

(Please also refer to EXECUTIVE SUMMARY in Alnap 57_exc)

II. METHODOLOGY

Under ENI/HR's support contract with BHM International, a two-person evaluation team undertook a month-long (February 1996) evaluation of the eight Project 0016 (Trauma and Humanitarian Assistance) grantees and selected subgrantees or collaborating partners in Croatia and Bosnia. According to the Request for Application (RFA), the grantees had submitted proposals in either of two categories: trauma training or community development.

Of the eight grantees, one (AICF/USA) operates only in Bosnia while three (ADF, CAB, and HPRT) operate only in Croatia. SPA, CRS's Croatian counterpart, conducts training in Croatia with some participants coming from Bosnia; CRS also works under a separate Project 0016 grant in Macedonia. Delphi operates in Croatia, Bosnia, and Macedonia; IRC and Save the Children operate in Croatia and Bosnia.

Seven of the eight grantees covered in this evaluation are private voluntary organizations. One, the Harvard University School of Public Health, is a university program. The acronym PVO is herein used to refer to US-based international grantees. The acronym NGO is herein used to refer to indigenous Croatian and Bosnian organizations.

The evaluation team began its work by obtaining some key documents from USAID, and, in a few cases, the US headquarters of the grantees. The team subsequently secured additional documents in the field at USAID/Zagreb and from various grantee and subgrantee sites visited.

In January 1996, the evaluation team leader suggested and discussed with USAID and BHM various scopes of work. The concerned parties accepted a proposed work plan that was to be organized around the PVOs' development of logic models of their perception of the linkages among project components. In early February, representatives of the eight grantees met with the evaluation team at USAID/Zagreb for a discussion of the evaluation's approach and logistics.

Immediately following the early February meeting, the evaluation team began its work by visiting grantee headquarters in Croatia (ADF; AICF/USA, whose headquarters is in Split, though projects are all in Bosnia; CAB; CRS; Delphi; Harvard; IRC; and SCF) and Bosnia (IRC). In addition, the evaluators observed CRS trainees in Bosnia (Zenica and Sarajevo) and once in Croatia (Split).

(End p1)

Subgrantee sites visited included the following:

- Four ADF sites—Medical Committee for Human Rights in Zagreb, members of the Coordinating Committee for Human Rights in Pakrac, the Dalmatian Solidarity Council in Split, and the Committee for Peace, Nonviolence, and Human Rights in Osijek;
- Six AICF/USA sites—the Bugojno suboffice; a hospital in Gornji Vakuf, a commercial fish farm in Bugojno; a Merhamet distribution organization and nine of its

elderly beneficiaries in Bugojno; representatives of a beekeeping society, a fish farmer, a reforestation agency, and an agricultural extension administrator; and an art therapy class;

- Three CAB support groups—Zagreb support group facilitator trainees, Rijeka Vukovar displaced person support group facilitator trainees, and counseling for children with cancer in a Zagreb hospital;
- One CRS site—the offices of SPA and one of its Advanced Trauma Recovery training sites (as well as 12 former trainees);
- Five Delphi STAR Project sites—the Advisory Council and Women’s Laundry Project in Pakrac, Infoteka (associated with Medica women’s clinic in Zenica), *Zena 21* magazine, and the women’s advocacy group “Tara” in Rijeka;
- Three Harvard sites—a psychosocial support team at University of Rijeka Hospital, the Merhamet Muslim refugee association, and a Ruke survey of the Varazde refugee center;
- Six IRC sites—Zagreb multipurpose center, Zenica adolescent counseling center, Stari Vitez children’s dance group, Sarajevo displaced children’s playroom in a displaced person collection center, school-based playroom and tutoring program for displaced persons also in Sarajevo, and “Duga” adolescent program in Daruvar; and
- Four SCF sites—preschools in Zadar, Benkovac, and Gornji Vakuf, Bosnia.

In addition to the 32 sites listed above, the evaluation team observed or visited three CRS/SPA trainee focus group meetings, 11 grantee field offices, five grantee home offices, and three USAID offices (Zagreb, Zenica, and Sarajevo).

The evaluation plan was for one team member to conduct an “evaluability assessment” while the other conducted a management assessment of both donor and grantees (not, it should be noted, an audit or comprehensive review). An evaluability assessment often leads to the conclusion that a program or project is, in the strictest sense, “unevaluable.” That is, if the key players cannot clearly delineate objectives, an evaluator cannot assess whether a program has achieved its stated objectives. (This does not mean that the evaluation is terminated; rather, it proceeds as a process evaluation rather than as an impact evaluation.)

(End p2)

The team used several approaches to draw out grantees (and, in a few cases, subgrantees) concerning their perceptions of where their activities might lead. Not surprisingly, the different layers of a single organization often expressed markedly different perceptions of overall program direction. Moreover, the team leader explicitly indicated her interest in evaluating the grantees both in terms of the various projects’ stated goals and objectives and the productive use of U.S. foreign aid dollars in supporting trauma and humanitarian assistance. The latter perspective intentionally provoked respondents into recognizing that the U.S. interest in the former Yugoslavia focuses on such broad-based goals as stability in the Balkans (a product of peace in Bosnia and Croatia) and that America’s willingness to fund a wide range of trauma assistance activities is linked to higher-order goals.

(End p3)