Session 1 - Describing and locating EHA

This session will look at:

a) The definitions and understandings of Evaluation of Humanitarian Action (EHA)
b) The increasingly wide range of activities and scenarios relevant to HA
c) The challenges this wide range presents

Session objective:

- **To emphasise the importance of not treating all HA as the same.**
- **To introduce the importance of choosing appropriate standards, indicators, and frameworks for differing HA contexts and types**

Key messages

- HA is increasingly diffuse as a concept, as reflected in all encompassing policies and objectives, many of which border on developmental activities
- **Major differences in HA contexts, aims and methods require different HA frameworks and perhaps approaches.** The use of appropriate, context specific standards and indicators for EHA in different situations is necessary

Activities

Time	***Title***	***Notes for facilitators***
5 mins	Welcome	
15 mins	Personal introductions and expectations	**Introductions**: In pairs, one participant introduces the other (or other such personal introduction exercise). Collect any additional expectations as part of the introductions. Using flip-chart, compare with summary of expectations from the pre-course questionnaire
10 mins	Introduce course and materials	**Introduction:** Objectives, schedule, materials, administration, etc. Review list of expectations and compare to the schedule and objectives. Any questions?
10 mins	Defining 'evaluation' and 'HA'	**Exercise**: Pairs to write short definitions of evaluation and HA on cards and list of types of HA scenarios or contexts
10 mins		**Discussion and PPT** with definitions of evaluation: What? Why? So What? What Now?

Time	*Title*	*Notes for facilitators*
20 mins	Defining humanitarian action (broad range from preparedness thru response to recovery and implications for EHA)	**Discussion and PPT** o Show that (by quoting) Good Humanitarian Donorship, ECHO, Sphere and even the RC Code of Conduct essentially include everything as objectives, from saving lives and reducing suffering, to protection of and advocacy for human rights, to early recovery, to Disaster preparedness and Risk Reduction (DRR – which is an entirely developmental activity, as it addresses long-term vulnerability reduction) o Show the drift from the term 'emergency' to current 'HA'; continuum to contiguum to chronic crisis/transition; quasi-developmental approaches ('grey-zone'); HA definitions by different actors, content – from IHL to 'all things to all people', and therefore the need to re-define and draw boundaries when evaluating. Link with the later criteria and frameworks session.
10 mins	Strengths, weaknesses and myths of EHA	**Exercise:** read the synopses of newspaper articles relating to learning and accountability, on: • World Bank report on the use/abuse of WB evaluations; • Global Warming • Stopping of an official investigation into corruption. • The dropping of Pluto as a planet And extract observations on EHA from them (see below)
20 mins		**Discussion and PPT** on pros and cons of EHA as a learning and accountability tool concluding that EHA is not the answer to all or even to a lot (i.e. not to overestimate EHA), but it is very much worth doing well, and professionally!

Background documents to be found in course manual:

- Four media articles (pp17-19)
- EHA types and categories (p22)
- Evaluation of Protection (pp40-41)

Session 2. Purpose of evaluation

This session will look at:

a) Accountability and lesson-learning
b) Drivers towards accountability in humanitarian assistance
c) Types of evaluation

Session objective:

- **To emphasise the importance of clarifying the purpose of an evaluation, especially if it is to be user-focused.**
- **To understand the tensions between accountability and lesson-learning, and the implications for designing an evaluation**

Key messages

- Lack of clarity of purpose leads to the selection of inappropriate evaluation approaches.

- As the definition of evaluation implies, it is usually intended to play an accountability as well as a learning role. But it is often challenging to fulfil both roles. At best this is a creative tension. At worst, one objective dominates and it is impossible to fulfil both roles. Consider the following:

  "Where accountability is the priority, the traditional virtues of rigour, independence, replicability and efficiency tend to be the primary concerns. Where learning is the priority, the emphasis is more likely to be on achieving 'buy-in' from stakeholder, focusing on the process, and creating space to make sure that experience is properly discussed and lessons drawn out… These two objectives are not necessarily incompatible… but they are sufficiently different to merit separate consideration."
  (Background synthesis Report, OECD, 2001)

- Since the early 1990s there has been growing pressure to improve accountability of the humanitarian sector, resulting in a number of accountability initiatives. Although this pressure continues, more recently there has been growing interest in strengthening the learning function of evaluations, partly as a result of recommendations having been ignored over many years (ref 2005 ALNAP review).

- There are many different types of evaluation. By being clear about the overall purpose and objectives of the evaluation, you can select the most appropriate type.

Activites

Time	***Title***	***Notes for facilitators***
10 mins	Introduction	Introduce importance of clarity of purpose & tension between accountability and lesson-learning
10 mins	Spectrum: accountability to lesson learning	Facilitator reads out examples of different evaluation exercises. Participants plot where they might sit on the accountability vs lesson-learning spectrum
15 mins	Brainstorm on approaches	What kind of different approach might you use for accountability vs lesson-learning?
15 mins	Summing up	What **is** the tension between accountability and lesson-learning?
15 mins	Accountability drivers	Drive towards accountability – accountability initiatives
15 mins	Knowledge management	Lesson learning and model of knowledge management (check familiarity with KM amongst participants)
20 mins	Plotting participant experience	Introduce different types of evaluations. Get participants to plot their experience against them. If time, a word on joint evaluations

Background documents to be found in course manual:

- What are evaluations for? Accountability vs lesson-learning (p20)
- Accountability and quality initiatives within the humanitarian aid sector (p21)
- Evaluation types (p22)

Session 3. Initiating and planning the Evaluation

This session will look at:

a) **Who needs what and why?**
b) **What to evaluate?**
c) **Who should evaluate?**
d) **When to evaluate?**

Session objectives:

- **To prepare participants to plan an evaluation, paying particular attention to who needs what and why, as well as other aspects of the planning process**

Key messages

- Planning an EHA involves examination of the following aspects:
    - Purpose
    - Identifying and involving key stakeholders
    - Determining the scope and focus
    - Feasibility
    - Timing
    - Developing the TOR (to come later)

Who needs what and why?

- Investment in the planning phase is critical to a utilisation focus, paying attention to issues of participation, ownership and relevance:
    - 'A serious intention to use an evaluation is indicated by careful planning, adequate time and appropriate mechanisms for follow-up that suit and serve the users'
      (ALNAP Review of Humanitarian Action, 2006, 'Key Messages')

- Stakeholders are the actors who can influence or be influenced by the achievement of a given goal or undertaking. At the outset, when planning an evaluation, conduct a stakeholder analysis and decide who are the primary stakeholders and how do you want them to be using the evaluation.

What to evaluate?

- There is a clear need to establish the scope and focus of the evaluation and the questions for the evaluation to answer. Adequate time is needed to identify the objectives of the evaluation which need to be realistic and feasible.

- Many important questions can be addressed. Stay focused on the primary purpose for your evaluation activities, and then prioritise the critical questions. Avoid a ‘shopping list’ of objectives

When to evaluate?

- It is important to think through timing issues to ensure that a proposed evaluation is feasible and will provide accurate, reliable and useful information.

Activities

Time	***Title***	***Notes for facilitators***
10 mins	Introduction	Importance of planning. Check out participant experience in planning evaluations
30 mins	Who needs what & why?	Stakeholder analysis. Exercise to conduct stakeholder mapping, based on an NGO evaluation
15 mins	Who should evaluate?	Pros & cons of internal vs external evaluators. Mini case study of learning-focused evaluation
5 mins	What to evaluate	Importance of establishing the scope and focus of the evaluation. (Criteria come in later session)
10 mins	When to evaluate	Considerations for timing of an evaluation
30 mins	Introduction to the TOR	Clarify functions of a TOR. If time, allow participants to critique a TOR. If not, distribute a sample TOR

Background documents to be found in course manual:

- Stakeholder mapping exercise (p25)
- Potential advantages and disadvantages of internal and external evaluators (pp27-28)
- Timing of an evaluation (p29)
- Function and Content of the Terms of Reference (p30-31)
- Sample Terms of Reference (pp32-37)

Session 4 - Evaluation Criteria and Frameworks

This session will look at:

a) Standard DAC evaluation criteria
b) HA frameworks

Session objective:

- **To explain and emphasise the importance of applying standard DAC evaluation criteria, especially, Effectiveness; Efficiency; Relevance and Impact**
- **To develop knowledge of how to apply HA frameworks covering all main HA scenarios and contexts, specifically how to use them to formulate appropriate questions for evaluating HA in different contexts**

Key messages

- The four main DAC criteria (see above) can be explained simply as follows: Effectiveness and Efficiency – 'doing the thing right'; relevance and Impact – 'doing the right thing'

- HA covers such a wide range of activities and scenarios (including relief and protection, in various scenarios from emergency to recovery, preparedness and mitigation) that a very wide range of distinct scenarios are required.

Activities

Time	*Title*	*Comment*
10 mins	DAC criteria	**Introduction:** Show the link between defining evaluation questions and choosing appropriate methods.
15 mins	Defining and applying DAC criteria	**Exercise**: Card exercise (this should be rapid as they will have been asked to prepare based on the ALNAP/Beck's EHA guide): write one sentence definitions and at least one sample generic EHA question for each of the four main DAC criteria – effectiveness; efficiency; relevance (appropriateness); and impact (sustainability can be placed under impact) 10 minutes
25 mins		**Report back, PPT and discussion:** Explain the criteria and organise into the 2 categories: 'Doing the Thing Right' and 'Doing the Right

Time	*Title*	*Comment*
		Thing' (see PPT slides). Again, this should be fast given prior preparation.
10 mins	Introduction to frameworks from humanitarian action (e.g. Sphere, IHL, Deng on IDPs etc)	**Introduction PPT and discussion:** Link to the session defining HA – that HA is a nebulous concept and therefore the need to (re-) define and draw boundaries relevant to specific contexts and agencies, to choose frameworks (both generic and from the agencies involved) to supplement the generic criteria. PPT giving an overview, explanation, relevance and use
10 mins	Scenarios and frameworks	**Exercise:** In pairs, threes or groups, match the mini-scenarios with the sample frameworks. One-paragraph HA scenarios (armed conflict emergency; sudden onset natural disaster recovery; chronic crisis; etc.) are to be matched with a selection of HA frameworks. Ten minutes for this relatively simple exercise
20 mins		**Report back, PPT and discussion** - Go through each scenario and pros and cons for choosing a framework for each.
	BREAK	
40 mins	Design EHA questions for a specific case (Guinea and the West Africa sex-for-food abuse scandal)	**Exercise** in groups: formulate EHA questions under the four main DAC criteria, which are also based on the RC Code of Conduct as a framework. The written report can be used as a case study, or any other case study
30 mins		**Report back on the case PPT** and discussion, including pros and cons of frameworks - limitations and difficulties, such as those associated with the log ('lock') frame; multiple, competing or contradictory frameworks, etc.
15 mins	Framework and criteria issues for Joint-evaluations	Short **PPT** and discussion, looking at joint evaluations in that they address programmes, perhaps multiple frameworks and implications
5 mins	Wrap-up	

Background documents to be found in course manual:

- Frameworks and Scenarios Exercise (pp42-43; facilitator's answer guide below)
- The Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement Code of Conduct (pp44-48)

- The Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement Code of Conduct and DAC criteria (p49)
- Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) Principles (pp50-52)
- DAC criteria definitions
- The 'Lock-Frame' approach and its problems and log-frame Cartoon (pp53-55)
- 'Consult the people' cartoon (p56)

Exercise: Frameworks and scenarios **FACILITATOR'S ANSWER GUIDE (not for distribution)**

Framework	No.	Scenario for an EHA
1. The Convention on the Rights of the Child	4	Programme for Unaccompanied Minors demobilising from the Lord's Resistance Army in Uganda
2. The Sphere Project Handbook	3	Emergency response activities to address the basic survival needs of refugees and IDPs fleeing violence in the DR Congo
3. Guidelines for addressing and preventing Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGVB)	11	The West Africa 'sex-for-food' abuse case
4. The Good Humanitarian Donorship principles (GHD)	6	Official funding in response to the Indian Ocean tsunamis disaster
5. The Red Cross and Red Crescent Code of Conduct	5	NGO responses to the on-going Darfur, Sudan crisis
6. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights	8	Activities advocating for respect for the basic Human Rights of peoples living in Palestine
7. The HAP-I accountability principles	10	An examination of an agency's compliance with accountability principles and standards to which it has formally subscribed
8. The UN (Francis Deng) Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement	1	Comprehensive, integrated programmes to address the needs of Colombian IDPs during the full cycle of their displacement and related solutions
9. Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters	14	A capacity building programme for micro-seismic mapping and related vulnerability assessments for hospitals in Latin America
10. The 1951 Refugee Convention	12	The programme to 'evacuate' to third countries Serbian Kosovars who had fled into Macedonia, in 1999
11. The national nutrition protocol and	13	Feeding programmes for victims of chronic food

Framework	No.	Scenario for an EHA
guidelines		shortages in Ethiopia
12. WFP emergencies handbook	2	The procurement, transport and delivery of food for IDPs and returning refugees in Afghanistan
13. The ‘Do no Harm’ framework	7	Assistance for refugees and IDPs returning to mixed-ethnic areas of Bosnia and Herzegovina
14. OECD/DAC Poverty Reduction principles and guidelines	9	An Indian Ocean tsunami livelihoods recovery project

Session 5 Evaluation methodologies

This session will look at:

- **a) Different types of data collection methods**
- **b) The importance of documentation review**
- **c) Some useful distinctions: quantitative vs qualitative indicators, formal vs informal methods of data collection**
- **d) Informal data collection methods (PRA, focus group discussions, timelines etc) and challenges of analysis**
- **e) Interviewing skills**
- **f) Data analysis and dealing with bias**
- **g) Ethical considerations**

Session objectives:

- **To familiarise participants with different evaluation methods, and how to choose amongst them**
- **To sharpen participants experience of interviewing skills**
- **To alert participants to issues of bias and ethical considerations**
- **To guide participants in data analysis**

Key messages

- NB evaluation is an art not a science. It is about relationships, interacting with people and inter-personal skills as well as about effective and reliable methods of collecting and analyzing data. Good judgement is critical

- Selecting methods needs to be guided and informed by the evaluation purpose.

- Valid and reliable information is needed. One solution is to use multiple information sources and several different methods to generate information about the same topic or issue, which then substantiates or disproves an assessment or conclusion - triangulation.

- There is a need to ensure that the methods used provide a credible basis for conclusions, and that the description of methods fully reflects what the evaluation team has done – in particular in relation to triangulation of data and consultation with primary stakeholders. (ALNAP Annual Review 03)

- The difference between ‘formal’ and ‘informal’ evaluation methods, and the value of the latter in humanitarian evaluations which often take place in challenging environments, with an absence of baseline data. ‘Informal’ methods use less precise procedures than formal. Rely to a large extent on experience, intuition and subjective judgement.

- NB pay attention to analysis of qualitative data from early on. Be prepared to analyse in stages (eg writing up according to an agreed format, oral analysis, written analysis).

- Be creative, responsive and flexible (not slavish!) in your choice of evaluation methods.

- Good interviewing skills cannot be assumed, are not innate. Pay attention to how you build rapport, how you ask questions, and how you listen.

Activities

Time	***Title***	***Notes for facilitators***
10 mins	Introduction & brainstorm on methods	Introduce session. Brainstorm on evaluation methods that participants have experience of. Recap of data collection methods - handout
10 mins	Documentation review	Documentation review: facilitator stresses importance. Discussion – types of relevant documents
10 mins	Definitions & distinctions	Useful distinctions: quantitative vs qualitative & informal vs formal data collection methods
20 mins	Informal data collection methods	Informal data collection methods – bring in participant experience
30 mins	Exercise on interviewing skills	Exercise in 3's: sharpening your interviewing skills
10 mins	Data analysis	Data analysis: what it is Brainstorm on potential problems & solutions Examples of bias - handout
10 mins	Ethics of evaluation	Ethical considerations: brainstorm, then review handout *or* start with handout and add

NB Last 2 activities may be shortened if interviewing skills exercise needs longer

Background documents to be found in course manual:

- Pointers for good practice (p57)
- Examples of data collection methods (p58)
- Data collection methods: some useful distinctions (p59)
- Data analysis (p61)
- Bias (p62)
- Ethical considerations (p63)

Session 6 Teams and Management

This session will look at:

a) EHA evaluation teams
b) Management of EHA activities

Session objective:

- **To develop skills in EHA team management and membership**
- **To develop skills and knowledge in the management of EHA activities**

Key messages

- Management of EHA activities requires planning of and attention to three main aspects: Objectives and principles of the evaluation exercise; resources (human, financial and material); and organisation (including systems, roles and responsibilities)
- Detailed time planning from beginning to end of the evaluation, especially the latter stages including report preparation and delivery, is essential
- Appropriate team-leadership and team-membership skills, attitudes and actions can make the difference between success and failure of an EHA

Activities

Time	***Title***	***Comment***
5 mins	Introduction to management of EHA, including Teams	**Introduction**: Elicit feedback on the EHA management process as a series of steps from conception; scoping; design; planning; organisation; implementation; analysis and reporting; use; and monitoring and evaluation of the entire process. Within this, team issues include: • Team composition & selection • Team involvement (from when to when), management and role of team-leader • Contracting arrangements, ongoing relationship between evaluation manager and team, disputes etc. • Crisis management
20 mins	EHA Management Case Study	**Exercise in pairs or threes:** The case covers most issues relevant to managing the EHA management process. Participants review read and discuss it in function of the question ‘What do you learn about managing EHA from this case?’ (Sub questions if needed to clarify; ‘What went well and what did not

Time	*Title*	*Comment*
		go well in this case? And what conclusions can you make regarding the management of EHA, including evaluation teams?')
30 mins		**Report back, PPT and discussion** (see PPT for main points)
25 mins	Planning EHA	**Exercise:** In groups make a financial, time and logistics plan, using a time-line, for an EHA of the Guinea case. Include all main steps, who should be responsible and by when (time may be planned as D for day the start; D – 20 for scoping, D+3 for team workshop, etc.
15 mins	Reports back, PPT and discussion	**PPT**: Show a sample time-line on a PPT slide or on the flip chart
5 mins	Managing Joint-evaluations PPT and discussion	**PPT**

Background documents to be found in course manual:

- The EHA supervision & support study (pp64-66) (and see the facilitator version below)
- Budget framework (p87)
- DFID evaluation management checklists and matrix (pp67-70)
- Evaluator Competencies and Qualities (p72)
- Managing Multi-agency Evaluations (MAE's) (pp73-75)

Facilitator's guide: Case study with notes on each section: Not for distribution

The issues for discussion are highlighted throughout the text in blue.

Assist, Protect or Control (alt, delete?)

This case is based on real experiences selected from a variety of evaluations [1]

In a mid-sized humanitarian organisation, a 'Geographical Desk' Officer feels that a particular programme is not well managed. An external evaluation might improve the programme and, perhaps, teach the field director a lesson or two. The evaluation unit would like to be seen to be responsive to 'operational priorities'. Evaluations are often criticised by operations staff as irrelevant, or badly managed. Funds are found which

[1] *This case includes some issues identified in a case by the same author, originally prepared for UNHCR*

must be committed rapidly (unspent funds will be returned to the central budget). The evaluation will take place!

- Financial planning
- Knowing your role and motivation

The evaluation unit wants 'ownership' to be shared. They hurriedly request Terms of Reference (TOR) from the Desk. Priority is given to issues of contention between headquarters and the field. The TOR are 'professionalised' in the evaluation unit, through the addition of a set of criteria (effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact…) and a list of questions. A paragraph on methodology is also inserted, essentially interviewing, observation and documentary research.

- Wrong motivation – unclear
- Quick and dirty adaptation of the TOR but not substantive
- No real consultation on TOR

The contracting of external evaluators proves unexpectedly difficult. The assumption that a handpicked team could be put together, made up of tried and trusted consultants, is wrong. The financial department insists on a tender. A consortium of five consultants (a team-leader/generalist, and four technical experts) wins on a balance between price and quality. The team looks good on paper. That said, other proposals included *individuals* that are known by the organisation as highly competent both technically and as evaluators, yet sensitive to the culture and needs of the organisation, and fluent in the local language. The consortium cannot match this combination.

- Know contracting requirements, and decide what you want and whether willing to run with it
- Team size
- Team quality – compromise and/or minimum standards (language…)
- Team combinations of expertise

When the field is informed, sparks fly. The field director is livid. She says this is the third such exercise (carried out by a range of donors and partners) in as many months. It is decided to postpone and shorten the field visits. The nutritionist now cannot participate, as he had time just for the original planned period. The team insists that the words 'to be addressed if feasible' be inserted into the TOR on the nutrition questions.

Field staff are anxious upon hearing of the evaluation. Why them? Is there a plan to cut staff? Will heads roll? They are re-assured by the evaluation unit that it is all about 'broad lessons' and not their performance. The field staff, timorous that a failure to co-operate would be seen as a lack of transparency, agrees to support fully.

- Inform the field last, though field crucial
- Leave enough time for the evaluation – good work

- Coordination of multiple evaluations
- Knock on effect of changes caused by bad decisions or lack of planning
- Information to the field and stakeholders – standard circulars
- Recognise the angst associated with evaluations

A short meeting at headquarters is held with the team. Papers are hurriedly collected and copied in a file for each. The original assessment of needs is inadvertently left out and is only received in the field. A few cursory interviews are held (albeit not with key technical units, who have a number of issues they would like to see examined). The consultants pry into many issues (perhaps related, but not central to the evaluation). They demand documentation that requires a lot of effort to prepare. Headquarters staff are uneasy and some downright critical, albeit behind closed doors.

- Pre-mission meetings
- Pre-evaluation missions
- Time for preparations and research
- Uncontrolled consultant work or unguided or unfacilitated in offices and the tension it creates
- Lack of communication of criticism to the team

Based on conversations with the field director, an itinerary has been proposed. Unbeknownst to all, some of the assumptions regarding logistics (distances, frequency of flights, etc.) are erroneous. To save 200 USD per ticket, the evaluation unit insisted on a flight route which implies exhausting transfers and delays. The unit also refuses to help with visas, reluctantly providing a note for the embassies concerned, but no more. The team is tired before it begins.

- Bad planning
- Consultants who know the area
- Micro-management causing a lot of hassle, for next to nothing
- Basic support in visas can be crucial

On arrival to the field, they find that contrary to briefings at headquarters, there are major problems with nutrition. The health expert, despite her limited expertise, takes on the nutrition issues in addition to her other responsibilities. At one stage, the team has a serious falling out. Another of the technical experts insists that the evaluation cannot be conducted unless the field offices produce hard *statistical* information on the assistance delivered, when, where and to whom. This was never systematically recorded and is simply not available. The team-leader over-rules the team-member. The expert effectively sulks through the rest of the mission. He is increasingly hard to find, turns up late to meetings, seemingly doing other work he has brought along, and is constantly emailing and phoning.

- Headquarters briefings not up to standard and not prepared
- Expect surprises, question your assumptions

- Team management explicit – the role and responsibilities of the team leader
- Consultants are individualists, generally and hard to manage and have many jobs at a time
- Sanctions for bad consultants (no pay?)

One field worker has had an on-going row with his boss. He ingratiates himself with the team by ‘feeding them the dirt’ on certain contentious episodes. He ‘courts’ the evaluation team by inviting them home to eat and socialise. One team-member in particular takes up the regular invitations. The superior detects this and decides to withdraw his support. He refuses to be interviewed and criticises the evaluation team to his staff. Word gets back to headquarters that the evaluation is already in trouble.

- Abuse and lack of professionalism, with serious repercussions – need for an ethics list
- People are not stupid – they see what is going on
- Closer monitoring to detect what’s going on – how?

The evaluation manager decides to go to the field to see for himself. He is cautious, however, not to be seen as interfering with what is an ‘external’ evaluation. He meets with the team-leader (not the team, again seeing team matters as the responsibility of the leader). They assure each other mutually that the evaluation is on track and that the team differences can be overcome. After detailed review of finances (evaluation team meal costs, taxis, etc.), the evaluation manager returns to headquarters.

- Trip to visit the team is good and should be built in where funds permit
- Opportunity missed to meet all the team and also key field staff and sort it all out
- Spent time in micro-management

The time required for interviews has been under-estimated. Interview quality suffers, as does the health of the evaluators (stress). One field location has to be dropped from the programme. Significant preparations have been made in that location. Staff at the location are very disappointed. Additionally, this sub-programme apparently contains aspects and issues that are quite specific and quite unlike those of other areas.

- Lack of logical, cautious and realistic planning
- Impact on others, and need to respect the effort of others
- Again loss of opportunity

On another occasion, the team arrives to the wrong place for an interview. The driver, who was meant to be fluent in English, in fact had only a rudimentary knowledge of the language. He misunderstood the instructions given in English by the team.

- Bad planning
- Language issue

- Briefing of interpreters and drivers, etc.

'Assembling' the draft report becomes a nightmare for the team-leader. Differing styles must be married into one coherent document, in a very short time. (Two of the team are not native English speakers). Some of the findings by the technicians, she discovers, are based on incorrect information. Others fall outside the Terms of Reference. To 'fix' the eventual draft report, a lot of extra work is needed, by both the team and headquarters. This is despite recommendations that are both substantiated and of great potential importance for beneficiary welfare. Many of the weaknesses of the report are merely editing matters.

- Drafting is a nightmare, especially for the team-leader
- Capacity to draft in English
- Planning the drafting
- Tips – the format, the stand alone nature of inserts (boxes, statistics, sub-reports, etc. that cannot be integrated into one document)

None-the-less, the field vehemently rejects the first draft, which is deeply critical of their performance. They reject the entire exercise as amateurish, citing shoddy drafting, and the inadequate coverage of nutrition and certain geographic areas. To cap it all, one team-member wishes to check recommendations. Unilaterally, he decides to discuss these with interviewees (both inside and outside the organisation). The organisation is deeply embarrassed! Under internal pressure, the evaluation unit refuses to pay the consortium the last instalment of fees. A mumbled threat to sue is made.

- Sinking the ship for the want of a bucket of tar – a good exercise can fail trough the lack of a little extra investment: need good editing, layout and style, in addition to, and not just good content
- Protocols for circulation and clarity for consultants and choosing experienced consultants

Finally, the evaluation unit had tried to be professional by building follow-up of the evaluation into the TOR (workshops on the conclusions, and lessons, etc.). This is now not feasible due to the loss of confidence in the process. None-the-less, the Desk has taken some recommendations selectively to justify staff cuts!

- Damage to follow-up by bad evaluation management
- Again knock-on effect
- Insincerity of assurances by evaluation manager that no agendas, and that only lessons – didn't control this, yet promised

***

Session 7 Reporting

This session will look at:

a) Options for reporting (both verbal and in writing)
b) Planning reporting
c) Preparing and conducting reporting

Session objective:

- **To set out the variety of options for reporting EHA results, both verbal and in writing**
- **To develop skills and approaches for effective reporting**
- **To understand the linkages between systematic analysis and gradual development of EHA results (findings, conclusions and recommendations) and clear, credible and effective presentation of those results**

Key messages

- Reporting is often the 'poor cousin' in EHA planning. Preparation is frequently left until (too) late, inadequate time and resources are provided and the detailed process, including consideration of stakeholder comments is often badly planned.
- The strength of the report is in the analysis it adds to the findings.
- Analysis requires not only data examination, but, fundamentally a rigorous construction, testing, verification and exposition of related ideas and hypotheses. This is where the richness of an evaluation may become evident.

Activities

Time	***Title***	***Comment***
5 mins	Introduction to analysis and reporting	**Introduction**: Explain terms and what is covered by them (see below). Brainstorm forms of reporting (verbal: workshops; de-briefing; etc. Written: reports, summaries; extracts; articles; etc.)
20 mins	Design a report outline format for and EHA of the Guinea sex-for-food abuse case	**Exercise** in groups: based on the Guinea case, design an outline report format for a possible EHA of that case
20 mins		**PPT and discussion:** possible formats, pros and cons and tips for report design, drafting, 'assembly'

Time	*Title*	*Comment*
		(if a team effort), review (including clarity of authority versus independence in the review process) and presentation (including ownership)
20 mins	ALNAP pro-forma (this activity might alternatively precede the previous ‘design’ exercise)	**Exercise:** Review the ALNAP Proforma and critique it as a tool for judging the quality of reports – pairs or groups
15 mins		**PPT and discussion**
15 mins	Analysis: The ‘So What’? (of What? Why? So What? What Now?)	**PPT and discussion:** the central role of ‘analysis’, based on expected use/objectives and methods and frameworks applied. The process of logical and systematic building of conclusions from findings, and recommendations/lessons from conclusions, including hypotheses, and the testing and their development or replacement, including dialectic discussion
5 mins	Wrap-up	

Background documents to be found in course manual:

- Extract from ALNAP/Zed books Extract from Wood, A., Apthorpe, R. and J. Borton (2001) *Evaluating International Humanitarian Action: Reflections from practitioners* London: Zed Press/ALNAP. Chapter 10, pp183–185 on Writing up – *modus operandi* (pp89-90)
- ALNAP Quality Proforma (pp93-104)
- Sample Report outline, as contained in the above pro-forma
- Definitions of terms ‘Analysis’, ‘Hypothesis’, and ‘Dialectic’. (p88)
- Guinea/West Africa case study (pp76-85) (or any other as a basis for the exercise p86)

Session 8 Use and dissemination of evaluations

This session will look at:

a) **Evidence of how we learn**
b) **Good practice and potential pitfalls of dissemination**
c) **Examples of good dissemination practice**

Session objectives:

- **To emphasise the importance of planning for use and dissemination of evaluations, from the outset**
- **To review the very poor record in evaluation follow up in the humanitarian aid sector**
- **To share examples of good practice in dissemination and follow-up**

Key messages

- Use and dissemination of evaluations tends to be an after-thought at best, and forgotten at worst. This is the main weakness in the whole EHA process, which explains the poor record of utilisation of evaluations (ref ALNAP review 2006).

- Use and dissemination needs to be planned from the outset, when conducting a stakeholder analysis and deciding who the evaluation is for.

- Data on how we learn shows that learning from reading scores very low, compared with learning based on hearing, seeing and experiencing. This should be borne in mind. Use and dissemination is about much more than delivery and dissemination of the evaluation report.

- Well-planned, adequately-resourced, creative (and opportunistic) dissemination strategies can make all the difference in how an evaluation is used (with reference to the experience of the multi-agency evaluation of the international humanitarian response to the Rwanda crisis in the mid 1990s).

Activities

Time	***Title***	***Notes for facilitators***
5 mins	Introduction	Introduce session. Relate back to session on day 1 about purpose of evaluations. Check participant experience in designing dissemination strategies
20 mins	Reflection on organisational	Exercise: in pairs or small groups, participants reflect and share experiences of how their

	learning	organisations use evaluations, and how significant they are in organisational learning.
10 mins	The record of evaluation use and dissemination	Presentation of poor record in the humanitarian aid sector, in terms of use of evaluations (ALNAP Annual Review 2006)
10 mins	Research on how we learn	Participants to guess how we learn most effectively. Present research data showing that learning by reading is usually weakest
30 mins	Dissemination strategies & examples of good practice	Participants share in plenary good and bad practice in dissemination from their own experience. Present formalised evaluation follow-up processes of MFA Norway and of Danida, and what worked from the JEEAR follow-up process
20 mins	Review of an evaluation dissemination strategy	Circulate and critique an evaluation strategy eg TEC Communications Plan
5 mins	Wrap-up	Recap on key messages

Background documents to be found in course manual:

- Evaluation use and dissemination: points of good practice (p91)
- Evaluation follow-up: procedures in MFA Norway and Danida (p92)