

Roles and responsibilities

Determine how decisions will be made on: the focus of the evaluation; choosing the evaluator / evaluation team; approving the evaluation design; approving evaluation report(s) and who can access the report(s) and data.

There are many decisions to be made in an evaluation. It is important to be clear about who will be involved in making these decisions, what their role will be and how the decisions will be made.

Always check if existing processes and structures can be used; if these are not appropriate or adequate, then new ones may need to be established for the purposes of the specific evaluation. Also consider any pre-established agreements such as, for example, partnership agreements.

Control of the evaluation process may be centralised in a dedicated manager or committee or it may be shared by a working group involving representatives from many different stakeholders. It is important to describe clearly each actor / entity's role to avoid confusion, duplication of effort or things falling through the cracks.

Products

The following items are potential outputs from this step. Where possible, it might be useful to research other deliverables that have also been shown to be effective.

- Evaluation management plan
- Decision making matrix
- List of responsibilities of the evaluation manager
- List of responsibilities of the evaluator
- Evaluation partnership agreement

Identify who will be involved in decisions and what their roles will be

It is important to be clear about who will be involved in the various decisions involved in an evaluation, and what their roles will be.

Who might be involved in making decisions?

Consider the possible involvement of:

- The manager of the intervention
- An evaluation steering committee
- A technical advisory group or some individual technical advisors
- A community consultation committee or key informants from the community

What will be their role in decision making?

The role of each individual or group in relation to specific decisions can be specified as follows:

- Consulted - Those whose opinions are sought; they are engaged in two-way communication.
- Recommends - Those who are responsible for putting forward a suitable answer to the decision.
- Approves - Those who are authorised to approve an answer to the decision.
- Informed - Those who are informed after the decision has been made; they are engaged in one-way communication.

How will decisions be made?

Decisions may be made in different ways; one or more of the following processes may be used:

- Majority decision making - Decisions are made on the basis of the support of the majority of the decision makers; in contentious decisions, it is important to be clear about who is able to vote including whether proxy votes are allowed.
- Consensus decision making - Decision making processes that aim to find decisions which everyone can accept; in practical terms, that can mean giving all decision makers the right of veto.
- Hierarchical decision making - Decisions are made on the basis of formal positions of authority.

Product

The following item is a potential output from this sub-step. Where possible, it might be useful to research other deliverables that have also been shown to be effective.

- Decision making matrix - It can be useful to summarise decision makers and types of decisions in a matrix which can be referred to when developing and implementing evaluation processes. It is important to ensure that -where relevant decision making structures and processes already exist- these are incorporated.

An example of a decision making matrix

	Technical advisory committee	Evaluation steering group	Program manager	Senior management
Focus of evaluation	Consulted	Recommends	Approves	Informed
Selection criteria for evaluator/evaluation team	Consulted	Recommends	Approves	Informed
Choosing evaluator/evaluation team	Consulted	Approves	(included in steering group)	Informed
Evaluation design	Consulted	Approves	(included in steering group)	Informed
Evaluation report	Consulted	Approves	(included in steering group)	Informed
Release of report and data	Consulted	Consulted	Recommends	Approves

Example

An Evaluation Steering Group was used for ongoing evaluation of a large multi-donor initiative:

The Think Tank Initiative (TTI) is a major program funded jointly by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad).

TTI's operations are implemented by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), while strategic decisions are taken by an Executive Committee composed of one senior member from each donor organization and the TTI Program Manager.

TTI Phase II will be independently evaluated throughout the 5 years. The evaluation is intended to provide timely and actionable feedback to allow for the adaptive management, as well as rigorously documented and validated learning about the program. This balances both accountability and learning purposes.

The evaluation is being commissioned and managed by IDRC, and the evaluators will have a single point of contact at IDRC with whom to interact on all evaluation-related matters. IDRC is managing the evaluation in collaboration with an Evaluation Steering Group composed of delegates from each of the five TTI funding agencies. Steering Group representatives coordinate evaluation inputs from their respective organizations.

The Evaluation Steering Group is responsible for:

- reviewing and approving work plans;
- participating in annual evaluation planning meetings;
- commenting on and approving evaluation deliverables; and,
- keeping the TTI Executive Committee apprised of development and progress taking place in the TTI Evaluation.

The TTI Executive Committee is responsible for approval of all interim and final reports.

Resources

Decision making structures

- [Advisory group](#)

An advisory group can be established to provide advice on an individual evaluation, a series of evaluations, or the evaluation function within an organization.

- [Steering group](#)

Evaluation management often involves a steering group, which makes the decisions about the evaluation. It is important to distinguish between a steering group (which makes decisions) and an advisory group (which provides advice).

Decision making processes

- [Consensus decision making](#)

Consensus decision is a decision-making method that involves reaching agreement between all members of a group with regards to a certain issue.

Specify responsibilities of the evaluation manager and the evaluator(s)

Evaluation managers are often, but not always, the project / program manager, the head of programming in the organization, or the manager or other staff from the evaluation unit (or the dedicated M&E officer in the organization).

The evaluation manager is responsible for:

- ensuring that the evaluation runs according to plan (see [Step 6](#)) and meets the milestones or deliverables on time
- problem-solving where needed (or direct issues to the relevant individual / entity to address)
- ensuring evaluators have access to all relevant project / program documents and stakeholders involved in the project / program and/or the evaluation (see [Step 7](#))

In a large evaluation, the evaluation manager may be assisted by one or more other staff members who will be assigned specific responsibilities in the management process.

Basic management skills also apply to managing an evaluation in terms of personnel management and logistics. Where evaluation management differs is in the content: the evaluation manager needs to have a basic understanding of evaluation methods and processes to assist the evaluation team with making the best possible choices.

It is crucial to the success of the evaluation that the evaluation manager:

- is formally identified;
- has a clear understanding of the scope of her/his authority (i.e., knows what she/he can decide herself/himself related to the running of the evaluation and what she/he needs to get clearance for and from whom);
- can access relevant information and staff (of the organization commissioning the evaluation and of the intervention implementers).

In addition, a clear understanding of the roles of all those involved in the evaluation is essential including the evaluator(s).

Products

The following items are potential outputs from this step. Where possible, it might be useful to research other deliverables that have also been shown to be effective.

List of responsibilities of the **evaluation manager** which may include:

- Educate the external evaluator(s) about: the program's objectives, operations and intended beneficiaries; the expectations about the evaluation and any relevant organizational background.
- Provide input and/or collate feedback on the evaluation plan.

- Specify the reporting requirements in terms of progress in the implementation of the evaluation (including reporting of important challenges and their resolution or which potential issues need to be raised for decision making elsewhere)
- Specify what is expected to be included in the formal evaluation report(s).
- Keep the evaluator(s) apprised of any changes in the program's operations or evaluation context.
- Provide regular updates on the evaluation process to all staff.
- Monitor the implementation of the evaluation including completion of milestones/deliverables.
- Facilitate program staff involvement in the evaluation, where relevant and agreed.
- Serve as the trouble-shooter, resolving problems or locating help to resolve them.

Adapted from: The Program Manager's Guide to Evaluation. Second Edition. Washington DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. Administration for Children and Families, US Department of Health and Human Services, 2010; p.28

List of responsibilities of the **evaluator** which may include:

- Develop an evaluation plan, in conjunction with the evaluation manager and program staff.
- Provide monthly or quarterly progress reports on the implementation of the evaluation (written or in person).
- Attend program staff meetings, evaluation advisory board or coordinating committee meetings.
- Train data collectors such as on:
 - Participant/case selection for sampling purposes
 - Using data collection instruments
 - Data quality assurance
- Ensure adherence to ethical standards adherence (e.g., confidentiality of data) during all phases of the evaluation.
- Implement or oversee implementation of data collection such as:
 - Interviewing program staff, program participants
 - Conducting focus groups
 - Observing service delivery activities
 - Reviewing participant case records
 - Developing data management procedures and tools (e.g., database)
 - Coding, entering, and cleaning data
 - Analyzing data
- Write interim (quarterly, biannual, yearly) evaluation reports and the final evaluation report.
- Present findings to program staff and others in the organization
- Present findings at meetings and conferences.

Adapted from: The Program Manager's Guide to Evaluation. Second Edition. Washington DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. Administration for Children and Families, US Department of Health and Human Services, 2010; p.27

[Address particular evaluation management issues relating to joint projects, including donor partnerships](#)

Evaluations may involve interventions that are collaborative ventures (such as co-funded or jointly implemented projects).

Different types of partnerships and their implications for evaluation management:

There can be collaborations at various stages and levels of an intervention – such as among implementing organizations, within a network, between implementing agencies and donors, or among donors.

Increasing degree of 'jointness' diagram

See more detailed information:

[Types of partnerships and their implications for evaluation management processes](#)

[DOC](#)

[41.5 KB](#)

Evaluation of donor partnerships:

The evaluation of donor partnerships requires careful management and governance. All donors enter a project with their own political context and their own set of expectations. Deciding on key strategic questions -such as what constitutes success and what results donors need to demonstrate- can take time.

Most donors have specific expectations for monitoring, evaluation and reporting related to supported projects or programs. The evaluation manager should be cognizant of these and ensure that the latest information is available as donor's expectations may change over time.

They may include requirements about the use a 'third party' evaluator (i.e., someone who is not affiliated, in any way, with any of the organizations involved in project or program implementation), specific evaluation designs, involvement in the evaluation process, approval or sign-off procedures, data or report sharing and the like.

Where the requirements from different donors are not aligned, or where the needs of a specific evaluation would be better served by a different or more flexible approach, the evaluation manager is responsible for negotiating an agreed way forward with the different donors.

Different options for joint evaluations:

Diagram of three options for joint evaluations

Product

The following item is a potential output from this sub-step. Where possible, it might be useful to research other deliverables that have also been shown to be effective.

- Evaluation partnership agreement

IDRC-specific information

Donor partnerships, as collaborative ventures that are managed and implemented by IDRC, are increasingly a core part of IDRC's business model. The increasing emphasis on jointly funded projects and other types of partnerships presents particular issues for evaluation management processes. Agreements about evaluation are made during partnership development. Partnership agreements generally lay out when evaluation will take place, who will be responsible for managing it, and what the overall use will be. More detailed discussions take place when it is time to develop the specific terms of reference for the evaluation.