

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
THIRD ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON PROGRAM EVALUATION:  
NEW PARADIGMS FOR EVALUATING  
DIPLOMACY IN THE 21ST CENTURY  
June 8-9, 2010

Science/Technology/Trade Track

PowerPoint presentation from workshop on  
Evaluation Processes that Facilitate Knowledge Transfer and Aid  
Transparency: Case Studies of DOL-funded Projects in sub-Saharan  
Africa

Session transcript:  
<http://www.state.gov/s/d/rm/rls/rm/2010/148052.htm>

# EVALUATION PROCESSES THAT FACILITATE KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER AND AID TRANSPARENCY

CASE STUDIES OF DOL PROJECT EVALUATIONS IN SUB-SAHARAN  
AFRICA



Presented by  
Lili Stern, *Department of Labor, Office of Trade and  
Labor Affairs*  
Michael Branson, *Georgetown Public Policy  
Institute*

June 8, 2010

# AGENDA



1. EVALUATION POLICY
  1. *HISTORY OF EVALUATION POLICY IN THE U.S.*
  2. *OBAMA ADMINISTRATION POLICY*
  3. *ILAB EVALUATION POLICY*
2. CASE STUDIES: ILAB AFRICA PROJECTS
3. CHALLENGES IN MEETING POLICY GOALS
  1. *PROBLEM DEFINITION*
  2. *RECOMMENDATIONS*
4. RECOMMENDATIONS
5. QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

# SHIFTS IN USG EVALUATION POLICY VIS-À-VIS FOREIGN ASSISTANCE (1993-2008)



## **1993:** Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)

- Shift towards results-oriented measurement of federal programs

## **2003:** Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)

- Focus on encouraging agencies to use the type of evaluation that will best demonstrate the effectiveness of their programs

## **2005:** Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice calls for foreign-assistance strategy that includes:

- “a system of coordinated planning, budgeting, and evaluation.”

# SHIFTS IN USG EVALUATION POLICY VIS-À-VIS FOREIGN ASSISTANCE (2009 - PRESENT)



## ***July 10, 2009:***

Hillary Clinton calls for a quadrennial diplomacy and development review (QDDR)

## ***August 31, 2009:***

President Obama announces a Presidential Study Directive on Global Development Policy

- Program sustainability
- Larger investment in M&E

## RECENT LEGISLATION

**April 28, 2009:** H.R. 2139, *Initiating Foreign Assistance Reform Act of 2009* introduced

**May 13, 2009:** H.R. 2387, *Strategy and Effectiveness of Foreign Policy and Assistance Act of 2009* introduced

**July 28, 2009:** S. 1524, *Foreign Assistance Revitalization and Accountability Act of 2009* introduced

# CURRENT USG EVALUATION POLICY



## IMPACT EVALUATIONS

- The Obama Administration is focusing its attention on **IMPACT EVALUATIONS** over **PROCESS EVALUATIONS**

## STEPS TAKEN TO PROMOTE IMPACT EVALUATIONS

- Plan to post all USG impact evaluations online
- Interagency working group
- Voluntary evaluation initiative

# CURRENT USG EVALUATION POLICY CONT.



## OTHER ADMINISTRATION EFFORTS:

### Transparency of evaluations

- Effort to make evaluations available to other USG agencies, researchers, and public

### Whole-of-government approach to foreign aid

- Effort to coordinate the activities of all development-focused agencies

# CURRENT DOL/ILAB EVALUATION POLICY



	Current USG Evaluation Policy	International Labor Affairs Bureau OCFT	OTLA
Method	Impact evaluations	Process evaluations, moving toward impact	Process evaluations, moving toward impact
Transparency	Transparency of evaluation process important	Evaluation summaries posted on the web	Evaluations only available within the Bureau; reports available upon request
Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Determine cost effectiveness</li> <li>(2) Strengthen design and operation of programs</li> <li>(3) Shape budget priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Assess if desired outcomes reached</li> <li>(2) Improve program design and management</li> <li>(3) Achieve cost efficiencies</li> <li>(4) Program sustainability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Enhance management of ongoing projects</li> <li>(2) Improve preparation of new projects</li> <li>(3) Provide inputs into broader program evaluations</li> </ul>

# DOL/ILAB CASE STUDIES



**CASE STUDIES OF DOL-FUNDED LABOR  
PROJECTS IN AFRICA WILL BE DISCUSSED AS  
THEY RELATE TO 2 QUESTIONS:**

- 1) Did evaluations foster program improvements?
- 2) How transparent was the evaluative process?

# PROJECTS USED AS CASE STUDIES

(Did evaluations foster program improvements?)



- 1) **STRENGTHENING LABOR ADMINISTRATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (SLASA)**
  - *Midterm Evaluation: October 31, 2003*
  
- 2) **IMPROVING INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN MOZAMBIQUE**
  - *Final Report by USDOL: December 11, 2003*
  
- 3) **SOUTH AFRICAN VETERANS EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM (TSWELOPELE)**
  - *Final Evaluation: December 10, 2004*
  
- 4) **NIGERIAN VETERANS EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM**
  - *Final Evaluation: October 1, 2004*

## PROJECTS USED AS CASE STUDIES CONT.

(Did evaluations foster program improvements?)



### 5) TANZANIA LABOR EXCHANGE CENTER (LEC) PROJECT

- *Final Evaluation:* February 2004

### 6) NIGERIAN DECLARATION (NIDEC) PROJECT

- *Final Evaluation:* June 24, 2005

### 7) IMPROVING LABOR SYSTEMS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA (ILSSA)

- *Midterm Evaluation:* October 2006

# CHALLENGES to PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

## 1) DEVELOPING EFFECTIVE INDICATORS FOR MEASURING PROGRESS

- Six of the seven projects reviewed experienced serious problems with their performance monitoring plans (PMPs), leading to a lack of information about the projects' outcomes.

### COMMON PROBLEMS FOUND IN EVALUATIONS

- (1) Lack of timeliness in PMP design
- (2) Poor drafting of indicators
- (3) Incompletion or unsatisfactoriness of PMP
- (4) Reporting of indicator data not useful

# RECOMMENDATIONS for INTERNAL PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT



## CONDUCTING PROCESS EVALUATIONS

AGENCIES SHOULD:

- (a) Focus on accuracy of indicators and quality of reporting
- (b) Budget an appropriate amount of time for the design of a PMP with effective progress-measuring indicators

## IMPACT VERSUS PROCESS EVALUATIONS

AGENCIES SHOULD:

- (a) Balance and prioritize impact and process evaluations based on what needs to be learned about the project
- (b) Select and tailor methodologies accordingly

# CHALLENGES to INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING



## 1) FOSTERING INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING

- Common problems in project design and implementation were found in the evaluations reviewed, suggesting a lack of institutional learning that would have reduced the severity of such problems over time.

### COMMON PROBLEMS FOUND IN EVALUATIONS

- (1) PMPs
- (2) Goals and activities
- (3) Management and staffing
- (4) Program sustainability

# TRANSPARENCY CASE STUDY

## (How transparent is the evaluative process?)



### **4 Key Documents Reviewed**

1. OCFT Procedures for Working with Contractor-Led Evaluations
2. TOR for ILO-IPEC Mali Final Evaluation (OCFT May-June 2010)
3. TAATC Guide to Evaluations
4. TOR for ILSSA Final Evaluation (TAATC July 2008)

# CHALLENGES to TRANSPARENCY



## 2) FOCUSING ON TRANSPARENCY

- There is currently a lack of transparency in the evaluation process, further limiting knowledge transfer achieved through the evaluation process.

### COMMON PROBLEMS

- (1) Key agency evaluation documents lack reference to transparency.
- (2) Key project agreement documents lack reference to transparency of evaluations.
- (3) Staff performance measures lack reference to transparency of evaluation processes or outputs.

# RECOMMENDATIONS for EXTERNAL IMPROVEMENT



## TRANSFERRING KNOWLEDGE

### AGENCIES SHOULD:

- (a) Make process and impact evaluations available within the agency and, preferably, to other USG agencies
- (b) Summarize the findings of evaluations completed within the agency and keep track of common trends

## INCREASING TRANSPARENCY

### AGENCIES SHOULD:

- (a) Make better use of the Web to post project evaluation plans, requests for stakeholder input, scheduled evaluation missions, and evaluators' reports for broader USG and public access

# CONCLUSION



ILAB's Africa projects over the past decade produce a compelling example of what needs to be done at the agency level to improve the transparency of the evaluation process and the knowledge transfer necessary to improve foreign-assistance projects. Separate from Administration policy, agencies need to take concrete steps to weave evaluation measures into project design as well as to improve their mechanisms for transferring the knowledge gained from evaluations as a way to increase institutional learning.

# SMALL GROUP BRAINSTORMING



1. Integrating evaluation planning in program design
2. Transitioning to impact-oriented evaluation methodologies
3. Enhancing evaluation processes to facilitate knowledge transfer
4. Increasing transparency of evaluations and evaluation processes

*\*Depending on the # of participants, Groups 1&2 and Groups 3&4 may be combined.*