Roles and Responsibilities in M&E

Rabat, January 27, 2016
Carlos Asenjo (Consultant, The World Bank)
1. General view
2. Roles and responsibilities in program monitoring
3. Roles and responsibilities in program evaluation
4. How to get there? How to ensure the sustainability of the M&E system? Roles and responsibilities in the institutionalization of M&E
5. Quick review – main ideas
1. Roles and responsibilities in M&E: general view
## Roles and responsibilities in M&E: general view

- Developing at the planning stage the **results framework** of the program is **essential** for ensuring that the aimed goals are **achieved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Means of verif.</th>
<th>Risks and assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact statement (Ultimate benefits for target population)</td>
<td>Measure of progress against impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions made from outcome to impact. Risks that impact will not be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome statement (aimed effects —e.g. on the behavior of the target population)</td>
<td>Measure of progress against outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions made from outputs to outcome. Risks that outcome will not be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs (Products and services—tangible and intangible—delivered or provided)</td>
<td>Measure of progress against output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions made from activities to outputs. Risks that outputs may not be produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities (Tasks undertaken in order to produce research outputs)</td>
<td>Milestones or key targets for production of outputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preconditions for implementation of activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on: PNUD (2009)
Roles and responsibilities in M&E: general view

• A sound **M&E system** offers the opportunity:
  – To **better understand** and to **learn** in order to **inform decisions** that may contribute to improve program implementation and the achievement of results; and
  
  – To strengthen **dialogue** and to improve **coordination** among stakeholders and other partners based on **common practices** and the **evidence** available
Roles and responsibilities in M&E: general view

Monitoring and evaluation are two integral parts of the same results-based system.

Monitoring and evaluation...

• Have different goals and need to be programmed, organized and implemented differently; and

• Have complementary roles:
  – Monitoring tells what happens and evaluation may help us understand why things happen that way;
  – Sound monitoring is critical for good evaluation.
Complementary roles of monitoring and evaluation for results

**Monitoring**
- **Clarifies** program objectives;
- **Links** activities and their resources to objectives;
- Translates objectives into performance indicators and sets targets;
- Routinely **collects data** on these indicators, and compares actual results with targets;
- **Reports progress** to managers and alerts them of problems.

**Evaluation**
- Analyzes **why intended results were or were not achieved**;
- Assesses specific causal contributions of activities to results;
- Examines implementation process;
- Explores unintended results;
- Provides **lessons**, highlights significant accomplishment or program potential, and offers recommendations for improvement.

*Source: Kusek & Rist (2004)*
Roles and responsibilities in M&E: general view

Monitoring and evaluation need to be **planned** and involve **collecting, processing and analyzing data**; as well as **reporting, discussing and disseminating results** so that they can be **used** for informing **program improvements** and for **accountability**.
2. Roles and responsibilities in program monitoring
Roles and responsibilities in program monitoring

- Monitoring takes place at **different result levels**:

  - **RESOURCES (INPUTS)**: Financial, human, and other resources mobilized to support activities
  - **ACTIVITIES**: Actions taken or work performed to convert inputs into specific outputs
Roles and responsibilities in program monitoring

- Monitoring takes place at **different result levels**:
  - **Product-level**: goods and services delivered by the program

**RESOURCES (INPUTS)**
- Financial, human, and other resources mobilized to support activities

**ACTIVITIES**
- Actions taken or work performed to convert inputs into specific outputs

**PRODUCTS (OUTPUTS)**
- Project deliverables within the control of implementing agency
  - SUPPLY SIDE—
Roles and responsibilities in program monitoring

- Monitoring takes place at different result levels:
  - **Product-level**: good and services delivered by the program;
  - **Effect-level**: changes triggered on target population’s behavior/perception/values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCES (INPUTS)</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PRODUCTS (OUTPUTS)</th>
<th>MEDIUM-TERM OUTCOMES (EFFECTS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Financial, human, and other resources mobilized to support activities | Actions taken or work performed to convert inputs into specific outputs | Project deliverables within the control of implementing agency  
(SUPPLY SIDE) | Use of outputs by beneficiaries and stakeholders outside the control of implementing agency  
(DEMAND SIDE) |
Roles and responsibilities in program monitoring

- Monitoring takes place at different result levels:
  - **Product-level**: good and services delivered by the program;
  - **Effect-level**: changes triggered on target population’s behavior/perception/values;
  - **Impact-level**: changes the program contributes to generate/enhance in the economy/society as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCES (INPUTS)</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PRODUCTS (OUTPUTS)</th>
<th>MEDIUM-TERM OUTCOMES (EFFECTS)</th>
<th>LONG-TERM OUTCOMES (IMPACTS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial, human, and other resources mobilized to support activities</td>
<td>Actions taken or work performed to convert inputs into specific outputs</td>
<td>Project deliverables within the control of implementing agency —SUPPLY SIDE—</td>
<td>Use of outputs by beneficiaries and stakeholders outside the control of implementing agency —DEMAND SIDE—</td>
<td>Changes in outcomes that the program has contributed to trigger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roles and responsibilities in program monitoring

- There are specific **individual** and **collective** monitoring responsibilities at each level for the **implementing agency** and for **partner organizations**.
  - While some monitoring functions can be assigned to specific entities or functionaries, such as project managers at the project or output level, **monitoring responsibilities at outcome and higher result levels are collective efforts**.

- Developing a **M&E plan** is needed for:
  - Establishing individual and organizational **responsibilities**; and for
  - Clarifying **links** between activities and expected results **so that, at each level, staff have a clear “line of sight” into, or understanding about, each of the other levels and how they relate to one another**.

Usual roles and responsibilities in monitoring

Senior management of implementing agency
Ensure, in collaboration with partners, results-based and active management in the implementing agency.

Program director
Ensure that program results are monitored. Use information collected through monitoring to inform program discussion.

Project manager / coordinator
Place the project in a broader context by communicating with partners and beneficiaries. Ensure project monitoring.

Thematic / operational experts
Provide advice and quality control.

Agency-level M&E committee
Establish, coordinate and promote collaboration within the M&E system.

M&E officer for the program
Monitor program results (effects and impacts). Alert of problems.

M&E officer for the project
Monitor the results of projects and alert of problems. Contribute to the monitoring of program effects and impacts, in collaboration with partners.

M&E officers of other projects and programs
Monitor the results of other projects and programs. Alert of problems. Share information.

Program beneficiaries
Contribute to goal setting and to the definition of expected results. Inform about satisfaction and utilization of products delivered by the project.

Internal and external partners
Contribute to goal setting and to the definition of expected results. Actively collaborate for designing and implementing the M&E system.

Source: The author
Let’s see it step by step…
Usual roles and responsibilities in monitoring

Manager of Project 1

M&E officer for Project 1

M&E officer for Project 1

M&E officer for Project 2

Manager of Project 1

Manager of Project 1

M&E officer for Project 3

External and internal partners

Beneficiaries

Source: The author
Usual roles and responsibilities in monitoring

Source: The author
Usual roles and responsibilities in monitoring

Senior management of the implementing agency

Director of Program A
- M&E officer for Project 1
- Manager of Project 1

Manager of Project 1
- M&E officer for Project 1

M&E officer for Project 2

Director of Program B
- M&E officer for Project 3
- Manager of Project 1

Manager of Project 1

Agency M&E Committee

Thematic / operational experts

External and internal partners

Beneficiaries

Source: The author
Usual roles and responsibilities in monitoring

- **High-level government officers**
- **Committee for the M&E of the National Development Plan**
- **Other national and international partners**
- **Thematic / operational experts**
- **External and internal partners**
- **Beneficiaries**

**Roles and Responsibilities**

- **Director of Program A**
  - M&E officer for Project 1
  - Manager of Project 1
  - M&E officer for Project 1
  - M&E officer for Project 2
  - M&E officer for Project 3

- **Manager of Project 1**
- **M&E officer for Project 1**
- **M&E officer for Project 2**
- **M&E officer for Project 3**

**Committee for the M&E of the National Development Plan**

**Agency M&E Committee**

**Senior management of the implementing agency**

**Source:** The author
Tips for defining the roles and responsibilities of M&E units: common mistakes

- Being too ambitious –i.e. by trying to collect **too much information** or by trying to address **too many questions**:
- Being perfectionist –i.e. establishing an M&E system that is so complex that **only works on paper**;
- Loose perspective and become **isolated** in the system.
  - When we not know what other monitoring partners are doing (what their contributions to the system are, and what their information needs are), monitoring becomes a unidirectional practice in which we demand data and we report results "**to others**";
- Promoting the utilization of **only certain methods**, instead of encouraging the most suitable method to be chose in each specific situation;
- **Limit the dissemination** of results to the publication of monitoring and evaluation reports – instead of actively promoting knowledge sharing and utilization;
- Forget the importance of using the M&E plan in a flexible way –i.e. by **not adapting to changes** in priorities or in the evolution of policy/program context.

Based on: Timreck (2003); MAEC (2007); PNUD (2009)
Tips for defining the roles and responsibilities of M&E units: recommendations

• Elaborate an M&E plan and **systematically** develop **M&E frameworks** for projects:
  – Be **clear** on the **M&E priorities** and on **who needs what** information.
  – Keep it **simple**. Select a **small number of indicators** so that they **can be well monitored**;
    → *Do not collect data unless you have an idea of what the information may be used for*;
  – Identify **M&E capacity building needs** in the implementing agency and partners;

• During the **implementation** of the M&E plan:
  – **Pilot** indicators and data collection instruments before rolling them out on the entire system;
  – **Meet regularly** with key stakeholders and partners to collect data and to check whether they are finding useful the information provided by the M&E system.

• **Program periodic meetings** with senior management for **reporting and discussing results**; and be creative by tailoring reporting formats to the needs of managers, policy makers, academia...

• **Combine rigor and flexibility**: assess regularly whether the M&E framework is pertinent given the last changes in development priorities and in the context.

Based on: Timreck (2003); MAEC (2007); PNUD (2009)
## Roles & responsibilities in program monitoring - Example 1: PNUD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who: Actors and Accountability</th>
<th>What: Roles and Responsibilities</th>
<th>How: Timing and Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National authorities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Monitoring for programme level results</strong></td>
<td>1. At initial planning stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main responsibilities:</td>
<td>To ensure nationally owned results-based monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Through active participation in development and approval of M&amp;E frameworks for national programmes and UNDAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Lead and oversee national programmes to determine progress towards intended results</td>
<td>To provide clear basis for decision making and guide development initiatives</td>
<td>2. Annual reviews (of progress towards results) by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Identify and manage partnerships</td>
<td>To use partner monitoring systems based on their comparative advantages</td>
<td>■ Reviewing progress, issues, and trends in the achievement of results given in documents for the annual review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To link results with resources and ensure accountability in the use of resources</td>
<td>■ Making decisions on changes as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure quality and the appropriate use of monitoring evidence and lessons learned</td>
<td>■ Approving future work including M&amp;E tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To resolve key bottlenecks to implementation in order to improve the chances of achieving results (outcomes)</td>
<td>3. Participating in joint monitoring (selectively as decided by prior agreement with partners)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PNUD (2009)
### Roles & responsibilities in program monitoring - Example 1: PNUD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who: Actors and Accountability</th>
<th>What: Roles and Responsibilities</th>
<th>How: Timing and Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior managers of UNDP programmes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Monitoring for programme level results</strong></td>
<td>1. At initial planning stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main responsibilities:</td>
<td>- To forge strong coalitions for results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lead, implement and monitor the progress of country programmes, together with governments, UN organizations and other partners</td>
<td>- To provide clear basis for decision making and guide development initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collaborate with national partners to determine the focus and intended results of UNDP assistance to the country</td>
<td>- To ensure active and results-based monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify and manage partnerships</td>
<td>- To ensure quality and the appropriate use of monitoring evidence and lessons learned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To resolve key bottlenecks to implementation in order to improve the chances of achieving results (outcomes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To link results with resources and ensure accountability in the use of resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To adjust UNDP assistance in view of emerging changes as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Through active participation in the development and approval of M&E framework  
2. Participate in joint monitoring (see above)  
3. Prior to annual reviews by  
   - Determining strategic contribution being made by programme towards results through review of outcome group reviews and Annual Project Reports  
   - Deciding on strategic changes needed in programme results and resources, if needed  
   - Finalizing evidence-based contribution of programme as a whole to annual review  
4. Participate in annual reviews  

Source: PNUD (2009)
# Roles & responsibilities in program monitoring - Example 1: PNUD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who: Actors and Accountability</th>
<th>What: Roles and Responsibilities</th>
<th>How: Timing and Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDP portfolio managers</strong></td>
<td><strong>At outcome level</strong></td>
<td>1. At initial planning stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main responsibilities:</td>
<td>- To analyse progress towards achievement of outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contribute to sectoral/outcome level coordination mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Manage UNDP portfolio of programmes and projects in a thematic area such as governance or poverty, in other words, UNDP contribution to outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To assess the efficacy of partnership strategies and take related actions (e.g., better coordination with partners)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To monitor the effectiveness of implementation strategies in tackling the constraints to the achievement of results (outcomes) and take related actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To ensure effective use of resources, deploying them to maximize the possibility of achieving results (outcomes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Throughout programme cycle by carrying out monitoring activities and joint monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prior to annual reviews by determining:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Progress towards the achievement of outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Progress of the partnership strategies for achieving outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rate and efficiency of resource use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Issues that require decisions at the annual reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PNUD (2009)
## Roles & responsibilities in program monitoring - Example 1: PNUD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who: Actors and Accountability</th>
<th>What: Roles and Responsibilities</th>
<th>How: Timing and Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project managers and staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>At project level, monitoring outputs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main responsibilities:</td>
<td>To ground the project in the larger context</td>
<td>1. At initial planning stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Manage UNDP-assisted projects to help produce outputs</td>
<td>To take steps towards achieving output targets</td>
<td>■ Development of and agreement on M&amp;E framework for project through an inclusive process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Contribute to project management and project performance</td>
<td>To ensure effective collaboration with partners</td>
<td>2. Throughout programme cycle by carrying out monitoring activities connected with the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To interface with beneficiaries</td>
<td>3. Prior to annual reviews by determining:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure efficient use of resources</td>
<td>■ Progress towards the achievement of outputs and contribution related outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To feed information of project data to higher level monitoring (outcome and programme-level monitoring)</td>
<td>■ Rate and efficiency of resource use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ Issues that require decisions at the annual reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Inputs to programme reviews and annual reviews in the Annual Project Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roles and responsibilities in program monitoring – Example 2: M&E in the Swiss Development Cooperation

SDC (2015)
Usual roles and responsibilities in monitoring
3. Roles and responsibilities in program evaluation
Usual roles and responsibilities in evaluation

Senior management of implementing agency
- Promote in the agency the evaluation function and the utilization of results

Program director
- Responsible for the program object of evaluation. Owner of the evaluation.

Project manager
- Responsible for implementing the project and for programming and supporting the evaluation.

Internal and external partners
- Contribute to defining the object of evaluation and to results dissemination

Steering group
- Management support and supervision of the evaluation process

Evaluation manager
- Responsible for putting together the evaluation team, and for facilitating and overseeing their work

Evaluation and thematic experts
- Provide advice for improving the quality of the study. Contribute to disseminating results

Reference group
- Quality control and results dissemination. Critical friends role.

Evaluator / evaluation team
- Responsible for conducting the study

Beneficiaries of the program
- Bring their perspective. Provide information.

Other key actors involved
- Bring their perspective. Provide information. Contribute to results dissemination.

Individuals vs. Firms

Source: The author
(No little visual break here)

Sorry!
### Internal evaluation vs. External evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avantages de l’évaluation externe</th>
<th>Avantages de l’évaluation interne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Strengthens the <strong>credibility</strong> of the evaluation project from an <strong>accountability</strong> perspective by underpinning the <strong>independence</strong>, <strong>objectivity</strong> and <strong>transparency</strong> of the process;</td>
<td>• Supports directly <strong>organizational learning</strong>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Optimizes</strong> use of scarce <strong>human resources</strong> and brings in expertise, which might not be available in the organization.</td>
<td>• Mobilizes available <strong>in-house knowledge</strong>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitates <strong>direct feedback</strong> into the design of an intervention;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be carried out whenever financial resources are limited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from: EC (2004)
## Selecting evaluators: individuals vs. firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The variety of backgrounds of individual team members contributes to <strong>debate</strong> and <strong>discussion</strong> that can enrich the exercise –but also increase the risk of internal conflicts that can affect progress;</td>
<td>• Members of the team are <strong>used to working together</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The contracting process normally is <strong>faster</strong> –but identifying individual consultants may take time.</td>
<td>• The firm assures the <strong>quality</strong> of the products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Services provided by individual consultants may be <strong>less expensive</strong>.</td>
<td>• <strong>Bidding procedures</strong> can be lengthy and cumbersome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Logistics</strong> to be provided by the commissioning unit.</td>
<td>• <strong>The fees may be higher</strong>, as the firm's overhead will be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individual consultants may be <strong>more amenable to changes in the ToR</strong> or other arrangements –but changes in the schedule can result in additional costs in fees, per diem and travel arrangements.</td>
<td>• The firm develops the <strong>methodology</strong> or proposal for the evaluation, and is responsible for providing the <strong>logistics</strong> needed for the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The <strong>sudden unavailability</strong> (e.g., illness) of an individual evaluator may affect the timely completion of the study.</td>
<td>• <strong>Fees</strong> are agreed as a package that is <strong>unlikely to vary</strong>, unless there is a change in the ToR;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In the event of sudden unavailability of an evaluator, the firm is responsible for providing a <strong>substitute</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from: PNUD (2009)
Tips for managing evaluations: common mistakes

• Starting de evaluation process without having sufficiently discussed and agreed with all key stakeholders and partners what is expected of the evaluation;
  – Forgetting the expectations agreed during the implementation of the study, or in discussion of evaluation results;
• Expecting that the principal evaluator or other key stakeholders or partners would take decisions or actions beyond their responsibilities;
• Taking too long in: (i) Making decisions; (ii) Responding to advice/feedback requests made by the evaluation team; (iii) Reviewing evaluation reports; or (iv) Making the payments agreed once the corresponding deliverables have been received;
• Not asking questions to the evaluators – i.e. when they seem "too basic" or "too technical";
• Starting to implement the evaluation without having agreed with all key actors involved and with the evaluation team suitable communication channels and protocols, or without having granted evaluators the access to information sources they need to perform their job.
• Not planning or delaying the meetings planned for reporting the evaluation results and for discussing its conclusions and recommendations with interested parties.
Tips for managing evaluations: recommendations

- Promote **ownership** by timely taking the decisions required at each stage of the evaluation process;
- Discuss with all key stakeholders and partners what they expect of the evaluation, and agree with them a set of common **expectations** before starting the evaluation;
- **Monitor progress** in the evaluation work and **provide timely and pertinent feedback** as needed;
- **Ask all the questions you need to the evaluation team** (no matter how “basic” they seem) and, in the event that problems are detected, be open to their suggestions about possible solutions;
- As early in the evaluation process as possible:
  - Discuss and agree with the evaluation team **communication protocols and channels** – both formal and informal;
  - Ensure evaluators **access to the information sources** they need for conducting the study;
- Meet with the evaluation team and with other key actors and discuss with them the drafts and the final version of the **evaluation report**;
- **Plan ahead** meetings for **presenting the evaluation results** to managers and to other interested parties.

Based on: Timreck (2003); MAEC (2007); PNUD (2009)
Tips for writing the Terms of Reference (ToR) of an evaluation: common mistakes

• Establish evaluation goals that are not realistic:
  – Too many questions or questions that are too complex for available resources and time;

• Unclear or vague ToR;

• Too detailed ToR may limit the flexibility that the evaluation team needs for adapting to the changes in the context or in the information needs of the program;

• Launch the call for proposals for conducting the evaluation in the last minute:
  – Good evaluators plan their work ahead of time and are not usually available for imminent collaborations;

• Evaluation timeline is not well synchronized with the program timeline.

Thanks Kevin for the useful ideas!
Tips for writing the Terms of Reference (ToR) of an evaluation: recommendations

• State **clearly** the **objectives of the evaluation** and identify the following:
  – General issues and **preliminary evaluation questions** to be addressed;
  – Key stakeholders and their expected uses of the evaluation;
  – Overall evaluation approach to be adopted;
  – Products expected from the evaluation;
  – Expertise required from members of the evaluation team; and **logistical** arrangements.

• **Avoid technical jargon** – e.g. **acronyms** – when stating the evaluation expectations and objectives. Be clear on how the evaluation is expected to help the organization.

• Focus on **preliminary questions** to be addressed.

• **Avoid choosing too many questions**. It is better to have an evaluation examine a few issues in depth than to look into a broad range of issues superficially.

• **Include all stages of the evaluation process** in the **evaluation timeline** – including expected **delivery dates** and specific activities for the **reporting/discussion of results**.

Based on: Morra Imas & Rist (2009)
Roles and responsibilities in program evaluation – Example 1: European Commission

Source: EC (2008)
Roles and responsibilities in program evaluation – Example 1: European Commission

Source: EC (2008)
Usual roles and responsibilities in evaluation

**Senior management of implementing agency**
- Promote in the agency the evaluation function and the utilisation of results.

**Program director**
- Responsible for the program under evaluation. Owner of the evaluation.

**Project manager**
- Responsible for implementing the project and for programming and supporting the evaluation.

**Steering group**
- Management support and supervision of the evaluation process.

**Reference group**
- Quality control and results dissemination. *Critical friends* role.

**Evaluator / evaluation team**
- Responsible for conducting the study.

**Evaluation manager**
- Responsible for putting together the evaluation team, facilitating and overseeing their work.

**Internal and external partners**
- Contribute to defining the object of evaluation and to results dissemination.

**Evaluation and thematic experts**
- Provide advice for improving the quality of the study and contribute to results dissemination.

**Beneficiaries of the program**
- Bring their perspective and provide information.

**Other key actors involved**
- Bring their perspective. Provide information. Contribute to results dissemination.

**Usual roles and responsibilities in evaluation**

- **Steering group**
  - Management support and supervision of the evaluation process.

- **Reference group**
  - Quality control and results dissemination. *Critical friends* role.

- **Evaluator / evaluation team**
  - Responsible for conducting the study.

- **Evaluation manager**
  - Responsible for putting together the evaluation team, facilitating and overseeing their work.

- **Project manager**
  - Responsible for implementing the project and for programming and supporting the evaluation.

- **Program director**
  - Responsible for the program under evaluation. Owner of the evaluation.

- **Senior management of implementing agency**
  - Promote in the agency the evaluation function and the utilisation of results.

**Source:** The author
4. Roles and responsibilities in the institutionalization of M&E
What is institutionalizing M&E?

The M&E function is considered to be institutionalized in a country when...

- M&E is integrated in the policy and program cycles, and M&E activities are programmed –units responsible for M&E have sufficient human and budget resources allocated for successfully performing their job;
- M&E is mandatory –the decision of conducting M&E is not discretionary;
- M&E is extensively practiced in government agencies –it is not limited to certain priority programs and/or sectors;
- Decisions to evaluate are based on pre-established criteria –more generally, the offer of evaluations is not only determined by specific information requests;
- The M&E function is legally established/regulated;
- M&E tasks are performed by qualified experts who meet professional standards;
- The information and recommendations emanating of the M&E system are used for decision making by managers and policy makers.

Based on: EUROsociAL (2015)
How to get there? Roles and responsibilities in the institutionalization of M&E

- Building and sustaining results-based M&E systems requires **continuous commitment**, **time**, **effort**, and **resources**;

- There are political, organizational, and technical challenges to overcome:
  - «**Primarily a political process, and less so a technical one**»
  - **Political champions** highly placed in the government who are committed to change towards results-based management can help overcome such challenges.

- On the **technical** side it is important:
  - To develop **sound statistical systems** so that they can provide the data that are needed for M&E;
  - To encourage **results** dissemination and **knowledge sharing**:
    → **“Little champions”** are also essential on the **technical level** for developing and consolidating M&E **communities of practice**.

¹ Kusek & Rist (2004)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Senior government officials</strong></th>
<th>Overall “champion” for the drive for results-based M&amp;E in the public sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Central agency** (e.g. Ministry of Finance, Ministry for Planning) | “Champion and facilitator for M&E development and implementation in all ministries;  
• Lead in the development of a national performance framework;  
• Government policy center for M&E: guidance and guidelines for performance measurement, monitoring, evaluation and reporting to all other actors in the system;  
• Oversight and quality control role for all M&E performance measurement and reporting;  
• Facilitate or manage high-level evaluations or special studies on priority areas;  
• Advise senior government officials on all M&E matters;  
• Provide and/or promote M&E capacity building initiatives: workshops, training, etc;  
• Promote the professionalization of M&E and facilitate the development of M&E communities of practice. |
| **Other ministries and implementing agencies** | Establish internal M&E units and groups for supporting and overseeing M&E initiatives;  
• Develop performance frameworks linking ministry programs with sector goals;  
• Conduct thematic evaluations on each ministry’s policy area and key programs;  
• Report sector-level results and participate in policy formulation and budgetary discussions. |

Based on: Karkara (2013), EUROsociAL (2015)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| High-level M&E committee                  | • Determine priorities for the conducting of high-level evaluation or special studies;  
                                         | • Provide a forum for review of findings and decisions for follow-up;  
                                         | • Oversight role over the pace of national evaluation capacity development.                                                             |
| Parliament                                | • Central role in ensuring the accountability of government to citizens;  
                                         | • Demand and use the information emanating of the M&E system for informing the discussion of parliamentary committees –i.e. the budgetary discussion in parliament;  
                                         | • Develop new legislation in favor of results-based management as needed.                                                               |
| Auditor General                           | • Potential oversight role (audits on quality of data, quality of results reporting, etc).                                                     |
| National statistical agency               | • Conduct national surveys and provide guidance to ministries in data collection;  
                                         | • Focal point for the national data development strategy.                                                                                 |
| Training institutions                     | • Universities and other training institutions can contribute to strengthening the national M&E capacity in the public sector.               |

Based on: Karkara (2013), EUROsociAL (2015)
## How to get there? Roles and responsibilities in the institutionalization of M&E

| Civil society | • Collaborate with central agency for establishing feedback and results reporting mechanisms;  
|              | • Potential role of providing technical assistance. |
| Private sector | • Collaborate with central agency and ministries to develop periodic feedback mechanisms;  
|               | • Provide services – e.g. data collection – as needed. |
| Media | • Contribute to the dissemination of results of public policies and programs. |
| Observatories | • Contribute to the collection, analysis, and utilization of data and statistics for informing decision making in government and partner organizations. |
| International partners | • Promote M&E and results-based management in the region and globally;  
| | • Develop and promote international standards and norms for M&E;  
| | • Contribute to knowledge sharing and to the dissemination of good practices and lessons learned in the development of M&E systems. |

Based on: Karkara (2013), EUROsociAL (2015)
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Source: The author
Roles and responsibilities in the institutionalization of M&E – Example: Evaluation system in the Spanish Cooperation

Source: MAEC (2013)
Quick summary (1/2)

• Roles and responsibilities within the M&E system are **shaped by**:
  – The **different (albeit complementary) roles of monitoring and evaluation** in results-based management;
  – The **types of actions** that the M&E practice involves: data collection, data analysis, results reporting, discussion, and dissemination; and utilization of recommendations;
  – The specificities of the **institutional context** to which the M&E system belongs.

• **Results monitoring** takes place at different result levels (**products, effects and impacts**):
  – Developing an **M&E plan** is critical for establishing at each level the **individual and collective responsibilities** of the implementing agency and partner organizations. The plan needs to:
    → **Be clear** on the M&E priorities and on who needs what information; and
    → **Be simple** – by selecting just a small number of indicators so that they can be well monitored;.
Quick summary (2/2)

- In program evaluation:
  - Establishing **steering groups** and/or **reference groups** contributes to enhance the **technical quality, good governance** and **results dissemination** of evaluations;
    - It is advisable to consider the pros and cons of **internal** and **external** evaluations; and, in case of external evaluations, of joining a team of **individual evaluators** or contracting an **evaluation firm**.

- Building and **institutionalizing** a results-based M&E system requires **continuous commitment, time, effort, and resources**.
  - It is primarily a **political** process, and *less so* a technical one;
  - **Political leadership** ("great champions"), **active support by government staff and technical experts** ("little champions") and **active engagement of other institutions and individual citizens** are also needed for ensuring the success of the system.
شكرا لك!

Merci!

¡Gracias!

Thank you!
Questions / comments?


• SDC (2015). *Monitoring at SDC: Summary of key aspects and Feedback from experiences in the field on what works and why*. Presentation at the M&E workshop for Europe and CIS development assistance providers at Bucharest, Romania.