicator targets are being reached.

Main Hypotheses:

1. Inputs are on schedule and effective.
2. Project has achieved the targetted output progress indicators.

Performed by: Interim joint USAID/HFC evaluation.

2. Second Evaluation - September 1978. Type: Output, Purpose, and Subgoal Effectiveness.

An in-depth evaluation to measure performance of the management advisory team and achievement by the HFC of the project purpose. The results of this project evaluation will be prepared in report form and distributed to the GOH, AID, and contractor. AID will base any Phase II plans on this evaluation report.

Hypothesis: End-of-purpose status indicators have been achieved.

Performed by: Joint USAID and GOH evaluation; AID/W invited to participate.

EVALUATION

WORKSHOP

B

Planning a Project Evaluation

Participant Materials

EVALUATION WORKSHOP B

Objective: To plan the Scope of Work and specify other details for a project evaluation.

Materials:

1. Workshop B: Objective/Materials/Procedure Sheet
2. "Standard Log Frame" (from Workshop A)
3. Background Information (from Workshop A)
4. Standard Evaluation Plan (from Workshop A)
5. Situation Report (Aug. 1978)
6. Evaluation Planning Packet
7. Standard Solution

Procedures:

Given items 2, 3, 4, and 5 you will first study the situation report. Then you will work in subgroups to write a detailed Scope of Work for the upcoming Sept. 78' evaluation. This should specify adequately the what, how, and where of the evaluation activity. The participants will then reconvene to discuss their findings and reach a group consensus. The group solution will then be compared to the Standard Solution.

EVALUATION WORKSHOP B

<u>Sequence of Steps:</u>	<u>Time:</u>
1. Leader hands out statement of training objective/ materials/procedure.	}
2. Leader instructs group to get: - Standard Evaluation Plan from their Workshop A notes - Standard Log Frame from their Workshop A notes.	10 min.
3. Leader hands out Situation Report as of May 1978.	-
4. Questions.	5-10 min.
5. Group individually reads Situation Report.	10 min.
6. Leader hands out Special Evaluation Planning Packet.	-
7. Group works individually to fill out blanks in Evaluation Planning Packet.	50 min.
TOTAL TIME:	<u>80 min.</u>
BREAK:	15 min.
TOTAL TIME:	<u>95 min.</u>
8. Group discussion on thrust of Special Evaluation (can be based on evaluation cueing questions).	40 min.
9. Leader passes out Frame of Reference and asks group to designate a reporter to fill out frame according to group consensus.	20 min.
10. Leader distributes Standard Frame of Reference.	-
11. Group compares Workshop Frame with Standard Frame.	20 min.
12. Leader sums up the results of Workshop B and leads into Workshop C.	5 min.
TOTAL TIME:	180 min. <u>3 hours.</u>

Assumed Date:
Aug. '78

SITUATION REPORT FOR USAID HEPTAR FERTILIZER PROJECT I

The first evaluation of this project completed in August 1977 (because of a month's delay in the arrival of the USAID advisors) revealed that the project was proceeding fairly well without significant delays and with effective input implementation methods. Output progress targets were being achieved to a large extent at that time.

In light of the fact that previous GOH and HFC attempts to encourage small farmer use of fertilizer failed to generate meaningful support, USAID decided to concentrate a portion of its managerial support 1/ in assisting an HFC publicity effort aimed at persuading the small farmer to use fertilizer and other crop aids. This effort included such activities as:

- . Placing HFC signboards containing various simple slogans on fertilizer use.
- . Promoting school tours through the HFC and through its "one-stop" stores.
- . Preparing signs comparing the advantages of using fertilizer against their non-use and the advantages of utilizing pesticides on cotton.

Additional means of outreach to the small farmer have been the set up of "one-stop" stores and the development of an expanding distribution network. The attraction of the "one-stop" stores rests in the fact that they enable the small farmer to make one stop for all his agricultural needs saving him time and transport costs. Not only do these stores sell such agricultural products as small farmer tools and equipment, chemicals for control of plant disease and pests, agro-chemicals, veterinary products and the like, but they also allow the small farmer to receive immediate instruction and demonstrations on how to apply these products from specially trained retailers in each district.

The tactics to involve the small farmer in fertilizer use seem to be paying off. Fertilizer sales appear to be increasing, although exact figures can only be established through program evaluation.

The two year time span for Phase I has made it difficult to assess accurately the impact of the project on actual agricultural production. Nevertheless, USAID, GOH, and HFC advisors have become somewhat alarmed at recent hints from the Ministry of Agriculture suggesting a decrease in wheat production from 1975 figures. Cotton production is said to have increased slightly and "other" production may have increased minutely if at all. This informal information, if true, would be especially confusing since the experimental plots are meeting their targetted production goals. The advisor Team Leader admits to being somewhat puzzled.

The officials of the Agricultural Development Bank are also understandably concerned over this state of affairs and are auditing HFC's marketing department. This audit, which will be completed in August 1978, will investigate any operational problems with respect to distribution, other marketing activities, and HFC administrative factors.

It has been suggested by some that there were unusually heavy rains in Apr. 1977 which may have affected a certain percentage of agricultural production by washing away planted acreage. (Since Heptar's soils are unusually low in organic material heavy rains in the mountainous areas could wash away newly planted crops.)

Another story going around is that the retailers who are supposed to instruct the farmers are really "bad news". It is further believed that misuse of fertilizer could result in reducing agricultural production. Moreover, if excess fertilizer were being used, it would tend to drain the GOH economy. Farmers would spend more money than is necessary and as a result the GOH would spend more foreign exchange than necessary for the import of fertilizer.

Thus, the planned USAID program evaluation in Sept. 1978 will be very timely indeed. The report is eagerly awaited by several organizations.

1/ There is some doubt as to whether HFC could operate at all without advisory assistance.

EVALUATION PLANNING CHART

Time	Date	Name of Person Responsible for Eval. Planning, Conducting & WriteUp	Host Country Participation	Evaluation Staffing	Alignment of Project Design			Tenability of Assumptions	Efforts or Inputs	Effectiveness or Performance			Adequacy/ Impact/ Significance	Progress	Efficiency									
					Goal	Purp.	Output			G	P	O												
1	2	3	4	5	6	6	6	7	8	9	9	10	11	11	12									
I	Mo: _____ Yr: _____	Plan: _____ Conduct: _____ WriteUp: _____	Person(s) _____ Title(s) _____ Organization(s) _____ N.A. _____	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>ATD</td> <td>HC</td> <td>OC</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	ATD	HC	OC							See p. 2	See p. 3	See p. 4	See p. 5	See p. 6	See p. 7	See p. 8	See p. 9	See p. 10	See p. 11	See p. 12
ATD	HC	OC																						
II	Mo: _____ Yr: _____																							
III	Mo: _____ Yr: _____																							

(C7:9-76)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

6.
GOAL ALIGNMENT

1. Is the need implied in the G. still operative?	_____	Yes	_____	No	
2. Are the specified G. indicators still appropriate?	_____	Yes	_____	No	Which? _____
" " " " " " " accessible?	_____	Yes	_____	No	Which? _____
3. Are the specified sub-G. indicators still appropriate?	_____	Yes	_____	No	Which? _____
" " " " " " " accessible?	_____	Yes	_____	No	Which? _____
4. Does achievement of stated purpose and application of stated assumptions still hold reasonable assurance of achieving the G.?	_____	Yes	_____	No	
5. a. Have any <u>new</u> G. indicators (not previously specified) become appropriate since the last evaluation or beginning of project?	_____	Yes	_____	No	What? _____
b. If so, are they accessible?	_____	Yes	_____	No	Where? _____

6.
PURPOSE ALIGNMENT

1. Is the specified Purpose statement still appropriate? _____ Y _____ N
If not, specify change(s): _____

2. If yes, are all the specified purpose indicators still appropriate? _____ Y _____ N
Are all the specified purpose indicators still accessible? _____ Y _____ N
3. a. Have any new P indicators become appropriate since the last evaluation? _____ Y _____ N
b. If so, are they accessible? _____ Y _____ N
4. Does achievement of stated outputs and application of stated assumptions still hold reasonable assurance of achieving the Purpose(s)? _____ Y _____ N

6.

OUTPUTS ALIGNMENT

1. Is the specified output statement still appropriate? _____ Y _____ N
2. If yes, are the specified output indicators still appropriate? _____ Y _____ N
3. a. Have any new output indicators become appropriate since the last evaluation?
_____ Y _____ N What? _____
- b. Are they accessible? _____ Y _____ N Where? _____
4. Does provision of stated inputs and application of stated assumptions still hold reasonable assurance of producing the output(s)? _____ Y _____ N

8.

EFFORTS OR INPUTS

1. a. Specify any input element(s) that seem(s) to be causing problems at this time:

b. Where is most accurate current indicator data located? _____

c. Suggested method of collection: _____

d. Suggested method of analysis: _____

2. a. Specify whether probing for reasons of problem(s) is desired at this time: _____ Yes _____ No

b. If so, specify: Source(s): _____

Collection method: _____

3. a. Specify indicator data location for other input elements: _____

b. Collection methodology: _____

c. Analysis methodology: _____

9.
EFFECTIVENESS (GOAL LEVEL)

1. Specify which of listed goal indicator(s) to concentrate on (if all, so state);

2. Data Source(s): _____

3. Physical Location(s): _____

4. a. Method(s) of data collection: _____

b. Degree of precision necessary: _____ Gross _____ Normal _____ Exacting

5. Hypotheses: _____

6. Proposed Analyses: _____

EFFECTIVENESS (PURPOSE LEVEL)

1. Specify which of the listed Purpose indicators is most relevant for the objective of the present evaluation: _____

2. Data Source(s): _____

3. Physical Location(s): _____
4. a. Method(s) of data collection: _____
b. Degree of precision necessary: _____ Gross _____ Normal _____ Exacting
5. Hypotheses: _____

6. Proposed Analyses: _____

9.
EFFECTIVENESS (OUTPUT LEVEL)

1. Specify which of listed Output indicators to concentrate on: (If all, so state):

2. Data Source(s): _____

3. Physical Location(s): _____

4. a. Method(s) of data collection: _____

b. Degree of precision necessary: _____ Gross _____ Normal _____ Exacting

5. Hypotheses: _____

6. Proposed Analyses: _____

10.

ADEQUACY/IMPACT/SIGNIFICANCE

1. State hypotheses in terms of output-purpose, purpose-goal or output-goal linkages: _____

2. List other projects that may provide data: _____

3. Specify level of confidence required in conclusion(s):
_____ Minimal _____ Normal _____ Extremely high

11.
PROCESS

Specify the points of difficulty or success to be identified in the evaluation (check as many as appropriate):

- Project-USAID Mission
- Project-HC institution(s)
- Project-HC government(s)
- Project-Other donor agencies
- Project-AID/W
- Project-Suppliers
- Intraproject
- Other What? _____

12.
EFFICIENCY

1. What is the total cost of the project inputs (to date)? _____ Specify in terms of direct and indirect cost: _____
2. Are the cost estimates still realistic? _____ Y _____ N If not, what new estimates should be used? _____
3. Specify basis of assessing value of achieving outputs, purposes, goals? _____ _____
4. Specify period for which input to effectiveness indices are to be calculated: _____ _____

STANDARD SOLUTION
WORKSHOP B

SCOPE OF WORK & SPECIFICATIONS

Evaluation of Heptar Fertilizer Project I Sept. '78

This evaluation must deal with the following questions to determine the extent of the project's effectiveness:

At the output level -

1. Is HFC now operating without advisory assistance, as shown by Indicator 2a?
 - a. Data Source: Correspondence and documents
 - b. Location: HFC and/or USAID Mission
 - c. Collection Method: search files, get copy or make notes
 - d. Degree of Precision needed: normal
 - e. Hypothesis: HFC top management is now conducting international business transactions, including fertilizer procurement.
 - f. Analysis: find evidential records to support or refute the hypothesis.

2. Has HFC developed an adequate distribution network, as shown by Indicator 3b?
 - a. Data Source: Records
 - b. Location: HFC and/or USAID Mission
 - c. Collection Method: search files, make notes
 - d. Degree of Precision needed: normal
 - e. Hypothesis: At least one retailer is in place in each agricultural district (as of Sept. '77).
 - f. Analysis: find evidential records to support or refute the hypothesis.

3. Is HFC now marketing agricultural products other than fertilizer, as shown by Indicator 4a?
 - a. Data Source: Records
 - b. Location: HFC and/or USAID Mission
 - c. Collection Method: search files, make notes
 - d. Degree of Precision needed: normal
 - e. Hypothesis: Sales of other agricultural inputs were \$2M by 1977 and are \$2.5M in 1978.
 - f. Analysis: find evidential records to support or refute the hypothesis.

At the Purpose Level

4. Has small farmers' usage of fertilizer increased, as shown by Indicators 1a and 1b?
 - a. Data Source: Records
 - b. Location: Ministry of Agriculture and/or USAID Mission
 - c. Collection Method: search files, make notes
 - d. Degree of Precision needed: exacting
 - e. Hypothesis:
 - 1a. Number of small farmers using fertilizer has increased to 65,000 by end of 1977.
 - 1b. Total amount of small farmer fertilizer sales has increased to 24,543 MT by end of 1977.
 - f. Analysis: find evidential data to support or refute each of the hypotheses. Compare with baseline figures.

At the Sub-goal Level

5. Has agricultural production of small farmers increased, as shown by the specified sub-goal indicator?

a. Data Source: Records

b. Location: Ministry of Agriculture

c. Collection Method: search files, make notes

d. Degree of Precision needed: exacting

e. Hypothesis:

1977 Wheat production has increased at least 3% over 1976

1977 Cotton production has increased at least 10% over 1976

1977 Production of other crops has increased at least 5% over 1976

f. Analysis: find evidential data to support or refute each of above.

Factors outside log frame

If the suspected discrepancy between fertilizer utilization (purpose level) and agricultural production (sub-goal level) is actually found to exist, the evaluation must look into the following:

1. Is rain a plausible reason?
 - a. Data Source: Precipitation Tables
 - b. Location: Ministry of Agriculture
 - c. Collection Method: get precipitation records for 1977
 - d. Degree of Precision needed: exacting
 - e. Hypothesis:
 1. Rainfall for 1977 was significantly greater than average.
 2. Rainfall for April 1977 was abnormally high.
 - f. Analysis: Compare 1977 mean rainfall with previous years' data, (t-test, chi square, or other).

Compare April 1977 data to determine its deviation (t-test, chi square, or other).

If the discrepancy exists, then also evaluate:

1. Are the retailers actually giving the farmer/customers needed instruction and demonstration on proper application of fertilizer?
 - a. Data Source: Records
 - b. Location: HFC
 - c. Collection Method: search files, make notes
 - d. Degree of Precision needed: normal
 - e. Hypothesis: Retailers are providing proper instruction and demonstrations to the farmers.
 - f. Analysis: Find evidential data to support or refute the hypothesis.

Use of the services of an outside contractor to carry out this evaluation has been agreed to by the Mission, AID/W, GOH and HFC since a dispassionate and objective analysis of the project might facilitate locating and correcting any problems.

12.
EFFICIENCY

1. What is the total cost of the project inputs (to date)? _____
Specify in terms of direct and indirect cost: _____
2. Are the cost estimates still realistic? _____ Y _____ N
If not, what new estimates should be used? _____
3. Specify basis of assessing value of achieving outputs, purposes, goals? _____

4. Specify period for which input to effectiveness indices are to be calculated: _____

STANDARD SOLUTION
WORKSHOP B

SCOPE OF WORK & SPECIFICATIONS

Evaluation of Heptar Fertilizer Project I Sept. '78

This evaluation must deal with the following questions to determine the extent of the project's effectiveness:

At the output level -

1. Is HFC now operating without advisory assistance, as shown by Indicator 2a?
 - a. Data Source: Correspondence and documents
 - b. Location: HFC and/or USAID Mission
 - c. Collection Method: search files, get copy or make notes
 - d. Degree of Precision needed: normal
 - e. Hypothesis: HFC top management is now conducting international business transactions, including fertilizer procurement.
 - f. Analysis: find evidential records to support or refute the hypothesis.

2. Has HFC developed an adequate distribution network, as shown by Indicator 3b?
 - a. Data Source: Records
 - b. Location: HFC and/or USAID Mission
 - c. Collection Method: search files, make notes
 - d. Degree of Precision needed: normal
 - e. Hypothesis: At least one retailer is in place in each agricultural district (as of Sept. '77).
 - f. Analysis: find evidential records to support or refute the hypothesis.

3. Is HFC now marketing agricultural products other than fertilizer, as shown by Indicator 4a?
 - a. Data Source: Records
 - b. Location: HFC and/or USAID Mission
 - c. Collection Method: search files, make notes
 - d. Degree of Precision needed: normal
 - e. Hypothesis: Sales of other agricultural inputs were \$2M by 1977 and are \$2.5M in 1978.
 - f. Analysis: find evidential records to support or refute the hypothesis.

At the Purpose Level

4. Has small farmers' usage of fertilizer increased, as shown by Indicators 1a and 1b?
 - a. Data Source: Records
 - b. Location: Ministry of Agriculture and/or USAID Mission
 - c. Collection Method: search files, make notes
 - d. Degree of Precision needed: exacting
 - e. Hypothesis:
 - 1a. Number of small farmers using fertilizer has increased to 65,000 by end of 1977.
 - 1b. Total amount of small farmer fertilizer sales has increased to 24,543 MT by end of 1977.
 - f. Analysis: find evidential data to support or refute each of the hypotheses. Compare with baseline figures.

At the Sub-goal Level

5. Has agricultural production of small farmers increased, as shown by the specified sub-goal indicator?

a. Data Source: Records

b. Location: Ministry of Agriculture

c. Collection Method: search files, make notes

d. Degree of Precision needed: exacting

e. Hypothesis:

1977 Wheat production has increased at least 3% over 1976

1977 Cotton production has increased at least 10% over 1976

1977 Production of other crops has increased at least 5% over 1976

f. Analysis: find evidential data to support or refute each of above.

Factors outside log frame

If the suspected discrepancy between fertilizer utilization (purpose level) and agricultural production (sub-goal level) is actually found to exist, the evaluation must look into the following:

1. Is rain a plausible reason?
 - a. Data Source: Precipitation Tables
 - b. Location: Ministry of Agriculture
 - c. Collection Method: get precipitation records for 1977
 - d. Degree of Precision needed: exacting
 - e. Hypothesis:
 1. Rainfall for 1977 was significantly greater than average.
 2. Rainfall for April 1977 was abnormally high.
 - f. Analysis: Compare 1977 mean rainfall with previous years' data, (t-test, chi square, or other).

Compare April 1977 data to determine its deviation (t-test, chi square, or other).

If the discrepancy exists, then also evaluate:

1. Are the retailers actually giving the farmer/customers needed instruction and demonstration on proper application of fertilizer?
 - a. Data Source: Records
 - b. Location: HFC
 - c. Collection Method: search files, make notes
 - d. Degree of Precision needed: normal
 - e. Hypothesis: Retailers are providing proper instruction and demonstrations to the farmers.
 - f. Analysis: Find evidential data to support or refute the hypothesis.

Use of the services of an outside contractor to carry out this evaluation has been agreed to by the Mission, AID/W, GOH and HFC since a dispassionate and objective analysis of the project might facilitate locating and correcting any problems.

EVALUATION

WORKSHOP

C

Participant Training Materials

EVALUATION WORKSHOP C

Objective:

- To collect data on specified indicators at the output, purpose and/or subgoal levels.
- To analyze the verbal data and reduce the quantitative data found, as appropriate.

Materials:

1. Evaluation Specifications (Product of Workshop B)
2. Evaluation Analysis Form
3. The complete files of HFC, Heptar Ministry of Agriculture, USAID Mission, and Heptar Meteorological Institute

Procedures:

You will review the Evaluation Specifications which were developed in Workshop B. Pay special attention to the indicators and to the location of data on each of the indicators.

After reviewing the Evaluation Specifications, you will then read the contents of this Workshop C training packet. The workshop leader will answer any questions you may have. You will then form subgroups of two or three. Each group will work together throughout Workshop C. After the groups are formed, you will have to organize yourselves and go to the data files to begin the data collection and analysis efforts. It is recommended that you use the Evaluation Analysis Form for recording your findings. Any quantitative data should be reduced (e.g. averages and variation indication rather than a distribution of raw numbers).

You will reconvene as a group of the whole after you have completed these activities. The workshop leader will ask a reporter from each group to report their findings. The various groups' findings will then be compared and discussed.

INSTRUCTIONS WORKSHOP C

Trainees

Step 1 - Data Collection

- You are to examine progress toward the appropriate output, purpose and/or subgoal indicator targets based upon data that may be found in the files of HFC, Ministry of Agriculture, USAID, and the Weather Bureau.
- You use the indicators because they are the gauges of project success. To determine the "reading" on the gauges, you must find the progress data that the project management team has collected during the implementation period.
- Now if the indicators tell you that all is not going well, then you have some problems because you're going to have to (1) determine what happened, (2) determine why it happened, and then you're going to have to (3) come up with suggested corrections for the remainder of the project, or another phase if such is contemplated.
- You are going to have to search internally and externally for factors which are causing HFC to go well or not so well. Examples of the external factors which could slow up the progress of HFC could lie in the environment in which the project operates, decreases in demand, and the fact that the small farmers may not be responding to the incentive that was built into the project, weather, and so on.

Step 2 - Synthesis

- Synthesize the verbal (nonquantitative) information you have found; formulate tentative recommendations.

Step 3 - Quantitative Data Reduction

- Calculate percentage, means, standard deviations if and as appropriate.

Workshop C

Considerations for Collecting Data

- Examine Baseline Carefully
- Baseline Data Includes all Data
 - from 1964 (when fertilizer sales were recorded) to 1976 (the beginning of the Management Support Project)
- Baseline Can be Used in the
 - Analysis for a Comparison of Rates of Growth Before the Project and After Implementation

Workshop C

The Analysis

- Breakdown of Data
- Answers Questions
- Permits Use of Statistics
- Detects Data Flaws
- Addresses Flaws
- Leads to Recommendations

ANALYSIS EVALUATION FORM

Design Level	Indicators	Achieved?			Deviation(s)	Major Problems / Comments
		(Yes	No	Partially)		
<u>Subgoal:</u> To increase agricultural production of small farmers	1.					
<u>Purpose:</u> To increase small farmers' annual usage of fertilizer	1.a. 1.b.					
<u>Output:</u> HPC operates without advisory assistance	2.a.					
HPC has developed a distribution network with adequate supply and marketing capability	3.b.					
HPC markets other agricultural inputs	4.a.					

EVALUATION WORKSHOP D

Objective: Workshop D participants will:

- . Carry out statistical hypothesis tests
- . Formulate recommendations for Phase II Project redesign
- . Write a draft evaluation report in outline form

Materials Needed:

1. Rainfall tables and data (from Workshop C)
2. Analysis recording form (Product of Workshop C)

Procedure: 1. Workshop participants will form groups of twos or threes and will work in these groups throughout the workshop with the rainfall tables, notes, statistical concepts and the analysis recording form in hand. Workshop D participants will carry out a statistical hypothesis test to determine the importance of rainfall in the decrease of wheat production. (Note: The Workshop leader will assist you in carrying out this test.)

2. After the test has been completed, workshop participants will then use the results of the analysis of the indicators (which will be recorded on the analysis recording form) to formulate recommenda-

tions which will be used in Phase II project redesign.

3. Once recommendations are formulated, Workshop D participants will then write a draft evaluation report. This report should cover problems identified in the analysis, shortcomings in the project design and recommendations.

APPENDIX 6

Draft Revised PD&E Seminar
Outline - 15 June 76

<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
I. Seminar objectives and program outline	1. Description of seminar objectives and program content <u>1/</u>	Day 1 AM
	2. Brief overview of the methods and forms AID uses in its design and evaluation of projects <u>2/</u>	
II. The Program Context	1. Overview of recent AID policy and procedure changes regarding design and evaluation	Day 1 AM
	2. AID program policy	
	3. Reconciliation of H.C. and AID goals	
	4. the DAP	
	5. Sector Analysis and plan	
	6. the Goal hierarchy	
	7. choice among alternative program strategies	
	8. the G-P link	
III. Project Selection PID- PRP- PP	1. Problem definition <u>3/</u>	Day 1 AM
	2. Guidelines for conducting sector analyses	
	3. Social Soundness Analysis - should be discussed when discussing PRP	
	4. Means-end analysis	
	5. Choice among alternative project strategies	

1/ This description should include an explicit statement of the behavioral objectives, and how the achievement of these objectives might benefit the participants, USAID's, AID/W, and host countries.

2/ A glossary for the acronyms should be provided here.

3/ Discuss the PID in the problem definition; PRP with alternative strategies and PP with the log frame

<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
IV. Design Concepts: the logical framework methodology	1. Description of the concepts, purposes and uses of the log frame <u>4/</u> 2. The internal logic and the importance of assumptions	Day 1 PM
V. Design critique	Critique of actual project design taken from agency files	Day 1 PM
VI. Design Workshop A <u>5/</u>	Review, critique and correct several log frame designs with built-in weaknesses and errors. <u>6/</u>	Day 1 PM

4/ State how PPT may be used to monitor and manage the project through the log frame. It is important to tell the group of the relationship between the log frame and PPT at this point but the lecturer should not go into detail about it. He/she should indicate that PPT will be covered later in the course. In pointing out the uses of the log frame the fact that it is a tool of project design, evaluation and redesign should be stressed.

5/ Some group interaction exercises to develop the proper dynamics should precede the substantive portion of Workshop I.

6/ Such exercises must be designed for their heuristic value (i.e. to teach specific concepts) and as building blocks for ensuing workshops. Feedback should be provided at conclusion of workshop by facilitator.

<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
VII. Design Criteria	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Target setting - absolute vs. relative targets 2. Good and bad practices of target setting 3. Internal criteria vs. external criteria 4. Replicability 5. Spread effect 6. Cost/benefit 7. Cost effectiveness 8. Functional phasing of long-term projects projects 9. Experience with external factors/ assumptions 10. Dealing with uncertainty 11. Probability factors 12. Test of causal linkages 	Day 2 AM
VIII. Building Evaluation Elements into Design	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Summary of evaluative elements and actions which must be built into project/program design and into implementation plan 2. The project as an information system 	Day 2 AM

<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
IX. Design Workshop B	Critique and correct actual project(s) taken from Agency files	Day 2 PM

7/ More complex and realistic projects than in Workshop I; Feedback to be provided at conclusion.

<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
X. Indicators measurement techniques, means of verification	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Criteria for writing indicators 2. Tests of good and bad practices of writing indicators 3. Targetting indicators 4. Verification techniques 5. Indicators of institutional capability 6. Sources of indicators (PRP and PAR, Schwab's program) 7. Sources of information for developing indicators 8. Questions indicators must answer 9. Reasons why indicators are not targetted and why they are not used on a wide-spread basis. 	Day 3 AM

<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
XI. Design Workshop C	Prepare a design using the log frame with cues <u>8/</u>	Day 3 PM

9/ Some cells of the matrix should be pre-filled in to serve as prompts and dictate a certain internal logic. Provide feedback.

	<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
XII.	Design Problems	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discussion of the errors in the cases in Workshops I & II and the major problems of III 2. Modification 1 & 2 of log frame 	Day 4 AM
<hr/>			
XIII.	Progress Indicator Program	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demonstration of Schwab indicator program 2. Examples of indicators for each type of project AID sponsors. 	Day 4 AM

<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
XIV. Design Workshdp D	Prepare a complete design using the log frame. <u>9</u> /	Day 4 PM

9/ Including measurement and verification aspects given only the narrative country description. Each trainee should do this individually first and then arrive at a group solution.

	<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
XV.	Design Critique	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Critique project designs done in Workshop IV. 2. Cover modifications # and 4, 5, 6 and 7 of log frame 	Day 5 AM
XVI.	PBAR Review	A discussion of the five informational systems developed by PBAR Task Force	Day 5 AM
XVII.	Implementation planning, networking PPT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overview of networking principles, <u>10/</u> 2. Description of PPT, including CPIs, etc. as a management system for monitoring 	Day 5 AM

10/ with examples

11/ The key here is to show the relationship of PPT to log frame. Stress should be given to the fact that the PPT system strengthens project design, implementation, evaluation and replanning.

<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
XVIII. Design Workshop E	Mapping PPT and log frame. <u>12/</u>	Day 5 PM

12/ Participants will use the project design developed in Workshop IV for this. Provide feedback.

	<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
XIV.	Review of First Week		Day 6 AM

XX.	Introduction to Evaluation <u>13/</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purposes <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. target(s) attainment b. resource allocation and funding c. sector/program level effectiveness d. confirmation of development strategy/ technology e. cost effectiveness f. policy formulation 2. Types <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. summative-formative b. assessment of Efforts <u>14/</u> c. " " Effects <u>15/</u> d. " " Adequacy <u>16/</u> e. " " Efficiency <u>17/</u> f. " " Process <u>18/</u> 	Day 6 AM
-----	--	---	-------------

-
- 13/ A clear distinction between PAR and evaluation needs to be made.
14/ \cong "inputs" in log frame.
15/ \cong "outputs" and indicators.
16/ a measure of effects relative to need.
17/ ratio measures of efforts to effects
18/ how and why a project is or is not working.

	<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
XXI.	Case studies in evaluation design	Case studies illustrating how evaluation design is chosen to serve different objectives.	Day 6 PM
XXII.	Evaluation Workshop F	Review, critique and correct several Evaluation Study Designs and Scopes of work. <u>19/</u>	Day 6 PM

19/ Include cases of misapplication of designs to objectives; provide feedback at Workshop

	<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
XXIII.	Evaluation strategies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quasi experimental - non randomization 2. Cross sectional 3. Time series 4. Formative: evaluating an ongoing project without control conditions 5. Summative: evaluating a completed project without control conditions 	Day 7 AM
<hr/>			
XXIV.	Evaluation Procedures <u>20/</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hypotheses 2. Sampling and defining the unit 3. Data collection 4. Graphic presentation 5. Causality, association and effect 	Day 7 AM

20/ The actual behavioral objective must be reaffirmed here: the purpose is not to attempt to make them statisticians or research design experts but rather to enable them to specify the proper scope of work for an evaluation and to interpret the findings correctly.

	<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
XXV.	Evaluation Workshop G	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specify design given objective 2. Specify strategy given project history 3. Formulate hypotheses 4. Identify data collection system 	Day 7 PM

(Note: provide partial feedback here only)

<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
XVI.	Evaluation Procedures (cont.)	Day 8 AM
	1. Significance: statistical and practical	
	2. Methods to test evaluation hypotheses <u>21/</u>	
	3. a. One sample situation <u>22/</u>	
	b. Two sample " <u>23/</u>	
	c. More than two " " <u>24/</u>	

21/ Simple Tests on: means, percentages, distributions, correlation and trends. The objective is knowing properties and interpretation, not how to calculate.

22/ Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

23/ Chi square and t-test, Mann-Whitney U test

24/ Friedman two way Analysis of Variance

Title

Description of Content and Scope

Time

XXVII.

Evaluation
Workshop II

Given a filled-in log frame and PPT,
write evaluation of scope of work

Day 8
PM

	<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
XXVIII.	Case Studies in Evaluation	1. Case studies continued (case studies should cover the four areas of AID's project involvement). 2. How to replan based on evaluation findings	Day 9 AM

XXIV.	Evaluation Procedures (contd.)	1. Methods to test evaluation hypotheses (cont.) d. Understanding correlation <u>25/</u> e. Understanding partial correlation <u>26/</u> f. Understanding regression-discontinuity designs	Day 9 AM
-------	--------------------------------	---	----------

25/ Product-moment r , rank order r

26/ Kendall partial rank correlation

<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
XXX. Evaluation Workshop I <u>27/</u>	<p>Given documents normally available in the field</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Write evaluation scope of work specifying preferred strategy and procedures 2. Interpret evaluation report 3. Make recommendations based on evaluation 	Day 9 PM

27/ Provide partial feedback

	<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
XXXI.	Organizational and management aspects of evaluation	Description of roles played by HC, USAID, Contractors, PASAs, Vol Ags, and AID/W.	Day 10 AM
XXXII.	Development Information Services (DIS)	Description of DIS design characteristics, holdings and service modes	Day 10 AM
XXXIII.	Completion of questionnaire <u>28/</u>		Day 10 AM
XXIV.	Issues and Answers	Open-ended discussion of the content of the seminar and training techniques	Day 10 AM

28/ Questionnaire should be administered at this point to avoid consensual influence on individual responses.

<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Content and Scope</u>	<u>Time</u>
XXXV.	Selected non-AID participant guests describe design and evaluation in their own organizations (PVOs, grantees, HCs, other donors)	Day 10 PM
<hr/>		
XXVI.	Valedictory remarks and presentation of certificates	Day 10 PM

Revised Outline

PROGRAM DESIGN & EVALUATION SEMINAR
(Group Seven, July 1976)

DAY:	1	2	3	4	5
AM	<p>I Seminar objectives and program outline</p> <p>II The program Context</p> <p>III Project Selection PID-PRP-PP</p> <p>Priority #1</p>	<p>VII Design Criteria</p> <p>VIII Building Evaluation Elements into Design.</p> <p>Priority #1</p>	<p>X Indicators, measurement techniques, means of verification</p> <p>Priority #1</p>	<p>XII Design Problems Discussion of the errors in the cases in Workshops I & II and the major problems of III. Modification 1 & 4 of log frame.</p> <p>XIII Progress indicator program.</p> <p>Demonstration of Schwab indicator program.</p> <p>Examples of indicators for each type of project AID sponsors.</p> <p>Priority #1</p>	<p>XV Design Critique Critique project designs done in Workshop IV.</p> <p>Cover modifications 3, 6, and 7 of the log frame.</p> <p>XVI PBAR Review Priority #2</p> <p>XVII Implementation planning, networking PPT.</p> <p>Priority #2 or #3</p>
PM	<p>IV Design Concepts: the logical framework methodology</p> <p>V Design Critique</p> <p>VI Design Workshop A: review and critique log frame designs with built-in errors.</p> <p>Columns I & IV of Log Frame</p> <p>Priority #1</p>	<p>IX Design Workshop B Critique and correct actual projects taken from Agency files</p> <p>Columns II & III of Log Frame</p> <p><u>3 - 5 PM</u></p> <p>Critique and Integrate Workshop A & B</p> <p>Priority #2</p>	<p>XI Design Workshop C Prepare a design using the log frame with cues.</p> <p>Priority #1</p>	<p>XIV Design Workshop D Prepare and complete design using the log frame.</p> <p>Priority #1</p>	<p>XVIII Design Workshop E Mapping PPT and log frame</p>

DAY:	6	7	8	9	10
AM	<p>XIV Review of First Week</p> <p>XX Introduction to Evaluation</p> <p>Priority #1</p>	<p>XXIII Case Studies in Evaluation design illustrating how evaluation design is chosen to serve different objectives</p> <p>XXIV Evaluation Procedures</p> <p>Priority #1</p>	<p>XXVI Evaluation procedures (contd.)</p> <p>Priority #1</p>	<p>XXVIII Case Studies in Evaluation</p> <p>Priority #2</p>	<p>XXXI Organizational and management aspects of evaluation</p> <p>XXXII Development Information Services (DIS)</p> <p>XXXIII Completion of Questionnaires</p> <p>XXIV Issues and Answers</p> <p>Priority #2</p>
PM	<p>XXI Evaluation Strategies</p> <p>XXII Evaluation Workshop A: Review, critique and correct several Evaluation Study Designs and Scopes of Work.</p> <p>Priority #2</p>	<p>XXV Evaluation Workshop B:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specify design given objective 2. Specify strategy given history 3. Formulate hypotheses 4. Identify data collection system <p>Priority #1</p>	<p>XXVII Evaluation Workshop C:</p> <p>Given a filled-in log frame and PPT, write evaluation of scope of work</p> <p>Priority #2</p>	<p>XXIX Evaluation Procedures (contd.)</p> <p>XXX Evaluation Workshop D:</p> <p>Given documents normally available in the field</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Write evaluation scope of work specifying preferred strategy and procedures 2. Interpret evaluation report 3. Make recommendations based on it. <p>Priority #2</p>	<p>XXXV Selected non-AID participant guests describe design and evaluation in their own organizations (PVO's, grantees, HC's, other donors)</p> <p>XXXVI Valedictory remarks and presentation of certificates</p>

APPENDIX 7

EVALUATION PLANNING CHART

1	2	3	4	5	6			7	8	9			10	11	12									
					Goal	Purp.	Output			G	P	O												
I	Mo: _____ Yr: _____	Plan: _____ Conduct: _____ Write Up: _____	Person(s) _____ Title(s) _____ Organization(s) _____	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>AID</td> <td>HC</td> <td>OC</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	AID	HC	OC																	
AID	HC	OC																						
II	Mo: _____ Yr: _____																							
III	Mo: _____ Yr: _____																							