

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1	Toolkit background
ANNEX 2	Toolkit contributors
ANNEX 3	Workshop participants
ANNEX 4	Information sources
ANNEX 5	Glossary

ANNEX 1

Toolkit background

Since 2001, a group of information practitioners from development agencies have been working together on the evaluation of information projects, products and services. The lead agencies in this undertaking have been the ACP-EU Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA), the International Institute for Communication and Development (IICD) and the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT), working with a range of partner institutions. The group was referred to as the LEAP IMPACT partnership, after the name of the online community of practice.

The partnership examined the challenges facing the information professional who wants to evaluate his or her own information service, but does not have adequate experience and knowledge. This is mainly because:

- the literature that could act as a guide is highly dispersed, and the publications that are available tend not to be aimed at a self-help or practitioner audience
- there is often no evaluation culture or related evaluation expertise on which to build, with the result that carrying out an evaluation is often seen as intimidating

Although these challenges apply particularly to information professionals in a resource-poor or isolated situation, they are also valid for most information professionals working in the field of information for development. The ability to undertake an evaluation – and to look at one's own products and services in an analytical and systematic manner – strengthens the professional capacity of the information practitioner. Logically, this would lead to his or her professional empowerment and the improved management of information services in the organisation.

It was at the first meeting of the group in Bonn, Germany in 2001 that the idea for the first 'how to' manual on self-evaluation for information practitioners was conceived. The word 'smart' was chosen to emphasise the 'clever' or 'appropriate' aspects of the tools. It also referred to the SMART indicators (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, time-bound) common in the evaluation literature.

Potential contributors were identified and a series of workshops were held to refine the content of the manual. The first edition was launched in 2005 in Tanzania. The feedback indicated that a second, revised edition was called for. Writing the second edition involved information practitioners from South and North, putting their experiences down on paper and also tapping into the knowledge of experts in the field of evaluation and information. In order to obtain comments on the draft version from other experts and practitioners, a workshop was held in Bonn in 2007, followed by an evaluation training workshop in St Lucia in 2008. The draft was also made available for peer review on a wiki page, enabling the contributors to easily exchange views and provide new inputs for the second edition.

The feedback from the workshops and reviews was incorporated into the draft, and it then underwent a final editing process prior to publication.

ANNEX 2

Toolkit contributors

The co-ordinators from the lead agencies involved in compiling this toolkit – CTA, IICD and KIT – have played a pivotal role in making the toolkit a reality, and the LEAP IMPACT community of practice were crucial in facilitating dialogue among all those involved.

The writers and collaborators who voluntarily contributed their time and energy to the development of the evaluation tools were drawn from both the South and North, representing governments, the private sector, non-governmental organisations and universities. Many are information specialists with a wide range of experience in the evaluation of information products.

The tools were tested in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries, as well as in Asia, Europe and the USA, with many of the tool writers acting as supervisors and providing valuable guidance along the way. Many of the testers were drawn from networks developed as a result of the increased level of collaboration within the information community. These testers and supervisors contributed greatly to the further refinement of the toolkit.

Many of the tools were reviewed by a distinguished group of evaluators from the European Evaluation Society and the International Development Evaluation Association, who participated in electronic discussions and attended a workbench meeting to refine the manual.

The contributors to the second edition are listed here. This is followed by a list of contributors to the first edition, including test supervisors and reviewers.

SECOND EDITION

Co-ordinators

Heemskerk, Harry (KIT)
Khadar, Ibrahim (Dr) (CTA)
Nigten, Riet (IICD)

Writers and contributors

Akande, Modupe (Professor)
Alkemade, Bert
Batjes-Sinclair, Karen
op de Coul, Maartje
Cummings, Sarah
Davies, Jackie
Diallo, Alassane
Dumur, Dhaneswar
van Dyk, Herman
Gast, Lisette

Heemskerk, Harry
Hewlitt, Allison
Khadar, Ibrahim (Dr)
Kooijman, Margo
Kusters, Cecile
Lauckner, Bruce
Lenglet, Frans
McQuinn, Mark
Mook, Byron (Dr)
Nath, Shampa
Nigten, Riet
Okail, Nancy
Osei, Simon
Springer-Heinze, Andreas (Dr)
Vincent, Rob (Dr)
Visser-Mabogunje, Lola
Wigboldus, Seerp

**Steering Committee
(Bonn workshop, October 2007)**

Coordination and arbitration

Ayayi, Flora
Heemskerk, Harry
Keller, Mara
Khadar, Ibrahim (Dr)
Knipschild, Henning
Neun, Hansjörg (Dr)
Nigten, Riet

Content and development

Alkemade, Bert
Baguma, Sylvester
Batjes-Sinclair, Karen
Kebede, Gashaw (Dr)
Kusters, Cecile
Lauckner, Bruce

Lombard, Huibre
Pamba, Petro
Sam, Joel
Thieba, Daniel (Dr)

Editorial and production

Blackman, Rachel
Herrema, Auke
Matturi, Jenessi
Parr, Martin (Dr)

Outreach and collaboration

Assigbley, Yawo
Bernard, Marc
Byer, Mark
Kagoiya, Rachel
Mondé, Prosper
Nath, Shampa
Portegies Zwart, Robert

FIRST EDITION

Co-ordinators

Cummings, Sarah (KIT)
Gast, Lisette (IICD)
Visser-Mabogunje, Lola (CTA)

Writers and contributors

Akande, Modupe (Professor)
Batjes-Sinclair, Karen
op de Coul, Maartje
Cummings, Sarah
Davies, Jackie
Diallo, Alassane
Dumur, Dhaneswar
van Dyk, Herman
Gast, Lisette
Hewlitt, Allison
Khadar, Ibrahim (Dr)
Kooijman, Margo
Lauckner, Bruce
Lenglet, Frans
McQuinn, Mark
Mook, Byron (Dr)
Okail, Nancy
Osei, Simon
Springer-Heinze, Andreas (Dr)
Vincent, Rob (Dr)
Visser-Mabogunje, Lola

Collaborators

Chakanyuka, Jaison
Diaw, Boubacar
Dumur, Dhaneswar
van Dyk, Herman
Hendriks, Stefan
Kalume, Christine
Lauckner, Bruce
McQuinn, Mark
Phipps, Andy
Richardson, Victoria
Sam, Joel
Singh, Alec
Visser-Mabogunje, Lola

Testers

Ayinla, Alayande
de Chassy, Stephanie
Chibomba, Kelvin
De Frietas, Claudette
Diabate, Dembélé
Ebong, Geoffrey
Hattotuwa, Sanjana
Kasuga, Richard
Muinde, Francis
Nachibinga, Golden

Namponya, Clemens
Ogunsumi, Lucy
Okello, Dorothy
Prasad, Daniel
Sow, Fatoumata
van den Wollenberg, Lidwien

Test supervisors

Akande, Modupe (Professor)
op de Coul, Maartje
Cummings, Sarah
Diaw, Boubacar
van Dyk, Herman
Asaba, Jane Frances
Kooijman, Margo
Lauckner, Bruce
Lufadeju, E.A. (Professor)
Mbabu, Adiel (Dr)
Okello, Dorothy
Tiémogo, Ibrahim (Dr)

Visser-Mabogunje, Lola
Umar, Mohammed (Dr)

Editorial and production

Batjes-Sinclair, Karen
Allen, Ann
Budhram, Dowlat (Dr)
Pinder, Richard

Peer reviewers

Budhram, Dowlat (Dr)
Chakanyuka, Jaison
Khadar, Ibrahim (Dr)
Lauckner, Bruce
Lenglet, Frans
Mbeng, Martin
McQuinn, Mark
Niang, Thiendou (Dr)
Okail, Nancy
Pinder, Richard
Schiefer, Ulrich (Professor Dr)

ANNEX 3

Workshop participants

Bonn Workshop 9–12 October 2001

Guest participants

De Haas, Hans-Joachim (Dr)
Engel, Paul (Dr)
Franzen, Hubertus (Dr)
Greenidge, Carl B.
Kuby, Thomas
Suden, Wilhem (Dr)

Participants

Adupa, Joyce
Akande, Modupe (Professor)
Alexaki, Nancy
Asiamah, Helen
Badji, Moussa (Dr)
Batjes-Sinclair, Karen
Cummings, Sarah
Ducastel, Nathan
van Dyk, Herman
Esterhuysen, Anriette
Flanagan, Jim
Gast, Lisette
Graham-Knight, Natasha
Hagenaars, M.J.L.J. (Dr)
Hewlitt, Alison
Kalume, Christine
Kanfi, Shady
Kanyunyuzi-Asaba, Jane Frances
Khadar, Ibrahim (Dr)
Kooiman, Margo
Lauckner, Bruce
Lafadeju, Emmanuel A. (Professor)
Mbabu, Adiel Nkonge (Dr)
Mbaye, Ndiaga (Dr)
Mchombu, Kingo (Professor)
Medhine, Yohannes Gebre (Dr)
Menou, Michel (Professor)
Mook, Byron (Dr)
Mukhebi, Adrian Wekulo (Dr)
Nadeau, Charles Andrew
Redecker, Monika
Sanou, Fernand (Professor)
Springer-Heinze, Andreas (Dr)
Vogel, Isabel (Dr)

Amsterdam Workshop 19–22 November 2002

Addison, Chris
Akande, Modupe (Professor)
Batjes-Sinclair, Karen
Belt, John
op de Coul, Maartje
Cummings, Sarah
Diaw, Boubacar
van Dyk, Herman
Gast, Lisette
Hardon, Anne
Hewlitt, Alison
Kalume, Christine
Khadar, Ibrahim (Dr)
Kooijman, Margo
Kulis, Ivan
Lauckner, Bruce
Mbabu, Adiel Nkonge (Dr)
Mchombu, Kingo (Professor)
Mook, Byron (Dr)
Osei, Simon K.
Sam, Joel
Springer-Heinze, Andreas (Dr)
Thieba, Daniel (Dr)
Visser-Mabogunje, Lola

**Wageningen Workshop
8-12 September 2003**

Akande, Modupe (Professor)
 Budhram, Dowlat (Dr)
 Coul, Maartje
 Cummings, Sarah
 Davies, Rick (Dr)
 Diaw, Boubacar
 Dyk van, Herman
 Engel, Paul (Dr)
 Gast, Lisette
 Khadar, Ibrahim (Dr)
 Kooijman, Margo
 Lauckner, Bruce
 Lufadeju, E.A. (Professor)
 Mbabu, Adiel Nkonge (Dr)
 Mook, Byron (Dr)
 Niang, Thiendou (Dr)
 Osei, Simon
 Richardson, Victoria
 Shadrach, B.
 Singh, Alec
 Thieba, Daniel (Dr)
 Thioune, Alioune
 Umar, Mohammed (Dr)
 Vincent, Rob (Dr)
 Visser-Mabogunje, Lola
 Webster, Christine

**Workbench Meeting, Wageningen
14-15 February 2005**

Akande, Modupe (Professor)
 Allen, Ann
 Batjes-Sinclair, Karen
 Blok, Lucie (Dr)
 Budhram, Dowlat (Dr)
 op de Coul, Maartje
 Cummings, Sarah
 Khadar, Ibrahim (Dr)
 Kooijman, Margo
 Lauckner, Bruce
 Lenglet, Frans
 Gast, Lisette
 Mbeng, Martin
 McQuinn, Mark
 Nthuku Muinde, Francis
 Niang, Thiendou (Dr)
 Okail, Nancy
 Pinder, Richard
 Schiefer, Ulrich (Professor, Dr)
 Tiémogo, Ibrahim (Dr)
 Visser-Mabogunje, Lola

ANNEX 4

Information sources

General references

- Batjes-Sinclair, K. and Cummings, S. (2003) *Smart Tools for Evaluating the Performance of Information Products and Services*. Proceedings of a KIT/CTA/IICD/LEAP IMPACT technical consultation. Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 19–22 November 2002. CTA Working document 8029. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- Batjes-Sinclair, K. and Khadar, I. (2002) *Assessing the Performance and Impact of Agricultural Information Products and Services: Summary Report and Recommendations of a Technical Consultation*. Bonn, Germany, 9–12 October 2001. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- Boissière, N. (2000) Assessing methodologies in studies of the impact of information: a synthesis. In: *Defining and Assessing the Impact of Information on Development: Building Research and Action Agendas*. Horton, F.W. Jr (ed.) FID Occasional Paper 16. pp 49–64. IFID, The Hague, The Netherlands
- Botswana National Library Service (2002) *Revitalisation of Public Libraries*. Monitoring and evaluation workshop, 14–17 May 2002. Botswana National Library Service, Gaborone. Botswana
- Caldwell, R. (2002) *Project Design Handbook*. CARE International, Atlanta, USA
- Change Management Learning Centre. <http://www.change-management.com/tutorial-adkar-overview.htm> (accessed 1 October 2009)
- CTA (1998) *Assessing the Impact of Information and Communication Management on Institutional Performance*. Proceedings of a CTA workshop, Wageningen, the Netherlands, 27–29 January 1998. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- CTA (2002) *Technical Consultation on Assessing the Performance and Impact of Agricultural Information Products and Services*. Proceedings of a CTA/IICD/LEAP IMPACT Technical Consultation, Bonn, Germany, 9–12 October 2001. CTA Working Document 8027. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- CTA (2004) *CTA Annual Report 2003*. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- Conole, G., Oliver, M. and Harvey, J. (2000) *Toolkits as an Approach to Evaluating and Using Learning Materials*. www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/coffs00/papers/grainne_conole.pdf (accessed 1 October 2009)
- Cummings, S. (2002a) Conceptual frameworks and methodologies used for evaluating agricultural information products and services. In: *Technical Consultation on Assessing the Performance and Impact of Agricultural Information Products and Services*. Proceedings of a CTA/IICD/LEAP IMPACT Technical Consultation, Bonn, Germany, 9–12 October 2001. CTA Working document 8027. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands

- Cummings, S. (2002b) Inventory: conceptual frameworks and methodologies used for evaluating agricultural information products and services. In: *Technical Consultation on Assessing the Performance and Impact of Agricultural Information Products and Services*. Proceedings of a CTA/IICD/LEAP IMPACT Technical Consultation, Bonn, Germany, 9–12 October 2001. CTA Working document 8027. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- Cummings, S. and Mchombu, K. (2003) Developing evaluation practice in the information sector: Introduction to the special issue. *Information Development* 19 (2)
- DAC (2002) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-based Management*. OECD/DA, Paris, France
- DANIDA (1999) *Evaluation Guidelines*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark
- Danish Management et al. (2001) *Handbook for Monitors*. EVA/1999/11, ALA/MED/ACP and Balkans Monitoring Project, for European Commission. EuropeAid Unit H6
- Davies, R. and Dart, J. 2005. *The Most Significant Change (MSC) Technique: A Guide to its Use*. Davies and Dart, UK
- EC (2004) *Aid Delivery Methods. Volume 1: Project Cycle Management Guidelines*. EC, Brussels, Belgium
- EC (2005) *Evaluation of EU Activities: An Introduction*. EC, Brussels, Belgium.
- Engel, P.G.H. and Salomon, M.L. (1997) *The Social Organization of Innovation: A Focus on Stakeholder Interaction*. A RAAKS Resource Box. KIT/CTA/STOAS, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- EuropeAid (2001) *Manual of Project Cycle Management*. European Commission, Brussels, Belgium.
- FAO (2001) *Project Cycle Management Technical Guide: Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis Programme (SEAGA)*. FAO, Rome, Italy
- Gittinger, J.P. (1982) *Economic Analysis of Agricultural Projects* (2nd edn) Johns Hopkins University Press Baltimore, MD, USA
- Hiatt, J.M. (2006) *ADKAR: A model for change in Business, government and our community: How to implement successful change in our personal lives and professional careers*. Prosci Research, CO, USA
- Herman, J., Morris, L. and Fitz-Gibbon, C. (1987) *Evaluator's Handbook*. Sage Publications Newbury Park, CA, USA
- Horton, D., Ballantyne, P., Peterson, W., Uribe, B., Gapasin, D. and Sheridan, K. (1993) *Monitoring and Evaluating Agricultural Research: A Source Book*. CAB International/ISNAR, Wallingford, UK
- Horton, D. et al. (2003) *Evaluating Capacity Development: Experiences from Research and Development Organisations around the World*. ISNAR/CTA/IDRC, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- IADB (1997) *Evaluation in the Bank*. Office of Evaluation and Oversight, IADB, Washington, DC, USA
- IFAD (2004) *A Guide for Project M&E: Managing for Impact in Rural Development*. IFAD, Rome, Italy
- Johnson, R. and Redmond D. (1998) *The Art of Empowerment*. Financial Times/Prentice Hall, London, UK

- Katzenback, J.R. and Smith, D.H. (1993) *The Wisdom of Teams, Creating the High Performance Organisation*. Harper Business, New York, USA
- Kellogg Foundation. Using Logic Models to Bring Together Planning, Evaluation, and Action: Logic Model Development Guide. Available at <http://www.wkkf.org/Pubs/Tools/Evaluation/Pub3669.pdf>. (accessed 1 October 2009)
- Khadar, I. (2002) Evaluation concepts and terminology: a discussion note. In: *Technical Consultation on Assessing the Performance and Impact of Agricultural Information Products and Services*. Proceedings of a CTA/IICD/LEAP IMPACT Technical Consultation, Bonn, Germany, 9–12 October 2001. CTA Working document 8027. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- Khadar, I. (2004). An evaluation framework for evaluating the performance and impact of information projects, products and services. In: *Smart Tools for Evaluating the Performance of Information Products and Services*. Proceedings of a KIT/CTA/IICD/LEAP IMPACT technical consultation. Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 19–22 November 2002. CTA Working Document 8029. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- Kirkpatrick, D.L. 1994. *Evaluating Training Programs*. Berrett-Koehler, San Francisco, USA
- Kolb, D.A. (1984) *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA
- Kusek, J. and Rist, R. (2004) *Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System*. IBRD, Washington, DC, USA: World Bank
- Laurence., A. and Hawthorne, W. (2006) *Plant Identification: Creating User-Friendly Field Guides for BioDiversity Management*. Earthscan, London, UK
- Levi, D. 2001. *Group Dynamics for Teams*. Sage Publications, London UK
- Lewin, K. 1943, Defining the 'field at a given time'. *Psychological Review* 50: 292-310
- MacKay, K. (2005) *Influential Evaluations: Detailed Case Studies*. Washington, DC, USA: Operations Evaluation Department, World Bank
- Mbabu, A. (2002) Principles of evaluation. *Technical Consultation on Assessing the Performance and Impact of Agricultural Information Products and Services*. Proceedings of a CTA/IICD/LEAP IMPACT Technical Consultation, Bonn, Germany, 9–12 October 2001. CTA Working document 8027. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- Mchombu, K. (2002) Key issues on the characteristics of agricultural information. In: *Technical Consultation on Assessing the Performance and Impact of Agricultural Information Products and Services*. Proceedings of a CTA/IICD/LEAP IMPACT Technical Consultation, Bonn, Germany, 9–12 October 2001. CTA Working document 8027. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- Mook, B.T. (2003) *Evaluating Information: A Letter to a Project Manager*. CTA/ISNAR, Wageningen, The Netherlands. Available at: <http://www.ifpri.org/isnararchive/Publicat/PDF/rmg8.pdf>
- Moss Kanter R. (1994) *The Change Masters*. Free Press, New York, USA
- Osborn, A. 1953. *Applied Imagination: Principles and Procedures of Creative Problem Solving*. Scribner, New York, USA.
- OECD (1992) *Development Assistance Manual: DAC Principles for Effective Aid*. OECD, Paris, France

- OECD (2001) *Evaluation Feedback for Effective Learning and Accountability*. Report of DAC Tokyo workshop on 'Evaluation feedback for effective learning and accountability', 26–28 September 2000. OECD/DAC Paris, France
- OECD (2002) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*. OECD, Paris, France
- Oomkes, F. and Thomas, R. H. (1992) *Cross cultural communication: A trainers manual*. Gower, Aldershot, UK.
- Open University (2000) *Technique Library*. Prepared by J. Martin and R. Bell. Open University, Milton Keynes, UK
- Powell, M. (2003) *Information Management for Development Organisations*. Oxfam, Oxford, UK
- Pretty, J. (1994) Alternative systems for inquiry for a sustainable agriculture. *Institute of Development Studies Bulletin* 25 (9)
- Project Management Institute. (2000) *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK Guide)*. Project Management Institute, Pennsylvania, USA
- Roche, C. (1999) *Impact Assessment for Development Agencies: Learning to Value Change*. Oxfam, Oxford, UK
- Royal Institute of the Tropics/World Bank. (2000) *Village Participation in Rural Development. The African Network on Participatory Approaches Manual*. KIT/World Bank, The Hague, The Netherlands
- Sayce, K. and Norrish, P. (2006) *Perception and Practice: An Anthology of Impact Assessment Experiences*. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- Schiefer, U. and Döbel, R. (2001) *MAPA-PROJECT: A Practical Guide to Integrated Project Planning and Evaluation*. Institute for Educational Policy/Open Society Institute, USA
- Senge, P. (1994) *The Fifth Discipline*. Random House, New York, USA
- SIDA (2004) *The Logical Framework Approach – A Summary of the Theory behind the LFA Method*. SIDA, Stockholm, Sweden
- Springer-Heinze, A. (2003) Indicators: between hard measures and soft judgements. In: *Smart Tools for Evaluating the Performance of Information Products and Services*. Proceedings of a KIT/ CTA/ IICD/ LEAP IMPACT technical consultation. Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 19–22 November 2002. CTA Working document 8029. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- Thomas, A., Chataway, J. and Wuyts, M. (eds) (1998) *Finding out Fast: Investigative Skills for Policy and Development*. Sage/Open University, London, UK
- UNESCO (1989) *Measuring the Performance of Public Libraries*. UNESCO, Paris, France
- UNEP (2005) *Project Manual: Formulation, Approval, Monitoring and Evaluation*. UNEP, New York, USA
- Westat, J.L. et al. (2002) *The 2002 User Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation*. National Science Foundation, Virginia, USA

References on information evaluation

- Association of College and Research Libraries. (1998) *Task Force on Academic Library Outcomes Assessment Report*. ACRL, USA. Available at: <http://www.ala.org/acrl/outcome.html>
- Baark, E. and Heeks, R. (1998) *Evaluation of Donor-funded Information Technology Transfer Projects in China: A Life-cycle Approach*. Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, UK

- Bellamy, M. (2000) *Approaches to Impact Evaluation (assessment) in Agricultural Information Management: Selective Review of the Issues, the Relevant Literature and Some Illustrative Case Studies*. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- Burroughs, C.M. and Wood, F.B. (2000) *Measuring the difference: guide to planning and evaluating health information outreach*. National Network of Libraries of Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA
- CIDA (2000) *CIDA Evaluation Guide*. CIDA, Toronto, Canada
- Correa, A.F., Ndiaye, D., Mchombu, K.J., Rodriguez, G.M., Rosenberg, D. and Yapa, N.U. (1997) *Rural Information Provision in Developing Countries: Measuring Performance and Impact*. UNESCO, Paris, France
- CTA (1998) *Assessing the Impact of Information and Communication Management on Institutional Performance*. Proceedings of a CTA workshop. Wageningen, The Netherlands, 27–29 January, 1998. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- DAC–OECD. (2001) Evaluation feedback for effective learning and accountability. *OECD Evaluation and Aid Effectiveness* No. 5, 117pp
- Ernberg, J. (1998) *Integrated Rural Development and Universal Access: Towards a Framework for Evaluation of Multipurpose Community Telecentres*. ITU, Geneva, Switzerland
- Gangapersad, G. (2000) *Assessing the Impact of Information and Communication to NAMDEVCO's Clientele through its Newsletter and a Hot Pepper Seminar*. Trinidad and Tobago
- Gómez, R., Hunt, and P. Lamoureux, E. (1999) *Enchanted by Telecentres: A Critical Look at Universal Access to Information Technologies for International Development*. IDRC, Toronto, Canada
- Hafkin, N. and Menou, M.J. (1996) *Impact of Electronic Communication on Development in Africa*. CABECA/IDRC, Toronto, Canada
- Haravu, L.J. and Rajan, T.N. (1995) *Impact of the Semi-Arid Tropical Crops Information Service*. SATCRIS/ICRISAT, India
- Harris, R.W. *Evaluating Telecentres within National Policies for ICTs in Developing Countries*. Faculty of Information Technology, University of Sarawak, Malaysia
- HealthLink World-wide. Monitoring and evaluation. In: *Resource Centre Manual. How to Set Up and Manage a Resource Centre*. HealthLink. UK
- Hudson, H.E. *Designing Research for Telecentre Evaluation*. Acacia Program, IDRC, Toronto, Canada
- Kidane, S. *Report of Evaluation of HealthNet Service*. Nuffield Institute Health Resource Centre, University of Leeds, Sheffield, UK.
- Mchombu, K. (1995) *Impact of Information on Rural Development: Background, Methodology and Progress*. IDRC, Toronto, Canada
- Menou, M. (1993) *Indicators and Assessment Methods*. IDRC, Toronto, Canada
- Menou, M. (1993) *Preliminary Framework for Impact Assessment*. IDRC, Toronto, Canada
- Menou, M. (1999) Impact of the Internet: Some conceptual and methodological issues, or how to hit a moving target behind the smoke screen. In: Nicholas, D. and Rowlands, I., (eds) *The Internet: Its Impact and Evaluation*. Aslib, London, UK.

- Møller Rasmussen, A.. (2001) Information and development: the information effect. *Information Development* vol 17(1)
- Mook, B. (2001) *Evaluating Information: A Letter to a Project Manager*. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- Parker, S. (2000) Knowledge is like light – information is like water. *Information Development* 16(4). Pages: 233–236
- Saunders, M. (2000) Beginning an evaluation with RUFDATA: theorising a practical approach to evaluation planning. *Evaluation: the International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice* 2000 6 (1)
- Tague-Sutcliffe, J., Vaughan, L. and Sylvain, C. (1995) *Using LISREL to Measure the Impact of Information on Development: London site pilot study*. IDRC, Toronto, Canada
- Vincent, R. (2001) *Beyond Circles in Square Boxes: Lessons Learned from Health Communication Impact Evaluations*. Exchange, HealthLink Worldwide, London, UK
- Vogel, I. (2001) An online impact assessment tool for research information: some preliminary concepts. *Information Development* 17 (2) 111-113.
- Whyte, A. (1999a) *Indicators in Telecentre Studies*. IDRC, Toronto, Canada
- Whyte, A. (1999b) *Understanding the Role of Community Telecentres in Development*. Mestor Associates, Canada
- Wilson III, E.J. and Daly, J. (1998) *Internet Counts: Measuring the Impact of the Internet*. National Academy Press, Washington DC, USA

Selected references for tools, products and services

These references relate to the tools described in Part 3 and the products and services described in Part 4

Evaluation tools

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

- AusGUIDELines The Logical Framework Approach. Available at:
<http://portals.wi.wur.nl/files/docs/ppme/ausguidelines-logical%20framework%20approach.pdf>
 (accessed 1 October 2009)
- Caldwell, R. (2002) *Project Design Handbook*. CARE International, Atlanta, USA
- Checkland, P.B. and Scholes, J. (1990) *Soft Systems Methodology in Action*. John Wiley, Chichester, UK
- EuropeAid (2001) *Manual of Project Cycle Management*. European Commission, Brussels, Belgium
- EC. (2004) *Aid Delivery Methods. Volume 1: Project Cycle Management Guidelines*. EC, Brussels, Belgium
- FAO (2001) *Project Cycle Management Technical Guide: Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis Programme (SEAGA)*. FAO, Rome, Italy

- GTZ. (2000) *Guidelines for Impact Monitoring in Economic and Employment Promotion Projects with Special Reference to Poverty Reduction Impacts*. GTZ, Eschborn, Germany
- Hambly Odame, H. (2001) *Engendering the Logical Framework*. ISNAR, The Hague, The Netherlands
- IADB (1997) *Evaluation: A Management Tool for Improving Project Performance (A Logical Framework)*. IFAD, Washington, DC.
- IFAD (2004) *A Guide for Project M&E: Managing for Impact in Rural Development*. IFAD, Rome, Italy
- IUCN (1997) *Designing Projects and Project Evaluations using the Logical Framework Approach*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland
- Schiefer, U. and Döbel, R. (2001) *MAPA-PROJECT: A Practical Guide to Integrated Project Planning and Evaluation*. Institute for Educational Policy/Open Society Institute, USA
- SIDA (2004) *The Logical Framework Approach – A Summary of the Theory behind the LFA Method*. SIDA, Stockholm, Sweden
- UNEP. (2005) *Project Manual: Formulation, Approval, Monitoring and Evaluation*. UNEP, New York, USA

RESULTS-BASED MANAGEMENT

- ELI Monitoring & Evaluation. (2000) *Results Based Management for ELI: A Primer*. ELI, World Bank, Washington DC, USA
- Kusek, K.Z. and Rist, R.C. (2004) *Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System*. World Bank, Washington, DC, USA
- Schiavo-Campo, S. (1999) Performance in the public sector. *Asian Journal of Political Science* 7 (2): 75–87

BENCHMARKING

- Camp, R.C. (1989) *Benchmarking: The Search for Industry Best Practices that lead to Superior Performance*. ASQ Quality Press, Milwaukee, WI, USA
- Camp, R.C. (1995) *Business Process Benchmarking: Finding and Implementing Practices*. ASQ Quality Press, Milwaukee, WI, USA
- Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P. (1992) The balanced scorecard – measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review* Jan/Feb: 71–79
- Paton, R. (2001) The performance of social enterprises. In: *Materials from TU870 Course Capacities for Managing Development*. Open University, Milton Keynes, UK: Open University
- Russell, P.J. (1998) *Quality Management Benchmark Assessment*. ASQ Quality Press, Milwaukee, WI, USA
- Spendolini, M. (1992) *The Benchmarking Book*. AMACOM, New York, NY, USA

INDICATORS

CIDA. (1999) *Results-based Management in CIDA: An Introductory Guide to the Concepts and Principles*. CIDA, Ottawa, Canada

Jaeger, R. (1978) About educational indicators. *Review of Research in Education* 6, 276–315

Moldan, B. and Billharz, S. (eds) (1997) *Sustainability Indicators: Report of the Project on Indicators*. Ministry of the Environment, Prague, Czech Republic

Mook, B.T. (2003) *Evaluating Information: A Letter to a Project Manager*. CTA/ISNAR, Wageningen, The Netherlands

TERMS OF REFERENCE

DANIDA (1999) *Evaluation Guidelines*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark

EC (2001) *Evaluation in the European Commission: A Guide to the Evaluation Procedures and Structures Currently Operational in the Commission's External Cooperative Programme*. EC, Brussels, Belgium

EC (2004) *Aid Delivery Methods. Volume 1: Project Cycle Management Guidelines*. EC, Brussels, Belgium

FAO (2001) *Project Cycle Management Technical Guide: Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis Programme (SEAGA)*. FAO, Rome, Italy

Mook, B.T. (2003) *Evaluating Information: A Letter to a Project Manager*. CTA/ISNAR, Wageningen, The Netherlands

LOGIC MODEL

Caldwell, R. (2002) *Project Design Handbook*. CARE International, Atlanta, USA

Kellogg Foundation. *Using Logic Models to Bring Together Planning, Evaluation, and Action: Logic Model Development Guide*

University of Wisconsin. *Program Development and Evaluation: Logic Model. Program Development and Evaluation*

SWOT ANALYSIS

Balamuralikrishna, R. and Dugger, J.C. (1995) SWOT analysis: a management tool for initiating new programs in vocational schools. *Journal of Vocational and Technical Education* 12(1) (e-journal)

Berkowitz, E.N., Kerin, R.A., Hartley, S.W. and Rudelius, W. (2000) *Marketing*. (6th edn) Irwin/McGraw Hill, Boston, MA, USA

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

- Dawson S. and Manderson, L. (1993) *A Manual for the Use of Focus Groups*. INFDC, Boston, MA, USA
- Gibbs, A. (1997) Focus groups. *Social Research Update 19*. (e-journal) Available at: <http://www.soc.surrey.ac.uk/sru/SRU19.html> (accessed 1 October 2009)
- Kitzinger, J. (1995) Introducing focus groups. *British Medical Journal* 311: 299-302
- Krueger, R.A. and Casey, M.A. (2000) *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research* (3rd edn). Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, USA

CASE STUDIES

- Tellis, W. (1997) Introduction to case study. *The Qualitative Report* 3 (2). Available at: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-2/tellis1.html> (accessed 1 October 2009)
- Whittemore, C.T. (1995) Teaching interpersonal and transferable skills to students of agriculture: a case study. *European Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension* 1: 87-106
- World Bank/OECD. (2005) *Influential Evaluations: Detailed Case Studies*. World Bank/OECD, Washington DC, USA
- Yin, R.K. (2003) *Case Study Research, Design and Methods*. (3rd edn) Sage, London, UK

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

- Consumer Health Care Information Workgroup 'Techniques for Testing and Evaluation'. Available at: http://www.talkingquality.gov/docs/section5/5_3.htm#Qualitative%20Methods (accessed 1 October 2009)
- McDowell, D. (1997) *Process Guide #6: Interview Techniques*. Available at: <http://projects.edtech.sandi.net/staffdev/tpss99/processguides/interviewing.html> (accessed 1 October 2009)
- Robinson, M. and Thin, N. (1993) *Project Evaluation: A Guide for NGOs*. ODA, East Kilbride, UK

PARTICIPATORY AND CREATIVE TOOLS

- IIED (2003) *Learning and Teaching Participation. Tips for Trainers*. PLA Notes 48: IIED, London, UK
- IIED/ODA (1994) Participatory reflection and action methods. In: *Whose Eden? An Overview of Community Approaches to Wildlife Management*. IIED/ODA, London, UK
- World Bank. 2004. Participatory video: Rural people document their knowledge and innovations. *IK Notes*. No. 71, August 2004. Available at: <http://www.worldbank.org/afr/ik/iknt71.pdf> (accessed 1 October 2009)

AFTER ACTION REVIEW

Collison, C. and Parcell, G. (2001). *Learning to Fly*. Capstone Publishing, Milford, CT, USA

Darling, M.J. and Parry, C.S. (2001) *From Post-mortem to Living Practice: An In-depth Study of the Evolution of the After Action Review*. Signet Consulting Group, Boston, MA, USA: Signet Consulting Group

DATA ANALYSIS

den Boer, D.-J., Bouwman, H., Frissen, V. and Houben, M. (1994) *Methodologie en Statistiek voor Communicatie-onderzoek*. Bohn Stafleu Van Loghum. Zavetem Houten, The Netherlands

Coghlan, D. and Brannick, T. (2005) *Doing Action Research in Your Own Organisation*. Sage, London, UK

Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M. (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Sage, London, UK

Patton, M.Q. (2002) *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, USA

Voelkl, K. and Gerber, S. (1999) *Using SPSS for Windows. Data Analysis and Graphics*. Springer Verlag, New York, NY, USA

WRITING AND DISSEMINATING AN EVALUATION REPORT

ISNAR/IDRC/CTA. (2003) *Evaluating Capacity Development: Experiences from Research and Development Organisations around the World*. Arlington Press, UK

Schiefer, U. and Döbel, R. (2001) *MAPA-PROJECT: A Practical Guide to Integrated Project Planning and Evaluation*. Institute for Educational Policy/Open Society Institute, USA

UNICEF. *A UNICEF Guide for Monitoring and Evaluation: Making a Difference?* UNICEF, New York USA. Available at: <http://www.unicef.org/reseval/mande4r.html> (accessed 1 October 2009)

PROMOTING THE USE OF EVALUATION FINDINGS

ISNAR/IDRC/CTA. (2003) *Evaluating Capacity Development: Experiences from Research and Development Organisations around the World*. Arlington Press, UK

OECD (2001) *Evaluation Feedback for Effective Learning and Accountability*. Report of DAC Tokyo workshop on 'Evaluation feedback for effective learning and accountability', 26–28 September 2000. OECD/DAC Paris, France

TRANSLATING EVALUATION FINDINGS

Open University (2000) *Technique Library*. Prepared by J. Martin and R. Bell. Open University, Milton Keynes, UK

Tubbs, S.L. (2004) *Decision-making Processes*. McGraw-Hill, New York, USA

Information products and services

TRAINING COURSE

Casly, D.J. and Lang, D.A. (1982) *Monitoring and Evaluation of Agricultural and Rural Development Projects*. World Bank, Washington, DC, USA

Mook, B.T. (2003) *Evaluating Information: A Letter to a Project Manager*. CTA/ISNAR, Wageningen, The Netherlands

UN (1984) *Guiding Principles for the Design and Use of Monitoring and Evaluation in Rural Development Projects and Programmes*. FAO, Rome, Italy

Winfrey, E.C. (1999) Kirkpatrick's four levels of evaluation. In B. Hoffman (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Educational Technology*.

NEWSLETTER

Mook, B.T. (2003) *Evaluating Information: A Letter to a Project Manager*. CTA/ISNAR, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

Winfrey, E.C. (1999) Kirkpatrick's four levels of evaluation. In B. Hoffman (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Educational Technology*.

WEBSITE

Additional evaluation and repair software for web accessibility is available from <http://www.w3.org/WAI/ER/existingtools.html> (accessed 1 October 2009)

CGIAR. *Evaluating the Impact of Your Website: A guide for CGIAR Centers to Evaluate the Usage, Usability and Usefulness of Their Websites*. ICT-KM Guide, version 1.0, November 2007. Available at: <http://ictkm.cgiar.org/archives> (accessed 1 October 2009)

Evaluation framework. Available at: <http://www.urbandevelopmentforum.org/WebsiteEvaluation/docs/WebsiteEvaluationFramework.html> (accessed 1 October 2009)

QUESTION-AND-ANSWER SERVICE

Bellamy, M. (2000) *Approaches to Impact Evaluation (assessment) in Agricultural Information Management: Selective Review of the Issues, the Relevant Literature and Some Illustrative Case Studies*. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands

CTA (2001). *Manual for the Management of Question and Answer Services*. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands

Mook, B.T. (2003) *Evaluating Information: A Letter to a Project Manager*. CTA/ISNAR, Wageningen, The Netherlands

SMALL LIBRARY / RESOURCE CENTRE

- ACRL. (1998) *Task Force on Academic Library Outcomes Assessment Report*. ACRL, USA
- CTA (1998) *Assessing the Impact of Information and Communication Management on Institutional Performance*. Proceedings of a CTA workshop, Wageningen, the Netherlands, 27–29 January 1998. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- Mook, B.T. (2003) *Evaluating Information: A Letter to a Project Manager*. CTA/ISNAR, Wageningen, The Netherlands

ONLINE COMMUNITY

- Church, M., Bitel, M., Armstrong, K. Fernando, P. Gould, H. Joss, S., Marwaha-Diedrich, M. Torre de la, A.L. and Vouhé, C. (2000) *Participation, Relationships and Dynamic Change: New Thinking on Evaluating the Work of International Networks*. A Development Planning Unit Project. University College London, UK
- Cummings, S., Heeks, R. and Huysman, M. (2003) *Knowledge and Learning in Online Communities in Development: A Social Capital Perspective*. Development Informatics Working Paper Series No. 16, Institute for Development Policy and Management, Manchester, UK

RURAL RADIO

- Adam, G. and Harford, N. (1998) *Health on Air – A Guide to Creative Radio for Development*. Health Unlimited, London, UK
- Adam, G. and Harford, N. (1999) *Radio and HIV/AIDS: Making a Difference*. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) and Media Action International. UNAIDS, Geneva, Switzerland
- AMARC. *The African Community Radio Manager's Handbook: A Guide to Sustainable Radio*. AMARC Africa. Available at:
http://www.apc.org/apps/img_upload/29f7440303691f46ae6e48c35512ccf2/AMARC_manual_for_managers.doc (accessed 1 October 2009)
- OneWorld Radio, resources section on evaluation. Available at:
www.oneworld.net/radiohttp://radio.oneworld.net/index.php?fuseaction=cms.trainingResourcePage

SELECTIVE DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION SERVICE

- CTA (1998) *Assessing the Impact of Information and Communication Management on Institutional Performance*. Proceedings of a CTA workshop, Wageningen, the Netherlands, 27–29 January 1998. CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands
- McKimmie, T. (1994) *Evaluation of a Current Awareness Service in an Academic Library*. New Mexico State University, Mexico
- Mook, B.T. (2003) *Evaluating Information: A Letter to a Project Manager*. CTA/ISNAR, Wageningen, The Netherlands

Niang, T. (2001) Information services to agricultural research management at the Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation. In Vernon, R. (ed) *Knowing Where You're Going: Information Systems for Agricultural Research Management*. ISNAR, The Hague, the Netherlands

Poncelet, J. (1980) *Guide for the Establishment and Evaluation of Services for Selective Dissemination of Information*. UNESCO UNISIST, Paris, France

ANNEX 5

Glossary

These terms are defined within the context of information projects, products and services.

Accessibility: The extent to which the target groups have access to a product or service.

Accountability test: Traditionally, the main focus of an evaluation. This exercise generally assesses the extent to which available resources have been spent according to set procedures and for the intended activities. It now also includes accountability to clients.

Accuracy: A measure of the quality of the information.

Appraisal: Analysis of a proposed project to determine its merits and acceptability in accordance with established criteria. It assesses whether the project is feasible practically, the objectives are appropriate and the costs are reasonable. Common synonyms: feasibility study, *ex ante* evaluation.

Assumptions: External factors that could affect the progress of the project, but over which the project manager has no direct control.

Attribution problem: Whether changes observed after project implementation can be directly attributed to the project.

Beneficiaries: People and/or institutions that benefit, in one way or another, from the implementation of a project. They include:

- Implementing organisations (those receiving financial means to carry out a project)
- Intermediate beneficiaries (those supported in the project to better deliver services to the target group)
- Target groups (the primary stakeholders, whose lives will be directly affected by the project and with whom project staff will work closely)
- Final beneficiaries (those in the wider society who will benefit from the project in the long term)

Cost–benefit: Relates inputs into the information system to impact.

Cost-effectiveness: Relates inputs to the information system to usage of the outputs.

Data-collection tools: The methods used to identify information sources of data and to collect those data.

Effectiveness: Relates outputs of the information system to usage.

Efficiency: Measures the outputs (qualitative and quantitative) in relation to the inputs. It is a term that signifies that the project uses the least costly resources in order to achieve the desired results.

Evaluation: An assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of ongoing and completed projects, in terms of their design, implementation and results. It is generally carried out before a project begins (sometimes called *ex ante*); in mid-cycle (mid-term); or at the end when impact can be measured (sometimes called *ex post*). It is usually undertaken as an independent examination of the background, objectives, results, activities and means deployed, with a view of drawing lessons to guide future decision-making.

Feasibility study: This assesses whether a proposed project is well-founded and is likely to meet the identified needs of its intended target groups.

Formative evaluation: This is designed to increase understanding in order to improve performance.

Gender approach: The socio-cultural construct that refers to roles, responsibilities, characteristics, attitudes and beliefs about men and women. They are defined, supported and reinforced by societal structures and institutions, and are learned and change over time, varying within and between cultures. Factors such as education, technology, economics and crises such as war and famine often bring about changes in gender roles.

Gender analysis: An organised assessment aimed at understanding how men and women relate to each other in terms of roles and responsibilities, access and control. The purpose is to ensure that project activities fully incorporate the roles, needs and participation of women and men. It requires separate data and information by gender and age.

Goals: Clear statements of success that a project is working to achieve.

Impact: Long-term effects (economic, social and environmental), anticipated or unanticipated, positive or negative, at the individual or organisational level, brought about by a development intervention. Relates use of information outputs to transformation of the users or their environment.

Indicators: Measurable elements that indicate whether project efforts are successful. They help to define what information must be collected to answer evaluation questions.

Logical framework (logframe): A methodology for planning, managing and evaluating projects, involving stakeholder analysis, problem analysis, analysis of objectives, analysis of strategies, and preparation of the logframe matrix and the activity and resource schedules.

Monitoring: A continuous process of collecting and analysing data for performance indicators, to compare a project's progress against intended results.

Objectives: Interim, measurable goals that can be achieved within a defined period.

Outcomes: The differences a project makes to the target group. They should flow directly from the project's goal or purpose.

Outputs: Reflect measurable products of a project. They can include anything that can be counted, such as people, activities, materials and time. Outputs measure quantity, not quality.

Performance: Quality of the way a project functions.

Productivity: The output in relation to the input.

Purpose: The direct outcome to be achieved as a result of the outputs produced by the project.

Relevance: The extent to which project objectives are consistent with the target group's needs.

Results: The products of the activities undertaken.

Self-evaluation: An evaluation by those responsible for the design and implementation of a project.

Stakeholders: Agencies, organisations, individuals or groups who have a direct or indirect interest in a project and its evaluation.

Summative evaluation: Measures overall performance against external standards or intended achievements.

Sustainability: The likelihood of a continuation in the products/services delivered by the project, after the project itself has ended.

SWOT analysis: Analysis of an organisation's strengths and weaknesses, and the opportunities and threats that it faces.

Target group: The people whose lives a project seeks to positively affect.

Terms of reference: Defines the tasks and parameters that the agency implementing a project should adhere to, indicating the objectives, planned activities, expected outputs, budget, timetable and job descriptions.

Transformation path: Stages an idea must go through before visible impact among the primary stakeholders is attained.

Utility: The extent to which the project can be successfully replicated in another location or among different stakeholders.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AAR	after-action review
ACP	African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States
AIDS	acquired immune deficiency syndrome
APC	Association for Progressive Communications
ARIS	Agricultural Research Information Service
ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa
CABI	Centre for Agriculture and Biosciences International
CAQDAS	Computer-Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis
CARDI	Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institute
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CORAF	Conférence des responsables de recherche agronomique africains
CSO	civil society organisation
CTA	Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation
CTRL	control
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (OECD)
DANIDA	Danish International Development Assistance
DFID	Department for International Development
EC	European Commission
ECART	European Consortium for Agricultural Research in the Tropics
ECDPM	European Centre for Development Policy Management
EU	European Union
FAKT	Fördergesellschaft für Angepasste Techniken
FAQs	frequently asked questions
FID	International Federation for Information and Documentation
GDC	Gabriima Development Centre (SWOT tool)
GTZ	Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
HIV	human immunodeficiency virus
HTML	hypertext mark-up language
ICT	information and communication technology
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IDS	Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, UK
IEC	information, education and communication
IICD	International Institute for Communication and Development
IK	indigenous knowledge
INFDC	International Nutrition Foundation for Developing Countries
ISNAR	International Service for National Agricultural Research
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
KISS	keep it short and simple
KIT	Royal Tropical Institute
LEAP	Learning and Evaluation Action Program
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MDF	Management Development Foundation
MOV	means of verification (Logframe)
NGO	non-governmental organisation
NUD*IST	Non-numerical, Unstructured Data Indexing, Searching and Theory-building
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OVI	objectively verifiable indicator (Logframe)
PCM	project cycle management
PRA	participatory rural approach
R&D	research and development
RBM	Results-based management
QAS	Question-and-Answer Service

RUFDATA	reasons and purposes, uses, focuses, data and evidence, audience, timing, agency
SAR	specific actionable recommendations
SDI	Selective Dissemination of Information
SMART	specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, time-bound
SWOT	strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats
ToR	terms of reference
UK	United Kingdom
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
URL	uniform resource locator
USA	United States of America
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WWW	World Wide Web

INDEX

- accessibility see evaluation criteria
- accountability v, vii, viii, 33
- action plan 61-62
- ADKAR model 63
- After Action Review 40, 106, 109, 155-157
- analysis see data analysis, gender analysis, objectives analysis, problem analysis, situation analysis, stakeholder analysis, strategy analysis, SWOT analysis
- assumptions 11, 13 see also logical framework

- baseline data 24, 76
- benchmarking 67, 88-91
- brainstorming 171-173
- budget 3, 30, 43-46, 79

- cascading projects 76-77
- case studies 106, 109, 136-139
- change, managing 63-64
- communication strategy 26, 30, 41-42, 45, 46, 54-56, 188-189, 217-218, 229-230, 241-242, 252-254, 266-267, 277-279, 290-292
- CREAM 50, 87
- criteria, evaluation see evaluation criteria
- critical reflection see reflection, critical

- data analysis 25, 26, 30, 32, 45-46, 52-54, 60, 106, 157-162, 186-188, 201-203, 216-217, 228-229, 239-241, 252, 263-265, 276-278, 289-290
- data collection 17, 20, 25, 26, 30-32, 37-41, 45, 46, 48-49, 52, 58-59, 106-115, 181-186, 195-201, 209-216, 221-228, 235-239, 245-251, 257-263, 272-276, 283-289
- data, baseline see baseline data
- data, qualitative see qualitative data
- data, quantitative see quantitative data
- database evaluation x, 176, 268-280
- design, evaluation see evaluation design
- drawing 145-147

- effectiveness see evaluation criteria
- efficiency see evaluation criteria
- evaluation
 - context 1-27
 - criteria 16, 33-34, 51, 80-82
 - definition 2 see also M&E
 - design 19, 30-31, 46-54
 - ex ante 19
 - ex post 19
 - external viii
 - findings 66, 163-173, 163 see also communication strategy
 - focus 46, 49-51, 182-186, 195-199, 210-213, 225-226, 235-238, 247-249, 261-262, 274-275, 284-288
 - follow-up 20, 30-31, 61-64
 - implementation x, 8, 20, 30-31, 58-62, 66, 106-162
 - internal viii

- objectives 10, 11, 24
- participatory *see* stakeholder participation
- planning 8, 9, 26, 30, 32, 43-45, 67
- process 29-64
- purpose 24, 32-33, 45
- questions 49, 59 *see also* evaluation focus
- recommendations 63
- report 26, 30, 33, 42, 45, 55, 60-61, 163-167 *see also* communication strategy
- scope 24, 32, 33-35, 45
- team 35, 43
- tools x, 65-173
- ex ante* evaluation *see* evaluation, *ex ante*
- ex post* evaluation *see* evaluation, *ex post*
- expected results *see* logical framework
- external evaluation *see* evaluation, external

- feedback 27
- findings, evaluation *see* evaluation findings
- focus group discussions 40, 106, 109, 128-132
- focus, evaluation *see* evaluation focus
- follow-up, evaluation *see* evaluation follow-up
- force-field analysis 170-173

- Gantt chart 78
- gender analysis 70
- goal *see* logical framework
- group dynamics 56-58

- impact assessment v, 2, 3, 8-10, 21-27, 186 *see also* evaluation criteria
- implementation, evaluation *see* evaluation implementation
- indicators viii, 11, 13, 25, 47, 49-51, 67, 91-98 *see also* logical framework, SMART indicators, SPICED indicators
- information needs *see* data collection
- inputs 10, 11, 13 *see also* logical framework
- internal evaluation *see* evaluation, internal
- intervention logic *see* logical framework
- interviews 106, 109, 141-144, 200, 262-263

- key questions 49-51 *see also* evaluation focus
- Kirkpatrick's model 183, 197
- Kolb's learning cycle 5-6

- learning v, vii, viii, 2, 5-8, 30
- logic model 67, 99, 103-106, 180-181, 194, 208, 223, 234, 247, 259, 271, 285
- logical framework 3, 11-14, 47, 67, 68-81, 179, 193, 207, 222, 233, 246, 258, 270, 284

- M&E, definition of 2
- means of verification 11, 13 *see also* logical framework
- methodology 38-40, 45, 52-54, 60 *see also* data collection, data analysis
- monitoring viii, 2, 3, 8, 16-18, 24-27, 87

- newsletter evaluation x, 37, 48, 53-56, 176, 191-204

- objectives analysis 71-72
- objectives, evaluation *see* evaluation objectives

- online community evaluation x, 176, 243-254
- outcomes v, 10 see *also* logical framework
- outputs v, 10, 11, 13, 45 see *also* logical framework

- participatory and creative tools 106, 109, 144-154
- participatory evaluation see stakeholder participation
- participatory learning and action (PLA) 4, 40
- participatory video 147-150
- planning, evaluation see evaluation planning
- problem analysis 71
- process flowchart 106, 132-134
- programme, definition of 8
- project
 - concept 24, 46-47
 - cycle vii, 8-10
 - definition of 8
 - management x, 2, 36
 - objectives 46-47
 - plan viii, 2, 10-16, 66-98
- purpose, evaluation see evaluation purpose

- qualitative/quantitative data 106-107, 158-162
- qualitative/quantitative methods see methodology
- question-and-answer service evaluation x, 16, 176, 219-230
- questionnaires 40, 106, 109, 120-127, 200

- radio evaluation see rural radio evaluation
- rapid appraisal 40
- recommendations, evaluation see evaluation
- reflection, critical 8, 9, 25, 42, 45, 55, 60-61
- relevance see evaluation criteria
- report, evaluation see evaluation report
- resource centre evaluation see small library / resource centre evaluation
- results, evaluation see evaluation findings
- results-based management 67, 83-88
- review, critical see reflection, critical
- rich pictures 150-152
- role-play 145-147
- rural radio evaluation x, 176, 255-267

- sampling 109-112
- scope, evaluation see evaluation scope
- selection dissemination of information (SDI) service evaluation x, 176, 281-292
- self-evaluation vii, viii, 3, 30
- situation analysis 8, 9
- small library / resource centre evaluation x, 176, 231-242
- SMART indicators viii, 50, 96
- Smart Toolkit* background vii-xi, 294
- Smart Toolkit* contributors 295-297
- Smart Toolkit* workshops 298-299
- SPICED indicators 50, 96
- stakeholder analysis 3-5, 68-70, 182, 196, 209 see *also* stakeholder participation
- stakeholder participation x, 2, 3-5, 23, 30, 35-37, 38, 45, 181-182, 195, 209-210, 221-225, 235-236, 245-248, 257-260, 272-274, 283-286
- stakeholders 3, 4, 18, 24, 27, 32, 34-37, 47 see *also* stakeholder participation

strategic positioning 8, 9
strategy analysis 73
surveys 22, 184, 215
sustainability see evaluation criteria
SWOT analysis 40, 106, 109, 115-119

team, evaluation see evaluation team
terms of reference 30, 32-46, 99-103
theory of action 11-12, 47
tools, evaluation see evaluation tools
training course evaluation x, 9, 34, 176, 177-190

usability see evaluation criteria
utility see evaluation criteria

Venn diagrams 152-154

web statistics 214-215
website evaluation x, 176, 205-218

