

Evaluation of Development Action – Why? of What? for Whom? The Challenges of Evaluation, as seen by some Canadian CSOs

Jean Christie, for the Canadian Council for International Co-operation
November 2008

1. INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

For years before the *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness* was adopted as the new framework for official development assistance, Canadian organizations were summarizing their program plans and funding requests to the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) with Results-Based Management (RBM) tables. They prepared these tables with varying degrees of skill and enthusiasm, setting out lists of indicators against which they and CIDA could track progress towards the results which the organizations had said they wanted to achieve.

As their experience with RBM grew, many organizations began to raise questions about its limitations for measuring some of the most important aspects of what civil society organizations (CSOs) do, or support. That is one part of the context for this small survey. This paper gathers together some of the thinking that Canadian CSOs are doing about RBM.

More recently, the Paris Declaration appeared on the scene, largely as a mechanism to bring country-level coherence to the many interventions of official aid donors – around some agreed principles, and in response to national government priorities. This framework is now well known to CCIC members.

From the outset, Canadian-based international cooperation organizations were concerned about the almost total absence of civil society from the Paris Declaration. Through CCIC, and with colleagues from around the world, they have sought to have CSOs acknowledged as important development actors in their own right – independent of governments, with the potential to help make aid more effective, but with an important place in the development of communities, countries and the world that goes far beyond effective or ineffective aid. Unless these wider roles are recognized and integrated into evaluation frameworks, CSOs will be judged solely as instruments for aid delivery, and not on their wider contributions to effective development.

Over the last two years, CCIC was part of a South/North, government/civil society Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness. This group, which was chaired by CIDA, consulted CSOs, governments and donors globally in the lead-up to the Third High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Accra in September 2008. The group shone a light on some of the most important roles of CSOs in development, in a synthesis of its findings that was presented to the Ghana meeting.¹ Its tenth recommendation is especially relevant to this discussion of CSO evaluation. It reads:

“ We recommend the following with respect to results management and accountability for development:

a) the adoption of results-based approaches and results-monitoring mechanisms intended first and foremost as management tools to promote iterative learning and adaptation, while empowering the ultimate beneficiaries of development programs;

b) the adoption of a more meaningful approach to results that includes greater attention to indicators of institutional and social changes and to sex-disaggregated data of importance to CSOs operating as agents of change;

c) an approach to accountability that emphasizes a rebalancing of accountability for results in favour of beneficiaries;

d) the reinforcement of accountability systems in country for all development actors (donors, government and CSOs); and

e) a multi-stakeholder approach to monitoring and evaluation that includes the effective and timely engagement of CSOs and beneficiary populations, including representation from women’s rights organizations and other socially marginalized groups.”

Meanwhile, in June 2008, CSOs launched the Open Forum for CSO Development Effectiveness. This is a multi-year global initiative to establish principles and guidelines for the development effectiveness (notably *not* aid effectiveness) of CSOs – in their own terms, and in light of the diverse roles of civil society in development.

In a statement to the Accra High Level Forum, the President of CIDA, Margaret Biggs, noted:

“Canada supports the findings and recommendations of the Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness. As we build a joint effectiveness agenda beyond Accra, there is an extraordinary opportunity to recognize and support civil society organizations as full partners in development....Canada strongly supports positive measures by civil society to strengthen their own effectiveness. Civil society contribution is fundamental to the achievement of development results, good governance and accountability.”

This commitment by Canada, and the global Open Forum initiative, together provide an important backdrop for current efforts of Canadian CSOs to consider ways to evaluate the effectiveness of their development interventions. These undertakings represent a significant window of opportunity for CSO dialogue with CIDA, about evaluation.

2. THIS REVIEW

This short reviewⁱⁱ is a first attempt by CCIC members to map out the “lay of the land” with regard to evaluation and results measurement – as seen by some CSOs, a few consultants who conduct evaluations and, to a limited extent, by the wider world of CSOs and researchers who study them. It looks at the questions that CSOs are asking themselves and CIDA, about the Why? What? and How? of evaluation and performance measurement. It draws together information about the methodologies that CSOs and consultants are using, adapting or inventing to learn from CSO experience and

measure meaningful results more fully. It provides a bibliography of relevant resources, and makes some suggestions about how CCIC and CIDA might advance the process of reflection in ways that would benefit both CSOs and CIDA.

This entire review is cursory at best. Notably absent is any analysis of specific efforts by CSOs to assess their Canadian public engagement programs, or their work on policy – in Canada, the multilateral arena or the South. CCIC itself has undertaken two initiatives to address evaluation of public engagement efforts, but this paper makes no attempt to report their findings. No efforts to evaluate policy dialogue were considered. But public engagement and policy dialogue are important CSO roles, and their omission is a substantial gap in this paper. When useful resources on evaluation in these areas were identified, they were included in the attached bibliography, but no concerted effort was made to find resources on these subjects, which pose methodological challenges that are very different from the challenges faced when evaluating international programs. Additional work would be needed to map how CSOs are assessing their work in public engagement and policy dialogue.

The Terms of Reference for this study called for a review of evaluation methodologies used by CCIC members and others. In practice, evaluation lies on a continuum of activities that also includes planning, monitoring, organizational and/or community learning. Some effort has been made below to distinguish between monitoring, evaluation and organizational learning. But in reality (and in the literature) the boundaries between

them are fuzzy. This blurring was evident in the interviews conducted for the study, and is repeated to some extent in what follows. In future, it would be useful to distinguish more clearly between these three related, but distinct, aspects of program assessment.

This report includes three appendices. **Appendix 1** lists the people interviewed. **Appendix 2** is a summary of evaluation methodologies unearthed during this study. **Appendix 3** is a bibliography of resources identified.

3. FINDINGS

3.1 Why Evaluation?

Intended Use of Evaluations is Key: People who study and theorize about evaluation and those who evaluate CSOs all underscore the importance of knowing why an evaluation is to be conducted, who will use its findings, and to what end.ⁱⁱⁱ Only when their ultimate use is clearly understood can evaluations be designed to serve their intended purpose(s). In the real world, most formal CSO evaluations in Canada are done for more than one reason. When funded by CIDA, evaluations must always serve the purpose of accountability – to government and ultimately to taxpayers. They are intended to assess whether public funds have been properly managed and well used. When serving this purpose, evaluations may be used in making decisions about future funding for organizations.

When done internally, and funded by CSOs themselves, the principal motivation for evaluation is usually to learn from past work – to improve practice, inform future programming, and/or pro-

vide information and analysis for organizational development and planning. In real life, there is rarely a choice made between accountability and learning. CSOs want to learn from CIDA-funded evaluations, and there is often an element of accountability – to contributors and the public – in CSO-driven evaluations. The balance among these purposes may vary, but both are almost always present. This means that evaluations must be designed intentionally, on a case-by-case basis, to serve both ends. In most formal evaluations, a workable balance seems to be found between accountability to funders and learning. The same is less true for monitoring, which is discussed again below.

It is less clear whether evaluations are serving a third purpose – raised in the Advisory Group recommendation above, and mentioned in interviews – for which little evidence was provided in data-gathering for this study. This is the issue of accountability to “beneficiaries”. CSOs offered many examples of innovative, participatory and/or joint evaluation processes that include their partners and are sometimes conducted by Southern consultants. But they provided less evidence for the involvement of people on the receiving end of partners’ efforts. In describing some large multi-year programs, some organizations did talk about community-wide surveys and data-gathering, and in one case reporting to communities. In general, however, the involvement of “beneficiaries” was not extensively discussed, by interviewees or in the literature^{iv}. Given the recommendation of the Advisory Group, this issue may merit further attention.

CSOs have Good Experience and Want to Evaluate Well: Perhaps the interview

sample for this study was overly representative of CSOs with a keen interest in evaluation and institutional learning, since seven of the eleven CCIC member organizations that took part had already joined a working group on evaluation. Skewed sample or not, these interviewees revealed that they had given considerable thought to evaluation: to the monitoring and evaluation tools their organizations were developing and adapting; the questions they were asking; and the efforts they were making within their own organizations to assess the impact of their work and relationships in meaningful ways. Most call themselves “learning organizations” and describe a range of internal learning processes that most separate from evaluation *per se*. At the same time, these organizations appeared to be working in isolation, despite having much to learn from one another. CCIC’s Reference Group on Evaluation is a timely development in this context.

There is ample evidence that CSOs do learn from evaluation, and that it influences their strategic planning, their day-to-day programming, and their internal operations. Evaluations have variously led the organizations sampled to move from a project to a program approach, to reshape their partnerships, shift organizational priorities, reorient existing programs and develop new ones. Internally, evaluations have led organizations to redesign their planning processes, integrate new evaluation methodologies into daily practice, and become more intentional “learning organizations”. It seems clear that evaluations are used by CSOs. It is less clear how CIDA uses the evaluations it funds – in part because the principal informants for this study were CSOs, not CIDA.

3.2 Results-Based Management

Because RBM is the framework that CSOs must use if they receive CIDA funding, it is the starting point for most current CSO discussions of evaluation methodologies. It was usually the entry point for the interviews conducted during this study. Though many organizations and consultants know about and use other methodologies, RBM is central to discussions about evaluation.

“Yes, but...” to Accountability: Everyone consulted in this study understands and accepts the need for accountability – both for money and for “results”. All interviewees want to account well for money, and to be as effective as possible in their development work. The questions they raise concern the type of results for which CSOs should be accountable, and to whom they should be accountable. Like the Advisory Group in its synthesis and recommendations for the Accra Forum, many of the people consulted for this study feel that RBM skews accountability toward quantitative outcomes and away from less tangible, qualitative ones (which they often see as the most important), and toward donors rather than “beneficiaries”. They want to shift this balance toward more qualitative assessment of outcomes, and more accountability to beneficiaries.

RBM is Linear; Real Change is Not: Most interviewees in this study consider RBM a useful tool for planning, and for helping organizations to articulate clearly what kinds of changes they are hoping to achieve, and how they propose to get there. However, most of them, and much of the literature reviewed, also argue that the “theory of change” implicit in the RBM methodology is lin-

ear, while the organizational, social and economic processes in which CSOs are intervening are anything but. CSOs want to assess their contributions in ways that don’t reduce complex processes of change to straight lines of cause and effect. They are looking for ways to measure progress against objectives in complex, multi-directional systems, where causality is not cut and dried, and where attribution of success to a single actor or intervention is impossible.

Hard to Measure the “Intangibles”; Harder Still to “Roll them Up”: Over and over, interviewees returned to the observation that it is easier to fit quantifiable outcomes and indicators into an RBM framework and measure progress against them, than it is to find meaningful qualitative indicators for the less “hard” outcomes that many CSOs seek. It is relatively easy, for example, to determine whether household incomes have risen, or if the incidence of malaria or maternal mortality in an area has decreased, or whether a steady supply of potable water is available in a village. (And such things are often part of what CSOs are trying to achieve). It is much harder to measure things like individual behavioural change (e.g. regarding gender equality), or increased organizational capacity, greater social inclusion, more effective involvement of CSOs in policy processes, increased “democratic space”, improvements in human rights, or more responsive governments – to name some recurring examples cited by interviewees. It is in these less tangible areas – which derive from the broader development roles of CSOs – that organizations are asking the most profound questions, and challenging the constraints of RBM.

Most of the CSOs consulted can measure the tangible outcomes of their work. Increasingly, CSOs are also finding indicators that help them measure the intangibles. But these are highly specific to particular programs, and don't "roll up" easily into preset categories of quantifiable "results". In a context in which CIDA is trying to aggregate results, this presents a serious methodological problem. Assuming it could be found, how would one usefully "roll up" evidence that women are now more active participants in community decision-making, with evidence that civil society has demonstrably greater access to a national PRSP process, with evidence that fewer CSO people are being jailed or beaten up by paramilitaries, with evidence that community-based teachers or health workers are better trained? Even if aggregation were possible, would it not risk losing all meaningful detail?

Monitoring vs. Evaluation: There is a big difference between monitoring and evaluation. In practice, concerns about RBM appear to relate at least as much to monitoring as to evaluation. Quarterly monitoring is perceived to be more about accountability for money and "results"; evaluation more about learning from experience – to improve practice and programs, and plan future work. Monitoring of CIDA-funded programs invariably uses RBM indicators and is done much more often than evaluation – many say too often. Comprehensive evaluation is done much less often. Whether internal or external, formal evaluations almost always go beyond the RBM frame. There should be a link between monitoring and evaluation, but the link is not always evident. And several people – both CSO representatives and evaluators – reported that the most useful and in-

structive findings often come from components of an evaluation that have little to do with RBM or its indicators.

Various Responses to RBM: All the CSOs contacted use RBM, if only because they must in order to receive funding from CIDA and satisfy CIDA's reporting requirements. Those who like RBM tend to use it flexibly; those who don't like it tend to find it rigid and mechanical. As noted above, many find RBM useful in planning, and in helping them to describe clearly what they want to achieve. Some also find it useful in assessing progress. Many organizations have received RBM training, and have conducted training with their partners, to familiarize them with the methodology. Partners apparently view RBM with the same mix of responses as Canadian CSOs – ranging from enthusiasm to incomprehension, to frustration and outright disdain. Two organizations reported that they had had to shift their direct support away from some of the most vulnerable groups they once supported, because community-based organizations with limited literacy skills or weak organizational infrastructures were unable to cope with the onerous demands of RBM. These organizations worried that RBM itself skews support away from small and community-based groups, towards intermediary organizations with professional staff and more organizational capacity. If this is true, and cannot be addressed in some way, there is a serious danger here.

When CSOs have found weaknesses or gaps in the RBM methodology, they have addressed them in various ways. One organization uses RBM (well, apparently) but puts a disclaimer in its funding proposals, spelling out the in-

adequacies of RBM for assessing the long-term and systemic outcomes that the organization and its partners are striving to achieve. Most organizations have tried to find (a few) relevant indicators that really capture the organizational, systemic and social changes that are hardest to measure. Virtually all add narrative and analytical information to their results-based monitoring and evaluation reports, and virtually all use a range of methodologies that complement RBM when conducting evaluations. Some, but not all, actively involve their partners in establishing desired RBM outcomes and indicators. Others intentionally shield their partners from the demands of RBM – compiling and “translating” material received from their partners into the RBM format, based on a solid knowledge of their partners’ work.

With CIDA support, one group of four Canadian organizations designed a three-day workshop in 2005, at which 70+ CSO participants, including 12 international panellists, reflected on 10 years of experience with RBM. Also with CIDA support, two organizations developed and piloted substantial refinements of the RBM framework, in response to their own objectives and programs. Two organizations were explicit in saying that they separate their RBM reporting to CIDA from their internal evaluation and learning processes, which they conduct with partners as part of their annual evaluation, organizational learning and program planning processes. Many of the other organizations interviewed implied this separation – describing a variety of innovative practices that include partners in priority-setting, program review, learning and forward planning. It is instructive that such learning initia-

tives are not easily accommodated in RBM reporting, and are done separately.

Scope, Scale and Duration; Contribution vs. Attribution: Everyone consulted for this study raised questions relating to the duration, scope and scale of development interventions, and the implications of size and time-frame when assessing program “results”. Related to this were concerns about “contribution vs. attribution”. Just how much credit can one reasonably claim, when one’s contribution is “a drop in the bucket”? Regardless of assessment methodology, the smaller and more short-lived the project, the less comfortable people were in claiming credit for definitive results – as if their modest contributions were solely responsible for any change(s) that could be discerned during the life of a short-term project. CSOs know that the small-scale, intermediary results that can be claimed legitimately for a project are often of little consequence on a stand-alone basis. But they may represent a significant contribution to a larger whole. RBM does not easily accommodate this reality.

Considerations such as these have led many organizations to adopt a program approach, and to build strong relationships with a stable set of partners, over a long period of time. This allows for a cumulative analysis of progress, with partners, over a time-frame in which real changes can be realistically expected, against established baselines (which are seen by many to be very important), and against higher order outcomes that can be tracked more meaningfully.

As if to contradict these observations about small-scale initiatives, however, there are other, very different questions

that relate to size. How does one assess the value of a small-scale innovation that is later scaled up – sometimes after a project is technically completed? How does one measure the power of example, when small initiatives lead the way to policy change on a national scale? (Examples of both were cited by CSOs during this review.) These considerations are important, and can get lost in time-bound evaluations.

Questions like these were often followed by admonitions for honesty, and a good dose of humility. Most of the people contacted directly, and many others whose writing was consulted, are looking for ways to escape assumptions of single and linear causality, while still assessing the value of their contributions, in the context of complex systems, multiple actors, and many uncontrollable forces that impinge on virtually any field of development intervention. CSOs are not alone in addressing this dilemma. In a different context, the office of Canada's Auditor General itself has confronted the question of contribution vs. attribution in complex systems.^v

To conclude on RBM: the difficulties that (some) organizations have described in using RBM may be due in part to their inexperience or lack of creativity in finding appropriate measures for the outcomes they are trying to achieve. But most organizations believe (as does this author) that there are limitations inherent in the RBM methodology itself. Especially when applied rigidly, in complex social systems where change does not happen in a straight line, RBM can miss some of the most important characteristics of good development. Such limitations can be mitigated by complementing RBM with other approaches.

But RBM's weaknesses are quickly compounded if the methodology is used mechanically, by people who have little or no experience with the real world of development. This concern was repeated frequently in interviews. People who understand the complexity of social change use RBM much more creatively than do inexperienced people, who too easily lose sight of its intent.

In an effort to find better ways to assess progress, many people around the world – in CSOs, bilateral agencies, multilateral organizations, and academic and research institutions – are looking for alternatives, either to replace or complement RBM.

3.3 Other Evaluation Methodologies

Much good thinking relevant to evaluation can be found in the literature about action research, complex systems, "theory of change", and planning and managing for social change, not about evaluation *per se*. An internet search on any of these topics will unearth volumes of possible reading material, much of it relevant to evaluation and CSOs. There is also an enormous quantity of material available on evaluation methodologies that implicitly or explicitly address the limitations of RBM identified above. This material focuses, among other issues, on complex systems, the multidirectionality of change, participatory techniques, questions of attribution, and unintended outcomes.

Appendix 2 is an integral part of this report. It summarizes some of the most commonly cited methodologies being used by evaluation consultants and CSOs, and to which CSOs are turning. All appear to have promise in expanding

the repertoire of evaluation methodologies that CSOs can use.

Appendix 3 is an annotated bibliography that cites some of the reference material and websites that seemed particularly relevant to CSO evaluation. Many are available on-line. These sources were selected from among thousands of available documents; the list is surely incomplete.

Beware of New Orthodoxies: Reading about alternate methodologies, and the many ways in which they are being used, raised a concern that their most ardent adherents may simply be replacing one rigid planning and evaluation tool with another. On-line discussions linked to several (good) methodology-specific websites seemed to indicate that some people were simply following a new set of marching orders – mechanically and somewhat rigidly applying a different set of pre-determined steps in their own situation. Surely what is needed is flexibility, a good appreciation of the possible uses of different methodologies, and then a good deal of common sense – so that use-specific tools, which are both rigorous and appropriate for the purpose at hand, can be chosen or adapted.

Evaluators Mix Methodologies: Although working in a context of RBM, evaluators seem to take an “RBM+” approach – combining a variety of additional tools and methodologies to gather the information they need to meet the multiple purposes of a particular evaluation. CSOs and evaluators should be encouraged to familiarize themselves with the range of evaluation approaches and tools that are available, but avoid any “one size fits all” solution. Each of the methods in Appendix 2 appears to

have merit, and appears to have been used to good effect. Using any tool mechanically and in all circumstances seems to be asking for trouble.

Some Common Threads: Regardless of methodology, some ideas appear repeatedly across approaches that are described as alternatives to RBM for evaluating processes of social change:

- Recognize that change processes are not linear, but take place within complex systems, involve multiple actors, are unpredictable and are only partially controllable.
- Develop and articulate a “theory of change”: an understanding about how you think change happens, and your place in the process.
- Know what you are trying to achieve (however defined), and chart a path (or paths) to move in that direction.
- Find some honest ways of tracking meaningful progress.
- Recognize the value of participation, collaboration, experiential learning, and shared ownership of results, and build them into evaluations when appropriate.
- Find time for ongoing reflection and learning, and be prepared to make adjustments when experience, contextual changes, new information, or unexpected outcomes indicate that a change in strategy is needed.

All the methodologies described in Appendix 2 propose ways of doing some of the above.

3.4. Other Findings

Power Dynamics: Relatively little time was spent discussing the implications for monitoring and evaluation of the power dynamics implicit in funding relationships, but almost all CSO interviewees mentioned this issue, as did several other interviewees and many of the documents consulted. It is clearly an important consideration. Power relations were usually raised as a tension that had to be managed during evaluations. But the disequilibrium between funding and recipient organizations was also seen by some to foster a reticence by funding recipients to examine weaknesses as fully as they might if their funding were not “on the line”. When Canadian organizations can lose their funding from CIDA, or Southern organizations their funding from Canadian CSO counterparts, there is a risk that people will be less inclined to report negative outcomes, or be critical of program weaknesses, than they would be if funding were not riding on evaluation findings.

Joint Evaluations: Two organizations discussed the advantages of joint evaluations, with which they had experience. In one case, multiple government funders of a single large program supported a common evaluation that covered the entire multi-year program. In another, multiple CSOs supporting a common initiative worked together with partners to define terms of reference that were commonly agreed, thus building cooperation among CSOs, and facilitating learning among them. Both these models are worthy of further consideration.

Lack of Time and Resources for Evaluation: Larger organizations and those that are affiliates of international

CSO “families” or networks seem to have been able to dedicate more resources to evaluation and organizational learning than have smaller CCIC members. But most of the consultants who evaluate CSOs, and all the organizations contacted for this study, raised concerns about the lack of time and resources available for organizational learning and evaluation. Some CSOs have designated specific people to oversee institutional learning, and some have invested seriously in in-house evaluation expertise, including training in different evaluation techniques and methodologies. But nobody felt their organization had enough time to evaluate and learn from experience in the way that most would like to do.

One researcher suggested that organizations have a finite amount of staff time for monitoring, evaluation and organizational learning.^{vi} In this “zero sum” reality, he argued that limited time might be better spent on more evaluation for learning, and less monitoring for reasons of accountability – especially if the monitoring is done against multiple indicators of dubious value. When tested with CSO representatives, this idea struck a chord. One could imagine reallocating limited resources, doing what is necessary to account for money, but spending less time on monitoring mechanically for results and more time on serious evaluation. This idea is worth serious consideration, because it could be implemented without additional funding.

4. QUESTIONS FOR CIDA

In the course of this review, a number of questions arose that are appropriately

directed at CIDA. They are presented below, for possible follow-up.

- (How) does CIDA use the evaluations it commissions, and the information it receives from CSOs via their monitoring reports? Are evaluation findings shared within Canadian Partnership Branch as a whole? With geographic program desks?
- What links are made between monitoring reports and evaluations?
- Does CIDA have advice to offer on the issue of contribution vs. attribution, or measurement of the “intangibles” such as behavioural change, capacity development, organizational development, social inclusion, or policy influence? How does CIDA itself measure these things?
- How does CIDA judge the strength, quality and “effectiveness” of civil society as a whole in a country? Of particular CSOs? Of civil society programs and projects?
- Does CIDA have a policy framework within which to assess the development impact and roles of civil society and CSOs? Should it have one?
- Would CIDA support joint evaluations, either among CSOs or among common donors to a single program?
- Would CIDA support peer evaluations, to encourage greater learning among organizations?
- How open is CIDA to approaches other than RBM?

- Would CIDA be willing to reduce the number of monitoring reports it requires, so more time could be spent on substantive evaluation and learning?
- Would CIDA be willing to support some focused learning opportunities on issues related to monitoring and evaluation?

5. PROPOSALS

Create Opportunities for CSOs to Learn from One Another: As noted above, most of the CSOs consulted during this study are already thinking creatively about evaluation and institutional learning, and working innovatively with their Southern partners to assess their efforts. But they are not sharing information about what they are doing or learning in any systematic way – sometimes not even within organizations, let alone among organizations, or with CIDA. Whether via dedicated web spaces, workshops, learning circles, peer evaluations or other means, opportunities should be found for Canadian CSOs to share and document the methods and findings of good evaluations, and information about evaluations that are used strategically and well.

Bring Theorists and Practitioners Together: There is also much to be gained by an exchange among CSOs, evaluators, academics and other researchers, like those whose work is cited in Appendices 2 and 3. There appears to be an appetite to work together on some of the issues identified in this paper. Opportunities should be created to make this happen.

It might be useful to identify some key evaluation-related issues that are of particular concern for CSOs, and plan an international conference of several days to address them. Invitees could include CSOs with innovative evaluation experience from Canada and the South, CIDA officials, and some of the world's most thoughtful researchers on the chosen subject(s). Conference streams might include: evaluation in the context of social change; evaluating capacity development; public engagement; policy work; and "RBM revisited". Each

stream might showcase examples of strategic learning by CSOs and government, and present concrete case studies where specific methodologies were used and recommendations implemented – drawing heavily from practical experience, but bringing together theory and practice in new and useful ways.

6. APPENDICES

Appendix 1: List of Interviewees

Appendix 2: Table of Methodologies

Appendix 3: Bibliography

ⁱ Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness. *Synthesis of Findings and Recommendations*. August 2008.

http://www.ccic.ca/e/docs/002_aid_2008-08_ag_synthesis_and_recs.pdf

ⁱⁱ In conducting this review, the author met or spoke with four CCIC staff, representatives from 11 CCIC member organizations, four evaluation consultants, three researchers who study evaluation, and four CIDA officials. In addition, she consulted the websites of dozens of organizations that study or conduct evaluations, and read many documents from the organizations consulted.

ⁱⁱⁱ "Utilization-focused evaluation" is a stream of study that encourages people to design evaluations with their use in mind. See the following for examples: <http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/ufe.pdf>

^{iv} The exception was ActionAid's ALPS methodology, which does aim to involve beneficiaries in planning and evaluation. See: http://www.actionaid.org/assets/pdf/ALPS2006FINAL_14FEB06.pdf

^v See John Mayne's *Addressing Attribution through Contribution Analysis: Using Performance Measures Sensibly*, in bibliography.

^{vi} David Bonbright of Keystone in the UK argues that individual program managers and organizations have only a limited amount of time for monitoring and evaluation. In this "zero sum" situation, time spent on monitoring may be time not spent on better programming, or more useful evaluation.

Thank You

I am grateful to all the people who agreed so willingly to take part in this small study, on very short notice. Without exception, they were generous with their time, and thoughtful in their contributions. They directed me to many of the resources identified in the appendices of this paper, and to many others that I simply couldn't get to. All expressed a sincere interest in the work that CCIC is undertaking, and in learning what comes of it. Thanks to all of you.

JC

Appendix 1

Interviewees for CCIC Review on CSO Evaluation

Canadian CSO Representatives

- Canadian Council for International Co-operation
 - Esperanza Moreno, Deputy Director
 - Ann Simpson, Program Officer, Program Management
 - Michael Stephens, Program Officer, Public Engagement and Capacity Building
 - Brian Tomlinson, Program Officer, Aid
- Julia Anderson, Make Poverty History Coordinator, Jamaican Self-Help Organization
- Theo Breedon, Diaspora Volunteering Development Officer and National Volunteering Development Officer, CUSO-VSO
- Gilio Brunelli, Director of International Programs, Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace
- Michel Charette, Directeur général, Centre d'études et de coopération internationale
- Mohammed Chikhaoui, Directeur de l'Organisation apprenante et de l'Évaluation, Directeur des Politiques, Oxfam Québec
- Abid Mallick, Co-Director, Programs, Aga Khan Foundation Canada
- Anna Nitoslawska, International Department, Canadian Labour Congress
- Will Postma, Program Director, Save the Children Canada
- Julie Rocheleau, Coordonnatrice à l'éducation et à l'évaluation, Jeunesse Canada Monde
- Jean Symes, Program Coordinator, Inter Pares
- Roger Young, Director, Americas Program, CHF – Partners in Rural Development

Evaluation Consultants

- Ted Jackson
- Richard Marquardt
- Kate McLaren
- Paul Turcot

CIDA Representatives

- Nalini Perera, Manager, Geographic Coordination and Corporate Planning Section, Strategic Planning and Coordination Directorate, Canadian Partnership Branch
- Alison Robey, International Development Officer, Geographic Coordination and Corporate Planning Section, Strategic Planning and Coordination Directorate, Canadian Partnership Branch
- Goberdhan Singh, Director, Evaluation, Strategic Policy and Performance Branch
- Naresh Singh, Director General, Strategic Planning and Coordination Directorate, Canadian Partnership Branch

Others

- Heather Baser, co-author, *Capacity, Change and Performance* (see Appendix 3)
- David Bonbright, Founder and Chief Executive, Keystone (UK)
- Sarah Earl, Senior Program Specialist, International Development Research Centre (IDRC)

Appendix 2

Evaluation Methodologies and Resources Used for Assessing Social Change

Note: This table is not exhaustive. It represents a small but significant sampling of work that is being done in the English-speaking world, to assess and learn from the development efforts of civil society organizations, and others.

Methodology / Organization	Aim / Intended Use	Description / Value / Critique <i>(self description when in italics)</i>
Results-Based Management	<p>RBM is widely required by donor agencies, and used by organizations that are funded by them.</p> <p>Intended to assist in planning, and focus on desired outcomes, and steps to achieve them. Intended to provide a framework for monitoring and evaluation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helpful in focusing on what you are hoping to achieve. • Better at measuring “hard” and quantifiable outcomes; less able to address “softer”, less tangible outcomes, such as capacity development, institutional and social change. • Assumes a linear theory of change, and thus risks reducing complex social processes of change to concepts of linear cause and effect. • Criticized for its rigidity, and lack of flexibility to take account of unanticipated outcomes, risks, external forces etc. • Seen to be used too mechanically.
<p>Accountability, Learning and Planning System – ALPS (ActionAid)</p> <p>A framework for Organizational Accountability, Learning and Planning</p>	<p><i>Intended to reduce unnecessary bureaucracy, while retaining core accountability... We believe that a robust impact system must</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>tell us about the things that are most important to the people with whom we work</i> • <i>tell us whether the work we are doing is helping or not</i> • <i>help us know more about other things that affect</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>It aims to share information freely between ActionAid and the people with whom it works.</i> • <i>Key elements ... are its emphasis on accountability to the poor, particularly women and girls, rather than just to donors, and its goal of sharing information freely between ActionAid and the people with whom it works. The only thing fixed about the system is its principles.</i> • <i>ALPS challenges our own hold on power, and forces us to relinquish it ... More critically, the approach puts poor people at the centre stage in learning, analysing and responding to their own situation.</i> • <i>ALPS lays out a framework for involving communities and partner organisations closely in all aspects of our programme work, including planning, budgeting, monitoring and reviewing.</i>

Methodology / Organization	Aim / Intended Use	Description / Value / Critique <i>(self description when in italics)</i>
	<p><i>people's lives</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>help us learn about what we are doing</i> • <i>help us improve our work in the future</i> [ALPS website] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>It should be a system that creates the possibility for honest, transparent, empowering relationships between ActionAid, its partners and the people with whom we work.</i> [ALPS website] <p>ALPS website: http://www.actionaid.org/main.aspx?PageId=261</p>
<p>Most Significant Changes Approach</p> <p>(Supported by an international group of NGOs; see column 3.)</p>	<p>Especially useful in identifying unexpected changes.</p> <p><i>[An] egroup was formed to promote discussion about the use of an innovative method of monitoring, called the "Most Significant Changes" approach. It has already been applied in developed and less developed economies, in participatory rural development projects, agricultural extension projects, educational settings and mainstream human services delivery.</i> [Most Significant Changes e-group website]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>... different from common monitoring practice in at least four respects: (a) The focus is on the unexpected, (b) Information about those events is documented using text rather than numbers, (c) Analysis of that information is through the use of explicit value judgements, (d) Aggregation of information and analysis takes place through a structured social process.</i> [Most Significant Change e-group website] • Involves project participants in deciding the value of reported changes and their impact. • Does not use predetermined indicators and does not attempt to identify causality. <p>The 'Most Significant Change' (MSC) Technique: A Guide to Its Use: http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.pdf</p> <p>Most Significant Changes e-group: http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MostSignificantChanges/</p> <p>[Funded by CARE International, UK; Oxfam Community Aid Abroad, Australia; Learning to Learn, Government of South Australia; Oxfam New Zealand; Christian Aid, UK; Exchange (UK); Ibis, Denmark; Mellempfolkeligt Samvirke, Denmark; Lutheran World Relief, USA]</p>

Methodology / Organization	Aim / Intended Use	Description / Value / Critique <i>(self description when in italics)</i>
Developmental Evaluation	<i>... an approach ... especially adapted to the emergent uncertainties of social innovations in complex environments, but doesn't say how to actually do it....</i>	<p><i>Developmental evaluation supports continuous progress and rapid response to complex situations with multiple variables. In such cases, the evaluator is often an integral member of the program design team. Developmental evaluation does not replace other forms of evaluation, rather it seems best suited for initiatives that are at an initial stage of development or undergoing significant change, and can benefit from careful tracking.</i></p> <p>[J.W. McConnell Family Foundation Website]</p> <p>http://www.mcconnellfoundation.ca/utilisateur/documents/EN/Initiatives/Sustaining%20Social%20Innovation/A%20Developmental%20Evaluation%20Primer%20-%20EN.pdf</p>
<p>Social Analysis Systems (SAS 2)</p> <p>(Developed by Jacques Chevalier at Carleton University, with Daniel Buckles.)</p>	<i>[an] international effort to address central issues in the creation and mobilization of knowledge for social change</i>	<p><i>The guiding principle is that dialogue and collaborative inquiry have become crucial for local and global development. Humanity can no longer rely on solutions engineered by private interests and experts alone. Social issues must be addressed socially and the insights that emerge fully integrated into processes of knowledge production, planning, and decision-making.</i></p> <p>[Used successfully by several Canadian evaluators and CSOs, including Canada World Youth]</p> <p>Social Analysis Systems: http://www.sas2.net/index.php?page=social-theory</p> <p>Social Analysis Systems – tools: http://www.sas2.net/index.php?page=tools-introduction</p>

Methodology / Organization	Aim / Intended Use	Description / Value / Critique <i>(self description when in italics)</i>
Outcome Mapping (Developed by IDRC.)	Developed for projects where capacity-building is the principal strategy.	<p><i>“Outcome mapping limits its concern to those results – or “outcomes” – that fall strictly within the program’s sphere of influence.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focuses not on impacts, but on changes in the behaviour, relationships, activities, or actions of the people, groups, and organizations with which a program works directly. • Emphasizes contribution, not attribution. • Is more realistic about the potential impact of a single donor.
Global Reporting Initiative: <i>A multi-stakeholder governed institution collaborating to provide global standards in sustainability reporting.</i>	<i>The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) has pioneered the development of the world’s most widely used sustainability reporting framework and is committed to its continuous improvement and application worldwide.</i>	<p><i>Sustainability reporting is the practice of measuring, disclosing, and being accountable to internal and external stakeholders for organizational performance towards the goal of sustainable development..... This framework sets out ... principles and indicators that organizations can use to measure and report their economic, environmental, and social performance. The cornerstone of the framework is the Sustainability Reporting Guidelines. (Work is currently being done with a group of CSOs, including Oxfam Quebec, to adapt this methodology for use by CSOs.)</i></p> <p>http://www.globalreporting.org/AboutGRI/WhatWeDo/ http://www.globalreporting.org/ReportingFramework/G3Guidelines/</p> <p>Guidelines document: http://www.globalreporting.org/NR/rdonlyres/ED9E9B36-AB54-4DE1-BFF2-5F735235CA44/0/G3_GuidelinesENU.pdf</p>

Methodology / Organization	Aim / Intended Use	Description / Value / Critique <i>(self description when in italics)</i>
Contribution Analysis	Addresses the issue of attribution, in situations where multiple actors and external factors are at play in a program area, all of which are likely to have contributed to outcomes.	<p>Attributing results to a single project or intervention requires one to claim a direct cause-effect relationship. Contribution analysis focuses on identifying likely influences.</p> <p><i>Addressing the attribution problem this way demonstrates that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>you are aware of the complexity of the situation;</i> • <i>you acknowledge and understand the other factors at play; and</i> • <i>you are nevertheless concluding (assuming you are) that the most likely explanation for the observed outcome is that the program has made a significant contribution.</i> <p>http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/site.cgi?s=4&ss=21& lang=en&article=16-1-001</p>
Keystone (UK)	<i>Keystone seeks to improve the effectiveness of organisations working in the human development field by developing new ways of planning, measuring and communicating social change that are practical and include the voices of their beneficiaries and other constituents. [Keystone website]</i>	<p><i>In most social change work, the problems are complex and not well defined. Solutions involve changing attitudes, relationships, capabilities, conditions and behaviours, and need to be worked out over time, with constituents, and often in collaboration with other organizations.</i></p> <p><i>Develop a Theory of Change:</i> <i>If we are serious about social impact, the first thing that we need to do is clarify and make explicit our assumptions about how change happens in our context. We need a clear picture of what success looks like, and what we think are the necessary preconditions for achieving and sustaining success...</i></p> <p><i>Map Pathways to Outcomes:</i> <i>Tools and methodologies designed to manage projects are not appropriate for organizations working on long term processes of social change. Most traditional logic models assume that clearly defined results flow logically from pre-planned activities and outputs in restricted (usually short term) time frames.</i></p> <p><i>Keystone offers... tools to help organizations clarify their theory of change, design outcome-based strategies and indicators of success, systematically collect evidence of success through quantitative metrics and qualitative feedback from constituents, and</i></p>

Methodology / Organization	Aim / Intended Use	Description / Value / Critique <i>(self description when in italics)</i>
		<p>report <i>meaningfully to constituents and other stakeholders about their learning and impacts.</i></p> <p>Keystone: http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/</p>
Utilization – Focused Evaluation	<i>The focus... is on intended use by intended users.</i>	<p><i>.... begins with the premise that evaluations should be judged by their utility and actual use;.... evaluators should facilitate the evaluation process and design any evaluation with careful consideration of how everything that is done, from beginning to end, will affect use.</i></p> <p><i>....answers the question of whose values will frame the evaluation by working with clearly identified, primary intended users who have responsibility to apply evaluation findings and implement recommendations</i></p> <p><i>...does not advocate any particular evaluation content, model, method, theory, or even use. Rather, it is a process for helping primary intended users select the most appropriate content, model, methods, theory, and uses for their particular situation. Situational responsiveness guides the interactive process between evaluator and primary intended users. [Michael Quinn Patton]</i></p> <p>Utilization-Focused Evaluation Checklist: http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/ufe.pdf</p>
Health and Peacebuilding filter	<i>The aim ...is to provide a structure within which to reflect on these [health and peacebuilding] issues and stimulate thinking about how activity might be done better...</i>	<p><i>It attempts to bring principles of conflict sensitivity into the health arena. Rather than introduce theory and principles alone, the Peacebuilding Filter relies on a series of grounded and challenging questions that can be asked of projects... Designed to promote discussion about principles rather than outputs, it makes explicit what is often implicit and enables issues such as trust or cultural sensitivity to take their place alongside more technical concerns that would otherwise dominate monitoring and evaluation efforts.</i></p> <p>See: http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a789773310~db=all~jumptype=rss</p>

Methodology / Organization	Aim / Intended Use	Description / Value / Critique <i>(self description when in italics)</i>
Rapid Appraisal of Agricultural Knowledge Systems [RAAKS]	<i>Designed to help stakeholders gain a better understanding of their performance as innovators</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Participatory action research methodology.</i> • <i>Central elements of RAAKS are team work, focused collection of information, qualitative analysis, and strategic decision making.</i> <p>Developed by Paul Engel and colleagues from Wageningen University, The Netherlands, http://portals.wi.wur.nl/ppme/?RAAKS</p>

Sources: Interviews; websites as identified above, and references in the Bibliography (Appendix 3).

Appendix 3

Annotated Bibliography on Evaluation and CSOs

What follows is a small sampling of the many resources that are available on-line.

General Reading relevant to Evaluation of “Results” in Civil Society Organizations

Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness. *Synthesis of Findings and Recommendations.* August 2008. http://www.ccic.ca/e/docs/002_aid_2008-08_ag_synthesis_and_recs.pdf

Bakewell, Oliver and Anne Garbutt. *The use and abuse of the logical framework approach.* Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency. November 2005. [Good analysis and critique of LFA and RBM.] <http://www.sida.se/shared/jsp/download.jsp?f=LFA-review.pdf&a=21025>

Baser, Heather and Peter Morgan, with Joe Bolger, Derick Brinkerhoff, Anthony Land, Suzanne Taschereau, David Watson and Julia Zinke . *Capacity, Change and Performance – Study Report.* European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM). April 2008. [A book-length study that addresses all aspects of capacity development, including evaluation.] <http://www.twine.com/item/1167scrvk-2l/capacity-change-and-performance> (then download the PDF attachment)

Blagescu, Monica and John Young. *Partnerships and Accountability.* Overseas Development Institute. Working paper 255. August 2005. [A “summary of current thinking on issues of accountability, partnership and capacity-building between Northern and Southern organisations... (including) some examples of current practice among organisations involved in similar work.”] <http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/odi-publications/working-papers/255-partnerships-accountability-civil-society-organisations.pdf>

Davies, Rick (manager). *Monitoring and Evaluation News.* [A news service focusing on developments in monitoring and evaluation methods relevant to development programmes with social development objectives] since 1997. <http://mande.co.uk/>

European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECPDM). *Mapping of approaches towards M&E of Capacity and Capacity Development.* Draft. June 2006. [Includes a variety of resources that explore issues relating to the monitoring and evaluation of capacity development]. <http://www.ecdpm.org>

Estrella, Marisol and John Gaventa. *Who Counts Reality? Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation - a literature review.* Institute of Development Studies. IDS Working Paper 70. [A “literature review of experiences in participatory monitoring and evaluation from around the world, used in differing contexts and involving all kinds of stakeholders...”] <http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop/wp/wp70.pdf>

Grove, Natalie J. and Anthony B. Zwi. School of Public Health and Community Medicine, The University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia. “Beyond the log frame: a new tool for examining health and peacebuilding initiatives.” *Development in Practice*. Volume 18, Issue 1, 2008, pages 66 – 81.

<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a789773310~db=all~jumptype=rss>

Horton, D. et al. *Evaluating capacity development: experiences from research and development organizations around the world*. International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR); International Development Research Centre (IDRC), ACP-EU Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation. 2003. [A book available on line, based on 12 case studies.]

[http://www.cta.int/pubs/isnar2/ECDBook\(final\).pdf](http://www.cta.int/pubs/isnar2/ECDBook(final).pdf)

Innovation Network (Innonet). [A nonprofit organization that shares planning and evaluation tools and know-how.] <http://www.innonet.org/>

Jackson, Edward T. “3 Indicators of Change: Results-Based Management and Participatory Evaluation”. In E.T. Jackson and Yussuf Kassam. *Knowledge Shared: Participatory evaluation in development cooperation*. IDRC/Kumarian Press. 1998.

http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-88062-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html

Keystone website. [A web space focusing on accountability for social change.]

<http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/>

Overseas Development Institute - toolkits. [A series of “toolkits” that “provide practical tips, tools and guidance for development practitioners and activists.”]

<http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/odi-toolkits.asp>

Overseas Development Institute – working papers. [A wide range of working papers, many of them relevant to monitoring and evaluation in different areas.]

<http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/odi-working-papers.asp>

Reeler, Doug. *A Theory of Social Change and Implications for Practice, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation*. Community Development Resource Association, South Africa. [A critique of logframe analysis, and alternative theory of change.]

<http://www.cdra.org.za/articles/A%20Theory%20of%20Social%20Change%20by%20Doug%20Reeler.pdf>

Material About (Specific) Methodologies

Davies, Rick and Jess Dart. *The ‘Most Significant Change (MSC) Technique: A Guide to Its Use*. [This initiative was funded by CARE International, UK; Oxfam Community Aid Abroad, Australia; Learning to Learn, Government of South Australia; Oxfam New Zealand; Christian Aid, UK ; Exchange, UK; Ibis, Denmark; Mellempfolkeligt Samvirke (MS), Denmark; Lutheran World Relief, USA.]

<http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.pdf>

Gamble, Jamie. *A Developmental Evaluation Primer*. The J.W. McConnell Family Foundation. 2008. [An approach to evaluation grounded in development practice and innovation.]

<http://www.mcconnellfoundation.ca/utilisateur/documents/EN/Initiatives/Sustaining%20Social%20Innovation/A%20Developmental%20Evaluation%20Primer%20-%20EN.pdf>

Mayne, John (Office of the Auditor General, Government of Canada). “Addressing Attribution through Contribution Analysis: Using Performance Measures Sensibly.” *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, Vol. 16, no. 1, pp 1-24, 2001. [Examines the issue of attribution, when multiple actors and other factors are at play. It is written from a government perspective, but the issues it explores are relevant to CSOs.]

<http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/site.cgi?s=4&ss=21& lang=en&article=16-1-001>

Outcome Mapping website: [An extensive website with descriptions of the outcome mapping framework, a brochure, case studies of its use, a facilitation manual, training materials etc.] http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-26586-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html

Patton, Michael Quinn. *Utilization-focused Evaluation Checklist*. January 2002. [Looks at all steps in the evaluation process from the perspective of who will use the evaluation, and for what purpose.] <http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/ufe.pdf>

Quarter, Jack, Laurie Mook and Betty Jane Richmond. *What counts? Social accounting for nonprofits and cooperatives*. Prentice Hall. 2003.

Social Analysis Systems (SAS): <http://www.sas2.net/index.php?page=social-theory>

SAS tools: <http://www.sas2.net/index.php?page=tools-introduction>

SAS techniques: <http://www.sas2.net/index.php?page=social-analysis-techniques>

CSO Materials

ActionAid impact assessment URL: <http://www.actionaid.org/main.aspx?PageID=260>

ActionAid’s Accountability, Learning and Planning System (ALPS):

http://www.actionaid.org/assets/pdf/ALPS2006FINAL_14FEB06.pdf [A comprehensive organizational manual, developed by ActionAid, based on clear principles and covering all aspects of ActionAid’s work.]

CHF – Partners in Rural Development. *Capacity Development: Key to North-South NGO Partnerships?* February 2008. [http://www.chf-](http://www.chf-partners.ca/publications/documents/CapacityBuildingCaseStudyFinalFeb408.pdf)

[partners.ca/publications/documents/CapacityBuildingCaseStudyFinalFeb408.pdf](http://www.chf-partners.ca/publications/documents/CapacityBuildingCaseStudyFinalFeb408.pdf)

CHF Capacity Building Approach. [An organizational manual to assist staff and partners in planning for and assessing capacity development initiatives.]

http://www.chf-partners.ca/publications/documents/CB_final_lr.pdf

Canadian Physicians for Aid and Relief, The Centre for International Health – University of Toronto, The International Development Institute – Humber College, World Vision Canada. *Results Based Management: Are we there yet? Ever? Workshop Report, November 16-18, 2005.* www.worldfish.org/PPA/PDFs/Semi-Annual%20VI/G-6.pdf

Chevalier, Jacques, and Paul Turcot, Kate McLaren (South House Exchange), Helen Patterson, Canada World Youth Research and Programming, and Daniel Buckles. *Canada World Youth Impact Assessment Guide.* Canada World Youth. Montréal: 2006. Available at: <https://idl-bnc.idrc.ca/dspace/bitstream/123456789/33177/1/126048.pdf>

Global Reporting Initiative: <http://www.globalreporting.org/AboutGRI/WhatWeDo/>

Mook, Laurie/ Canadian Cooperative Association. *Expanded Value Added Statement Toolkit.* <http://www.coopscanada.coop/newsletter/csr/winter2003/toolkit/PrintPages/entiredoc.pdf>

South House Exchange and Canada World Youth. *Canada World Youth Impact Assessment: Synthesis Report.* December 2006. (Impact assessment of international volunteering, using Social Analysis Systems.) http://doc.cwy-jcm.org/download/Synthesis_Final.pdf

Inventories and Summary Documents

Innonet. *Advocacy Evaluation Resource List.* http://www.innonet.org/client_docs/File/advocacy/advocacy_resource_list_nov2007_coffman.doc

Save the Children Canada. *Adapting RBM at the Community Level: tools and tool boxes – a review for Save the Children Canada.* [Includes a short review of 19 assessment techniques and tools that can be used to enhance, adapt or replace RBM in evaluating work at the community level.]

UNDP / GEF / UNEP. *Publications on Capacity Development.* [Inventory of capacity development literature, including many sources on evaluating capacity development.] http://ncsa.undp.org/report_detail.cfm?Projectid=211

Watson, David; *Embracing innovative practice.* [A good summary of work on evaluating capacity development, including a good bibliography.] http://www.capacity.org/en/journal/feature/embracing_innovative_practice