



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

MSI EVALUATION TRAINING FOR USAID AND STATE DEPARTMENT STAFF

REPORT FOR CERTIFICATE COURSE IN EVALUATION

JULY 25, 2009

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Molly Hageboeck, Larry Beyna and Micah Frumkin Management Systems International.

MSI EVALUATION TRAINING FOR USAID AND STATE DEPARTMENT STAFF

REPORT FOR CERTIFICATE COURSE IN EVALUATION



Management Systems International
Corporate Offices
600 Water Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024

Contracted under USAID Contract # RAN-M OQ-04-00049 A-FY05-071

MSI Certificate Program in Evaluation – Final Report

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	II
1. BACKGROUND.....	1
2. CERTIFICATE PROGRAM CURRICULUM	1
3. PARTICIPANTS, INSTRUCTORS AND THE COURSE MANAGER.....	3
4. TRAINING WORKBOOKS AND SCHEDULE.....	3
5. PARTICIPANT EVALUATION TEAMS	4
6. TOPICAL FOCUS OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS.....	5
7. PARTICIPANT KNOWLEDGE GAINS FROM PHASE I OF THE CERTIFICATE PROGRAM IN EVALUATION.....	6
8. PRODUCTS AND DISCUSSION OUTCOMES FROM PHASE III EXERCISES	7
A. Program level or Meta-Evaluation Exercises.....	7
B. Techniques for Improving the Utilization of Evaluation Findings	8
C. Participant Action Plans.....	10
9. PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT OF EXTENT TO WHICH THE COURSE ACHIEVED ITS OBJECTIVES.....	11
A. Quantitative Rankings of Aspects of the Certificate Program in Evaluation.....	12
B. Written/Qualitative Participant Comments on the Course.....	15
10. INSTRUCTOR OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	16
A. Observations	16
B. Recommendations.....	17
 ANNEXES	
Annex A: Core Phase I Curriculum – MSI Certificate Program in Evaluation.....	19
Annex B: Illustrative Class Agendas for Phase I and Phase III	21
Annex C: Participant List	23
Annex D: Evaluation Report Review – Score Sheet	25
Annex E: Course Evaluation Results	28
Annex F: Program Level or Meta-Evaluation Questions Addressed by Participant Teams	50

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Between January and June, 2009, 45 individuals from USAID, the US Department of State and USAID implementing partners participated in the Management Systems International (MSI) Certificate Program in Evaluation, sponsored by the United States Department of State and USAID. The Certificate Program is an experiential learning course comprised of three phases: two weeks of classroom training, with one week of fieldwork in between during which students evaluate a small project or program or a component of a larger one.

The objectives of MSI's course are to ensure that USAID participants:

- Understand the role of evaluation in the program and activity management cycle;
- Improve skills they need to prepare high quality, utilization-focused evaluation Statements of Work;
- Understand the importance of ethics in evaluation;
- Develop the capacity to carry out an evaluation that will produce the kind of information needed to answer evaluation questions;
- Learn how to review and critique evaluation plans and draft evaluation reports with an eye on improving them; and
- Utilize evaluation findings to inform management decisions.

The core curriculum for the course covers the full cycle of an activity or program evaluation (see Annex A). Illustrative agendas for Phase I (classroom) and Phase III (classroom) are found in Annex B.

Students attend one week of classroom training during which they learn about and work in teams to prepare a Statement of Work and develop a methodology to conduct an evaluation. In Phase II, the teams spend a week collecting and analyzing data for their assigned evaluations and draft their evaluation reports. In Phase III, participants return for the second week of classroom work that focuses on presenting, systematically reviewing and critiquing evaluation reports (see Annex D for the report checklist used in the course) and fostering their utilization.



This training program was conducted twice during the period, both times in Washington, DC, for 24 and 19 participants respectively. Of the 43 individuals who started the Certificate Program, 36 completed all three phases; the remaining participants completed two of the three phases. (See Annex C for the list of participants and instructors for each class.)

The course participants, operating in small teams, conducted 15 evaluations of local DC-based organizations. The evaluations focused either on community services offered by a local charity or on after-school programs funded by a public-private partnership with the DC Mayor's office. A list of these evaluations is provided on page 5.

In addition to critiquing each program evaluation, participants conducted an organization-wide meta-analysis using data from all of the evaluations carried out by the class. This determined what general lessons the

cluster of programs offered for the respective evaluation clients. The meta-analysis work gave participants experience with the type of analysis USAID expects when it carries out a stocktaking or evaluation synthesis activity.

Participants completed a pre-course questionnaire and two post-course evaluation forms, at the end of Phase I and Phase III. (Scores from evaluations, including qualitative comments are found in Annex E.) Both the classroom and fieldwork phases of the training program received high marks from USAID participants and many compared it favorably to other USAID courses they had taken:

- 68 percent of the participants who finished the course reported that the course provided the right level of information on the various topics it covered in the classroom portion of the training.
- 90 percent of participants who finished the course reported that the field portion of this course was worth the expense and effort involved.
- While not all participants who finished the course had been exposed to USAID training programs prior to this course, over 83 percent of all participants rated it as being more useful than other USAID courses they had taken.

Also provided in the post-course evaluations were recommendations for how the course could be improved in future iterations. Participants recommended that future courses should, among other things:

- Improve time management for each of the three phases.
- Provide more insight during Phase I into the demands of Phase II.
- Make available resources such as computers and working space during Phase II and Phase III.

The trainers had some additional recommendations of their own based on some of their observations. It became apparent in this series of courses that there is a large impact on the course when participants withdraw during Phase II. In future courses an increased emphasis must be placed on ensuring that participants are fully committed to seeing the course through to the end. Additionally, there was a large interest in learning more about rigorous impact evaluations with treatment and control groups. A module was added to Phase III of each course and trainers will continue to monitor participant interest to keep the course current and informational for all attendees.

I. BACKGROUND

The MSI Certificate Program in Evaluation was first provided to USAID staff in 2003 under a contract between Management Systems International (MSI) and USAID's Bureau for Europe and Eurasia (E&E). USAID staff in that bureau had identified evaluation as a field where there was both a need for and interest in enhancing staff capacity. Originally developed in 1997 for NGO leaders in Russia, the Certificate Program in Evaluation has since been periodically taught by MSI both domestically and abroad. It has been offered to leaders of host country non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and representatives of universities and private firms, as well as in the United States at George Washington University's Elliott School of International Affairs.

The US Department of State's Office of Foreign Assistance, in collaboration with USAID's Management and Performance Bureau, contacted MSI to offer a course for State Department and USAID Staff in Washington DC to fill a critical need to enhance staff skills in evaluation. The course began January 26th, 2009.

As plans for this course moved forward, the sponsors requested that a second course be added. This course was agreed upon and began on April 6th, 2009. The organizations chosen to serve as the evaluation clients for the January and April courses were the Catholic Charities Diocese of Arlington and the Child and Youth Investment Trust Corporation, respectively. The Child and Youth Investment Trust Corporation, also known as the Trust, is a public-private organization funded through the Washington DC Mayor's office that supports after-school programs within the District.

2. CERTIFICATE PROGRAM CURRICULUM

The MSI Certificate Program in Evaluation is an experiential learning course comprised of three phases: two weeks of classroom work, separated by one week of field work to evaluate selected programs of a Washington DC-based organization (see Annex A for the list of modules).

The objectives of the course are to ensure that USAID participants:

- Understand the role of evaluation in the program and activity management cycle;
- Improve skills they need to prepare high quality, utilization-focused evaluation Statements of Work;
- Understand the importance of ethics in evaluation;
- Develop the capacity to carry out an evaluation that will produce the kind of information needed to answer evaluation questions;
- Learn how to review and critique evaluation plans and draft evaluation reports with an eye on improving them; and
- Utilize evaluation findings to inform management decisions.



The core curriculum for the Certificate Program in Evaluation covers the full cycle of an activity or project evaluation as well as the role of an evaluator in that process. Topics normally included in the Phase I curriculum range from articulating the evaluation questions, to writing evaluation Statements of Work (SOWs). Also covered are potential methods for collecting data, data analysis techniques, and evaluation report writing.

The Phase III curriculum includes a review and critique of participant teams' fieldwork and products and several supplementary modules such as assessing cost-effectiveness through an evaluation. Topics covered in Phase III build upon skills that the participants have acquired in the previous phases.

During the Phase III week, each team makes an oral presentation, simulating the presentations evaluation teams are asked to make in missions. While one team reports, the class scores the report and presentation against a set of criteria for judging the quality of an evaluation (see Annex D for the list of criteria for reviewing an evaluation). During each presentation, representatives of the client organization are present and offer their questions and comments for each evaluation team.¹

Phase III also includes opportunities for participants to examine patterns in their evaluation findings through a program level or meta-evaluation. They are also encouraged to examine approaches for improving the utilization of evaluation findings in their own Missions or offices and M&E capacity in the countries in which they work.

While the list of topics this course covers is an important indication of the technical level of the course, the experiential nature of this training is what distinguishes it from many other courses. At every step, course participants have to apply what they are learning. Throughout the course they are experiencing steps in the evaluation process that they will likely use again when they return to their Missions, e.g., preparing Statements of Work (SOW) or reviewing draft evaluations. Participants finish the course with a much better sense of what evaluation SOWs require of those whom they ask to carry out evaluations on USAID's behalf. Through the course, by virtue of the level of detail at which they examine the projects they are assigned, most participants also come away with an appreciation for good project design and a heightened awareness of the relationship between good design and the achievement of results. There is also an important side benefit when the course has participant teams evaluate the programs of non-USAID organizations, such as the Trust: many participants come away with a heightened awareness of and respect for the work those organizations do—and some have even subsequently volunteered their services to the program they have just evaluated.

A COMMUNITY EXPERIENCE

“Choosing to evaluate community development projects was a very good idea. It made the training real and made the trainees feel valuable for their role as evaluators.”

—Course Participant

¹ When the course is conducted in a USAID mission, and USAID projects are the subject of the team evaluations, participants play the roles of “Mission Director,” “technical staff,” or representatives of the project that has been evaluated.

3. PARTICIPANTS, INSTRUCTORS AND THE COURSE MANAGER

Forty-five (45) participants completed Phase I of the Certificate Program in Evaluation. They included 24 USAID field staff from Missions and regional offices around the globe, 13 USAID/W staff, five State Department, officials, one senior program officer for the Trust (the organization whose programs were evaluated during the second course), and two staff from MSI. For various reasons beyond the trainers' control, two of the 45 Phase I participants did not participate in Phase II, and six did not participate in Phase III. A list of course participants and the segments they completed is provided in Annex C.

Seventy-one percent of the participants who responded to the pre-course questionnaire indicated at the start of the training program that monitoring and evaluation are a component of their job, with about one fifth of

SUPPORT AND INSTRUCTION MAKE THE COURSE

"Wonderful instruction. Excellent logistics support. Great field work component. Overall, a very useful exercise."

—Course Participant

all participants (18%) reporting that monitoring and evaluation is their primary responsibility.

MSI's primary instructors for both courses were Molly Hageboeck, MSI's course designer and senior evaluator, and Larry Beyna, an MSI senior evaluator and trainer. In addition to these two instructors, Richard Columbia, also a senior evaluator at MSI, attended the courses and assisted instructors both in presenting

selected modules and working with participants to answer any relevant questions. During all three phases of both courses, Sharon Benoliel (State Department, F Bureau) served as course manager and co-trainer.

Course logistics and facilitation were handled by Micah Frumkin of MSI.

4. TRAINING WORKBOOKS AND SCHEDULE

For both Phases I and III, participants, instructors and USAID/Washington course observers received course notebooks, which included hard-copy versions of the PowerPoint slides used in all presentations and supplementary reading materials and references linked to each module.

Illustrative agendas for Phases I and III are provided in Annex B. The course agenda served as a loose guide to the sequencing and timing of presentations and exercises, and was provided at the start of Phase I and Phase III, along with the caveat that it will not be followed rigidly. Between the two courses, some adjustments were made to the course agenda to facilitate the flow of the course. Such adjustments included shifting the Practicing Interviews module closer to the Data Collection Toolbox module in order to give participants an opportunity to work with some of the tools that they had just learned.

A PERSONAL EVALUATION LIBRARY

While large and burdensome, these manuals are thorough and contain some of the best materials I have seen on evaluation and related topics!

—Course Participant

5. PARTICIPANT EVALUATION TEAMS

At the beginning of each course, participants were organized into teams of three. A variety of criteria were used to guide the team formation process, including balancing gender and separating people from the same mission. For the purposes of this training program, three is the ideal number of evaluation team members. Three people are capable of carrying out all of the assigned tasks within the time allotted, provided that the size of the evaluation task they are given is reasonable and every team member equally shares in the work. The team can visit only one or two sites; those must be within a reasonable distance of each other and not inherently inaccessible. This approach was followed, with only a few exceptions:

- In both courses, a four-person team was formed due to the fact that a participant was unable to continue with the course beyond Phase I.
- In both courses at least one person was forced to withdraw from the course and caused a team to reduce its size to two.

In both courses, every team ended Phase I with a manageable Statement of Work in hand, and good preliminary ideas about how they would carry out their fieldwork. Some teams took more time than others in Phase I to begin developing the data collection instruments they would use and identifying the roles that each would play on the evaluation team. Teams that used their time in this manner often reported in Phase III that it helped them to have done so. Teams that did little by way of detailed preparation before assembling in the field ended up wishing that they had, as a group, focused more quickly on practical steps and methods for their team in Phase I.

In addition, the field experiences of several teams indicate that some amount of elapsed time between Phase I and the start of fieldwork actually helped a team do a better job with their evaluation. That elapsed time allows participants to absorb Phase I and focus systematically on Phase II in a manner that jumping directly into Phase II does not permit. (Teams with participants from overseas, however, did not have this luxury. They had to conduct their fieldwork during the week immediately following Phase I before returning home.)

When they returned for Phase III, participants made oral presentations of their evaluation results to their classmates, instructors, and representatives from the client organization. In addition to receiving feedback during the oral presentations, each team received reviews of their draft reports. For each oral presentation, participants were assigned the role of “evaluation client” and were told to comment on the presentations as if this was to be their final product. At the start of these critique sessions, participants typically ask only a few questions and the instructors often carry the burden of the detailed critique and praise each evaluation team deserves. By the time the third oral presentation comes around, however, roles are reversed, with participants out in front leading the critique, leaving the course instructors with little to say except that participants are clearly becoming better and better at spotting weaknesses and offering constructive suggestions to teams, which is precisely what we expect graduates of this course to be able to do when they return to their Missions.



6. TOPICAL FOCUS OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS

MSI's course instructors have learned that it is useful to select a set of evaluations for the fieldwork that have something in common. This way, in Phase III, the individual project or activity evaluations carried out in Phase II can be used as the basis for the meta- or program evaluation. Further, this allows students to draw common findings from several evaluations and use them to frame conclusions, lessons, and where relevant, draft recommendations for the client organization.

A list of the 15 evaluations completed by participants in these courses is provided in Box 1 below.

BOX I
LIST OF EVALUATIONS COMPLETED BY COURSE PARTICIPANTS

STATE DEPARTMENT SPONSORED CERTIFICATE COURSES IN EVALUATION
JANUARY – JUNE 2004

CATHOLIC CHARITIES DIOCESE OF ARLINGTON:

Alajami, Abdulhamid, Raidan Al-Saqqaf and Sara Calvert. *Catholic Charities Diocese of Arlington Emergency Assistance Program Evaluation*. March 2009.

Behrami, Sayed, Mark Carrato and Madeline Williams. *Evaluation Report – English as a Second Language Program*. March 2009.

Cormier, Kelly, Laurie de Freese and Mario Valori. *Aging in Community with Dignity – An Evaluation of the St. Martin de Porres Senior Center*. March 2009.

Gellis, Victoria, Anais Henriquez and Colleen Noble. *Report on the Evaluation of the Hogar Immigrant Legal Services Program*. March 2009.

Harmon, Shameka, John Hatch and Sharon Nwankwo. *Evaluation of the Adoption Services of the Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Arlington - Children's Services*. March 2009.

Herrera, Carol, Hanna Jung and Yvette Malcioln. *Evaluation of Volunteer Services at Catholic Charities Diocese of Arlington*. March 2009.

Lieberman, Jessica, Bhavani Pathak and Sandra Scham. *Evaluation of the Outreach Effectiveness of the Catholic Charities Diocese of Arlington (CCDA)*. March 2009.

Mandivenyi, Charles, Lisa Maniscalco and Karili Melo. *A Formative Evaluation of Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Arlington Christ House Emergency Shelter Program*. March 2009.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH INVESTMENT TRUST CORPORATION (CYITC) (aka the Trust):

Berlow, Jessica E., and Diane Ray. *Pen Pals and Partners Program Evaluation Findings*. June 2009.

Chavez, Fernando, Abdrahamane Dicko and Jose Luis Mota. *Kid Power After School Program Evaluation*. June 2009.

Chincaro, Samuel, Christopher Cushing and Maricela Ramirez. *External Evaluation of the Columbia Heights Youth Club Out of School Time Younger Youth Program Performance Management System*. June 2009.

Chisholm, Don, Micah Frumkin and Ky Lam. *YOUR Evaluation Report*. June 2009.

Chungbhivat, Phakatip, Dianna Darsney, Adel Khaksar and Mariella Ruiz-Rodriguez. *Kingman Boys and Girls Club Evaluation Report*. June 2009.

Clark, Logan, Charles Evans and Sarah Morgan. *Examining Out of School Time in New Communities For Children's Adolescents Building Literacy Through Expression (ABLE) Program*. June 2009.

Lukangu, Gastão, Mamesho Macaulay and Richard Reithinger. *Evaluation of Program Activities of Pediatric HIV/AIDS Care Inc*. June 2009.

7. PARTICIPANT KNOWLEDGE GAINS FROM PHASE I OF THE CERTIFICATE PROGRAM IN EVALUATION

The phased nature of the Certificate Program in Evaluation provides multiple opportunities for assessing knowledge gains. The first opportunity comes at the start of Phase I when a pre-test is administered to determine participants’ prior exposure to concepts that will be covered in the course. Knowledge gained from the first classroom phase of the course is directly assessed at the end of the week. This first post-test covers some items included in the pre-test. A second opportunity comes during Phase III, when instructors assess the completeness and quality of the evaluations participant teams have produced, and participants complete a Phase III course evaluation. This section discusses knowledge gained by participants during Phase I of the course.

Pre-test responses indicated that roughly half of all participants had at least a modest understanding of evaluation concepts at the start of Phase I. This is consistent with self-reporting by participants, which indicated that two-thirds of the participants in the courses had had some prior training in monitoring and evaluation, most of which was on-the-job training. The majority of other participants reported that they had previously read at least some materials on the topic.

When pre- and post-test answers were compared at the end of Phase I, substantial changes were found on a number of evaluation concepts. Not all participants filled out the pre-course survey for Course II, but the changes in understanding concepts for Course I are illustrated in Table 1. For every one of the nine concepts, there was an apparent increase in self-reported understanding of concepts “very well” in the Phase I post-test as compared to the start of Phase I. The increases range from a 37% increase in understanding when an evaluation is needed to a 1475% increase in understanding of how to use cross-tabulations. The number that described themselves as not understanding concepts well dropped for nearly every concept on which a comparison of ratings was made.

TABLE I. PARTICIPANT SELF-REPORTING ON UNDERSTANDING AT THE START AND END OF PHASE I

Concept or Idea Presented in the Training Program	How Well I Understand the Concept or Idea					
	Not well		Somewhat		Very well	
<i>Matched Items Before and After Phase I Training</i>	Before (n=24)	After (n=24)	Before (n=24)	After (n=24)	Before (n=24)	After (n=24)
The meaning of the term evaluation	0%	0%	38%	13%	63%	92%
The difference between a finding or fact, a conclusion and a recommendation	8%	0%	54%	25%	38%	75%
How to select a sample that is not biased	25%	4%	67%	67%	8%	71%
Why evaluators usually treat beneficiary data as being confidential	21%	0%	54%	13%	25%	88%
When an evaluation is needed	4%	4%	50%	38%	46%	63%

Concept or Idea Presented in the Training Program	How Well I Understand the Concept or Idea					
	Not well		Somewhat		Very well	
How to use a cross-tabulation to display and analyze the answers to two questions at the same time	63%	8%	33%	29%	4%	63%
When to use open-ended questions and when to use closed-ended questions	33%	0%	54%	54%	13%	50%
How to make observation a systematic data collection tool	46%	4%	46%	33%	8%	58%
The difference between a group interview and a focus groups interview	38%	4%	42%	21%	21%	75%

Source: Pre- and Post-Evaluation forms administered by course instructors.

Pre-test and post-test forms from Phase I, and final course evaluation forms from Phase III, are provided in Annex E, along with a summary of quantitative responses for all three courses on each of the concepts and a listing of all of the qualitative answers and other comments participants provided.

8. PRODUCTS AND DISCUSSION OUTCOMES FROM PHASE III EXERCISES

In addition to providing participants with feedback on their evaluation reports and oral presentations, Phase III provides several exercises that focus at the program or meta-evaluation level to identify patterns of findings across evaluations. Topics also covered include the utilization of evaluation findings, evaluation culture, ways USAID could help increase M&E, and individual and mission action plans outlining what participants hope to do to improve the evaluation enterprise in their Missions once they return home.

A. PROGRAM LEVEL OR META-EVALUATION EXERCISES

In Phase III, course participants were given a short presentation on meta-analysis techniques and then formed into new working groups. Generally, these groups were comprised of one participant from each evaluation team within a class. The program level, or meta-analysis, questions given to participants were created by the evaluation clients in collaboration with the course instructors and focused on threads of information that streamed through each evaluation report. A list of meta-analysis questions and responses from Course I can be found below in Table 2 given to the participants in each course is presented in Annex F.

When participants begin using evaluations as data sources to answer program level questions, they start to “own” the information they have collected and synthesized in a very different way than they do when they passively read evaluation reports. The process almost always brings to light aspects of their evaluations that could have been stronger, such as more careful data collection or better analysis. Nevertheless, participants also find their evaluations are rich sources which, when examined as a group, almost always suggest patterns that explain why a particular type of project is effective or ineffective and why.

Commenting on these participant products, the course instructors noted that these kinds of program-level conclusions cannot be reached when only one evaluation is considered at a time. The type of work participants do in the meta-analysis session is comparable to what the USAID Automated Directives System (ADS) suggests when it talks about the need to undertake broad evaluations that inform the process of moving from one strategy period to the next.

BOX 2

CATHOLIC CHARITIES DIOCESE OF ARLINGTON META-ANALYSIS

QUESTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Question 1: What do the evaluations find and conclude about the scope of various CCDA programs? Broad enough? Too broad and not targeted enough? *Awareness of community needs is not being represented by funding or effective use of resources. Stronger focus should be placed on urgency of needs and prioritizing use of funding and resources such as volunteers.*

Question 2: What does a review of all the evaluations show about gaps in efficiency, i.e., approaches/processes which if addressed might make it possible for CCDA to effectively serve a larger number of people? *Generally speaking, volunteers are not well coordinated or effectively managed. Additionally there is a duplication of efforts throughout the various branches of the organization. Website design is also poorly organized and not particularly user friendly across branches.*

Question 3: What do the evaluations say are the greatest strengths of programs the teams evaluated (or comparative advantage/niche where other programs were examined)? What patterns are evident across those strengths? *Staff and volunteers are satisfied, dedicated and self-motivated. Programs elicit a sense of community and are satisfying community needs and providing a positive reflection on the organization.*

Question 4: Where across programs do the evaluations suggest that unrealized potential for using volunteers exists and what if any findings do the evaluations provide concerning staff interest in/ability to integrate volunteers? *There were mixed results regarding mission statements across programs which make it difficult to answer this question. Mission statements should be strengthened to incorporated manageable interest, resources and reasonable targets.*

Question 5: Where across programs do the evaluations suggest that unrealized potential for using volunteers exists and what if any findings do the evaluations provide concerning staff interest in/ability to integrate volunteers? *Volunteer usage can be extremely valuable but must be well managed. Staff job-skills training is essential to productive and effective employees. Connections between beneficiaries, programs and the organization must be strengthened to reach synergy.*

Question 6: Several evaluations examined not only a CCDA program but also other similar programs run by other organizations. Across all these evaluations what key findings and conclusions emerge? *The internet is a strong promotional tool that is being underutilized by the organizations. Outreach to remote communities must be strengthened and connected to the organizations efforts through branding etc.*

B. TECHNIQUES FOR IMPROVING THE UTILIZATION OF EVALUATION FINDINGS

In class, the discussion of utilization began with an exercise in which participants rated the “evaluation culture” in their organizations (e.g., USAID Missions and other USAID offices). They rated their

organizations against a set of factors derived from a course reading.² In one course, participants scored their organizations positively on all but two of these factors. Organizations generally scored high on being “ethical” and “truth-seeking” but low on being “teaching-oriented” and “forward-looking.” Identifying these traits enabled a focused discussion on how the evaluation climate could be improved in their organizations.



Shifting the utilization discussion to the use of evaluation reports, instructors offered examples from their own experience and elicited participant experiences with the utilization of evaluations by missions. These discussions of utilization brought out the fact that while some participants could talk about instances where their organizations had taken action based on an evaluation, others could not – because their organizations had not undertaken any evaluations that the participants were aware of. Responses of this sort showed that USAID offices and Missions vary considerably in terms of their investment in evaluations as a program management tool.

Participants indicated that one of the most important factors associated with a Mission’s use of evaluations, was the presence of a full-time, or close to full-time, M&E officer in a unit. Participant responses on other discussion items were equally interesting and the cross-talk between participants from different Missions on various utilization questions was particularly appreciated. Some of the discoveries participants made by sharing what they knew about utilization in their Missions include the following:

- **Mission Evaluation Plans and Statements of Work.** **Mission evaluation plans are not widely used.** Even where the existence of an evaluation plan was reported, the Mission did not have a central point through which all evaluation documents flow, even in Missions with a full time M&E officer. One African Mission M&E officer said, for example, that while his office prepared a Mission Evaluation Plan annually, he was only consulted on evaluation statements of work when offices felt they needed assistance.
- **Tracking Completed Evaluations.** Missions differ in how progress on planned evaluations is tracked and how evaluations are handled once they are received. Only a few participants believed that their Missions counted up the number of planned evaluations that were actually completed during the year for which they were planned. None of the participants reported that a score sheet showing planned versus actual evaluations carried out during a year was prepared and circulated to staff.
- **Utilization of Evaluation Results.** Participants in all courses discussed the actual utilization of evaluation findings through examples. The most frequent use of evaluation findings was to inform and help design follow-on activities. Mid-term evaluations were also described as useful, as many led to important modifications in on-going activities. Participants in every course also indicated that there were some evaluations where it was not clear that utilization had occurred. These evaluations were not deliberately set aside; rather they just did not seem to be connected to any important Mission decisions or actions.

² William M.K. Trochim , “An Evaluation Culture” available at <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/evalcult.htm>

- **Systematic Follow-Up on Evaluation Recommendations.** Responses from participants indicated that follow-up on evaluation recommendations is occurring in some instances, but Missions have not usually established formal systems for tracking the results to determine the status of accepted recommendations. Most doubted that this idea had ever come up in their Missions. A number of participants said they found the idea intriguing as a way of monitoring evaluation utilization.
- **Dissemination of Evaluation Reports.** Most Missions do not have standard procedures for distributing evaluations internally, or to implementing partners, government, other donors, or the public. Some participants indicated that their Missions had disseminated certain evaluations quite widely among program stakeholders, but this was not always done. Only a few Missions had posted evaluations on their websites, and even then postings were not necessarily comprehensive. Missions in French-speaking countries were more likely to report that the Executive Summaries from their evaluation reports, or entire evaluations, were translated into a second language, but that process was not necessarily systematic and universal.

The discussion of utilization provided an opportunity for participants to compare their Mission or office to similar units and to a vision of what an organization that is very pro-active with respect to the utilization of evaluations might do to promote and establish norms in that regard. Ideas discussed in this session often reappeared later in the training program in the form of “action plan” items participants included on lists they developed toward the end of the training to take back to their Missions.

C. PARTICIPANT ACTION PLANS

At the end of Phase III individuals were asked to develop draft Action Plans that they could share with their Mission colleagues for improving mission monitoring and evaluation activities. Plans were not shared with course instructors in written form, but at the end of the Action Planning period, participants were asked to identify the top priorities they had put on their action plans. The major activities noted were as follows:

- Promote evaluation courses and distance learning options as well as teach colleagues what I have learned;
- Set up mission evaluation plans and a process for comparing these plans to what missions actually accomplished;
- Perform evaluability assessments;
- Update Mission orders on evaluation were contemplated by several teams;
- Improve local discussion of evaluations by posting them to the website in English and local languages;
- Establish processes for improving the evaluations, e.g., carry out formal reviews when evaluations are received by a mission, record decisions made about what evaluation recommendations the mission agrees with and plans to implement, and follow up to determine whether accepted recommendations were actually implemented.

BRINGING KNOWLEDGE AWAY FROM THE COURSE

“Excellent training – I am leaving the course ready to spread your enthusiasm for evaluations and advocate for more and better evaluations that are followed up with action.”

–Course Participant

BOX 3

HIGHLIGHTS OF PARTICIPANT ACTION PLAN – COURSE II

- Update mission order on M&E
- Get others to take the new distance learning course that is being rolled out
- Disseminate an evaluation review checklist
- Draft evaluation guidance for units (mention evaluation climate – social culture for evaluation government)
- Start doing “Evaluability Assessments”
- Conduct Evaluation 101 Training –with emphasis on being specific about what is wanted from an evaluation
- Survey what the Mission is currently doing – and start to provide information to fill in the gaps
- Automate the evaluation system – schedule, documents, etc.
- Improve local discussion of evaluations by posting them on the website in local languages
- Create a Mission roster of local evaluation organizations in the region
- Try to provide course credit for technical staff (speak with HR)
- Establish an evaluation segment at an upcoming mission-wide conference
- Follow up on the current evaluation recommendation system

Entries in Box 4 from the second course illustrate the full range of innovations that participants are recommending for action in their missions.

9. PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT OF EXTENT TO WHICH THE COURSE ACHIEVED ITS OBJECTIVES

At the start of the Certificate Program in Evaluation, the six objectives for the course were shared with the participants. In the final evaluation, students were asked to judge how well the course had met those objectives (i.e., fully, partially, marginally, or not at all). As Table 2 shows, better than 60 percent of the 40 participants who rated the course on its achievement of course objectives said that it had fully achieved four of the six. Over 50 percent of participants said that the other two objectives had been fully achieved. Most other scores said that objectives had been partially achieved.

A. QUANTITATIVE RANKINGS OF ASPECTS OF THE CERTIFICATE PROGRAM IN EVALUATION

This section reviews participant views on the degree to which the course achieved its objectives; their sense of how well it prepared them for various practical exercises they were expected to complete, the applicability of the knowledge gained to their work in USAID missions and Washington DC-based offices, and their sense of the value and cost-effectiveness of this course compared to other USAID courses. The following information is based on the post-course evaluations from both Phase I and Phase III.

Two of the three objectives on which participants provided the most positive ratings (“objective fully met”) are those that are the most critical in terms of their ability to carry out core evaluation responsibilities in USAID. The three critical objectives for participants to learn are understanding the role of evaluation, writing evaluation SOWs, and reviewing draft evaluation reports. Results on the achievement of objectives come from the post-Phase III survey.

TABLE 2. ACHIEVEMENT OF COURSE OBJECTIVES

Course Objective	Degree to which Objective Was Achieved (N = 40 participants)			
	Fully	Partially	Marginally	Not
Understand the role of evaluation in the program and activity management cycle.	90%	8%	3%	
Improve skills needed to prepare high quality, utilization-focused evaluation Statements of Work.	60%	35%	3%	
Understand the importance of ethics in evaluation.	50%	40%	10%	
Develop the capacity to carry out an evaluation that will produce the kinds of information needed to answer evaluation questions	63%	32%	5%	
Learn how to review and critique evaluation plans and draft evaluation reports – with an eye to improving them.	73%	28%		
Improve understanding of how to utilize evaluation findings to inform management decisions.	55%	45%		

Source: Post-Evaluation forms administered by course instructors.

Based on the post-Phase I survey, some 73 percent said there were sufficient class discussion opportunities, (rating a 4 or 5), while 69 percent scored class exercises and preparation for fieldwork in Phase II at the 4 to 5 level. Most individual modules also scored high, with exceptions being data analysis, sampling, values & ethics, and how to manage evaluation teams. Most participants scored these modules somewhat lower on the scales, noting the need for more time on these difficult topics.

Participants indicated that they had been provided the right amount of information in most areas, as Table 3 illustrates. Fewer than 15 percent said they had received too much information in an area. A higher percentage (25%) said that “not quite enough” information had been provided on research design, data collection, and project design. The students requested more time be spent on techniques for data analysis, among other modules.

TABLE 3. ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION PROVIDED IN PHASE I

Adequacy of Information Provided in Phase I (N=39)	Too Much	Right Amount	Not Quite Enough	Not at all
Did the classroom experience in Phase I provide you with sufficient theory on the purposes, ethics and evolution of evaluation?	13%	80%	8%	
Did the classroom experience give you enough information on evaluation design to develop a valid and efficient approach to your field evaluation assignment?	5%	57%	20%	
Did the classroom experience give you enough information on methods of collecting data for you to select and apply appropriate data collection methods to your field assignment?	5%	68%	25%	3%
Did the classroom experience give you enough information on data analysis techniques for you to organize, summarize, interpret and display the data you collected?	5%	53%	25%	3%
Did the classroom experience give you enough insight into good project design for you to identify project design weaknesses in the projects you evaluated as part of your field assignment?	3%	65%	25%	5%
Did the classroom experience give you enough information to write a professional report on the evaluation you carried out during your field assignment?	10%	80%	10%	

Source: Post-Evaluation forms administered by course instructors.

Commenting on the field experience, one-third of the participants rated their teams as functioning well, while three percent said their teams did not function well. The remaining 64 percent of participants rated their team as functioning moderately well.

The majority of participants said that they only partially or marginally collected an adequate amount of data during their fieldwork and felt the same way regarding their analysis of the data they did collect. Lack of time for fieldwork was the issue for all teams as well as lack of time to prepare their written report. Only twenty-three percent of participants said they had sufficient time to complete the Phase II task to their satisfaction.

TABLE 4. ADEQUACY OF TEAM ACTIVITY AND TIME IN PHASE II

Adequacy of Phase II Teamwork and Time (N=39)	Fully	Partially	Marginally	Not at all
Was your “team” able to function effectively as a “team” in the manner that the course had suggested is appropriate for evaluation work?	33%	43%	18%	3%
Looking back, do you feel that your team developed an adequate plan for its fieldwork?	20%	58%	18%	3%
Looking back, do you feel that you collected the data that you needed to prepare your evaluation report?	30%	48%	18%	3%
Looking back, do you feel that you adequately analyzed the data you collected?	38%	45%	15%	
Looking back, do you feel that you had enough time to complete your field assignment?	23%	30%	28%	18%

Source: Pre and Post Evaluation forms administered by course instructors.

Despite their sense that they did not have as much time as they would have liked for Phase II, which is also typical of the evaluation teams USAID hires, 55 percent rated the field work portion of the course highly, fully justifying the effort and expense involved

A third set of questions included in the course evaluation focused on participant views of the elements of Phase III. Table 5 provides information on the participatory aspects of Phase III.

The major tasks of the second week of class - team presentations, discussion on the field work, and feedback sessions with course instructors - were considered very important to over 60 percent of the participants (Table 5). The responses to these three questions were similar across both courses.

TABLE 5. IMPORTANCE OF PARTICIPATORY SESSIONS IN PHASE III

Importance of Participatory Sessions During Phase III (N=39)	Very important	Important	Marginally Important	Not at all
How important to your overall experience was the task of making a presentation on your evaluation?	63%	23%	15%	
How important for you was the discussion among all teams of their field assignment experiences?	60%	33%	8%	
How important was the feedback session with the course instructors for your team?	73%	20%	5%	3%
How important was your participation in an effort to look across the project evaluations and develop general findings about the whole group of projects, i.e., the cross-project analysis?	28%	40%	25%	5%

Source: Pre and Post Evaluation forms administered by course instructors.

Participant responses concerning the importance of the Phase III meta-analysis segment of the course were about the same in both classes with three-quarters of the classes feeling that this segment was either important or very important.

In the course evaluation, participants were also asked to identify the impact of the course on their work in the Missions. From a list of statements provided in the questionnaire, the most frequently selected statements were as follows:

- Because of what I learned in this course, I am now able to participate on an evaluation as an expert member of an evaluation team (78% of the participants).
- The course gave me enough experience that with some technical assistance I am now confident that I am able to develop evaluation SOWs that will result in evaluations my Mission finds informative and useful. (65%).
- I now feel sufficiently confident of my evaluation skills that I could be a team leader and principal author of a project evaluation for USAID or any other international donor organization (43%).
- I may not be able to participate in many evaluations in the future, but I now have a good idea of how to use evaluations to learn more and improve my Mission's programs (23%).



In a final question, participants were asked to compare the Certificate Program in Evaluation to other USAID courses they have taken. Out of 32 participants who responded to the question, 54 percent indicated that the course was “much more useful” than other USAID training courses they have taken, 39 percent said “somewhat more useful,” 18 percent said “about the same,” and four percent said “somewhat less

useful.” No respondents said “much less useful” than other USAID training courses.

B. WRITTEN/QUALITATIVE PARTICIPANT COMMENTS ON THE COURSE

Written comments on the course as a whole were consistent with participants overall ratings; there were over 20 comments within both classes claiming that this was a great experiential course that was well run with knowledgeable trainers. Participants came back to Phase III with stories of how they had already used knowledge gained in Phase I. Such stories told of complete revisions of SOWs, improved data collection methodologies, preparedness for proposal reviews and the ability to successfully lead two field evaluations all during Phase II. Beyond the numerous personal thanks given at the end of each course, nine participants showed their appreciation for the dedication and assistance offered by the course instructors, manager and facilitator with direct thanks in the post-course evaluations.

While the overall feeling coming from the comments was positive, there were also some comments for improving aspects of the course and comments that trainers will be taking to heart when conducting the next course in the fall of 2009. Such comments for the trainers revolve around interactions with participants and colleagues. In particular

A COURSE TO REMEMBER

“This was an excellent course. The mix of presentations and class exercises was great – one of the best I’ve ever had in a training course.”

–Course Participant

maintaining a level of respect for everyone in the room at all times which means providing positive constructive feedback and focusing on the course even when not presenting.

In regards to improving aspects of the course, participants provided a number of suggestions. The most common suggestions included the following:

- Improve time management for each of the three phases. (31 comments)
- Provide more insight during Phase I into the demands of Phase II. (12 comments)
- Make available resources such as computers and working space during Phase II and Phase III. (11 comments)
- Instructors should work with teams/participants directly more often throughout the entire ten-week period. (9 comments)
- Ensure that the evaluation clients are prepared for their commitment in regards to time and availability of materials. (8 comments)

Participants' narrative answers to all open-ended questions are provided in Annex E, on a course-by-course basis.

10. INSTRUCTOR OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section summarizes observations and conclusions of the course instructors, and presents the recommendations for future courses that follow from them.

A. OBSERVATIONS

Generally speaking, the results for participants from the MSI Certificate Program in Evaluation courses paralleled results elsewhere for this course.

- Participants in courses of the MSI Certificate Program in Evaluation were actively engaged in all phases.
- The small number of individuals who did not complete the course all faced either insurmountable logistical impediments to doing so or were drawn away by personal emergencies and commitments they could not ignore. To the best of their ability, individuals who found themselves in this situation appeared to have tried to help their team members complete the exercise and produce solid evaluation reports and presentations.
- All of the fundamental characteristics of the course – a team approach for the participants and the application of concepts at every stage of the program– continue to work exceptionally well.



- Teams and fieldwork remain the heart of the course.
- Participants gained the most by applying concepts presented in class to a real evaluation, as with other classes that have completed this course. It is the practical experience combined with classroom training that they appreciated. In the opinion of the instructors, the growth of participants' capacities in all three phases of the course, was tangible. They saw participants' ability to think critically, improve, and then improve again. They saw the fear of standing at the front of the room or offering critical advice in a public setting among some of them fade away. Their confidence, presence, and certainty that they can handle evaluations for USAID and do it well grew right before the instructors' eyes.

Course instructors also observed the following:

- Participants in this round of courses brought a wide range of experience to the class and exceptional energy. Of particular note, a number of participants over the last year have asked questions about more rigorous impact evaluations involving treatment and control groups. In response, the instructors have added a new segment to Phase III which is drawn from a short course developed for USAID's DG Bureau.
- Both of the courses were based in Washington, and while it is challenging to find partner organizations with a range of programs to evaluate, both of the organizations that MSI partnered with for this round of courses has been involved in programs which the participants found interesting and challenging to examine.
- The course continues to struggle with occasional participant withdrawals mid-way through the course. This is difficult for the other participants as work is done in teams. Remaining participants have, nevertheless, turned in impressive work.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continue to incorporate a module on rigorous impact evaluations involving treatment and control groups. On a similar note, continue to ask participants what additional information they would most like to receive in order to monitor trends in evaluation and the needs of USAID and State Department staff.
2. Emphasize even more strongly the need for full participation in all three phases of the course as mid-course drop-outs continue to have a significant impact on the entire course. Be clear with participants and their supervisors about the commitment of time needed and obtain firm agreements from participants' supervisors to allow their staff to participate fully in all three phases.

ANNEXES

- Annex A Core Phase I Curriculum – MSI Certificate Program in Evaluation
- Annex B Illustrative Class Agendas for Phase I and Phase III
- Annex C Participant List
- Annex D Evaluation Review Criteria
- Annex E Pre-Test Results
- Annex F Program Level or Meta-Evaluation Questions Addressed by Participant Teams
- Annex G Conflict Management Projects In East Africa
- Annex H A General Guide to the Construction of an Evaluation Report

Annex A: Core Phase I Curriculum – MSI Certificate Program in Evaluation

- **Evaluation – The Evolution of the Concept** introduces participants to a range of ideas about the purpose of evaluation, the role of stakeholders in the evaluation process and other concepts that help to define this discipline.
- **Evaluation in the Project Cycle** places evaluation into the context of development programs.
- **Monitoring and Evaluation – What’s the Difference?** This module highlights the evolution of monitoring from a concern with budget and schedule to the kind of performance monitoring systems found in development organizations today. The different and complementary roles of monitoring and evaluation are defined.
- **Evaluation Statements of Work (SOW).** This module focuses on all of the elements of an evaluation statement of work and the role these elements play in procurement and in guiding the work of an evaluation team.
- **Evaluation Questions.** This is a core module that highlights the importance of questions as focus of an evaluation. Differences in the types of questions that are appropriate for mid-term, final, and impact evaluations are examined.
- **Evaluation Schedule and Budget.** This module complements the SOW module by providing guidelines from experience about the level of effort needed for each stage of an evaluation. Basic scheduling concepts are also reviewed. The module focuses on the fact that time and budget constraints on evaluations require evaluators to make practical choices with respect to the methods to be used for data collection and analysis.
- **Values and Ethics in Evaluation.** Basic concepts are discussed, including the need to guard against bias, the need to avoid leading questions, and other common problems in evaluation.
- **Building an Evaluation Team.** This module briefly introduces basic team selection and management concepts appropriate to evaluation.
- **Evaluation Design.** This module focuses on the development of a framework for carrying out an evaluation. The methods that are used to develop evaluation questions play a central role in soliciting responses that are appropriate and manageable. Evaluation plans are presented as composites of the best methodologies selected to address the questions in evaluation SOW.
- **Sampling.** This topic is included to assist participant evaluation teams in selecting sites they will visit as well as individuals they will interview. Probability and non-probability sampling are explained and the appropriate uses of both defined.
- **Data Collection Toolbox.** This module introduces participants to a wide range of data collection approaches including observation, the use of instruments to collect information and interrogation, or the art of asking questions. Reactive and non-reactive methods of data collection are discussed.
- **Data Analysis** is a module that teaches participants to focus on how data will be analyzed when an evaluation plan is prepared. Basic analysis techniques are presented for quantitative and qualitative data.
- **Evaluation Reports.** This module focuses on the differences between findings, conclusions and recommendations. A sample report outline is provided, highlighting these three elements and indicating what kinds of materials are best relegated to an evaluation report annex.

Additional Topics – MSI Certificate Program in Evaluation

- **Program Theory.** This segment focuses on the underlying logic of the types of projects participants will evaluate.
- **Evaluation in the USAID Automated Directives System.** This module, which is sometimes useful as a closing to Phase I review module, takes participants through the USAID ADS on evaluation, allowing them to discover at the end of the course that they already understand all parts of this guidance.
- **Utilization of Evaluations.** This module focuses on steps that can be taken both at the start of an evaluation and once it is completed to help ensure that utilization occurs. This issue is introduced in Phase I through discussions and key readings. The issue is addressed in greater detail in Phase III.
- **Assessing Cost-Effectiveness through Evaluation.** This module provides an overview of techniques for incorporating a cost-effectiveness analysis in an evaluation. Given time constraints, and that participants are not expected to incorporate this type of analysis in their field work in Phase II, this module is often presented during Phase III.
- **Multi-Method Evaluation.** As evaluations increasingly utilize a multi-method strategy for gathering data, the need has arisen for techniques that help evaluators integrate information from different sources in their analysis. The module introduces an innovative approach for weighting data from different sources.
- **Data Quality.** The module on data quality helps participants put the experience they gain in assessing the quality of evaluations carried out during the course into a broader context. This module draws on USAID's ADS data quality assessment guidance.
- **Program, Cross-Site and Meta Evaluation.** This module introduces participants to program level evaluation, which for USAID includes evaluations undertaken at the level of a Strategic Objective. The module also covers cross-site evaluations, which for USAID, often means topical evaluations of similar activities in several Missions. Meta-evaluation, a term that is generally used to describe reviews of existing evaluations to assess either their quality or the substantive lessons they provide is also included in this module. Practical application of both meta-evaluation techniques and cross-site evaluation techniques takes place during Phase III of the course.
- **Gender in Evaluation.** The module focuses on a variety of issues that may trigger data disaggregation, e.g., concerns about differential impacts on people living in different locations; of different age groups or ethnic backgrounds; with different levels of education or income, etc. Participants learn to address gender in evaluations and how this variable may impact data collection and analysis.
- **Participatory Evaluation.** This topic, touched on in Phase I, is revisited, in the light of participant field experiences. Having carried out an evaluation, course participants have a better basis for understanding both the complexity and potential value of involving a range of stakeholders, including beneficiaries, in evaluations at the design stage, during data collection and analysis; in the framing of recommendations, and as recipients of evaluation results.
- **Evaluation Standards.** This module introduces participants to a set of standards for practitioners of evaluation that have been established and promulgated by the American Evaluation Association. The module also examines the cross-cultural validity of these standards, drawing upon participant knowledge of their own cultures and upon published research into the cross-cultural validity of these evaluation standards.
- **Evaluation Capacity in the Region.** This module introduces course participants to efforts underway around the world to build evaluation capacity at the national level in developing and transition countries. Participants receive information on grass-roots evaluation networks and associations that are emerging in these countries.

Annex B: Illustrative Class Agendas for Phase I and Phase III

Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
8:30	<p><i>Welcome and Introductions</i></p> <p><i>Course Structure and Objectives</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation in the Program Management Cycle</i></p>	<p><i>Quick Review</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation Questions</i></p> <p><i>Teams Draft Evaluation Questions for their SOWs</i></p>	<p><i>Quick Review</i></p> <p><i>The Data Collection Toolbox and the Getting to Answers Worksheet</i></p> <p><i>Using Observation Techniques to Collect Evaluation Data</i></p>	<p><i>Quick Review</i></p> <p><i>Selecting Samples from a Population</i></p> <p><i>Data Analysis: Qualitative Techniques</i></p>	<p><i>Quick Review</i></p> <p>Teams Evaluation Plans Presentations & Feedback from Class (6-9 minute flip chart or PowerPoint presentations focusing on team data collection & analysis plans) (Roughly 20 minutes per team for both presentation and class feedback.)</p>
10:15	Break	Break	Break	Break	Break
10:30	<p><i>Statement of Work (SOW) for an Evaluation & Program Theory</i></p> <p><i>Teams Established for Phase II Evaluations</i></p>		<p><i>Using Key Informant and Group</i></p> <p><i>Interviews to Collect Evaluation Data</i></p> <p><i>Using a Mini-Survey to Collect Evaluation Data</i></p>	<p><i>Data Analysis : Quantitative Techniques</i></p> <p><i>Teams resume their preparations – prepare a sampling plan if needed and a detailed data analysis plan</i></p>	<p>Teams Evaluation Plans Presentations & Feedback from Class</p>
12:15	Lunch	Lunch		Lunch	Lunch
1:30	<p><i>Teams prepare a brief description of the projects they will evaluate, including a statement or diagram of the project's cause and effect logic (program theory)</i></p>	<p>Team SOW Presentations (4-5 minute flip chart presentations cover program theory and evaluation questions and feedback from the class. (Roughly 10 minutes per team for both presentation and feedback)</p>	<p><i>Teams make decisions about which evaluation methods to use for each evaluation question and begin developing their data collection instruments.</i></p>	<p><i>Team planning continues – work on data collection instruments and data analysis plan.</i></p>	<p><i>Teams finalize their Phase II data collection/ analysis plans and establish member's roles and responsibilities, including for preparation of their evaluation report. Internal team deadlines are set.</i></p>
2:45	Break	Break	Break	Break	Break
3:00	<p><i>Team briefing & interview</i></p> <p><i>Teams may revise their project description and draft their evaluation purpose statement after this session</i></p>	<p><i>Evaluation Design</i></p> <p><i>Teams start working on "Getting to Answers" Worksheets</i></p>	<p><i>Team time continues, teams start to develop their data collection instruments</i></p> <p><i>Values and Ethics in Evaluation</i></p> <p><i>Practical Interviewing Skills</i></p>	<p><i>Team time to complete their evaluation plans and prepare for Friday presentations which may use Flip Charts or PowerPoint</i></p> <p><i>Building Effective Evaluation Teams</i></p>	<p><i>Essence of a Great Evaluation Report</i></p> <p><i>Visual Display of Quantitative Information</i></p> <p>Class input for Phase III solicited: Topics of Interest</p> <p>Phase I Course Evaluation</p>
5:00	Session Ends	Session Ends	Session Ends	Session Ends	Phase I Ends
On Your Own	<p>Reading:</p> <p><i>Michael Quinn Patton article on Evaluation Questions (Tab 4.B)</i></p>	<p>Reading</p> <p><i>Objectivity in Social Science Research (Tab 10.A.1)</i></p>	<p>Reading:</p> <p><i>Influential Evaluations (Handout)</i></p>	<p>Reading:</p> <p><i>Guide to Construction of an Evaluation Report (Tab 12.A.1)</i></p>	

Phase I Class Schedule

Phase III Class Schedule

Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
8:30	<p>Welcome Back</p> <p>Review of team experiences/key problems</p> <p><i>Process for Presenting and Reviewing Evaluation Reports</i></p>	<p>6th Team Presentation</p> <p>7th Team Presentation</p>	<p>Quick Review</p> <p><i>Synthesizing Findings from Mixed Method Evaluations</i></p> <hr/> <p><i>Incorporating Cost-Effectiveness into Evaluations</i></p>	<p>Quick Review</p> <p>Presentations from Meta-Evaluation Working Groups</p>	<p>Quick Review</p> <p><i>Evaluation Culture</i></p> <p><i>Developing Action Plans – Individual Time</i></p>
10:15	Break	Break @ 10:30	Break	Break	Break
10:30	<p>Team time for preparing presentations</p> <p>1st Team Presentation</p>	<p>8th Team Presentation</p> <p>Summary Comments from Stakeholders</p>	<p><i>Program and Meta Evaluation</i></p> <p>Meta-Evaluation Questions and Procedures for Working Groups</p> <p>Working Groups begin Meta-Evaluation</p>	<p><i>Impact Evaluations</i></p>	<p><i>Continue Action Plans and Present Action Plan Reports</i></p>
12:15	Lunch	Lunch		Lunch	Lunch
1:15	<p>2nd Team Presentation</p> <p>3rd Team Presentation</p>	<p>Instructor Overview of Priorities for Team Evaluation Revisions</p> <p>Team Time: Teams establish priorities and team assignments for rewriting report to meet Friday deadline & get started</p>	<p>Working Groups continue Meta-evaluation and prepare presentations.</p>	<p><i>Evaluation Standards and the Quality of Evaluations</i></p> <p><i>Strengthening the Utilization of Evaluations</i></p>	<p>Teams turn in Revised Evaluation Reports</p> <p>Course evaluation</p> <p>Graduation Celebration & Certificates Issued</p>
2:45	Break	Break	Break	Break	Course Ends
3:00	<p>4th Team Presentation</p> <p>5th Team Presentation</p>	<p>Team Time: Revise Evaluation Reports</p>	<p>Team Time: Finalize Evaluation Reports</p>	<p>Team Time: Finalize Evaluation Reports</p>	
Session ends daily at 5:00					
On Your Own	<p>If you have not read and scored the reports for tomorrow's presentations, do so tonight!</p>			<p>Reading: <i>Evaluation Culture</i></p>	

Annex C: Participant List

Name, Surname	Office/Mission	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III
Course I: Catholic Charities Diocese of Arlington				
Abdulhamid Alajami	USAID/Yemen	●	●	●
Raidan Al-Saggaf*	USAID/Yemen	●	●	
Sayed Behrami	USAID/Afghanistan	●	●	●
Sara Calvert	USAID/Nicaragua	●	●	●
Mark Carrato	USAID/Columbia	●	●	●
Kelley Cormier	EGAT/ED/HEW	●	●	●
Laurie de Freese	ASIA/SPO/SP	●	●	●
Victoria Gellis	USAID/Rwanda	●	●	●
Shameka Harmon	GH/OHA/SCMS	●	●	●
John Hatch	EGAT/ED/BE	●	●	●
Anais Henriquez	USAID/Honduras	●	●	
Carol Herrera	Citizen's Exchanges-Africa	●	●	●
Hanna Jung	ODP/OD	●	●	●
Jessica Lieberman	State/DRL	●	●	●
Yvette Malcioln	HR/FSP	●	●	●
Charles Mandivenyi	USAID/Pretoria	●	●	●
Lisa Maniscalco	GH/HIDN/HS	●	●	●
Karili Melo	USAID/Brazil	●	●	●
Colleen Noble	USAID/Guyana	●	●	●
Sharon Nwankwo	AFR/SD/ED	●	●	●
Bhavani Pathak	EGAT/PAICO/PAMS	●	●	●
Sandra Scham	ASIA/SPO	●	●	●
Mario Valori	USAID/Bolivia	●	●	●
Madeline Williams	USAID/Egypt	●	●	●
Course II: Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation				
Jessica Berlow	State-INL	●	●	●
Fernando Chavez	USAID/Peru	●	●	●
Samuel Chincaro	USAID/Peru	●	●	●
Don Chisholm	State-INL	●	●	●
Phakatip Chungbhivat	USAID/Liberia	●		●
Logan Clark	MSI	●	●	●
Christopher Cushing	USAID/Panama	●	●	●
Dianna Darsney	USAID/Peru	●	●	
Abdrahamane Dicko	USAID/Mali	●	●	●
Charles Evans	CYITC	●	●	●
Micah Frumkin	MSI	●	●	●
David Jessee	LAC/RSD/BBEG	●		
Khaksar Adil	USAID/Afghanistan	●	●	
Ky Lam	GH/PDMS	●	●	●
Gastao Lukangu	USAID/Angola	●	●	●
Mamesho Macaulay	USAID-IG/MCC/PA	●	●	
Sarah Morgan	State-DRL	●	●	●
José Luis Mota	USAID/Mexico	●	●	●
Maricela Ramirez	USAID/Santa Domingo	●	●	●
Diane Ray	USAID-M/MPBP/PERF	●	●	●
Richard Reithinger	USAID/Ethiopia	●	●	●
Mariella Ruiz-Rodriguez	USAID/West Bank and Gaza	●	●	●
Total		45	43	39

*Left USAID employment.

Course Instructors and Observers

Name, Surname	Office/Mission	Email Address	Course I	Course II
Molly Hageboeck	MSI	mhageboeck@msi-inc.com	●	●
Larry Beyna	MSI	lbeyna@msi-inc.com	●	●
Richard Columbia	MSI	rcolumbia@msi-inc.com		●
Micah Frumkin	MSI	mfrumkin@msi-inc.com	●	●
Peter Davis	State Department	davispb@state.gov	●	●
Sharon Benoiel	State Department	benoiels@state.gov	●	●

Annex D: Evaluation Report Review – Score Sheet

NOTE: TURN IN AFTER EACH TEAM MAKES ITS PRESENTATION

Check your reviewer category:

Member of This Team _____ Member of a Different Team _____ USAID/W _____
 MSI Instructors _____ Program Implementer _____

Title of study being reviewed: _____

ELEMENTS OF AN EVALUATION REPORT

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	Yes	Partially	No
STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT			
1. Does the report have a Table of Contents?			
2. Does the report identify the evaluation team members and any sponsors of the evaluation?			
3. Does the report have a Glossary of Terms?			
4. Does the report state the period in which the evaluation was conducted?			
5. Is the date of the report given?			
6. Does the body of the report adhere to the 20 page rule?			
7. Does the report include the complete Statement of Work in an annex?			
8. Is the report well-organized (each topic is clearly delineated, subheadings used for easy reading)?			
9. Does the presentation highlight important information in ways that capture the reader’s attention?			
10. Is the report well written (clear sentences, reasonable length paragraphs, no typos, acceptable for dissemination to potential users)?			
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY			
11. Does the Executive Summary concisely state the main points of the evaluation?			
12. Does the Executive Summary follow the rule of only saying what the evaluation itself says and not introducing new material?			
INTRODUCTION			
13. Does the introduction explain the problem/opportunity the project was trying to address?			
14. Are the “theory of change” or development hypotheses that underlie the project explained? (Does the report specify the project’s inputs, direct results (outputs), higher level results and goals, so that the reader understands the logical structure of the project and what it was supposed to accomplish?)			
15. Is the context in which the project was undertaken explained?			
16. Does the introduction explain/show where the project was implemented (physical location)?			
17. Does the introduction explain when the project was			

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	Yes	Partially	No
implemented?			
18. Is USAID’s level of investment in the project stated?			
19. Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly stated?			
20. Is there a clear statement of how the evaluation will be used and who the intended users are?			
21. Are the evaluation questions presented in the introduction?			
METHODOLOGY			
22. Does the report provide a clear description of the evaluation’s research design? (The way in which the team went about answering specific questions, such as by making comparisons?)			
23. Is there a clear description of the evaluation’s data collection methods (summarized in the text with the full description presented in an annex)?			
24. Are the questionnaires or other data collection instruments provided in the methods annex?			
25. Does the evaluation clearly state any data “limitations” in the body of the report, before the reader reaches the findings section (small samples, only went to villages near the road, implementer insisted on picking who team met with)?			
FINDINGS			
26. Are the evaluation FINDINGS (findings are more or less analyzed facts) stated clearly? (Can the reader easily understand what the team found?)			
27. Are FINDINGS presented in a way that makes their relationship to specific evaluation questions clear?			
28. Are FINDINGS adequately supported by relevant quantitative or qualitative data?			
29. Are percentages, ratios, cross-tabulations, rather than raw data presented, where appropriate?			
30. When percentages are given, does the author always indicate the number of cases used to calculate the percentage?			
31. Are charts and graphs used to present or summarize data, where relevant?			
32. Are adequate data provided to address the validity of the “theory of change” or development hypothesis underlying the project, i.e., cause and effect relationships?			
33. Are alternative explanations of any observed results discussed, if found?			
34. Are unplanned results the team discovered adequately described?			
35. Are opinions, conclusions, and recommendations kept out of the description of FINDINGS?			
CONCLUSIONS			
36. Is there a clear distinction between CONCLUSIONS and FINDINGS?			
37. Is every CONCLUSION in the report supported by a specific or clearly defined set of FINDINGS?			
38. Are the CONCLUSIONS credible, given the FINDINGS the report presents?			

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	Yes	Partially	No
39. Can the reader tell what CONCLUSIONS the evaluation team reached on each evaluation question?			
RECOMMENDATIONS			
40. Are RECOMMENDATIONS separated from CONCLUSIONS? (Are they highlighted, presented in a separate section or otherwise marked so that the reader sees them as being distinct?)			
41. Are all RECOMMENDATIONS supported by a specific or clearly defined set of FINDINGS and CONCLUSIONS? (Clearly derived from what the evaluation team learned?)			
42. Are the RECOMMENDATIONS relevant and practical?			
43. Are the RECOMMENDATIONS responsive to the purpose of the evaluation?			
44. Is it clear who is responsible for each set of recommendations? (The project implementation team, USAID staff, the host government, USAID/W, etc.)			
LESSONS LEARNED, IF APPROPRIATE			
45. Did this evaluation include any lessons that would be useful for future projects or programs, in the same country or elsewhere?			
46. Are the <i>Lessons Learned</i> highlighted in a clear way?			
47. Did the report indicate who those lessons are for? (The project implementation team, future project, USAID/W, etc.)			
BOTTOM LINE			
48. Does the evaluation report give the appearance of a thoughtful, well-researched and well organized effort to objectively evaluate what worked in the project, what did not and why?			
49. Is the evaluation report structured in a way that will promote its utilization?			

Annex E: Course Evaluation Results

End of Phase I Evaluation

MSI Certificate Course in Evaluation (course 1 of 2) – Phase I Participant Assessment ~ Washington, DC, January 2009

Name: _____

(optional)

A. Understanding of Concepts

(Place an X in the box that describes your level of understanding)

Concept or Idea Presented in the Training Program	How Well I Understand the Concept or Idea		
	Not well	Somewhat	Very well
The meaning of the term evaluation		3	22
The difference between a finding or fact, a conclusion and a recommendation		6	18
That both monitoring and evaluation gather information about <i>what</i> happened in a project or program		3	20
That evaluations are expected to provide information about <i>why</i> projects are/are not succeeding		2	22
That evaluation is different from auditing		1	23
How to select a sample that is not biased	1	16	7
Why evaluators usually treat beneficiary data as being confidential.		3	21
That the questions asked by clients and other stakeholders should be the main focus for an evaluation team		3	21
What to do to increase the likelihood that an evaluation will be utilized		12	12
That comparison – before and after, or Project A to Project B is almost always an element of a good evaluation		7	17
How to use a cross-tabulation to display and analyze the answers to two questions at the same time	2	7	15
That evaluation teams have a right/obligation to ask sponsors and clients to clarify the evaluation purpose and questions if they are not clear in an evaluation Scope of Work		4	20
When an evaluation is needed	1	9	15
How to write a closed-ended question		2	22
When to use open-ended questions and when to use closed-ended questions		13	12

Concept or Idea Presented in the Training Program	How Well I Understand the Concept or Idea		
	Not well	Somewhat	Very well
That creating more precise definitions and measures for projects is often part of an evaluator's job	1	6	17
That most project evaluations try to compare planned to actual performance		6	18
The difference between a probability and non-probability sample	2	13	9
How to make observation a systematic data collection tool	1	8	14
That an evaluation team must make a special effort if it wants to learn about the unplanned results of projects and programs	1	7	16
That when an innovative project is evaluated, the evaluation comparisons are sometimes built into the project design in the form of a "comparison" group that does not receive project services		7	17
That existing data and information may be used by an evaluator. Evaluators do not have to rely only on the new data they collect themselves		2	22
That the process of data collection can cause a reaction, i.e., that people often try to give evaluators the answers they think the evaluators want		1	23
How to prepare tables and other formats for recording data from different interviews and site visits in a common way		7	17
The role of an evaluation officer in USAID	5	11	8
The difference between a group interview and a focus groups interview	1	5	18
That evaluation teams actually design a structure or framework for an evaluation before they go out to gather data		1	23
How to create a scale that can be used to gather data on opinions or perceptions	1	10	13

B. Evaluation of the Workshop

Please rate the usefulness of workshop elements listed below using a ✓ in the appropriate column

Workshop Element		<i>Participant Ratings of Usefulness of Training Elements</i> (One = low and Five = high)				
		<i>One</i>	<i>Two</i>	<i>Three</i>	<i>Four</i>	<i>Five</i>
Trainers	Molly Hagebock			3	8	12
	Larry Beyna			1	7	15
Course Content: Presentations and Slides	Evaluation Through the Decades		3	5	10	4
	Monitoring and Evaluation in USAID Today		2	5	9	6
	Elements of Evaluation Scopes of Work			1	10	14
	Articulating Program Theory			5	8	11
	Influential Evaluations		1	2	8	10
	Evaluation Questions			4	5	16
	Evaluation Teams, Schedule and Budget in SOWs		1	3	8	12
	Evaluation Design			3	3	17
	Data Collection Toolbox			4	10	10
	Sampling		1	2	8	12
	Managing Evaluation Teams		1	6	9	7
	Values and Ethics	1	1	7	8	5
	Art of Asking Questions	1	1	3	10	8
	Data Analysis	1		2	11	10
Evaluation Reports			3	7	13	
Participant Notebooks – Readings and Handouts					3	3
Class Exercises	In Class Exercises		3	2	9	9
	Team Preparation for Phase II Evaluations		3	3	6	11
Opportunities for Participation and Discussion				2	5	14

C. What was most useful in Phase I of the Course?

- SOW composition (6)
- Preparation for Phase II throughout
- Meeting client on Day 1
- Thought-provoking examples of presenter's own experience (4)
- Preparing reports
- Evaluation design (4)
- Teamwork (6)
- Group discussion
- Frameworks and formats (3)
- Data collection toolkit (3)

- Evaluation reports (3)
- Program theory (5)
- *Micah's intervention & help ID an evaluation subject
- Practical section (3)
- Everything (2)
- Sampling section

D. What was least useful during Phase I?

- lack of time to prepare evaluation for real client
- in-depth disc of sampling
- some material presented too quickly – especially on statistics review
- too much discussion on specific points
- sampling section (2)
- people with different backgrounds slowed the course down
 - o covered info already known (5)
- trainers need to pay more attention to participants while speaking – a lot of interruptions
- evaluation report formats – a sample handout would be useful
- lack of time (8)
- need more balanced discussion
- ethics – to simplified
- quantitative data analysis too simple (2)
- 1st session introduction was too long
- Test your skills exercise
- Update PPT information
- Need to account for email instead of phone and regular post (mail)

E. Suggestions for topics I would like to learn about in Phase III of the course (the second classroom phase, after teams have completed their field work).

- follow up on report drafting and data analysis tools
- evaluation presentation techniques
- add “No side bar conversations’ to group norms
- establishing a baseline
- budgeting for an evaluation (2)
- mission orders on an evaluation
- examples of good evaluation reports and designs (4)
- use findings to make persuasive argument (2)
- info on making projects evaluable
- ex-post facto evaluations
- timing – how long is too long for an evaluation
- more info on qualitative analysis
- impact evaluations
- doing evaluations domestically
- don't put people from same mission on same team (2)
- trouble shooting
- Molly should explain things more fully

**MSI Certificate Course in Evaluation (course 2 of 2) – Phase I
Participant Assessment ~ Washington, DC, April 2009**

Name: _____

(optional)

A. Understanding of Concepts

(Place an X in the box that describes your level of understanding)

Concept or Idea Presented in the Training Program	How Well I Understand the Concept or Idea		
	Not well	Somewhat	Very well
The meaning of the term evaluation		3 (14.3%)	18 (85.7%)
The difference between a finding or fact, a conclusion and a recommendation		4 (19.0%)	17 (81.0%)
That both monitoring and evaluation gather information about <i>what</i> happened in a project or program		3 (14.3%)	18 (85.7%)
That evaluations are expected to provide information about <i>why</i> projects are/are not succeeding		1 (4.8%)	20 (95.2%)
That evaluation is different from auditing		2 (9.5%)	19 (90.5%)
How to select a sample that is not biased		11 (52.4%)	10 (47.5%)
Why evaluators usually treat beneficiary data as being confidential.		6 (28.6%)	15 (71.4%)
That the questions asked by clients and other stakeholders should be the main focus for an evaluation team		2 (9.5%)	19 (90.5%)
What to do to increase the likelihood that an evaluation will be utilized	1	8	14
That comparison – before and after, or Project A to Project B is almost always an element of a good evaluation		6 (28.6%)	15 (71.4%)
How to use a cross-tabulation to display and analyze the answers to two questions at the same time	1 (4.8%)	5 (23.8%)	15 (71.4%)
That evaluation teams have a right/obligation to ask sponsors and clients to clarify the evaluation purpose and questions if they are not clear in an evaluation Scope of Work		1	17
When an evaluation is needed	2 (9.6%)	4 (19.0%)	15 (71.4%)
How to write a closed-ended question		6 (28.6%)	15 (71.4%)
When to use open-ended questions and when to used closed-ended questions		4 (19.0%)	17 (81.0%)
That creating more precise definitions and measures for projects is often part of an evaluator’s job		3 (14.3%)	18 (85.7%)
That most project evaluations try to compare planned to actual performance	1	4	15

Concept or Idea Presented in the Training Program	How Well I Understand the Concept or Idea		
	Not well	Somewhat	Very well
The difference between a probability and non-probability sample	2 (9.5%)	6 (28.5%)	13 (62.0%)
How to make observation a systematic data collection tool	1	11	10
That an evaluation team must make a special effort if it wants to learn about the unplanned results of projects and programs		6 (28.6%)	15 (71.4%)
That when an innovative project is evaluated, the evaluation comparisons are sometimes built into the project design in the form of a “comparison” group that does not receive project services		3 (14.3%)	18 (85.7%)
That existing data and information may be used by an evaluator. Evaluators do not have to rely only on the new data they collect themselves		2 (9.5%)	19 (90.5%)
That the process of data collection can cause a reaction, i.e., that people often try to give evaluators the answers they think the evaluators want	1		19
How to prepare tables and other formats for recording data from different interviews and site visits in a common way		8	12
The role of an evaluation officer in USAID	1 (4.8%)	9 (42.8%)	11 (52.4%)
The difference between a group interview and a focus groups interview		5	15
That evaluation teams actually design a structure or framework for an evaluation before they go out to gather data		2 (9.5%)	19 (90.5%)
How to create a scale that can be used to gather data on opinions or perceptions		8 (38.1%)	13 (61.9%)

B. Evaluation of the Workshop

Please rate the usefulness of workshop elements listed below using a ✓ in the appropriate column

Workshop Element		<i>Participant Ratings of Usefulness of Training Elements</i> (One = low and Five = high)				
		<i>One</i>	<i>Two</i>	<i>Three</i>	<i>Four</i>	<i>Five</i>
Trainers	Molly Hagebock		1 (4.8%)	4 (19.0%)	4 (19.0%)	12 (57.2%)
	Larry Beyna			2 (9.5%)	7 (33.3%)	12 (57.2%)
	Richard Columbia	1		4	4	11
Course Content: Presentati	Evaluation Through the Decades		1	5	8	4
	Monitoring and Evaluation in USAID Today		1 (4.8%)	4 (19.0%)	8 (38.1%)	8 (38.1%)
	Elements of Evaluation Scopes of		1	1	8	10

Workshop Element		<i>Participant Ratings of Usefulness of Training Elements</i>				
		(One = low and Five = high)				
		<i>One</i>	<i>Two</i>	<i>Three</i>	<i>Four</i>	<i>Five</i>
ons and Slides	Work					
	Articulating Program Theory			2	7	10
	Influential Evaluations			4	6	9
	Evaluation Questions			2 (9.5%)	8 (38.1%)	11 (52.4%)
	Evaluation Teams, Schedule and Budget in SOWs			5 (23.8%)	8 (38.1%)	8 (38.1%)
	Evaluation Design			1 (4.8%)	8 (38.1%)	12 (57.1%)
	Data Collection Toolbox			2 (9.5%)	7 (33.3%)	12 (57.2%)
	Sampling			6	6	8
	Managing Evaluation Teams	1 (4.8%)		6 (28.6%)	5 (23.8%)	9 (42.8%)
	Values and Ethics			7	4	7
	Art of Asking Questions	1		5	8	6
	Data Analysis	3 (14.3%)		3 (14.3%)	6 (28.6%)	9 (42.8%)
	Evaluation Reports			3 (14.3%)	6 (28.6%)	12 (57.1%)
	Participant Notebooks – Readings and Handouts				1	1
Class Exercises	In Class Exercises		1	5	7	6
	Team Preparation for Phase II Evaluations			3	8	7
Opportunities for Participation and Discussion		1	1	3	5	9

End of Course Evaluation

Evaluation: Certificate Program in Evaluation - Phase III (course 1 of 2)

A. Purposes of the Certificate Program

The Certificate Program in Evaluation had six objectives:

1. Understand the role of evaluation in the program and activity management cycle.
2. Improve skills needed to prepare high quality, utilization-focused evaluation Scopes of Work.
3. Understand the importance of ethics in evaluation.
4. Develop the capacity to carry out an evaluation that will produce the kinds of information needed to answer evaluation questions.
5. Learn how to review and critique evaluation plans and draft evaluation reports – with an eye to improving them.
6. Improve understanding of how to utilize evaluation findings to inform management decisions.

Overall Achievement of Course Objectives

Keeping in mind these objectives, please give us your honest assessment of this course:

		Fully	Partially	Marginally	No
1	Did the course achieve Objective 1?	21 (95.5%)		1 (4.5%)	
2	Did the course achieve Objective 2?	13 (59.1%)	9 (40.9%)		
3	Did the course achieve Objective 3?	10 (45.5%)	9 (40.9%)	3 (13.6%)	
4	Did the course achieve Objective 4?	13 (59.1%)	8 (36.3%)	1 (4.5%)	
5	Did the course achieve Objective 5?	17 (77.3%)	5 (22.7%)		
6	Did the course achieve Objective 6?	14 (63.6%)	8 (36.4%)		

B. Phase I Classroom Training

Thinking back to Phase I of this course, please answer the following questions

	Phase I Classroom Training	Too Much	Right Amount	Not Quite Enough	Not at all
7	Did the classroom experience provide you with sufficient theory on the purposes, ethics and evolution of evaluation?	4 (18.2%)	17 (77.3%)	1 (4.5%)	
8	Did the classroom experience give you enough information on evaluation design to develop a valid and efficient approach to your field evaluation assignment?	1 (4.5%)	17 (77.3%)	4 (18.2%)	
9	Did the classroom experience give you enough information on methods of collecting data for you to select and apply appropriate data collection methods to your field assignment?	1 (4.55%)	12 (54.55%)	9 (40.90%)	
10	Did the classroom experience give you enough information on data analysis techniques for you to organize, summarize, interpret and display the data you collected?	1 (4.5%)	10 (45.5%)	11 (50%)	
8	Did the classroom experience give you enough insight into good project design for you to identify project design weaknesses in the projects you evaluated as part of your field assignment? <i>One answered with a ? mark.</i>	1 (4.5%)	13 (59.1%)	7 (31.8%)	
9	Did the classroom experience give you enough information to write a professional report on the evaluation you carried out during your field assignment?	2 (9.1%)	18 (81.8%)	2 (9.1%)	

10. What suggestions do you have to improve Phase I?

- Lost valuable teaching/learning time to group with. For some (like me) the group was more frustrating than it was a learning experience.

C. Phase II: On-Site Evaluation (Fieldwork)

Looking back to the evaluation you carried out as part of a team, please answer the following questions. If you did not participate in the fieldwork portion of this course, please skip to Section D of this questionnaire.

		Fully	Partially	Marginally	Not at all
Phase II – On-site Evaluation (Fieldwork)					
11	Looking back, was your “team” able to function effectively as a “team” in the manner that the course had suggested is appropriate for evaluation work? <i>No answer - 1</i>	4 (18.2%)	10 (45.5%)	6 (27.3%)	1 (4.5%)
12	Looking back, do you feel that your team developed an adequate plan for its fieldwork?	2 (9.1%)	13 (59.1%)	6 (27.3%)	1 (4.5%)
13	Looking back, do you feel that you collected the data that you needed to prepare your evaluation report?	6 (27.3%)	12 (54.5%)	3 (13.6%)	1 (4.5%)
14	Looking back, do you feel that you adequately analyzed the data you collected?	5 (22.7%)	12 (54.5%)	5 (22.7%)	
15	Looking back, do you feel that you had enough time to complete your field assignment?	1 (4.5%)	8 (36.4%)	9 (40.9%)	4 (18.2%)

16. If you did not have enough time, what aspect of your evaluation suffered from insufficient time?

- ♦ Analysis (11)
- ♦ Data-collection (7)
- ♦ Report writing (5)
- ♦ Planning (4)
- ♦ Document review (2)
- ♦ Methodology (1)
- ♦ Team work (1)

17. Was the choice of evaluating community development projects a good idea? (22)

Yes – 19 No – 1 No answer – 2

18. Did the Phase II on-site evaluation research and report writing phase of this course justify the expense and effort involved? (22)

Fully – 10 Partially- 10 Marginally – 1 Not at all – 0 No answer - 1

19. What suggestions do you have to improve Phase II of this course?

- ♦ More time is needed (data-collecting, writing report, preparing SOW) (7)
- ♦ Be sure client is prepared to support team (3)
- ♦ Give a session on group dynamics, team-building (3)
- ♦ Provide a realistic notice about amount of time course will take (particularly in regards to time spent on this outside of classroom sessions) (3)
- ♦ Access to resources (i.e. Computers for report-writing) (3)
- ♦ Importance of creating a work plan

- ♦ Give a session on budgeting for an evaluation
- ♦ Spend more time on utilization of evaluation reports
- ♦ More information and stress on ADS regulations regarding evaluations
- ♦ Decrease the workloads for small groups; do small group work during class and rotate groups so that experience & skill are mixed and balanced more adequately
- ♦ Rethink Phase II, so students are better prepared for field work
- ♦ Do not mix DC-based and overseas participants
- ♦ Check on participant progress
- ♦ Find a way to create better balanced teams
- ♦ Combine fieldwork with classroom activities
- ♦ Evaluation questions should be clear
- ♦ 3 Phases should take place consecutively
- ♦ Mandate that Washington-based teams do 1 full week, instead of spreading the work out
- ♦ Do half day at the end of 2nd week on report planning
- ♦ Brief the client on expectations of what can be accomplished and (if possible) have them do more thinking about the types of questions they need answered before the first meeting

D. Phase III - Classroom Work

		Very important	Important	Marginally Important	Not at all
	Phase III - Classroom Work				
20	How important to your overall experience was the task of making a presentation on your evaluation?	14 (63.7%)	5 (22.7%)	3 (13.6%)	
21	How important was the discussion among all teams of their field assignment experiences?	13 (59.1%)	8 (36.4%)	1 (4.5%)	
22	How important was the feedback session for your team with the course instructors?	17 (77.3%)	4 (18.2%)	1 (4.5%)	
23	How important was your participation in an effort to look across the project evaluations and develop general findings about the whole group of projects, i.e., the cross-project analysis? <i>No response - 1</i> (4.5%)	7 (31.8%)	8 (36.4%)	4 (18.2%)	2 (9.1%)
24	How useful were the additional training sessions presented during this classroom phase (see list below) <i>No response -9</i> (40.9%)	3 (13.6%)	7 (31.8%)	2 (9.1%)	1 (4.5%)
25	How important was the Data Quality session? <i>No response - 4</i> (18.2%)	7 (31.8%)	8 (36.4%)	3 (13.6%)	
26	How important was the session on Cross-Site and Meta-Evaluation Approaches?	7 (31.8%)	10 (45.5%)	5 (22.7%)	
27	How important was the session on Evaluation Standards?	5 (22.7%)	12 (54.5%)	5 (22.7%)	

28. What suggestions do you have to improve Phase III of this course?

- ♦ Better balance – class time / report writing (4)
- ♦ More resources for reports (computers, printers, etc.) (4)
- ♦ More time for reports (3)
- ♦ Temper presentation comments when client is present
- ♦ Place more emphasis on evaluation standards

- ♦ Evaluation Standards session should be at beginning of course
- ♦ More classroom time in Phase II, less in Phase III
- ♦ Advise participants of schedule and due dates in advance
- ♦ Be sure Missions make sure participants are committed to participating in all 3 Phases
- ♦ Provide location for Phase II work
- ♦ More time for preliminary work during Phase I would make Phase III more productive
- ♦ More time for extra presentations
- ♦ Useful sections for USAID work (impact evaluations, utilizations, evaluation culture) got short shift while other sessions not as useful got too much
- ♦ Should be more in depth instead of a survey of too much information
- ♦ Does not really consolidate or build on Phase I

E. Final Thoughts

29. Please mark the statements which best describe the overall assessment of the impact of this course on your knowledge and skills. Put a mark in the far right column for as many statements that apply.

a	The course was interesting but it is not likely that I will be able to use much in my future work.	1
b	I did not find much in this course that was relevant or useful for my work at USAID.	0
c	I may not be able to participate in many evaluations in the future, but I now have a good understanding of how to use evaluations to learn more and improve my Mission's programs.	4
d	The course gave me enough experience that with some technical assistance, I am now confident to develop evaluation scopes of work that will result in evaluations my Mission finds informative and useful.	14
e	Because of what I learned in this course, I am now able to participate as a member of an evaluation team.	18
f	I now feel sufficiently confident of my evaluation skills and think that I could be a team leader and principle author of a project evaluation for USAID or any other international donor organization.	8
g	By funding my participation in this three week off-site course, my Mission is unlikely to fund my participation in other key USAID courses such as CTO training or the Planning, Achieving and Learning (PAL) Course on ADS 2000.	3
h	Because I am a part time Evaluation Officer in addition to other duties, this course was too long.	0

30. Is there any information you learned in this course – or skills you developed – that you have already applied in your Mission? If you have already found ways to apply what you have learned to your work in your Mission, please briefly describe those applications.

- ♦ Evaluation proposal review, better equipped to review evaluation proposals as a TEC member
- ♦ Made suggestions to office on how important it is to think of M&E at the beginning of project/program design
- ♦ Better preparing a SOW
- ♦ Led an evaluation of two Environmental Governance activities between Phase I and III – largely learned how to NOT schedule evaluation team travel and deliverables
- ♦ All, I only do evaluations
- ♦ Responded to/critiqued 3 department SOWs for evaluation from Missions
- ♦ Data collection

- ♦ Gave presentation on what I learned. Incorporated evaluations in Performance Monitoring Plan. More attention to monitoring. May participate in mini-evaluations
- ♦ Including evaluation requirements in contract awards and in work plan development for new contractor
- ♦ Working on an impact evaluation SOW – find I have more to go on

31. Reflecting on what you have learned in this course, how would you compare it to other USAID training courses you have taken – considering both the length of the course and its cost to your Mission? No answer – 1 (4.5%); N/A – 1 (4.5%)

Much less useful than other USAID training courses I have taken	Somewhat less useful than other USAID training courses I have taken	About the same as other USAID training courses	Somewhat more useful than other USAID training courses I have taken	Much more useful than other USAID training courses I have taken
	1 (4.5%)	3 (13.6%)	5 (22.7%)	11 (50%)

32. Reflecting on what you have learned through this course, can you suggest any other type of

training course or experience that would have provided you with the same level of knowledge and skills – but at a lower cost, in terms your Mission’s investment of time, travel and other costs your Mission bore directly to provide you with this training?

- ♦ Auditing
- ♦ An advanced course concentrated on higher level evaluations – corporate or impact evaluations
- ♦ Program design and management
- ♦ Doing evaluation at the mission level with facilitators. May be more meaningful to address international development field
- ♦ Some of this could be done on-the-job with reference materials

33. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your experience in this course?

- ♦ Great experiential course (7)
- ♦ Thanks! (5)
- ♦ Presenters and support staff were wonderful (4)
- ♦ Address skill/experience imbalances within teams (2)
- ♦ Warn future participants of MAJOR time commitment
- ♦ Phase I wasn’t planned/timed well to prep teams for Phase II
- ♦ Include team-building next time
- ♦ Time and technology constraints made course frustrating and negative
- ♦ Best course taken!
- ♦ Glad we met client on Day 1 – Forced to focus!
- ♦ “I’m leaving the course ready to spread your enthusiasm for evaluation, and advocate for more and better evaluations that are followed up with action.”
- ♦ Recommend a course for State
- ♦ “Opens my eyes to initiatives underway internationally and within USAID to move to evidence-based programming/policy-making.”
- ♦ Better balance: client needs / student needs
- ♦ Be more adaptable when students need more time

- ♦ Include a program or contracting officer; to provide insight on the real-life constraints that USAID staff is faced with when trying to plan/fund/perform evaluations
- ♦ More information of semantics of doing joint evaluations
- ♦ Should be more in depth, needs to be reformulated
- ♦ Slides must be updated
- ♦ Instructors cut-off and interrupted students
- ♦ Too generalized, not functional or rigorous enough

Evaluation: Certificate Program in Evaluation - Phase III (course 2 of 2)

A. Purposes of the Certificate Program

The Certificate Program in Evaluation had six objectives:

7. Understand the role of evaluation in the program and activity management cycle.
8. Improve skills needed to prepare high quality, utilization-focused evaluation Statements of Work.
9. Understand the importance of ethics in evaluation.
10. Develop the capacity to carry out an evaluation that will produce the kinds of information needed to answer evaluation questions.
11. Learn how to review and critique evaluation plans and draft evaluation reports – with an eye to improving them.
12. Improve understanding of how to utilize evaluation findings to inform management decisions.

Overall Achievement of Course Objectives

Keeping in mind these objectives, please give us your honest assessment of this course:

		Fully	Partially	Marginally	No
1.	Did the course achieve Objective 1?	15 (83.3%)	3 (16.7)		
2.	Did the course achieve Objective 2?	11 (64.7%)	5 (29.4)	1 (5.9 %)	
3.	Did the course achieve Objective 3?	10 (55.5%)	7 (38.9%)	1 (5.6%)	
4.	Did the course achieve Objective 4?	12 (66.7%)	5 (27.7)	1 (5.6%)	
5.	Did the course achieve Objective 5?	12 (66.7%)	6 (33.3%)		
6.	Did the course achieve Objective 6?	8 (44.4%)	10 (55.5%)		

B. Phase I Classroom Training

Thinking back to Phase I of this course, please answer the following questions

	Phase I Classroom Training	Too Much	Right Amount	Not Quite Enough	Not at all
7.	Did the classroom experience provide you with sufficient theory on the purposes, ethics and evolution of evaluation?	1 (5.6%)	15 (83.3%)	2 (11.1%)	
8.	Did the classroom experience give you enough information on evaluation design to develop a valid and efficient approach to your field evaluation assignment?	1 (5.6%)	13 (72.2%)	4 (22.2%)	
9.	Did the classroom experience give you enough information on methods of collecting data for you to select and apply appropriate data collection methods to your field assignment?	1 (5.6%)	15 (83.3%)	1 (5.6%)	1 (5.6%)
10.	Did the classroom experience give you enough information on data analysis techniques for you to organize, summarize, interpret and display the data you collected?	1 (5.6%)	11 (61.1%)	5 (27.8%)	1 (5.6%)
11.	Did the classroom experience give you enough insight into good project design for you to identify project design weaknesses in the projects you evaluated as part of your field assignment?		13 (72.2%)	3 (16.7%)	2 (11.1%)
12.	Did the classroom experience give you enough information to write a professional report on the evaluation you carried out during your field assignment?	2 (11.1%)	14 (77.8%)	2 (11.1%)	

13. What suggestions do you have to improve Phase I? (8 responses)	3	Utilization of technology – distinction of software (i.e. Survey Monkey)
	1	Training in elementary principles of program design/Results Framework
	2	More advance training in data collecting, content analysis, and statistical analysis (correct definitions of mean, median, and mode)
	1	Spend more time on skills and tools to review and critiques evaluations
	1	Too much material; more time should be devoted to more important themes (inquire about class' knowledge weaknesses and select a few for a more thorough training)
	1	Incorporate Meta-Analysis questions and chart into Phase I
	1	make sure every team addresses a Meta question)
	1	Devote more time to how to write the evaluation report and provide examples of good and bad ones

C. Phase II: On-Site Evaluation (Fieldwork)

Looking back to the evaluation you carried out as part of a team, please answer the following questions. If you did not participate in the fieldwork portion of this course, please skip to Section D of this questionnaire.

	Phase II – On-site Evaluation (Fieldwork)	Fully	Partially	Marginal ly	Not at all
14.	Looking back, was your “team” able to function effectively as a “team” in the manner that the course had suggested is appropriate for evaluation work?	9 (52.9%)	7 (41.2%)	1 (5.9%)	
15.	Looking back, do you feel that your team developed an adequate plan for its fieldwork?	6 (35.3%)	10 (58.8%)	1 (5.9%)	
16.	Looking back, do you feel that you collected the data that you needed to prepare your evaluation report?	6 (35.3%)	7 (41.2%)	4 (23.5%)	
17.	Looking back, do you feel that you adequately analyzed the data you collected?	10 (58.8%)	6 (35.3%)	1 (5.9%)	
18.	Looking back, do you feel that you had enough time to complete your field assignment?	8 (47.1%)	4 (23.5%)	2 (11.8%)	3 (17.6%)

Other Comments:

- Q15 (marked partially) – Time was a significant factor for us.
- Q14 (marked partially) – Only comment here was because we lost a teammate right before data collection began. Otherwise, my remaining partner and I worked extremely well together!

19. If you did not have enough time, what aspect of your evaluation suffered from insufficient time? (11 responses)	1	All of it, particularly the preparation stage, which influenced subsequent parts
	1	Everything: too few people
	1	Design
	3	Data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (1) Data collection • (3) Our findings (i.e. broaden scope of interviewees to include other stakeholders) • (1) Data analysis • (2) Validation of data collection instruments
	3	Report writing
	1	Competing requirements of full-time job and doing evaluations
	1	Problem with organization’s representatives – arranging interviews and willingness of the children/teachers to participate in the survey.
	1	Enough time in terms of course
	1	Poor timing matched to specific grantees (i.e. after-school programs data would have been richer if collected earlier in the year).

20. Was the choice of evaluating community development projects a good idea? (16 responses)	14	Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (7) Yes (only) • (3) Good exercise/idea; good for organization & class • Though, more ideal to evaluate projects more akin to our USAID work and subject matter expertise • (1) Extremely good – Great being able to work with an organization that’s so passionate about its work & couldn’t have done this type of evaluation otherwise • (1) Made the training real and makes the trainee feel valuable for their role as evaluators • (1) Absolutely – Fantastic idea to connect with the local community in this manner • (1) Provided a good chance to learn slightly outside of a comfort zone • (1) Most “real” USAID programs/projects go that way
	1	Definitely interesting, but too labor-intensive, particularly with local participants (suggestion: hypothetical structure/scenarios)
	1	Prefer evaluating an international vs. domestic project

21. Did the Phase II on-site evaluation research and report writing phase of this course justify the expense and effort involved?

_11 (64.7%)_Fully _4 (23.5%)_Partially _1 (5.9%)_Marginally _____ Not at all Other:
Not sure _1 (5.9%)_

Comments:

- Marginally – thought to say now how this experience will be utilized
- Fully – A ton of work, but really learned a lot through it!

22. What suggestions do you have to improve the Phase II of this course? (15 responses)	1	Follow up with client institutions to ensure timely start of fieldwork
	1	More preparatory work with grantees so (1) staff are present and available to meet throughout Phase II and (2) data and reports are available
	3	Pitch programs to only those who have demonstrated earnest commitment and have showed willingness to cooperate in providing evaluators with data (i.e. commitment in writing)
	2	For after-school programs, Phase II timing could have been better (i.e. not at the end of the school year; no later than March to get best picture)
	1	Have a specific time when trainers check-in with participants to assure evaluation is on course
	1	Assign one mentor/facilitator/ coordinator to each team to provide advice and guide the process (fieldwork); most of us are inexperienced
	1	Make sure at least one native English speaker/writer on each team
	2	More time for fieldwork evaluation (i.e. four weeks/month training where trainees spend 100% of their time evaluations)
	1	Taking report writing to missions is not a good idea
	1	Cost of staying longer could be balanced with the cost of two return tickets.

	1	Provide background information to be more prepared (i.e. organization's website)
	1	Clearly and repeatedly state amount of time outside of collecting data (or for Phase II) will be more than 40 hours
	1	Give schedule of Phase III presentation upon completion of Phase II
	1	Make sure that the projects are evaluable with actual questions of impact
	1	Incorporate more technical aspects – the sessions felt like an afterthought and staff seemed more intent in getting through it than imparting information.
	1	Time management was lacking (amount of time for the meta-evaluation was particularly egregious)
	1	Feedback and critique that is supplied is counterproductive <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Particularly cutting from Molly when she said, "The teams were overwhelmed, so they didn't..." Doesn't take into account limitations of the course and particularly so when the underlying reason was poor planning and coordination by the facilitators (We were told by Molly to include Voice and Choice and then when Molly came late to a session Larry told us not to include it)
	1	5 days' advance notice is not enough time to work on presentations and to critique 3 other evaluations. Advance notice of work to be done, what is expected and dates/times was a particular weakness of this phase and the course in general
	1	Found some criticisms of USAID/personnel(s) dispiriting and somewhat insulting; not really reflective or recognizing of the hard work many of us try to do in the field

D. Phase III - Classroom Work

		Very important	Important	Marginally Important	Not at all
23.	How important to your overall experience was the task of making a presentation on your evaluation?	11 (61.1%)	4 (22.2%)	3 (16.7%)	
24.	How important was the discussion among all teams of their field assignment experiences?	11 (61.1%)	5 (27.8%)	2 (11.1%)	
25.	How important was the feedback session for your team with the course instructors?	12 (66.7%)	4 (22.2%)	1 (5.6%)	1 (5.6%)
26.	How important was your participation in an effort to look across the project evaluations and develop general findings about the whole group of projects, i.e., the cross-project analysis?	4 (22.2%)	8 (44.4%)	6 (33.3%)	
27.	How useful were the additional training sessions presented during this classroom phase (see list below)	1 (10.0%)	6 (60.0%)	3 (30.0%)	

28.	How important was the Data Quality session?	3 (16.7%))	10 (55.6%))	5 (27.8%))	
29.	How important was the session on Cross-Site and Meta-Evaluation Approaches?	2 (11.1%))	12 (66.7%))	4 (22.2%))	
30.	How important was the session on Evaluation Standards?	2 (11.1%))	14 (77.8%))	2 (11.1%))	

Other Comments:

- Q25 (marked very important)– Would have been ideal if instructors had made their comments in track changes, as many comments were difficult to read and decipher
- Q27 (marked important) – However, the last day served to have courses that were just fillers...could Phase III be reduced to 4 days?
- Q26 & Q29 (marked marginally important) – Though this may be due to short time frame.

31. What suggestions do you have to improve Phase III of this course? (8 responses)	1	Provide information in advance about work needed, particularly to allow enough time to prepare presentations
	1	Less theory, more hard skills <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More discussion on utilizing technology • Breakout sessions with analyses of specific case studies would be more helpful
	1	Better presentation on impact evaluation; it was not useful – too dense and more examples needed
	1	Would have benefited from doing a Meta Evaluation of SOW's.
	1	Given time constraints, it is practically impossible to review others' team report.
	1	Group work time in the morning (at least in part) to lessen the incentive/ability to decide to cut-out early.
	2	Meta questions/themes must be highlighted in Phase I, so they could be addressed during the evaluations and so that the Meta session can be more relevant
	1	More time for Meta questions
	2	Ask reviewing teams to write comments on report and hand back.
	1	About right as it is; could be reviewed time wise

E. Final Thoughts

32. Please mark the statements which best describe the overall assessment of the impact of this course on your knowledge and skills. Put a mark in the far right column for as many statements that apply.

A	The course was interesting but it is not likely that I will be able to use much in my future work.	
B	I did not find much in this course that was relevant or useful for my work at USAID.	

C	I may not be able to participate in many evaluations in the future, but I now have a good understanding of how to use evaluations to learn more and improve my Mission's programs.	5 (12.2%)
D	The course gave me enough experience that with some technical assistance, I am now confident to develop evaluation statements of work that will result in evaluations my Mission finds informative and useful.	12 (29.3%)
E	Because of what I learned in this course, I am now able to participate as a member of an evaluation team.	13 (31.7%)
F	I now feel sufficiently confident of my evaluation skills and think that I could be a team leader and principle author of a project evaluation for USAID or any other international donor organization.	9 (22.0%)
G	By funding my participation in this three week off-site course, my Mission is unlikely to fund my participation in other key USAID courses such as CTO training or the Planning, Achieving and Learning (PAL) Course on ADS 2000.	1 (2.4%)
H	Because I am a part time Evaluation Officer in addition to other duties, this course was too long.	1 (2.4%)

33. Is there any information you learned in this course – or skills you developed – that you have already applied in your Mission? If you have already found ways to apply what you have learned to your work in your Mission, please briefly describe those applications. (5 responses)	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already applied: Composition of a good statement of work; • To apply/share: evaluation report review forum; “tracking” M&E evaluation forum
	1	Not yet applied, but plan of action session was good! Might be interesting/motivation for MSI to implement a follow-up after 6 months (survey, email, etc.) on what has been done
	1	Reviewing statements of work/TORS for contractors for greater specificity/division of responsibilities
	1	Mission order on M&E
	1	Facilitate information exchange in past and prospective evaluations
	1	Facilitate dissemination of results
	1	Course gave different perspectives on evaluations, which I hope to apply in the future

34. Reflecting on what you have learned in this course, how would you compare it to other USAID training courses you have taken – considering both the length of the course and its cost to your Mission?

Much less useful than other USAID training courses I have taken	Somewhat less useful than other USAID training courses I have taken	About the same as other USAID training courses	Somewhat more useful than other USAID training courses I have taken	Much more useful than other USAID training courses I have taken
		2 (16.7%)	6 (50.0%)	4 (33.3%)

Comments:

- I found this course to be very useful, but I did not have any standard of comparison as I've never taken a formal course before.

35. Reflecting on what you have learned through this course, can you suggest any other type of training course or experience that would have provided you with the same level of knowledge and skills – but at a lower cost, in terms your Mission’s investment of time, travel, and other costs your Mission bore directly to provide you with this training? (9 responses)	1	Inadequate attention paid to quantitative data collection and analysis methods; important to be able to assess this aspect of program proposals. Suggest a course focused on this area.
	1	No, this is both the most expensive course and the one that provides knowledge/skills at highest level
	1	3 rd week presentations not as serious as the 1 st week; seems like the focus of the 3 rd week was on writing the report. However, if impact evaluation section was more thorough, the 3 rd week would be more valuable
	1	Short online M&E training
	1	An on-site mission training course
	1	Investment in time was the biggest investment. Can’t think of any other set-up that would provide as useful information as this course.
	1	How about a training on managing evaluation teams or training on effective presentations on recommendations?
	1	Regional trainings – cut the course to 2 weeks (3 is too long). Fieldwork took up too much time & conflicted with other obligations
	1	Maybe devise a pseudo project to evaluate.
36. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your experience in this course? (12 responses)	1	Disappointed in the qualitative methods section of this course; short in the schedule and even shorter shift in the course itself
	2	Course seemed unprofessional and disorganized: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (2) Starting late, session running over, trainers fighting with each other • (1) Facilitators, particularly Molly, should respect their professional colleagues and allow them their areas of responsibility and not berate them publicly. Too many instances where we were expected to adhere to a standard that was only presented after the fact and then were roundly criticized, particularly by Molly, for not following the instructions. Tell us what we need to do, but do not tell us after the fact, and the say it was our fault we didn’t do it. The preferred report structure is one example! • (1) Facilitators should take their disagreements outside of the classroom – public arguments and conflicts have no place in a training session. • (1) Way too much MSI business was being conducted on the side lines of the course distracting a key facilitator who also clearly dedicated minimal time to review of the evaluations prior to the critique period, yet provided criticism that were then refuted by the groups. • (1) Molly needs a course in providing effective, constructive feedback that demonstrates compassion and respect for others. One in working as a team wouldn’t hurt either.
	1	Participating in Phase II has been an enlightening experience on community development in the U.S.
	1	More breakout sessions with direct mentoring by MSI Evaluation Staff and produce a book of case studies showing pitfalls in certain methodologies
	1	Put the book on CD

	1	Warn participants during the sign-up more than 40 hours out of office is needed for Phase II; It was well-worth the effort but difficult at times to continue conveying the importance to my bureau's management.
	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (2) Trainers were knowledgeable and extremely helpful. • (1) I would like to thank Micah for all of his efforts and hard work in making this course run smoothly. • (1) Good work! • (1) Thank you all for your insight. Collectively you made this an incredibly informative and thought-provoking training. • (1) This has been a fantastic experience, and I feel like I learned a lot I can apply and that generally the class was enjoyable and fun. • (1) Overall, a very good course. Molly and Larry, the two are very different but complement each other. Good job!! • (1) Overall, I learned a lot, and I appreciated the feedback from the trainers and classmates. • (1) Overall, the course was good and useful. Definitely gave a solid base to apply skills and techniques learned as well as learn more about evaluation in the future.
	1	Misconception that once we go back to the mission that data analysis and report writing will be a priority. This is not the case. There is no time for work on this evaluation.
	1	Missions should be told that participants will need time to work on data analysis and report writing to meet draft deadline
	1	Fieldwork was not as helpful as I would have liked

Annex F: Program Level or Meta-Evaluation Questions Addressed by Participant Teams

Catholic Charities Diocese of Arlington Meta-Analysis Questions

Question 1: What do the evaluations find and conclude about the scope of various CCDA programs? Broad enough? Too broad and not targeted enough?

Question 2: What does a review of all the evaluations show about gaps in efficiency, i.e., approaches/processes which if addressed might make it possible for CCDA to effectively serve a larger number of people?

Question 3: What do the evaluations say are the greatest strengths of programs the teams evaluated (or comparative advantage/niche where other programs were examined)? What patterns are evident across those strengths?

Question 4: Where across programs do the evaluations suggest that unrealized potential for using volunteers exists and what If any findings do the evaluations provide concerning staff interest in/ability to integrate volunteers?

Question 5: Where across programs do the evaluations suggest that unrealized potential for using volunteers exists and what If any findings do the evaluations provide concerning staff interest in/ability to integrate volunteers?

Question 6: Several evaluations examined not only a CCDA program but also other similar programs run by other organizations. Across all these evaluations what key findings and conclusions emerge?

Quick Questions:

- 1) How did your personal impressions of CCDA and its programs change between the first day of class and today? What messages can we take from the way from the way your impressions changed about how our programs should be described?
- 2) What revenue generation ideas came out of your evaluations or your exposure to CCDA that we may not be using? Of the ideas your meta-evaluation team had, could you tell us which are the top three you think we should try and why?

Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation Meta-Analysis Questions

Question 1: Across the evaluation, what has been learned about the differences between boys and girls in terms of enrollment; attendance, retention/drop-out rate; types of program offerings girls/boys find valuable; skill acquisition; broader effects of the program on boys/girls?

Question 2: What do the evaluations show about how well the grantees are collecting and reporting on information required by the Trust, i.e., reported through Webstars? What are the main problems that the grantees are having meeting these requirements, as documented in the evaluations? Which problems were most/least frequently found across grantees?

Question 3: What do the evaluations say about the state of youth voice and choice development in programs? How do they cluster across the continuum that includes: none, token, consultation, representation, participation, self-managed? Were any “best practices” for expanding “voice and choice” identified by the evaluations that are worth documenting as models for future grant programs? What are they?

Question 4: What do the evaluations show about whether and what kinds of performance monitoring information grantees are collecting beyond what the Trust requires be submitted through Webstars? If some, but not all grantees are exceeding these requirements, what explains why some grantees have more advanced performance monitoring systems?

Question 5: Across the evaluations, what has been learned about differences between younger and older children in terms of enrollment; attendance; retention/drop-out rate; types of program offerings younger/older children find valuable; skills acquisitions; and broader effects of the program on younger/older children?

Question 6: Are there any programs that have developed one or more high quality performance monitoring methods/approaches/tools that could be considered “best practices” that are worth documenting as models for future grant programs? What are these methods/approaches/tools?

Question 7: What do the evaluations say about differences between children’s expectations about after school programs before or when they enroll and what they think about programs after they have been involved for a while? Are there clear gaps between expectations and reality and what do the evaluations suggest about the role of a gap of that sort on attendance and retention?

Question 8: What do the evaluations suggest grantees could/should be doing to develop/improve/better utilize their performance monitoring systems given their existing capacity (human and technological) and monetary resources?