



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

Organización
de las Naciones Unidas
para la Educación,
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация
Объединенных Наций по
вопросам образования,
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、
科学及文化组织

Internal Oversight Service Evaluation Section

IOS/EVS/PI/63
Original: English

EVALUATION HANDBOOK

December 2007

PREFACE

Created in 2001, the Internal Oversight Service was a central part of UNESCO's reform agenda. In its first six years of operation the evaluation function has significantly lifted the quality of evaluations, contributed to improved programme design and implementation and fostered greater accountability and learning throughout the Organisation.

Maximising the contribution of evaluation to UNESCO is essential to achieving the objectives of the Organisation. Critical to improving efficiency and effectiveness of programme activities, evaluations also strengthen the accountability of programme sectors for the resources entrusted to them.

The significance of evaluation as a strategic management tool has never been greater as UNESCO moves to strengthen results-based management and to become a learning organisation. We must make sure that all parts of the Organisation, including governing bodies and field offices, support the evaluation process and derive maximum benefits from the evaluations undertaken.

This evaluation handbook cements the place and importance of evaluation in UNESCO. The handbook and the associated tools and guidelines will be periodically revisited and revised as necessary. It is intended primarily for UNESCO staff, but will equally be useful to UNESCO's partners and independent evaluators.

John Parsons

Internal Oversight Service

December 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	4
Defining evaluation	5
Evaluation terms	7
Evaluation criteria	8
Key evaluation principles	9
Roles and responsibilities	11
Evaluation tools and guidance	16
References	18
Annex 1: Standards for evaluation in the United Nations system	19

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation handbook¹ has been prepared to further understanding among UNESCO staff and key stakeholders on what evaluation is, why it is important and who is responsible for what in the evaluation process. The handbook is intended to provide a robust foundation for evaluation activities in UNESCO based on the principles of independence, transparency and impartiality of the evaluation function. It also ensures that evaluations in UNESCO are undertaken in accordance with United Nations Norms and Standards (refer to Annex 1).

Evaluations in UNESCO seek to enable UNESCO to meet its mandate and become a results-driven organisation that is continually learning. They do this through enhancing accountability, improving efficiency and effectiveness of programmes and supporting strategic policy development. The handbook brings clarity to the evaluation processes followed in UNESCO with a view to ensuring that evaluations can be effectively planned, carried out and followed up. It complements the evaluation strategy which sets out in some detail specific objectives and courses of action that will be followed in the medium-term.

The handbook provides a definition of evaluation and contrasts it with other types of assessment such as investigation and audit. It then defines important terms used in UNESCO evaluations such as outputs and outcomes. The five key criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability used by UNESCO are then described. The handbook discusses key principles that guide UNESCO evaluations and then moves on to setting out in some detail the roles and responsibilities of the key stakeholders in the evaluation process. The handbook also introduces the tools and guidelines that have been developed to date to provide more detail on particular aspects of the evaluation process.

¹ This handbook is based on the Executive Board paper *UNESCO evaluation policy and elaborated elements of the UNESCO evaluation strategy* (176 EX/27) <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001501/150135e.pdf>.

DEFINING EVALUATION

1. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area or institution. As an essential part of the policy development process, evaluation provides timely assessments of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of interventions. Evaluation is essentially about – *are we doing the right thing, are we doing it right and are there better ways of achieving the results?* Evaluations should:

- provide assessments of what works and why, highlight intended and unintended results, and provide strategic lessons to guide decision-makers and inform stakeholders;
- provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons;
- feed into management and decision-making processes as a key component to managing for results²;
- inform the planning, programming, budgeting, implementation and reporting cycle;
- improve the institutional relevance and the achievement of results, optimize the use of resources, provide client satisfaction and maximize the impact of activities; and
- involve a rigorous, systematic and objective process in the design, analysis and interpretation of information to answer specific questions, based on agreed criteria and benchmarks among key partners and stakeholders.

2. Evaluations in UNESCO are carried out in accordance with the planning cycle:

- *Appraisal or ex ante assessment:* An assessment of a proposed intervention before a decision is made to implement it. The intention is to define objectives, identify options to achieve them and their likely impacts and costs, and ensure that later evaluation will be possible.
- *Mid-term evaluation:* An evaluation performed towards the middle of the period of implementation of the intervention. The intention is to learn from implementation carried out in order to improve subsequent design and delivery. Mid-term evaluations are a type of formative evaluation in that they are conducted during the implementation phase and are intended to improve performance.
- *Ex-post evaluation:* Evaluation of an intervention after it has been completed. It may be undertaken directly after or long after completion. The intention is to identify achievements and challenges encountered, to assess the sustainability of results and impacts, and to draw conclusions that may inform subsequent interventions. If the evaluation is undertaken immediately after implementation has finished, it is called a terminal evaluation. Ex-post evaluations that determine the extent to which anticipated outcomes were produced are called summative evaluations.

² Results-based management is a broad management strategy aimed at changing the way institutions operate, with improving performance and delivery as the central focus. Its focus is on results, not simply the activities undertaken and outputs delivered. RBM has been on UNESCO's agenda for several years and underpins the reform process of the Organisation.

3. Evaluations can be either externally or internally conducted. In UNESCO, strategically significant evaluations are typically conducted externally with UNESCO commissioning an external evaluator. IOS undertakes some evaluations, most often of field offices and institutes. A particular type of internal evaluation is self-evaluation which is evaluation conducted by those who are entrusted with the design and delivery of an intervention.

4. Evaluation differs from other types of assessment carried out at UNESCO. While there may be some overlap between the different types, they vary in purpose and level of analysis.

- *Monitoring*: An ongoing function that uses the systematic collection of data related to specified indicators which provides management and the main stakeholders of a development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of expected results and progress in the use of allocated funds. Monitoring provides an early indication of the likelihood that expected results will be attained and provides an opportunity to validate the programme theory and logic and to make necessary changes in programme activities and approaches. The periodic implementation reports to Donors³ are important components of monitoring of extrabudgetary projects. Monitoring provides essential inputs for evaluation and is therefore part of the overall evaluation process.
- *Review*: The periodic or ad hoc, often rapid, assessments of the performance of an intervention that do not apply the due process of evaluation. Reviews tend to emphasize operational issues.
- *Inspection*: A general examination that seeks to identify risk areas and malfunctions and to propose corrective action.
- *Investigation*: A specific examination of a claim of wrongdoing and provision of evidence for eventual prosecution or disciplinary measures.
- *Audit*: An assessment of the adequacy of management controls and performance to ensure the economic, efficient and effective use of resources, the safeguarding of assets, the reliability of financial and other information, compliance with regulations, rules and established policies, the effectiveness of risk management, and the adequacy of organizational structures, systems and processes. A distinction is made between financial auditing, which focuses on compliance with rules, statutes and regulations, and performance auditing, which is concerned with economy, efficiency and effectiveness of implementation. It takes the policy framework as given, unlike evaluation which assesses policy frameworks by examining issues of relevance, impact and sustainability.

³ This comprises a final report and at least annual reports (some Donors may require more frequent six-monthly or quarterly reports).

EVALUATION TERMS

5. The following definitions are those used in UNESCO evaluations. They are consistent with wider UN evaluation practice.

- *Results chain*: the causal sequence for an intervention setting out the necessary sequence to achieve desired outputs, outcomes and impacts through carrying out activities using inputs. In UNESCO, various parts of results chains are expressed in the biennial work plans, the C/5 and the C/4. Taken together, these planning documents capture the results chains.
- *Input*: Human, financial or other resource used to produce an output.
- *Activity*: An action taken or work performed through which inputs are mobilized to produce a specific output. An example of an activity for an education system reconstruction project would be an assessment of the current national education system.
- *Output*: A tangible product, capital good or service that results from an intervention. Using the same example, an output would be a situation analysis report completed and an education plan developed.
- *Outcome*: A short-term or medium-term effect of an intervention's outputs. It can be positive or negative, expected or unexpected. In UNESCO programming, expected medium-term outcomes are captured in the Medium-term Strategy C/4. Expected short-term outcomes are called expected results and are expressed in the C/5. Using the same example, an outcome would be an adoption of the new education plan by relevant authorities with teachers and school personnel implementing the plan.
- *Result*: A describable and measurable change in a state that is derived from a cause and effect relationship i.e. an outcome or impact. It is specific and can be captured either in quantitative or qualitative terms. It is mainly expressed and measured by performance indicators. In UNESCO programming, expected results are to be achieved within a particular biennium. Various expected results are grouped together into *Main Lines of Actions* in the C/5.
- *Impact*: A primary or secondary long-term effect of an intervention. It can be positive or negative, intended or unintended. Following through the education example, an impact would be higher literacy rates.
- *Performance indicator*: A quantitative or qualitative variable that allows the verification of a change brought about by an intervention and that shows a result relative to what was planned. Continuing with the education example, one indicator would be the number of teachers trained as part of the education plan.
- *Benchmark*: A reference point or standard against which performance or achievements can be assessed. In UNESCO programming, a benchmark is an achievable target for a performance indicator over a particular biennium. Using the same example, a benchmark would be the training of 2000 teachers as part of the education plan.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

6. In general, evaluation, both in theory and practice, covers the following criteria:⁴

- *Relevance*: The extent to which the objectives of an intervention are consistent with the organization's goals and strategies, beneficiaries' requirements, country needs and global priorities. Retrospectively, the question of relevance often becomes a question as to whether the objectives of an intervention or its design are still appropriate given changed circumstances.
- *Efficiency*: A measure of how economically inputs are converted to results.
- *Effectiveness*: The extent to which the intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. In this context, *cost-effectiveness* assesses whether the costs of an activity can be justified by the outcomes and impacts. At the design stage, the purpose is normally to identify the lowest cost alternative that will achieve specified objectives. At the monitoring and evaluation stage, the purpose is to analyse what outcomes have been achieved, at what cost.⁵
- *Impact*: The primary and secondary, positive and negative, intended and unintended long-term effects of an intervention.
- *Sustainability*: The continuation of benefits from an activity after major assistance has been completed.

⁴ [United Nations Evaluation Group, Norms for Evaluation in the United Nations System, 2005](#) and [OECD, Development Assistance Committee, Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and RBM, 2002](#).

⁵ Refer to document [176 EX/28](#) for a discussion on cost-effectiveness.

KEY EVALUATION PRINCIPLES

7. Evaluation in UNESCO is guided by the following principles. They are based on the norms endorsed by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). UNEG is a professional network of the units responsible for evaluation in the UN system that seeks to strengthen the objectivity, effectiveness and visibility of the evaluation function across the UN system and advocates the importance of evaluation for learning, decision making and accountability.

- *Independence*: The evaluation function should be structurally independent from the operational management and decision-making functions so that it is free from undue influence, can be more objective, and has full discretion in submitting directly its reports for consideration at the appropriate level of decision-making. To avoid conflict of interest and undue pressure, evaluators need to be independent, implying that members of an evaluation team must not have been directly responsible for the policy-setting, design or overall management of the subject of evaluation, nor expect to be in the near future.
- *Impartiality*: Removing bias and maximizing objectivity are critical for the credibility of an evaluation and its contribution to knowledge. Prerequisites for impartiality are: independence from management; objective design; valid measurement and analysis; and the rigorous use of appropriate criteria, indicators and benchmarks agreed upon beforehand by key stakeholders.
- *Timeliness*: Evaluations must be designed and completed in a timely fashion so as to address the specific purpose and objectives for which they were commissioned and ensure the usefulness of the findings and recommendations. Balancing technical and time requirements with practical realities while providing valid, reliable information is central to ensuring that evaluations support management for results.
- *Purpose*: The rationale for an evaluation and the decisions to be based on it should be clear from the outset. The scope, design and plan of the evaluation should generate relevant, timely products that meet the needs of intended users.
- *Transparency*: Meaningful consultation with stakeholders is essential for the credibility and utility of the evaluation. Full information on the evaluation design and methodology should be shared throughout the process to build confidence in the findings and understanding of their limitations in decision-making. Final Terms of References and evaluation reports should be available to major stakeholders and be public documents.
- *Competencies*: Evaluations should be conducted by well-qualified teams. The teams should be gender balanced, geographically diverse and include professionals from the countries or regions concerned.
- *Ethics*: Evaluation should not reflect personal or sectoral interests. Evaluators must have professional integrity and respect the rights of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence and to verify statements attributed to them. Evaluations must be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments and must be conducted legally and with due regard to the welfare of those involved in the evaluation, as well as those affected by its findings. In line with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender inequality.
- *Quality*: All evaluations should meet the standards outlined in the *Standards for Evaluation in the United Nations System*. The key questions and areas for review should

be clear, coherent and realistic. The evaluation plan should be practical and cost effective. To ensure that the information generated is accurate and reliable, evaluation design, data collection and analysis should reflect professional standards, with due regard for any special circumstances or limitations reflecting the context of the evaluation. To ensure this, the professionalism of evaluators and their intellectual integrity in applying standard evaluation methods is critical. Evaluation findings and recommendations should be presented in a manner that will be readily understood by target audiences and have regard for cost-effectiveness in implementing the recommendations proposed.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

8. The roles and responsibilities relating to evaluations of the key stakeholders are identified below.

General Conference

9. The General Conference, consisting of the representatives of the Member States of UNESCO, meets every two years to determine the policies and main lines of work of UNESCO. It approves UNESCO's biennial Programme and Budget (the C/5), of which the C/5 Evaluation Plan is a part.

Executive Board

10. The Executive Board, consisting of 58 Member States elected by the General Conference for a four-year term, assures the overall management of UNESCO. It prepares the work of the General Conference and seeks assurance that its decisions are properly carried out. The Executive Board is involved throughout the evaluation process by having the following evaluation responsibilities:

- Assure the independence of the evaluation function.
- Nominate topics/subjects for evaluation and endorse the C/4 and C/5 UNESCO Evaluation Plans.
- Draw on the findings and recommendations of evaluations to inform organizational policy, strategy and programmes.
- Seek assurance that management responds and follows up on evaluations.

Director-General

11. The Director-General of UNESCO is charged with the effective and rational execution of the programme of work for UNESCO adopted by the General Conference. The Director-General has the following evaluation responsibilities:

- Create an enabling environment which recognizes the importance of evaluation as a key accountability and learning mechanism.
- Nominate topics/subjects for evaluation.
- Report to the Executive Board on external evaluations listed in the C/5 Evaluation Plan.
- Ensure that management responses appropriately address evaluation recommendations.
- Report to the Executive Board on the implementation of the medium-term Evaluation Strategy and the IOS Strategy.

College of Assistant Directors-General (ADGs)

12. The College of ADGs comprises the senior management of the Secretariat. It is primarily an advisory body on all important issues affecting UNESCO's programme and presents recommendations to the Director-General. The College has the following evaluation responsibilities:

- Advise on the implementation of UNESCO's evaluation strategy and evaluation plans.
- Reflect on the implications of strategic evaluations.
- Provide assurance to the Director-General that appropriate actions have been taken in response to evaluation recommendations.

The Directorate

13. The membership of the Directorate comprises all ADGs and Directors from Central Services and is chaired by the Director-General. The Directorate examines evaluation findings and considers their strategic implications.

Evaluation Function, Internal Oversight Service

14. The Evaluation Function within IOS seeks to provide assurance through the evaluations undertaken that programmes are relevant and sustainable, delivered effectively and efficiently, and achieve impacts. Its work is guided by the C/5 Evaluation Plan which lists evaluations to be carried out in the biennium. IOS sets evaluation standards for planning, conducting and using evaluations and establishing institutional mechanisms for their application. It is also responsible for developing and disseminating evaluation tools, guidelines and methodologies. IOS promotes a focus on results by encouraging the incorporation of lessons learnt from evaluations. Its functions relate to the following five areas.

Governance and accountability

- Develop and monitor the implementation of the medium-term Evaluation Strategy⁶.
- Prepare the C/5 Evaluation Plan which lists evaluations to be carried out over the biennium.
- Prepare the Director-General's report to the Executive Board on the findings and recommendations of selected external evaluations listed in the Evaluation Plan.
- Prepare the Director-General's report to the Executive Board on the implementation of evaluation recommendations.
- Assist BSP in the preparation of the C/3, including validating the results achieved by sectors and services in the previous biennium.

Management of evaluation and quality assurance

15. All strategically significant evaluations, such as those contained in the C/4 and C/5 Evaluation Plans, are managed by IOS. These evaluations address the five criteria outlined in Section C (see page 8). As is standard practice in UN entities, IOS typically commissions an external evaluator(s) for these evaluations. IOS has the following responsibilities for these evaluations:

- Undertake the desk study.
- Provide support in developing the Terms of Reference.
- Approve the Terms of Reference and the selection of the external evaluator(s).

⁶ See 175 EX/26 and 176 EX/27.

- Review, comment on and approve the inception report, including the evaluation framework and evaluation methodology
- Review and comment on the draft reports in conjunction with the responsible UNESCO unit.
- Provide substantive and logistical support to the external evaluator(s) during the conduct of the evaluation.
- Approve the final evaluation report, based on rigorous quality assurance in accordance with the UNEG standards.
- Ensure the active participation of stakeholders in the evaluation process.
- Review and report on progress in the follow-up to evaluation recommendations.

Knowledge management and capacity development

- Disseminate evaluation findings and lessons in appropriate formats for targeted audiences and ensure the transparency of, and public access to, evaluation reports for those evaluations listed in the C/5 Evaluation Plan.
- Work with BSP to support the setting up of tools and structures for monitoring in the context of UNESCO's results-based management system to facilitate the evaluation of programmes and activities.
- Provide training to develop the necessary skills and knowledge required to carry out self-evaluation.

Complementarities and cooperation with the audit function of IOS

- Ensure that both evaluation and audit functions complement each other, drawing on their specialist skill sets.
- Undertake joint planning and reporting to governing bodies on results achieved.

Collaboration with United Nations counterparts

- Ensure that evaluation in UNESCO remains consistent with, and contributes to, United Nations policy and reforms, including supporting and participating in joint evaluations.⁷
- Actively participate in the United Nations Evaluation Group to advance the theory, practice, quality and usefulness of evaluation.

UNESCO sectors, field offices and category I institutes and centres⁸

16. UNESCO sectors, field offices and category I institutes and centres have the following generic roles and responsibilities:

⁷ This applies in particular to a recent United Nations Secretary-General High-Level Panel on Coherence recommendation to "... establish an independent United Nations system-wide evaluation mechanism and common evaluation methodologies and benchmarking".

⁸ The roles and responsibilities for this group also apply to Central Services when their activities are the subject of evaluation.

- Inform IOS of all evaluations planned and under consideration in order to determine the budget and the best approach to managing the evaluation.
- Monitor the implementation and performance of programmes, services and functions to generate relevant, timely and results-based information to facilitate evaluations.
- Identify, with key stakeholders, priority areas for evaluation for input into the biennial evaluation plans.
- Define and take appropriate and timely action in response to evaluation recommendations by preparing management responses indicating the feasibility of implementing recommendations and actions to address those recommendations that can be implemented.
- Disseminate evaluation findings and lessons in appropriate formats for targeted audiences and ensure the transparency of, and public access to, evaluation reports.

17. For those evaluations managed by IOS (i.e. those contained in the C/5 Evaluation Plans and other strategic evaluations), this group must:

- Ensure adequate funding for evaluations⁹.
- Provide assurance that each desk study is a complete and accurate representation of the intervention being evaluated.
- Actively participate in the evaluation process by contributing to the desk study, drafting Terms of References, and providing substantive and logistical support to the evaluation teams.
- Participate in evaluation reference groups.

Bureau of Strategic Planning

18. BSP is a central service whose primary role is to prepare UNESCO's Medium-Term Strategy (C/4) and the biennial Programme and Budget (C/5). It ensures that the strategic objectives and priorities set by the General Conference and the Executive Board are duly taken into account at all stages of programme elaboration. BSP can nominate topics/subjects for evaluation and has the following responsibilities as they relate to evaluation:

- Provide enabling tools and structures, including training on results-based management, for effective monitoring of programme performance.
- Provide assurance that programme proposals have been rigorously assessed.
- Use evaluation findings to inform future organizational strategies and programming.
- Produce, in conjunction with IOS, the C/3 which reports on the results achieved in the previous biennium against the C/5 expected results.

⁹ Sources: The Sectors fund the evaluation of C/4 Strategic Programme Objectives, BFC funds the evaluation of decentralized bodies, and IOS funds strategic evaluations.

Evaluation reference groups

19. Reference groups, comprising the relevant sector, IOS, stakeholders and experts, can be set up for strategically significant evaluations and for other large and complex evaluations. Reference groups for strategically significant evaluations have the following responsibilities:

- Advise on Terms of References.
- Advise on the composition of external evaluation teams.
- Provide feedback on draft evaluation reports.
- Provide assurance on the integrity and rigour of the evaluation process and the quality of the deliverables.
- Provide guidance on appropriate actions to be taken in response to evaluation findings.

EVALUATION TOOLS AND GUIDANCE

20. The Evaluation Function in the Internal Oversight Service has developed the following set of tools and guidelines as a supplement to the evaluation handbook. They provide guidance to UNESCO Headquarters and Field Office staff to improve the planning, implementation and follow-up to evaluation activities. The guidance will also be useful to external evaluators who undertake evaluation assignments for UNESCO. The tools and guidelines will be updated as required and new ones will be developed as needs are identified.

21. The following tools and guidelines can be found at the IOS website (www.unesco.org/ios) under evaluation tools and guidelines.

Guidelines for managing external evaluations

22. This tool sets out the stages in managing external evaluations: preparation, desk study, Terms of Reference, tendering, selection of evaluators, inception report, conducting evaluation, evaluation report, management response, dissemination, submission to the Executive Board and monitoring progress. All strategically significant evaluations, such as those contained in the C/4 and C/5 Evaluation Plans, are managed by IOS and are conducted by an external evaluator(s). Some evaluations managed by a sector, field office, category I institute or centre are conducted externally.

Guidelines for follow-up to evaluation report recommendations

23. These guidelines are a supplement to the guidelines in managing external evaluations. They go into further detail in describing the responsibilities and procedures for the management response and follow-up reporting on evaluations. They are to be used to by UNESCO management in response to evaluation report recommendations to ensure the application of a common practice across the organization.

Desk study checklist

24. This checklist tool sets out what is required in a desk study which is prepared for each programme prior to the drafting of the Terms of Reference. It is prepared by IOS with the relevant sector or field office contributing information as necessary. The relevant ADG provides assurance that the desk study is a complete and accurate representation of what is being evaluated. The desk study should set out basic, but essential, programmatic information for the evaluation. The emphasis is on the results chain of the programme, i.e. inputs, activities, outputs, results, outcomes and impacts. Obtaining this basic set of information is essential for drafting a meaningful Terms of Reference and allows the evaluator to focus on the questions contained in the Terms of Reference.

Guidelines for developing Terms of References

25. This set of guidelines sets out in detail the information that a Terms of Reference should contain: nature of evaluation, programme history, programme duration, programme rationale, inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and expected results, impacts, monitoring mechanisms, stakeholders and partners, dissemination and documentation.

Guidelines for selection of evaluators

26. These set out what must guide the selection of evaluators in UNESCO. They are based on two UNEG norms related to independence of the evaluator, one UNEG standard on the

qualifications of the evaluator and one UNEG standard on the composition of the evaluation team such as gender balance and geographical diversity.

Guidelines for inception reports

27. This set of guidelines sets out what an inception report should contain. An inception report is prepared by an evaluator shortly after reviewing relevant documentation and possibly visiting UNESCO and discussing the evaluation with relevant staff. The report should describe the conceptual framework the evaluator will use in undertaking the evaluation, the evaluation methodology, work plan and logistics.

REFERENCES

IAEA, Programme Evaluation Policy, SEC/NOT/1897, 2002

<http://www.uneval.org/indexAction.cfm?module=Library&action=GetFile&DocumentAttachmentID=1553>

IFAD, IFAD Evaluation Policy, 2003 http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/policy/new_policy.htm

OECD, Development Assistance Committee, Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and RBM, 2002
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf>

Swedish International Development Agency, Looking Back, Moving Forward Sida Evaluation Manual, 2004 http://www.sida.se/sida/jsp/sida.jsp?d=118&a=3148&language=en_US

UNDP, The Evaluation Policy of UNDP, DP/2005/28, 2006

<http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf>

UNESCO, Results-Based Programming, Management and Monitoring (RBM) at UNESCO: Guiding Principles, 2007

http://portal.unesco.org/es/file_download.php/ca5fb665c3d7892ad1ab2d0873bacc0dRBM+guiding+principles+15+april+2007.pdf

UNESCO, UNESCO's Extrabudgetary Activities: A Practical Guide, 2004

<http://ercintranet.unesco.org/erc/publications/134990e.pdf>

UNICEF, Programme Policy and Procedure Manual, 2005

http://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/ME_PPP_Manual_2005_013006.pdf

United Nations Evaluation Group, Norms for Evaluation in the United Nations System, 2005

<http://www.uneval.org/index.cfm?module=Library&page=Document&DocumentID=5550>

United Nations Evaluation Group, Standards for Evaluation in the United Nations System, 2005

<http://www.uneval.org/index.cfm?module=Library&page=Document&DocumentID=5551>

ANNEX 1: STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

<p>Institutional framework</p> <p><i>Standard 1.1:</i> United Nations organizations should have an adequate institutional framework for the effective management of their evaluation function.</p> <p><i>Standard 1.2:</i> United Nations organizations should develop an evaluation policy and regularly update it, taking into account the Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the United Nations system.</p> <p><i>Standard 1.3:</i> United Nations organizations should ensure that evaluation plans of evaluation activities are submitted to their governing bodies and/or Heads of organizations for review and/or approval.</p> <p><i>Standard 1.4:</i> United Nations organizations should ensure appropriate evaluation follow-up mechanisms and have an explicit disclosure policy.</p> <p>Management of the evaluation function</p> <p><i>Standard 1.5:</i> The head of evaluation has a lead role in ensuring that the evaluation function is fully operational and that evaluation work is conducted according to the highest professional standards.</p> <p><i>Standard 1.6:</i> The head of evaluation is responsible for ensuring the preparation of evaluation guidelines.</p> <p><i>Standard 1.7:</i> The head of evaluation should ensure that the evaluation function is dynamic, adapting to new developments and changing needs both within and outside the organization.</p> <p>Competencies</p> <p><i>Standard 2.1:</i> Persons engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities should possess core evaluation competencies.</p> <p><i>Standard 2.2:</i> Evaluators should have relevant educational background, qualification and training in evaluation.</p> <p><i>Standard 2.3:</i> Evaluators should have professional work experience relevant to evaluation.</p> <p><i>Standard 2.4:</i> Evaluators need to have specific technical knowledge of, and be familiar with, the methodology or approach that will be needed for the specific evaluation to be undertaken, as well as certain managerial and personal skills.</p> <p>Ethics</p> <p><i>Standard 2.5:</i> Evaluators should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relationships with all stakeholders.</p> <p><i>Standard 2.6:</i> Evaluators should ensure that their contacts with individuals are characterized by respect.</p>	<p>Selection of team</p> <p><i>Standard 2.7:</i> Evaluators should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of the individual informants.</p> <p><i>Standard 2.8:</i> Evaluators are responsible for their performance and their product(s).</p> <p>Design</p> <p><i>Standard 3.1:</i> The evaluation should be designed to ensure timely, valid and reliable information that will be relevant for the subject being assessed.</p> <p><i>Standard 3.2:</i> The Terms of Reference should provide the purpose and describe the process and the product of the evaluation.</p> <p><i>Standard 3.3:</i> The purpose and context of the evaluation should be clearly stated, providing a specific justification for undertaking the evaluation at a particular point in time.</p> <p><i>Standard 3.4:</i> The subject to be evaluated should be clearly described.</p> <p><i>Standard 3.5:</i> Evaluation objectives should be realistic and achievable, in light of the information that can be collected in the context of the undertaking. The scope of the evaluation also needs to be clearly defined.</p> <p><i>Standard 3.6:</i> The evaluation design should clearly spell out the evaluation criteria against which the subject to be evaluated will be assessed.</p> <p><i>Standard 3.7:</i> Evaluation methodologies should be sufficiently rigorous to assess the subject of evaluation and ensure a complete, fair and unbiased assessment.</p> <p><i>Standard 3.8:</i> An evaluation should assess cost-effectiveness, to the extent feasible.</p> <p><i>Standard 3.9:</i> The evaluation design should, when relevant, include considerations as to what extent the United Nations system's commitment to the human rights-based approach has been incorporated in the design of the undertaking to be evaluated.</p> <p>Process</p> <p><i>Standard 3.10:</i> The relationship between the evaluator and the commissioner(s) of an evaluation must, from the outset, be characterized by mutual respect and trust.</p> <p><i>Standard 3.11:</i> Stakeholders should be consulted in the planning, design, conduct and follow-up of evaluations.</p> <p><i>Standard 3.12:</i> A peer review, or reference group, composed of external experts may be particularly useful.</p>
---	--

<p><i>Standard 3.13:</i> Evaluations should be conducted by well-qualified evaluation teams.</p> <p><i>Standard 3.14:</i> Composition of evaluation teams should be gender balanced, geographically diverse and include professionals from the countries or regions concerned.</p> <p>Implementation</p> <p><i>Standard 3.15:</i> Evaluations should be conducted in a professional and ethical manner.</p> <p>Reporting</p> <p><i>Standard 3.16:</i> The final evaluation report should be logically structured, containing evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations, and should be free of information that is not relevant to the overall analysis. The report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible.</p> <p>Follow-up</p> <p><i>Standard 3.17:</i> Evaluation requires an explicit response by the governing authorities and management addressed by its recommendations.</p> <p>Evaluation reports</p> <p><i>Standard 4.1:</i> The title page and opening pages should provide key basic information.</p> <p><i>Standard 4.2:</i> The evaluation report should contain an executive summary.</p> <p><i>Standard 4.3:</i> The subject being evaluated should be clearly described, including the logic model and/or the expected results chain and intended impact, its implementation strategy and key assumptions.</p> <p><i>Standard 4.4:</i> The role and contributions of the United Nations organizations and other stakeholders to the subject being evaluated should be clearly described.</p> <p><i>Standard 4.5:</i> The purpose and context of the evaluation should be described.</p> <p><i>Standard 4.6:</i> The evaluation report should provide an explanation of the evaluation criteria that were used by the evaluators.</p>	<p><i>Standard 4.7:</i> The evaluation report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives as well as the scope of the evaluation.</p> <p><i>Standard 4.8:</i> The evaluation report should indicate the extent to which gender issues and relevant human rights considerations were incorporated where applicable.</p> <p><i>Standard 4.9:</i> The applied evaluation methodology should be described in a transparent way, including any limitations to the methodology.</p> <p><i>Standard 4.10:</i> The evaluation should give a complete description of stakeholders' participation.</p> <p><i>Standard 4.11:</i> The evaluation report should include a discussion of the extent to which the evaluation design included ethical safeguards where appropriate.</p> <p><i>Standard 4.12:</i> In presenting the findings, inputs, outputs and outcomes/impacts should be measured to the extent possible (or an appropriate rationale given as to why not).</p> <p><i>Standard 4.13:</i> Analysis should include appropriate discussion of the relative contributions of stakeholders to results.</p> <p><i>Standard 4.14:</i> Reasons for accomplishments and difficulties of the subject being evaluated, especially constraining and enabling factors, should be identified to the extent possible.</p> <p><i>Standard 4.15:</i> Conclusions need to be substantiated by findings consistent with data collected and methodology, and represent insights into identification and/or solutions of important problems or issues.</p> <p><i>Standard 4.16:</i> Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, be relevant and realistic, with priorities for action made clear.</p> <p><i>Standard 4.17:</i> Lessons, when presented, should be generalized beyond the immediate subject being evaluated to indicate what wider relevance they might have.</p> <p><i>Standard 4.18:</i> Annexes should be complete and relevant.</p>
---	---