



EMpower's Guide to Program Evaluation

This guide is intended to provide some basic definitions, tools, and methods related to program evaluation.

This document is divided into seven sections:

1. Why evaluate?
2. Types of evaluation: process versus outcome
3. Timing of your evaluation
4. Tools for collecting data
5. Tips on conducting focus groups, surveys, and in-depth interviews
6. Further resources on evaluation
7. Sample monitoring forms to use/adapt (program attendance sheet, service log, and community event log)

EMpower recognizes that organizations have different needs for and experiences with evaluation—many are already using some of the evaluation tools and strategies described in this guide. However, we also know that most organizations feel they can and need to do a better job evaluating their work. This guide attempts to find a middle ground by providing useful but not overly technical information that can be applied readily. We recognize that the question of evaluation is related to the question of capacities, and we encourage you to develop an evaluation plan that is feasible and realistic, rather than one that looks good on paper but that will be impossible for your organization to implement.

Finally, we recognize that any discussion of evaluation raises questions about the difficulties of measuring change, especially over a short period of time, and particularly among young people, who are by definition living through a dynamic, transitional period of their lives. The total effect of your program may be difficult to capture, especially in the short term. This document does not deal with impact evaluations: that is, more comprehensive processes that seek to capture the impact of your work over a period of many years. Although this kind of change is important to demonstrate, such evaluations require a level of time and resource investment that may not be feasible for your organization to undertake on an ongoing basis. It is still important to understand and maximize the results of your work, and to communicate those results more broadly. This guide is intended to help do that.

Many thanks to Julie Solomon, EMpower evaluation consultant, who drafted the original document (with subsequent review and revision by EMpower's Program Team: Cynthia Steele, Andrea Lynch, Julian Liu and Virginia Dooley).

1. Introduction to evaluation: why evaluate?

Planning a program requires that you have a clear idea of what you are trying to change or achieve (outcomes), and for whom (focus population). Evaluation uses a range of methods to assess progress against your program's goals and objectives. It helps answer the questions: What did the program do? What did it achieve? Did it do and achieve what it had planned to?

Evaluating a program requires resources, particularly staff time. Since resources are always limited, program staff may question why evaluation is a priority. Here are some reasons why evaluation is worth the investment:

- It allows you improve your program by learning what is working and what is not.

- It can help you attract and sustain funding, since donors are increasingly interested in seeing and understanding results.
- It can contribute to the field's knowledge of good practices for achieving important changes in the lives of young people.
- It can be used to increase community understanding of and support for your work.

Staff may already feel, based on their observations and experiences, that the program is making an important difference. Evaluation allows you to back up that feeling with more concrete, objective information. It can also capture how your organization has responded to shifting needs and circumstances in your community.

2. Types of evaluation: process vs. outcome

"You do work. When you evaluate how well you do what you do, it's called process evaluation. Your work has results. When you evaluate the results of your work, it's called outcome evaluation."

—Marcia Festen & Marianne Philbin, Level Best, 2007

When designing an evaluation plan, it is important to distinguish between process evaluation and outcome evaluation. The differences are summarized below:

Process evaluation assesses program implementation, including questions like:

- What activities or services did you deliver? Are they what you planned to deliver? If not, why did you change your plan?
- How many young people (or adults who work with young people, or other important people in young people's lives) did your program reach, and who are they (age, gender, ethnicity, economic status, etc.)? Are these the people the program was designed to reach?
- How satisfied are program clients or participants with the program? What are their suggestions for improvement?

Outcome evaluation seeks to capture changes in the focus population (such as young people, adults who work with young people, or other important people in young people's lives) as a result of your program. It answers questions like:

- How has the program changed people's knowledge, attitudes, skills, or behaviors?
- What is different about people's educational, work, or health status as a result of their participation in the program?
- Are these the changes the program was designed to achieve?
- Did these changes happen because of people's participation in the program, or for some other reason(s)?

Ideally, your evaluation plan should contain a balance between process evaluation and outcome evaluation, since an evaluation focused only on process will fail to capture the real effects of your work, but an evaluation focused only on outcomes misses the opportunity to gather information, such as feedback from participants, that can improve the program going forward.

While we see the value of both process and outcome evaluation, EMpower suggests focusing primarily on the **outcomes**, since this kind of information gives external audiences the greatest insight into the changes caused by your program. On the process side, it can also be helpful to track the number of direct and indirect beneficiaries reached by the program.

3. Timing of your evaluation

It is important to plan your evaluation when you plan the rest of your program. That way you can plan to collect the right data (information) at the right time, which will allow you to document your program's progress and achievements more accurately. If you wait until the end of the grant period and then try to remember everything the program has done and how many people have participated, the information you report will not be accurate. This is why EMpower recommends choosing which indicators during the

planning stage. Once you have chosen indicators, you can plan how you will measure them before, during, and after implementing your program.

Taking just a few minutes during each program session or activity to record key information will make it much easier to keep track of how your program is doing and to report this information afterwards. Also, if you intend to measure changes over time, you will need to collect information at the start of the program, then again at the end, in order to be able to do a comparative analysis. So your evaluation will only be accurate if you are prepared to collect data at both moments.

When choosing indicators, it is important to make sure that the information you collect from participants will demonstrate whether or you have achieved the desired outcome. For example, if the proposed result is a change in participants' knowledge of gender-based violence, and the strategy you are using to achieve the result is a workshop on gender-based violence, demonstrating that young people attended the workshops (via attendance sheets, for example) is not enough to demonstrate your proposed result. Beyond showing that young people attended the workshops, your evaluation should gather evidence that they left the workshops with increased knowledge (for example, by administering pre- and post-workshop surveys or interviews – see below).

4. Tools for collecting data

Tools for collecting process evaluation data

Attendance sheets, service logs, and community event logs can help you to collect and report information about your program (see section 7 for examples). If you don't already have data collection tools like the ones described below, you may want to adapt these samples to fit your program's needs. If you plan to check in with program participants in the future, you should include space for contact information in your attendance form or service log.

- *Program Attendance Sheets* (see Form A) record information about individuals' participation in the program over time, allowing you to track individual as well as overall participation. Attendance sheets are most useful for ongoing group activities, such as tutoring programs, workshops, training programs, sports activities, and arts workshops; as well as programs for adults working with youth.
- *Service Logs* (see Form B) document the dates that services are offered, how many young people use them, and the age and gender of each user. They are most useful for capturing services provided on an as-needed basis (clinical services, counseling, drop-in services, referrals, etc.).
- *Community Event Logs* (see Form C) document the dates of community events, and estimate the number and age range of youth and adults who attend the events. They are most useful for community educational presentations (talks, street theater presentations, health fairs, etc.), community organizing meetings or rallies, and mass media messaging (radio programs, blogs, websites, etc.).

In addition to documenting program delivery and attendance, you can also collect feedback from participants about their experience in the program via **surveys**, **focus groups**, or **interviews** (see below). Participant feedback provides evidence of your program's quality as well as useful suggestions for improvement.

Tools for collecting outcome evaluation data

Common sources of outcome evaluation data include:

- *Pre- and post-program written surveys or one-on-one interviews.* These can measure changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills, intentions, and behaviors among the young people who have participated in your programs.
- *School records* can be used to track grades, test scores, attendance, advancement, drop-out, and graduation rates for programs seeking to have an impact on participants' performance in school.

- *Program logs* can track such outcomes as microloan repayment rates, successful job placements, or related opportunities.

Outcome evaluation asks you to compare the results you observe to the objectives identified at the beginning of the project. When possible, you should express your program's outcome objectives as *benchmarks*, which are specific, numeric values. If it is not feasible to identify realistic benchmarks, you should express your outcomes objectives in terms of a *change over time* (i.e., an increase or decrease) in a certain characteristic or behavior. Here are some examples:

Outcome Objectives

Outcome objectives expressed as benchmarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By the end of the program, participants' relevant exam scores will have improved by 50%. • Secondary school graduation rates among program participants will be at least 60% higher than the graduation rates among other young people in the community. • By the end of their participation in the program, at least 80% of young people who are sexually active will report consistent condom use.
Outcome objectives expressed as changes over time, but not as benchmarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By the end of the program, participants' relevant exam scores will have improved. • Secondary school graduation rates among students in the class of 2010 will be higher than graduation rates among students in the class of 2009. • By the end of their participation in the program, consistent condom use among sexually active students will have increased.

For most outcome evaluations, data should be collected both *before* program participation begins (also called *baseline* or *pre-test*) and *after* it has ended (also called *post-test*), in order to be able to measure change over time. For example, a program that teaches financial literacy might test financial knowledge among young people before they participate in the program, and then compare it to their level of knowledge once they have completed the program.

For some types of outcomes, a *comparison across different groups of youth* is essential to understanding program effects. For example, looking at secondary school graduation rates among only one group of young people—those in your program—does not indicate whether an educational program is successful. The key question is whether students in your program have a higher secondary school graduation rate than students in the same school who are not in your program. Or, if all students in a school are in your program, do these students have a higher graduation rate than those from the previous year, who did not have access to your program?

Inclusion of a comparison group also can provide important evidence that it was your program—and not other factors, such as normal maturation, or other organizations' programs—that led to the positive outcomes. Sometimes, including a comparison group in an outcome evaluation is relatively easy. For example, for outcomes on graduation rates, school grades, or school attendance, there are usually existing school records that can be used to compare across different groups of youth.

Ideally, your evaluation would also address the issue of 'selection bias'—the idea that the young people participating in your program self-select based on pre-existing qualities. This can be difficult to assess. One strategy is to try and learn whether participants were already different from their peers in relevant ways *prior to entering your program*. For example, did program participants perform differently in school from their peers? Were there household differences between the participant group and others (such as parents' level of education or community involvement)? You could also find out from participants how they first learned of your program or why they decided to try it.

If it is not possible for you to include a comparison group in your evaluation, it is helpful to at least keep a record of other factors that may be influencing outcomes among your program participants. For example, are they learning things in school, in church, or on television that may be overlapping with what your program is teaching?

In deciding *what* to measure, it is important to keep in mind:

- the key objectives of your program
- what you can reasonably expect will have changed over the course of the project
- the resources available to conduct the evaluation

In deciding *how* to measure, whenever possible, try to use existing data sources (such as school records) to save time and money. If you have to create new data collection instruments, such as surveys, interview guides, or program logs, try to use or adapt instruments that have been developed and used successfully by other organizations, rather than starting from zero to develop your own tools (see section 5, below, for tips on survey design).

5. Tips for conducting focus groups, surveys, and in-depth interviews

Focus groups, surveys, and in-depth interviews are common ways to collect evaluation data. Here are some tips on how to carry them out effectively.

Focus Groups

A focus group is a confidential, facilitator-guided group discussion about a particular topic or set of topics. Participants are encouraged to interact with each other as they answer a series of questions that are designed to generate discussion. For program evaluation, focus groups are usually used to collect information on what participants feel they learned from or got out of a program, what they liked most about it, and their suggestions for improvement. Participants' comments are analyzed qualitatively, including points of agreement and disagreement. Focus groups should be used primarily for process evaluation, since the data they collect is usually not sufficient to demonstrate outcomes.

Group size, number, and composition: The ideal focus group size is usually 6-10 participants. It is important to have enough people to generate discussion, but not so many that it is difficult for everyone to participate actively. When possible, try to conduct **at least three** focus groups with separate sets of participants, to be sure that you get a variety of viewpoints. (Sometimes it is possible to conduct focus groups with all or nearly all of your program participants.) Also, try to make sure that the people who participate are not just those who are usually most enthusiastic, most talkative, or most active in the program, because their views will not necessarily represent the opinions of everyone in the group. Depending on the topics covered and the population involved, you may want to hold separate focus group sessions for females and males, and/or for younger youth, older youth, and adults. Dividing groups by gender and/or age can encourage participants to voice their opinions and to freely discuss topics that might be considered too sensitive or taboo to be talked about in a mixed gender/age group. All participants in a focus group should be informed about its purpose and reassured that their input will be kept confidential (see below). You should obtain consent from the young people themselves to participate, ensure that they understand what they are consenting to, and document the consent process (this is known as *informed consent*). Depending on the context, you may also want to obtain consent from a parent or guardian.

Length: Focus groups generally range from 1-2 hours in length. It usually takes at least 10-15 minutes for the facilitator to provide ground rules and for the group to get into a meaningful discussion, so shorter groups are generally not recommended. Longer groups are generally not advisable either, because participants tend to become restless or distracted. Sometimes for relatively long focus groups, a short break in the middle can help to re-energize and re-focus participants.

Setting: It is helpful to conduct the focus group in a quiet setting, away from other activities and people, and out of the listening range of anyone who is not participating in the group discussion. These conditions

will help keep participants' attention on the discussion, and also help protect their confidentiality—which will in turn allow them to speak more freely.

Arrangement: The facilitator and the participants should sit facing each other (for example, in a circle), to help promote active discussion.

Confidentiality: Participants' confidentiality should be maintained at all times to encourage honest and open discussion and to protect participants from possible negative reactions of people outside the group (such as parents, teachers, or other young people) who may have different viewpoints. Participants should also be informed of key ground rules, including:

- they do not have to answer any question that they do not want to answer
- they must not tell people outside the group who in the group said what
- their names (or other information that could identify them) will not be written next to their comments in focus group notes, or included in any reports

Any audio recordings of the group should be kept in a safe place (such as a locked drawer) and should be destroyed once reports have been finalized.

Facilitator: The focus group facilitator should be—and should be perceived to be—a trustworthy, neutral person by the participants. He or she should project a sense of trust, comfort, and openness, and should not take sides in the discussion or appear to like or dislike particular responses. This will help encourage group members to speak openly about their thoughts. The facilitator should be skilled at encouraging the participation of everyone in the group, not just those who are naturally the most talkative, without making anyone feel she or he is being pressured to speak. If focus group members will all be of the same gender, it may be most appropriate to have a facilitator of that gender. Ideally, focus groups should be facilitated by people who were not directly involved in the implementation of the program.

Note-taker: It is useful for an additional person (other than the facilitator) to serve as an observer and note-taker during the focus group. This way, the facilitator can concentrate on asking questions and ensuring that everyone is getting a chance to speak. If focus group members will be of the same gender, it may be most appropriate to have a note-taker of that gender. Like the facilitator, the note-taker should be, and should be perceived as, as a trustworthy and neutral person. His/her role should be explained, and participants should be reminded that all notes will be confidential and will not include information about who said what.

You may wish to make an audio recording of focus group discussions, which will help capture comments that were missed or not well understood. Audio recordings should only be made with the knowledge and consent of every participant. Even when an audio recording is made, it is still important to have notes taken during the session, because recording equipment may not work well all the time.

Questions for the group: Focus group questions should be thought out in advance. They should generally be open-ended—that is, they should not simply have a “yes” or “no” answer, but rather encourage participants to address “what?”, “how?”, “how much?” and “why?”. It is also helpful for the facilitator to have prompts prepared. Prompts are follow-up questions that can be used, as needed, to request further information related to the initial question. Below is an example of a main focus group question and possible prompts, designed in this case to evaluate an HIV prevention program.

Example of main focus group question:

1. What are the most important things you learned during the program?

Examples of prompts:

- a. What are some important things you learned about how HIV is transmitted?
- b. What new information did you learn about how to protect yourself from HIV?
- c. What did you learn about communicating with your partner on ways to avoid HIV?

Data analysis: In analyzing focus group data, it is helpful to look at the responses to each question, group the information into themes, and note points of agreement and disagreement among participants. In doing this, keep in mind that answers to one question might be provided during answers to another question. It is also helpful to note the exact words of comments that express ideas in clear and compelling ways. These quotes can help bring your findings to life in reports and program promotion materials.

Surveys

A survey (or questionnaire) is a set of questions that are posed in the same way to different members of a group. The questions are usually written, but they may also be asked orally (in a one-on-one interview or large-group format—see below), particularly where people have limited literacy skills. Each participant gives an individual response to the same questions.

Surveys can be used for process evaluation—collecting and quantifying information on how participants feel about a program (what they got out of it, what they liked most and least). They can also be used for outcome evaluation—collecting and quantifying information on participants' knowledge, attitudes, intentions, and/or behaviors concerning health, leadership, educational pursuits, livelihoods etc. For outcome evaluation surveys to produce useful information on the differences the program is making, a comparison element must be included in the evaluation design. You can achieve this either by surveying the same youth before and after participation in the program, or by surveying one group of youth who participated in the program, and another group who didn't, and then comparing their responses.

When conducting a survey of program participants, it is best to administer the survey to every participant in the program, so that your survey captures the broadest possible range of responses. If you are using pre-test and post-test surveys to assess program outcomes, it is important to have *both* a pre-test survey and a post-test survey from as many program participants as possible. In general, if a survey response rate is low, the findings from the survey will not be representative of opinions or outcomes among the whole group. Also, if you are using statistical tests to determine whether changes in program participants (or differences between program participants and a comparison group) are not likely due to chance, you should have complete data for **at least 30-40 participants**—or more—for the statistical tests to be of use.

If you do not have the resources to collect and analyze surveys from all program participants, you should administer surveys systematically (such as to every second participant who enrolls in the program), instead of handpicking participants according to personal characteristics. Selecting participants systematically will help to ensure that your sample is representative of the larger program population.

Content: Surveys should be as brief as possible, focusing on *what you most want to measure about your program*. Often, surveys collect background information about respondents (such as age, gender, etc.), so that it is possible to sort and compare results based on different aspects of participants' identities.

Timing: Program satisfaction surveys are usually implemented at the end of a program cycle, or when an individual completes the program. For outcome evaluation, surveys of knowledge, attitudes, intentions, and behaviors are usually implemented just before program participation begins (pre-test or baseline), and then again just after it ends (post-test). An additional follow-up survey can also be done some months later, in order to assess the program's longer-term effects. Remember to mark surveys so that it is clear which ones are pre-tests, which are post-tests, and which are follow-ups, and (if applicable) which ones are completed by program participants and which ones by comparison participants. *Remember: in order for a comparative evaluation to be effective, questions usually have to be posed in the same way each time (across time, and across program and comparison groups).*

Question format: Survey questions may be *closed-ended*, meaning that participants select from among a finite number of answer choices, or they may be *open-ended*, meaning that participants come up with their own answers (see examples of closed- and open-ended items in the box. Note that question 1 is closed-ended; question 1a includes both close- and open-ended components.)

Sample questions for survey for a financial literacy program:

1. Do you have any savings? *(Please check one answer)*

- Yes
- No

1a. If you do have savings, where are they kept? *(Please check one answer)*

- In a bank
- By a self-help group or savings club you belong to
- At home
- Other *(please describe:)* _____

Language: It is very important that surveys use language that can be easily understood by the survey-takers. Take into account the participants' linguistic capacities, age, formal education, and experience as you decide how to word the instructions and questions. You may need to use translators or translate particular questions if participants are most comfortable with another language or dialect.

Administration modes: Surveys are commonly administered in written format. If the people you are surveying have trouble reading and writing, it may be preferable for the survey administrator to meet one-on-one with each participant, reading aloud both the questions and answer choices, and marking each participant's oral responses on a form. Such interviews are time-consuming, however, and participants may feel too embarrassed to answer truthfully, particularly if the survey is about personal or sensitive topics. An alternate approach when literacy skills are limited and questions are closed-ended is to provide each survey-taker with a written survey, and also write the questions and answer choices on a large blackboard or on sheets of paper on a wall. The survey administrator can read aloud each question and its answer choices, then point to each item on the blackboard or wall. Participants can match the items that are read aloud to the written items on their survey sheets, and place a mark next to their answer.

Keep in mind that depending on your setting, it may be necessary to obtain consent from a parent or guardian for a young person to participate in a written or oral survey. The young person should also be informed of the nature and purpose of the survey and his or her consent should be obtained as well.

Survey administrator: Usually, one or two people are designated to administer the survey. They should be prepared to explain the instructions, answer questions from participants, distribute and collect surveys, and provide support for participants with limited literacy skills. The administrators should be—and should be perceived to be—trustworthy by the participants, and they should take all appropriate steps to ensure participants' confidentiality (see below).

Confidentiality: Participants' confidentiality should be maintained at all times to encourage honest and open responses and to protect their privacy. Participants should be encouraged to provide honest responses, but also be told that they have a right to refuse to answer individual questions or refuse to complete the survey, without penalty. Participants should be permitted to sit apart from each other and to cover their surveys (with their hand or with another sheet of paper) as they complete them, so that their peers cannot see what they are writing. In addition, participants' names should not be written on the surveys. If there is a need to identify whose survey is whose, so that pre-test surveys can be linked to post-test surveys for analysis purposes, a project code number should be written on the survey, and a separate key (listing names and code numbers) should be created and kept separate from the surveys (such as in a locked drawer or password-protected computer).

Pilot-testing: Whenever possible, surveys and survey administration procedures should be tested out with a small group of people who are similar to—but not the same as—the individuals who will participate in the evaluation. This will help ensure that the questions are clear and that the administration of the survey goes smoothly.

Analysis: Survey data are commonly entered into a computer program like Excel for analysis. Closed-ended responses are generally analyzed for frequencies, such as percents and averages. More sophisticated analyses are needed to look at changes over time and differences between groups. Open-ended responses may be analyzed thematically, as with focus group data. They may also be grouped into categories and reported on quantitatively. Quotes from open-ended survey items are commonly included in reports and communications materials (without identification of the persons who provided the quotes).

In-depth interviews

In-depth, one-on-one interviews with program participants can be used to collect information about a program’s process or outcome. These interviews are particularly helpful in obtaining detailed information on topics that program participants might not feel comfortable discussing in front of their peers, but would be willing to talk about with a neutral adult. For example, youth might be much more willing to discuss challenges they faced while working in peer groups if other youth are not present to hear their comments.

In-depth interviews may be used as a primary means of data collection, in which case they should be done with as many program participants as possible. Individual interviews can also be used to supplement survey or focus group findings. If they are used as a supplemental data source, it is helpful to conduct interviews systematically (for example, with every fourth person who enrolled in the program) or at least to interview people from a range of subgroups (e.g., boys, girls, younger youth, older youth) who participated in the program.

In-depth interviews often range from 30-60 minutes (and sometimes even longer), and generally include a combination of closed- and open-ended questions. The questions should be prepared in advance and asked by an experienced interviewer who is—and who is perceived to be—trustworthy, neutral, and non-judgmental. Depending on the topics covered and local cultural norms, it may be helpful for the interviewer and interviewee to be of the same gender. The interview setting should be relatively quiet and private, to reduce distractions and promote honest, thoughtful responses. The interviewer may make an audio recording of the interview (with the knowledge and consent of the interviewee), but should always take notes on the interviewee’s responses. As in the case of focus groups, any audio recordings should be kept in a safe place (such as a locked drawer) and should be destroyed once reports have been finalized. Interviewees’ names (or other information that could identify them) should not be written in the interviewer’s notes, or included in any reports. As in the case of other data collection methods, it is important to obtain consent from participants, and in the case of a young person, it may also be necessary to obtain consent from a parent or guardian.

Comparing data collection methods

The table below summarizes the advantages and disadvantages of focus groups, written surveys, and in-depth interviews. It is intended to help you choose the best method to analyze each aspect of your program that you wish to evaluate. You may wish to use more than one method.¹

Data Collection Method	Advantages	Disadvantages
Focus groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can collect broad and deep program information in a short time period • Permit on-the-spot follow-up to explore or clarify participant responses • Often yield very rich information as participants respond to each other’s 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compared to surveys, cannot collect information from as many participants in as little time • Can be hard to analyze the data and compare across subgroups • Opinions of people who are most talkative or outspoken may be

¹ Some of the content of this table was adapted from Marcia Festen & Marianne Philbin, *Level Best*, San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, 2007, pp. 78-79, citing C. McNamara’s “Overview of Methods to Collect Information, 1998..

	<p>comments and raise new topics that had not been considered by focus group facilitators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants do not need literacy skills • Participants often enjoy the chance to talk with peers about the program 	<p>incorrectly taken to be the most common viewpoints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants may be reluctant to express their true feelings to the group • A good facilitator is needed to maximize group participation • Can be challenging to get the required number of participants together
Written surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can collect information from many people at the same time • Are relatively inexpensive to administer (compared to other methods) • Participants can provide data anonymously (that is, without anyone knowing who said what) • Responses across participants (or over time for the same participant) can be easily compared using common computer software 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can be difficult to create questions that are understood as the survey creators intended • The information obtained tends to lack depth • No opportunity for on-the-spot follow up to explore or clarify participants' responses • Participants must have sufficient literacy skills
In-depth interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can collect broad and deep program information • Permit on-the-spot follow-up to explore or clarify participant responses • Can address topics that participants may be uncomfortable to discuss in front of peers • Afford maximum flexibility to accommodate participant's schedule • Participants do not need literacy skills • May help develop the organization's relationship with the participant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require more time and resources than other methods • Can be hard to analyze the data and compare across subgroups • Participants may be reluctant to express their true feelings to the interviewer • A good interviewer is needed to avoid biasing the responses

6. Further resources on evaluation

Finding Local Resources

Analyzing evaluation data can be difficult. If no one on your staff has experience with data analysis, it may be necessary to seek outside help, or to design an evaluation that does not require complicated data analysis. However, students in health, social science, or education programs at local universities may be able to help you analyze data, in return for school credits or a small stipend. Local evaluation consultants may be available, although their services are likely more expensive.

Global Resources Available

In addition, many evaluation guidebooks and manuals are available worldwide. All of the resources below can be downloaded for free:

Cross-Cutting Indicators for Youth

- Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development. (2005). *Reflect and Improve: A Tool Kit for Engaging Youth and Adults as Partners in Program Evaluation*. Takoma Park, Maryland:

Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development. Available at http://www.theinnovationcenter.org/files/Reflect-and-Improve_Toolkit.pdf.

This practical guide is designed to help adult and youth staff at youth development and civic engagement organizations to assess evaluation needs, design evaluations to fit organizational goals, and use data to report to funders and other community stakeholders. It includes practical case studies from community organizations, interactive activities, and step-by-step instructions.

Health

- Bloom, S.S. (2008). *Violence Against Women and Girls: A Compendium of Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA: MEASURE Evaluation, Carolina Population Center, U of North Carolina. Available at <http://www.cpc.unc.edu/measure/publications/pdf/ms-08-30.pdf>.

This compendium is written for program managers, organizations, and policy-makers who are working to address violence against women and girls at the individual, community, district/provincial and national levels in developing countries.

- Family Health International (FHI). (2004). *Monitoring HIV/AIDS Programs: A Facilitator's Training Guide*. Washington, DC: FHI. Available at <http://www.fhi.org/en/HIVAIDS/pub/guide/meprogramguide.htm>.

This resource includes ten modules designed to build monitoring and evaluation skills for HIV/AIDS programming. Each module includes a facilitator's guide and a participant's guide. The training is based on adult learning theory and includes lectures, discussions, small group work, and interactive exercises. The course was produced by the IMPACT Project, managed by FHI for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

- Pact Brasil. (2006). *Oficinas de Monitoramento e Avaliação*. São Paulo, Brazil: Pact Brasil. Available at <http://www.pactbrasil.org/pagina34.html>.

This Portuguese-language monitoring and evaluation guide, intended for service organizations, includes definitions, case studies, and sample evaluation forms in the area of HIV/AIDS. Available in Spanish (*Guía de Monitoreo y Evaluación*) at http://www.impactalliance.org/ev_es.php?ID=14432_201&ID2=DO_TOPIC

Education

- UNICEF. (2009). *Child-Friendly School Manual*. New York: UNICEF. Available at http://www.unicef.org/publications/index_49574.html. For the French version (*Manuel des écoles amies des enfants*): http://www.unicef.org/french/publications/index_49574.html. The Spanish version (*Manual para las escuelas amigas de la infancia*) is available at http://www.unicef.org/spanish/publications/index_49574.html.

This publication describes UNICEF's child-friendly school (CFS) model to advocate for and promote quality education for every girl and boy. Chapter 8 addresses evaluation and includes many practical examples and case studies from school-based evaluations around the world.

Leadership

- Faith and Service Technical Education Network (FASTEN). (No date). Youth Leadership Development Toolkit: Project Evaluation Tools. Available at <http://www.urbanministry.org/wiki/youth-leadership-development-toolkit>.

This webpage provides links to several sample evaluation forms for assessing youth leadership programs.

Livelihoods

- Chapa, D.R. (2008). *A Manual for the Participatory Self-Monitoring and Evaluation of Micro-Enterprise Development Programme Nepal*. Baluwatar, Nepal: Empowerment Centre. Available at http://www.medep.org.np/media.php?media_id=19.

This manual focuses on the evaluation of Nepal's Micro-Enterprise Development Programme, but its definitions and procedures are relevant for other microenterprise programs worldwide.

