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Preface

The International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET) program was initiated by the World Bank to meet the needs of evaluation and audit units of bilateral and multilateral development agencies and banks; developed and developing country governments, and evaluators working in development and nongovernmental organizations.

The overall goal of this training program is to enhance the knowledge, skills, and abilities of participants in development evaluation. It is our intention that by the end of the training program, participants will:

- Understand the development evaluation process
- Be familiar with evaluation concepts, techniques, and issues
- Be able to weight different options for planning development evaluations, including data collection, analysis, and reporting
- Be able to design a development evaluation

The training program is organized into twelve modules as follows:

Module 1. Introduction to Development Evaluation
Module 2. Evaluation Models
Module 3. New Development Evaluation Approaches
Module 4. Evaluation Questions
Module 5. Impact, Descriptive, and Normative Evaluation Designs
Module 6. Data Collection Methods
Module 7. Sampling
Module 8. Data Analysis and Interpretation
Module 9. Presenting Results
Module 10. Putting it all Together
Module 11. Building a Performance-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System
Module 12. Development Evaluation Issues
Each module is intended to stand alone, and includes:

- an instructional introduction
- at least one case example
- application exercises
- references to further reading and resources
- powerpoint presentations from IPDET

Comments and suggestions for improvement of these training modules are invited and may be addressed to:

Dr. Linda Morra-Imas  
Operations Evaluation Group  
International Finance Corporation  
World Bank Group  
2121 Pennsylvania Ave  
Washington, D.C. 20433

Dr. Ray C. Rist  
Operations Evaluation Department  
The World Bank  
1818 H. Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20433, U.S.A.
Module 1: Introduction to Development Evaluation

What is Development Evaluation?

Development evaluation is a systematic search for answers about development interventions and can be done at different times in the life cycle of an intervention. The evaluation can emphasize a wide range of questions, but regardless of the question, evaluation always involves gathering, analyzing, interpreting, and reporting information.

Performance-based evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of a planned, ongoing, or completed intervention. The aim is to determine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of a program, policy, or project so as to incorporate lessons learned into the decision-making process.

Development evaluation is emerging as an overall approach in response to a range of changes and challenges around the world. The rapid economic growth in industrialized countries is leaving developing countries far behind. The debt crisis and its effects make it more difficult to focus resources on evaluation. Attention on poverty reduction efforts is increasing but measuring impact is extremely difficult. Economic and political instability makes long-term, sustained efforts challenging. Humanitarian and environmental concerns bring more people and diverse issues to the development table; they do not always share the same definition of program success. Development evaluation is expanding the scope of reviews, from project monitoring and evaluation of a specific program toward more complex ‘thematic’ evaluations (evaluations of a set of programs addressing a common theme), interventions within countries, and across countries. Managers are increasingly required to demonstrate effectiveness in order to continue receiving funding, while resources for evaluation efforts are often limited. The development evaluation community is trying to respond to all these changes.

---

A report by the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD\textsuperscript{2} noted:

In the reorientation of development assistance work, more attention is being given to: the overarching objectives of poverty reduction, governance issues (elections, role of civil societies, human rights, corruption), the cross-cutting themes of gender equity, the environment, major collaborative evaluations of international emergencies and multi-donor programmes and agencies, the expanded roles of NGOs, internal management and operating systems, and new instruments of assistance such as sector support (investment, expenditure) programmes.

In today’s environment, therefore, interventions need to be evaluated against multiple measures, including sound governance, private sector involvement, inclusiveness and participation, equity, and environmental sustainability.

History and Traditions of Development Evaluation:

Development evaluation comes out of two traditions: the audit tradition and the social science tradition. The audit tradition has an investigative, accounting orientation: did the program do what was planned and was the money spent within the rules, regulations and requirements? Its emphasis is on accountability and compliance. Because of its investigative orientation, the auditors should be external and independent of the program and maintain a detached relationship with program officials.

Performance auditing and monitoring evolved from traditional audits. These evaluations keep track of program performance to ensure the program is on time, on budget and on target. More often than not, targets used in implementation monitoring are related to outputs (typically, products or services delivered by the program, policy, or project), rather than outcomes (effects on participants). Performance may be measured against baselines, goals, and/or targets. As a management tool, monitoring provides a basis for necessary corrections.

As donors moved from questions about compliance and performance to questions about impact, social science techniques were incorporated. Impact questions are questions about immediate and long-term change. These should always include any unintended consequences, as well as those that were

\textsuperscript{2} DAC Review, 1998.
intended. Social science has developed tools and techniques to help pinpoint cause and effect, through disciplined, systemic inquiry processes.

Development efforts are generally participatory and inclusive. The belief is that people closest to the problems know the solutions and they are more likely to actively engage in the projects if they feel a sense of ownership. In August 2000, OED\(^3\) summarized the research that compared 48 community-driven projects against 2,677 Bank projects (consisting of all other World Bank projects rated over the same period). Overall, 81% of the community-driven projects had satisfactory outcomes as compared to 76% of all other Bank projects, suggesting that community involvement can enhance the possible success of a development effort.

In response to the need for relevant, rapid feedback at reasonable cost, development evaluation has evolved toward approaches that are fast, flexible, and participatory. Evaluation has become more inclusive of the stakeholders, including funding officials, program officials and direct and indirect beneficiaries in designing evaluations and assessing the findings. While evaluation is still used to ensure accountability and measure impact, it is increasingly being seen as a way to provide information that can be used to make program improvements, to provide lessons learned to donors for future activities, and to make decisions about future policy aid. The goal of development evaluation has shifted from simply judging success or failure to one of understanding and continuous learning.

**Changing Evaluation Approaches, Roles, and Relationships:**

Development evaluation is no longer an approach that views the program from the detached perspective of an outsider, but now rather as a participatory, collaborative endeavor. The role of the evaluator has also expanded: from evaluator as accountant to evaluator as researcher to evaluator as facilitator (see Figure 1). Evaluators are now expected to have a broader and more diverse skill set. The relationships between participants, donors and evaluators are also changing. Where once evaluations were top-down events, they are changing to a more collaborative

approach that brings all the stakeholders together in designing and carrying out the evaluation.

**Figure 1: Evolution of Development Evaluation, Expanding Roles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Audit</th>
<th>Performance Audit</th>
<th>Impact Evaluation</th>
<th>Learning-focused Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator as Accountant</td>
<td>Evaluator as Researcher</td>
<td>Evaluator as Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approaches to Development Evaluation:**

To meet the demands of development evaluation, a variety of approaches are being used in various phases of the evaluation process. These include:

- Stakeholder analysis
- Rapid assessments
- Participatory evaluations
- Community mapping
- Evaluation synthesis

These approaches may be used with, or instead of, the more traditional audit and evaluation approaches.

**Standards:**

These changes to development evaluation are reflected in the standards of the field. In the early 1990s, the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development\(^4\) developed a definition of evaluation (Box 1-1) and a set of principles for evaluation of development assistance. These are useful in providing a common framework for quality evaluation. Briefly, they define the purpose of evaluation as to:

- Improve future policy, programs and projects through feedback of lessons learned; and

---

Provide a basis for accountability, including information to the public.

In order to be both credible and useful, evaluations need to strike an appropriate balance between being independent and having stakeholder involvement in the process. Stakeholders often have access to a wealth of information useful to the evaluators. In addition, stakeholder participation provides an opportunity for greater learning for all involved. However, extensive participation by stakeholders in setting the evaluation agenda can backfire by calling into question the independent and integrity (and therefore the credibility) of the evaluation.

**Box 1-1: Definition of Development Evaluation**

An evaluation is the process of systematically determining the value or significance of a development activity, policy or program. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, developmental efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors. (5).

Development evaluation can focus on several large areas:

- **Relevance**: is the program still relevant to the problem it was intended to address?
- **Effectiveness**: to what extent does the intervention achieve its objectives? What supports and barriers affected achievement?
- **Efficiency**: is the program delivered in a timely and cost-effective manner?
- **Impact**: What happened as a result of the program?
- **Sustainability**: To what extent can the program sustain itself after the program funding ceases?
- **External Utility**: To what extent might the approaches, methods, and/or content of the program have potential value if applied to another context/program/project?
A review of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) principles in 1998 concluded:

Evaluations have proved to be most useful (apart from those tied to specific project operations) in situations where they:

- Are linked to current and future programs rather than historical perspectives, although the need for accountability asks for the continuous evaluation of older programs;
- Provide opportunities for participation in drawing recommendations and designing future interventions;
- Are timely, and complete; and,
- Are substantive, succinct and readable.

Evaluations will be used as an instrument to learn lessons for future operations only if explicitly required by agency leaders. To promote their use, agencies need to create an environment based on organizational learning and ease access to evaluation results. In fact, the main obstacle to the use of evaluation as a learning instrument is the cost of searching for relevant information. “Just-in-time” practices will facilitate this task.

An example of a recent evaluation shows the range of issues addressed in accordance with the DAC principles is reported in Case 1-1.

Terminology note

Development evaluation covers a wide range of different kinds of ‘evaluand’ (objects of evaluation), such as programs, projects, and policies. These training modules have been designed so that, wherever possible, the general principles and methods presented will apply to programs, projects, and policies. Naturally, there will be considerable variation in the details (such as the criteria used and the methodology selected), as each evaluation requires the evaluator to gain a clear understanding of the nature of the evaluand, and the context in which it operates.

Further definitions and explanations of key evaluation-related terms are detailed at the end of this module.

---

Case 1-1: World Bank Agricultural Extension Projects in Kenya

Summary: The Kenyan extension service adopted the training and visit system of management in 1982 and has been supported by the World Bank and other donors. The project objectives were for institutional development of the extension service and sustained increases in agricultural productivity.

The evaluation sought in 1998 to relate the observed results in the farmers' fields to the projects' inputs. In addition, intermediate output and outcome indicators are measured to assess the performance of the extension system.

Main findings: Institutional Development: Limited impact. There appears to have been no appreciable improvement in the effectiveness of the extension services. Sustainability: The system is neither financially sustainable nor cost effective. Relevance: The rationale of providing extension services to smallholders is still relevant. However, several features of the projects' design proved to be inappropriate. The farmers value access to such services. Efficacy: Available data suggest that current institutional arrangements are ineffective in delivering service. Farmers do not appear to have adequate access now. The progress on gender issues has been mixed; bias against women farmers has been rectified but the proportion of female extension agents has remained unchanged since 1982. Efficiency: A positive rate of return cannot be established. The allocation of extension resources has been inefficient. Services have been poorly targeted.

Recommendations: Targeting: More efficient targeting to focus on areas and groups likely to have the greatest impact. Information systems: Need for timely and reliable information, hence a system for monitoring and evaluation. Intensity: Establish a leaner and less-intensive presence but with wider coverage. Pluralism: Adopt a more cost-effective communication strategy that uses demonstrations, printed media, and partnerships with civil-society and the private sector. Client focus: The central focus of the institutional design should be on empowering the farmer.
In 1994 the Program Evaluation Standards were published in the U.S. and were approved by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) as the American National Standards for program evaluation (see Further Reading and Resources, later in this module). This document defines evaluation as the systematic investigation of the worth or merit of an object (e.g., a program, project, or product). For example, a development program may be very effective in improving a country’s economy (merit or performance), but only at the expense of the welfare of its people (intrinsic worth). Both merit and worth are important in evaluating development programs.

The Program Evaluation Standards list four attributes of sound evaluation:

- **utility** - ensuring that an evaluation meets the information needs of intended users
- **feasibility** - ensuring that an evaluation will be realistic, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal
- **propriety** - ensuring that an evaluation will be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of those involved in the evaluation, as well as those affected by its results
- **accuracy** - ensuring that an evaluation will reveal and convey technically adequate information about the features that determine worth or merit of the program being evaluated

There are seven standards that will strengthen the utility of an evaluation; three standards directed toward strengthening its feasibility; eight standards to strengthen the propriety of an evaluation; and twelve standards aimed at strengthening the accuracy of an evaluation. Altogether, these standards provide a guide for those who are designing evaluations and for those who are evaluating evaluations.

The American Evaluation Association has also published "Guiding Principles for Evaluators." These principles, published in 1995, provide expectations for professional evaluators.

1. **Systematic inquiry**—that evaluators conduct systematic, data-based inquiries
2. **Competence**—that evaluators provide competent performance to stakeholders
3. Integrity/Honesty—that evaluators ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process
4. Respect for people—that evaluators respect the security, dignity, and self-worth of respondents, program participants, clients, and other stakeholders with whom they interact
5. Responsibilities for general and public welfare—that evaluators articulate and take into account the diversity of interests and values that may be related to the general public welfare

Further information about the Guiding Principles and the Program Evaluation Standards can be found at the AEA website, www.eval.org. The Australasian Evaluation Society has produced a similar set of ethical guidelines for evaluators, which are available on their website at http://www.aes.asn.au/content/ethics_guidelines.pdf. The European Evaluation Society has yet to develop a set of guidelines or principles for evaluators, but the Swiss Evaluation Society (SEVAL) has standards available on their website, http://seval.ch/. The German Society for Evaluation (DeGEval) has also adopted a set of standards (see http://www.degeval.de/standards/standards.htm). The Italian Evaluation Association has a set of guidelines comparable to the AEA Guiding Principles (see http://www.valutazioneitaliana.it/statuto.htm#Linee).
Application Exercises:

1. Imagine that you have been asked to justify why development evaluation should be a budgeted expense for a new national program designed to improve the education of families about effective health practices. What would you say in defense of development evaluation?

2. Interview an evaluator in your field (or review recent evaluation reports conducted in your field) to determine the extent to which standards and guiding principles are addressed in evaluations that this individual has seen. Where do the strengths seem to be? The weaknesses? What seems to be needed to improve development evaluations? Share your findings with evaluation colleagues and listen to their comments and experiences. Do you see any patterns?

Further Reading and Resources:


Web Sites:


American Evaluation Association:  www.eval.org

Canadian Evaluation Association: www.evaluationcanada.ca

European Evaluation Society:  http://europeanevaluation.org/

Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University:  www.wmich.edu/evalctr


Monitoring and Evaluation of Population and Health Programs, MEASURE Evaluation Project, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill:  http://www.cpc.unc.edu/measure/topics/topics.html


United Nations Development Project:  www.undp.org/eo/

World Bank:  www.worldbank.org
The following document was submitted to the Working Party on Aid Evaluation for review. It was prepared by the Operations Evaluation Department of the World Bank, on the basis of a previous draft prepared for the Working Party on Aid Evaluation and taking into account comments contributed by members of the Working Party before and during the ad-hoc meeting held on 23 May 2001, and by Dr. Michael Scriven, who reviewed an earlier version of this Glossary.
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TERMS GROUPED BY CATEGORIES

Quality assurance
- Appraisal
- Audit
- Conclusions
- Evaluation
- Feedback
- Findings
- Lessons learned
- Monitoring
- Performance measurement
- Project cycle management
- Quality Assurance
- Recommendation
- Results-Based management
Evaluation tools, measures, analyses, and criteria

Accountability
Analytic tools
Attribution
Base-line study
Counterfactual
Development intervention
Economy
Effect
Effectiveness
Efficacy
Efficiency
Feedback
Goal
Impact
Indicator
Institutional development impact
Lessons learned
Reach
Relevance
Reliability
Sustainability
Terms of reference
Triangulation
Validity

Result Based Management

Benchmark
Input
Outcome
Outputs
Performance
Performance indicator
Performance measurement
Performance monitoring
Project or program objective
Purpose
Result
Results chain
Results framework
Results-Based management

Types of evaluations

Cluster evaluation
Country program evaluation/Country assistance evaluation
Ex-ante evaluation
Ex-post evaluation
External evaluation
Formative evaluation
Independent evaluation
Internal evaluation
Joint Evaluation
Meta-evaluation
Mid-term evaluation
Participatory evaluation
Process evaluation
Program evaluation
Project evaluation
Risk analysis
Sector evaluation
Sector program
Self-evaluation
Summative evaluation
Thematic Evaluation

Stakeholders

Beneficiaries
Partners
Reach
Stakeholders
Target group

Logical Framework

Activity
Assumptions
Development objective
Immediate objective
Logical framework
Accountability
Obligation to demonstrate that work has been conducted in compliance with agreed rules and standards or to report fairly and accurately on performance results vis à vis mandated roles and/or plans. This may require a careful, even legally defensible, demonstration that the work is consistent with the contract terms.
Note: Accountability in development may refer to the obligations of partners to act according to clearly defined responsibilities, roles and performance expectations, often with respect to the prudent use of resources. For evaluators, it connotes the responsibility to provide accurate, fair and credible monitoring reports and performance assessments. Managers and policy makers are accountable to tax payers.

Activity
Actions taken or work performed through which inputs, such as funds, technical assistance and other types of resources are mobilized to produce specific outputs.
Related term: development intervention

Analytical tools
Methods used to process and interpret information during an evaluation.

Appraisal
An overall assessment of the relevance, feasibility and potential sustainability of a development intervention prior to a decision of funding. Often used as a synonym for evaluation, including informal evaluation.
Note: In development agencies, banks, etc., the purpose of appraisal is to enable decision-makers to decide whether the activity represents an appropriate use of resources.
Related term: Ex-ante evaluation

Assumptions
Hypotheses about factors or risks which could affect the progress or success of a development intervention.
Note: Assumptions are made explicit when using a theory based evaluation approach so that the evaluation tracks the anticipated results chain. Assumptions can also be understood as hypothesized conditions that bear on the validity of the evaluation itself, e.g., about the characteristics of the population when designing a sampling procedure for a survey.
**Attribution**
The ascription of a causal link between observed (or expected to be observed) changes and a specific intervention.
Note: Attribution refers to that which is to be credited for the observed changes or results achieved. It represents the extent to which observed development effects can be attributed to a specific intervention or to the performance of one or more partner taking account of other interventions, (anticipated or unanticipated) confounding factors, or external shocks.

**Audit**
An independent, objective assurance activity designed to add value and improve an organization’s operations. It helps an organization accomplish its objectives by bringing a systematic, disciplined approach to assess and improve the effectiveness of risk management, control and governance processes.
Note: the distinction is made between regularity (financial) audit, which focuses on the compliance with applicable statutes and regulations; and performance audit, which is concerned with the audit of relevance, economy, efficiency and effectiveness. By internal audit is meant an assessment of internal controls undertaken by a unit reporting to management while an external audit is conducted by an independent organization.

**Base-line study**
An analysis describing the situation prior to a development intervention, against which progress can be assessed or comparisons made.

**Benchmark**
Reference point or standard against which performance or achievements can be assessed.
Note: a benchmark refers to the performance that has been achieved in the recent past by other comparable organizations, or what can be reasonably inferred to have been achieved in the circumstances.

**Beneficiaries**
The individuals, groups, or organizations, whether targeted or not, that benefit, directly or indirectly, from the development intervention.
Related term: reach
Cluster evaluation
An evaluation of a set of related activities, projects and/or programs

Conclusion
A conclusion draws on data collection and analyses undertaken, through a transparent chain of arguments. Conclusions point out the factors of success and failure of the evaluated intervention, with special attention paid to the intended and unintended results and impacts, and more generally with regard to any other strength or weakness.

Counterfactual
The situation or condition as it hypothetically would be for individuals, organizations, or groups were there no development intervention.

Country Program Evaluation/Country Assistance Evaluation
Evaluation of one or more donor’s or agency’s portfolio of development interventions, and the assistance strategy behind them, in a partner country.

Development Intervention
An instrument for partner (donor and non-donor) support aimed to promote development
Note: Examples are policy advice, projects, programs,

Development objective
Intended effect contributing to physical, financial, institutional, social, environmental, or other benefits to a society, community, or group of people via one or more development interventions.

Economy
Absence of waste for a given output.
Note: An activity is more economical when the costs of the scarce resources used are close to the minimum needed to achieve planned objectives.

Effect
Intended or unintended change due directly or indirectly to a development intervention.
Related terms: results, primary effect, secondary effect, unexpected effect, direct effect, external effect, indirect effect, gross effect, net effect, first round effect, outcome

Effectiveness
The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Also used by other agencies, such as the World Bank, as a measure of the merit or worth of an activity, i.e. the extent to which a development intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its relevant objectives efficiently and sustainability.
Related terms: efficacy, efficiency, sustainability.

Efficiency
A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to outputs.

Evaluability
Extent to which an activity or a program can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion.
Note: Evaluability assessment calls for the early review of a proposed activity in order to ascertain whether its objectives are adequately defined and its results verifiable.

Evaluation
The assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors. Sometimes used to refer to the process of determining the worth or significance of a development activity, policy or program.
Note: Evaluation involves the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, an assessment of actual and expected results and the identification of relevant lessons. It can also refer to "reviews" which are summaries of multiple evaluations.
Related term: review
**Ex-ante evaluation**
An evaluation that is performed before implementation
Related terms: appraisal, quality at entry, evaluability assessment

**Ex-post evaluation**
Evaluation of a development intervention after it has been completed.
Note: It may be undertaken directly after or long after completion. The intention is to understand the factors of success or failure, to assess the sustainability of results and impacts, and to draw conclusions that may inform other interventions.

**External evaluation**
The evaluation of a development intervention conducted by entities and/or individuals outside the donor and implementing organizations.

**Feedback**
The transmission of findings generated through the evaluation process to parties for whom it is relevant and useful so as to facilitate learning. This may involve the collection and dissemination of findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons from experience.

**Finding**
A finding is an accumulation of evidence from an evaluation that allows for a factual statement.

**Formative evaluation**
Evaluation intended to improve performance, most often conducted during the design and/or implementation phases of projects or programs.
Note: Formative evaluations may also be conducted for other reasons such as compliance, legal requirements or as part of a larger evaluation initiative.
Related term: summative evaluation

**Goal**
The higher-order objective to which a development intervention is intended to contribute.
Related term: development objective
Impacts
Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Independent evaluation
An evaluation carried out by entities and persons free of control by those responsible for the design and implementation of the development intervention. Note: The credibility of an evaluation depends in part on how independently it has been carried out, i.e., on the extent of autonomy, and ability to access information, carry out investigations and report findings free of political influence or organizational pressure.

Indicator
Quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect the changes connected to an intervention, or to help assess the performance of a development actor.

Inputs
The financial, human, and material resources used by the development intervention.

Institutional Development Impact
The extent to which a development intervention improves or weakens the ability of a country or region to make more efficient, equitable, and sustainable use of its human, financial, and national resources, for example through: (a) better definition, stability, transparency, enforceability and predictability of institutional arrangements and/or (b) better alignment of the mission and capacity of an organization with its mandate, which derives from these institutional arrangements. Such impacts can include intended and unintended effects of a project.

Internal evaluation
Evaluation of a development intervention conducted by a unit and/or individuals reporting to the management of the donor, partner, or implementing organization. Related term: self-evaluation

Joint Evaluation
An evaluation to which different donor agencies and/or partners participate.
Note: There are various degrees of “jointness” depending on the extent to which individual partners cooperate in the evaluation process, merge their evaluation resources and combine their evaluation reporting. Joint evaluations can help overcome attribution problems in assessing the effectiveness of programs and strategies, the complementarity of efforts supported by different partners, the quality of aid co-ordination, etc.

Lessons learned
Generalizations based on evaluation experiences with projects, programs, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations. Frequently, lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome, and impact.

Logical framework (Logframe)
Management tool used to improve the design of development interventions, most often at the project level. It involves identifying strategic elements (inputs, outputs, purpose, goal) and their causal relationships, and the assumptions or risks that may influence success and failure. It thus facilitates planning, execution and evaluation of a development intervention.

Meta-evaluation
The term is used for evaluations designed to aggregate findings from a series of evaluations. It can also be used to denote the evaluation of an evaluation to judge its quality and/or assess the performance of the evaluators.

Mid-term evaluation
Evaluation performed towards the middle of the period of implementation of the intervention.
Related term: formative evaluation

Monitoring
A continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.
Related term: performance monitoring, indicator
Outcome
The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of a development intervention’s outputs.
Related terms: result, output, impact, effect.

Outputs
The products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes.

Participatory evaluation
Evaluation in which representatives of agencies and stakeholders (including beneficiaries) work together in designing, carrying out and interpreting an evaluation.

Partners
The individuals and organizations that collaborate to achieve mutually agreed upon objectives.
Note: The concept of partnership connotes shared goals, common responsibility for outcomes, distinct accountabilities and reciprocal obligations. Partners may include governments, civil society, non-governmental organizations, universities, professional and business associations, multi-lateral organizations, private companies, etc.

Performance
The degree to which a development intervention or a development partner operates according to specific criteria/standards/guidelines or achieves results in accordance with stated goals or plans.

Performance indicator
A variable that allows the verification of changes in the development intervention or shows results relative to what was planned.
Related terms: performance monitoring, performance measurement

Performance measurement
A system for assessing performance of development interventions against stated goals.
Related terms: performance monitoring, indicator
Performance monitoring
A continuous process of collecting and analyzing data to compare how well a project, program, or policy is being implemented against expected results.

Process evaluation
An evaluation of the internal dynamics of the implementing organizations, their policy instruments, their service delivery mechanisms, their management practices, and the linkages among these.
Related term: formative evaluation

Program evaluation
Evaluation of a set of development interventions, marshaled to attain specific global, regional, country, or sector development objectives.
Note: a development program is usually a time bound intervention that differs from a project in that it may cut across sectors, themes and/or geographic areas, involve lending and non-lending services, and may be supported by different funding sources.
Related term: Country program/strategy evaluation

Project evaluation
Evaluation of an individual development intervention designed to achieve specific objectives within specified resources and implementation schedules, often within the framework of a broader program.
Note: Cost benefit analysis is a major instrument of project evaluation.

Project or program objective
The intended physical, financial, institutional, social, environmental, or other development results to which a project or program is expected to contribute.

Purpose
The publicly stated objectives of the development program or project.

Quality Assurance
Quality assurance encompasses any activity that is concerned with assessing and improving the merit or the worth of a development intervention or its compliance with given standards.
Note: examples of quality assurance activities include appraisal, RBM, reviews during implementation, evaluations, etc. Quality assurance may also refer to the assessment of the quality of a portfolio and its development effectiveness.

**Reach**
The beneficiaries and other stakeholders of a development intervention.
Related term: beneficiaries

**Recommendation**
Proposals aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of a development intervention; at redesigning the objectives; and/or at the reallocation of resources. Recommendations should be linked to conclusions.

**Relevance**
The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ needs, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors policies.
Note: 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.

**Reliability**
Consistency or dependability of data and evaluation judgements, with reference to the quality of the instruments, procedures and analyses used to collect and interpret evaluation data.
Note: evaluation information is reliable when repeated observations using similar instruments under similar conditions produce similar results.

**Result**
The output, outcome or impact (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative) of a development intervention.
Related terms: outcome, effect, impact

**Results Chain**
The causal sequence for a development intervention that stipulates the necessary sequence to achieve desired objectives--beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes, impacts, and feedback.
Related Term: Assumption, results framework
Results framework
The program logic that explains how the development objective is to be achieved, including causal relationships and underlying assumptions.
Related terms: results chain, logical framework

Results-Based Management (RBM)
A management strategy focusing on performance and achievement of outputs, outcomes and impacts.

Review
An assessment of the performance of a development intervention, periodically or on an ad hoc basis.
Related term: evaluation

Risk analysis
A detailed examination of the potential unwanted and negative consequences to human life, health, property, or the environment posed by development interventions; a systematic process to provide information regarding such undesirable consequences; the process of quantification of the probabilities and expected impacts for identified risks.

Sector program evaluation
Evaluation of a cluster of development interventions within one country or across countries, all of which contribute to the achievement of a specific development goal.
Note: a sector includes development activities commonly grouped together for the purpose of public action such as health, education, agriculture, transport etc.

Self-evaluation
An evaluation by those who are entrusted with the design and delivery of a development intervention.

Stakeholders
Agencies, organizations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the development intervention or its evaluation.
Summative evaluation
A study conducted at the end of an intervention (or a phase of that intervention) to determine the extent to which anticipated outcomes were produced. Summative evaluation is intended to provide information about the worth of the program. Related term: formative evaluation

Sustainability
The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. Sometimes used as the resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time (such as assets, skills, facilities, or improved services) generated by a development project or program. The probability of continued long term benefits.

Target group
The specific individuals or organizations for whose benefit the development intervention is undertaken.

Terms of reference
The purpose and scope of the evaluation, the methods to be used, the standard against which performance is to be assessed or analyses are to be conducted, the resources and time allocated, and reporting requirements, generally conveyed in a written document. Two other expressions sometimes used with the same meaning are “scope of work” and “evaluation mandate.”

Thematic Evaluation
Evaluation of a selection of development interventions, all of which address a specific development priority that cuts across countries, regions, and sectors.

Triangulation
The use of three or more theories, sources or types of information, or types of analysis to verify and substantiate an assessment. Note: by combining multiple data-sources, methods, analyses or theories, evaluators hope to overcome the bias that comes from single informants, single-methods, single observer or single theory studies.

Validity
The extent to which the data collection strategies and instruments measure what they purport to measure.
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