

## WHO ARE THE QUESTIONMAKERS?

### Foreword

*"Who Are the Question-makers?: A Participatory Evaluation Handbook"* is the first in a new handbook series being launched by the UNDP Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning (OESP). This series aims to provide development practitioners with tools, examples, exercises and case studies that will help in translating plans into actions and theory into practice.

This handbook evolved from work undertaken during the past seven years in UNDP, first by the Central Evaluation Office (CEO) and in the past two years by OESP. Interest in participatory evaluation has deepened as UNDP has striven to improve interaction with and services delivered to end-users and beneficiaries, particularly at the grass-roots level. Work began in late 1989 with an occasional paper commissioned by CEO entitled "Participatory Evaluation: Questions and Issues" prepared by Kim Forss. This was followed by a research and pilot test phase during which three project evaluations were conducted along participatory lines.

While the original intention of undertaking these pilot exercises was to produce guidelines on participatory evaluation, as we gained more experience, we realized that participation is not a process that can be mandated from above or guided from the centre. In this realization, we in OESP travelled the same path as the authors of the World Bank *Source Book on Participations* who found that "the best way of learning about participation is to experience it directly. The second best way is by seeing what others have done in the name of participation, talking to them, and seeking their guidance".

The present handbook has been designed to capture OESP's learning on participation and share it with you in the hope that you will be motivated to try the best method (doing something yourself) through experiencing the second best method (reading about what others have done)! To achieve this, the handbook is divided into two distinct sections: the first provides an overview of participatory evaluation while the second includes a self-contained training module consisting of a case study that documents an attempt at participatory evaluation, warts and all. This case study

has been successfully used in training courses conducted for Junior Professional Officers during the past two years.

A few words of explanation will help you to understand why we chose the title "Who are the Question-makers?" As Michael Quinn Patton, one of the most eloquent and persuasive advocates for user-focused evaluation, puts it "Language matters. It simultaneously suggests possibilities and communicates boundaries." In this instance, the unfamiliar conjunction of "question maker" as distinct from the more usual "question asker" was chosen deliberately because it communicates a more active involvement of the stakeholder in the process of evaluation. A question-maker has more responsibility for seeking the answers than a more passive question-asker.

This handbook has been a collaborative effort by many people and we would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge their contributions: our thanks to Jennie Campos and Francoise Coupal, who helped to put the handbook together; to Kim Forss and Claus Rebien, who put the original case study together; and to the informal brainstorming and feedback group of Nurul Alam, Abdenour Benbouali, Janet Donnelly, Naheed Haq, Peter Hazelwood, Rosein Herweijer, Mala Liyanage, Rema Pai Nanda, Kaarina Valtasaari, Samir Wanmali and Rob Work. Carlos Lopes provided valuable insight and acted as a sounding board throughout the preparation of the handbook. Hearty thanks are due to the JPOs who participated in the induction course held in New York from late 1994 through 1996. The detailed feedback we received from these training sessions was of particular value to us in preparing section two. We would also like to acknowledge Barbara Brewka for her excellent editing work, enforcing rigour in the way we express ourselves, and Maureen Lynch for coordinating the design and layout stages of the publication. Finally, like all successful projects, this handbook had its champion. Chandi Kadirgamar's unstinting devotion to this initiative at every stage from conceptualization to publication is a clear manifestation of her commitment to fostering participatory practices in UNDP.

We hope this handbook proves worthy of its name and is frequently referred to, not only because it proves to be a useful resource but also because it is enjoyable reading. We see this as the first version of many and would therefore look forward to hearing your ideas and

suggestions on how it can be improved. Your input in expanding the annex on resource persons, groups and institutions who have experience in participation would be particularly appreciated.

Sharon Capeling-Alakija

Director

Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning

## Introduction:

Experience has shown that participation improves the quality, effectiveness and sustainability of development actions. By placing people at the centre of such actions, development efforts have a much greater potential to empower and to lead to ownership of the results.

The UNDP Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning (OESP) has been assessing the value and role of participation as part of its broader effort to redefine the function and role of evaluation within the organization. During this process, OESP has had to address several key questions, including:

- How can evaluation be a tool for development?
- How can evaluation build local capacity and contribute to a learning culture?
- How can evaluation contribute to the achievement of sustainable human development (SHD)?
- What is the value added of more responsive evaluation methods and would such methods require a change in attitudes and skills by UNDP staff?

In its search for answers to these questions, OESP has been experimenting with initiatives that involve greater participation of programme stakeholders and beneficiaries. Commonly referred to as "participatory evaluations", these experiments challenge the traditional way in which development is viewed and carried out.

While to some people, the participatory approach may represent a radical departure from past practices, others see it as a logical step in the evolution of development thinking and methods. For example, UNDP policies to promote decentralization, national execution of programmes and partnerships have all sought to transfer ownership to its partners in programme countries. Further decentralization is taking place within developing countries. Grass-roots efforts, bottom-up approaches, initiatives that empower are all focusing attention on the poor and disenfranchised, whose opinions and participation are increasingly being sought.

The growing interest in participatory evaluation parallels the growth of such concepts as empowerment, democratization, partnership and sustainability. Each of these concepts attempts in one way or another to give a greater say to the spectrum of voices in our programming countries not only to national governments but also to civil society, communities and municipalities, the poor and the disenfranchised who have been the object of development cooperation and whose voices have not been adequately heard.

## Purpose of the Handbook

In view of the growing importance that is being attributed to participation, this handbook has been prepared to:

- provide UNDP staff with a better understanding of what is meant by a participatory approach to evaluation and how they can support the participatory evaluation process;
- help to introduce participatory evaluations into UNDP programming, thereby enabling the multitude of stakeholders that are central to UNDP development efforts—the poor, local communities, Governments—to have a much stronger voice through development efforts that are more responsive to their needs and that contribute to capacity-building at the local and national levels;
- strengthen the learning and management culture of UNDP.

## Audience

The principal users of the handbook, which has been designed primarily for UNDP staff, include:

- Resident Representatives and Deputy Resident Representatives, who oversee the country programmes and make critical decisions about the allocation of resources, which programmes and projects will be evaluated and the approach to be used;
- National and International programme staff and Junior Professional Officers (JPOs), who are directly responsible for the day-to-day management of projects and who appraise, review or evaluate development activities and need assistance in designing field missions and preparing terms of reference (TOR).

UNDP staff may also want to share this handbook with colleagues who are interested in applying participatory evaluation techniques to their projects. Thus, it will also be useful for Government counterparts, project leaders and consultants who need to have a better understanding of how a participatory evaluation works and how it fits into UNDP programming.

## Organization of the Handbook

This volume provides the information needed, and helps to develop the sensitivity and skills required, to support evaluations that place greater emphasis on stakeholder participation in the evaluation process. It is divided into five parts.

Parts one to four, which present an overview of the participatory evaluation approach, include:

- a brief description of the evolution of the participatory approach;
- a comparison of participatory evaluation with more conventional evaluation approaches;
- a discussion of the role of participation in UNDP;
- a description of the framework of a participatory evaluation and a discussion of some of the practical issues involved in doing such an evaluation.

Part five consists of a stand-alone package developed around the case study MONEY AND MAMBAS. It describes an attempt at undertaking a participatory evaluation of a rural water supply and sanitation project and focuses on the practical aspects of applying participatory evaluation techniques:

- Pre-planning, including negotiation of the TOR, assessing the participatory evaluation context and identifying enabling and inhibiting factors surrounding that context;
- Collaborative planning with stakeholders;
- Data-gathering and analysis;
- Reflection and follow-up.

This case study is presented as a training module which can be the subject of a mini-workshop to introduce staff to the practice of participatory evaluation. We suggest that this exercise can be accomplished within 3 to 4 hours.

A glossary of basic terms, examples of some of the basic tools that can be used in participatory evaluations as well as lists of manuals and resource persons, groups and institutions are presented in the annexes.

## Introduction:

Experience has shown that participation improves the quality, effectiveness and sustainability of development actions. By placing people at the centre of such actions, development efforts have a much greater potential to empower and to lead to ownership of the results.

The UNDP Office of Evaluation and Strategic Planning (OESP) has been assessing the value and role of participation as part of its broader effort to redefine the function and role of evaluation within the organization. During this process, OESP has had to address several key questions, including:

- How can evaluation be a tool for development?
- How can evaluation build local capacity and contribute to a learning culture?
- How can evaluation contribute to the achievement of sustainable human development (SHD)?
- What is the value added of more responsive evaluation methods and would such methods require a change in attitudes and skills by UNDP staff?

In its search for answers to these questions, OESP has been experimenting with initiatives that involve greater participation of programme stakeholders and beneficiaries. Commonly referred to as "participatory evaluations", these experiments challenge the traditional way in which development is viewed and carried out.

While to some people, the participatory approach may represent a radical departure from past practices, others see it as a logical step in the evolution of development thinking and methods. For example, UNDP policies to promote decentralization, national execution of programmes and partnerships have all sought to transfer ownership to its partners in programme countries. Further decentralization is taking place within developing countries. Grass-roots efforts, bottom-up approaches, initiatives that empower are all focusing attention on the poor and disenfranchised, whose opinions and participation are increasingly being sought.

The growing interest in participatory evaluation parallels the growth of such concepts as empowerment, democratization, partnership and sustainability. Each of these concepts attempts in one way or another to give a greater say to the spectrum of voices in our programming countries not only to national governments but also to civil society, communities and municipalities, the poor and the disenfranchised who have been the object of development cooperation and whose voices have not been adequately heard.

## Purpose of the Handbook

In view of the growing importance that is being attributed to participation, this handbook has been prepared to:

- provide UNDP staff with a better understanding of what is meant by a participatory approach to evaluation and how they can support the participatory evaluation process;
- help to introduce participatory evaluations into UNDP programming, thereby enabling the multitude of stakeholders that are central to UNDP development efforts the poor, local communities, Governments to have a much stronger voice through development efforts that are more responsive to their needs and that contribute to capacity-building at the local and national levels;
- strengthen the learning and management culture of UNDP.

## Audience

The principal users of the handbook, which has been designed primarily for UNDP staff, include:

- Resident Representatives and Deputy Resident Representatives, who oversee the country programmes and make critical decisions about the allocation of resources, which programmes and projects will be evaluated and the approach to be used;
- National and International programme staff and Junior Professional Officers (JPOs), who are directly responsible for the day-to-day management of projects and who appraise, review or evaluate development activities and need assistance in designing field missions and preparing terms of reference (TOR).

UNDP staff may also want to share this handbook with colleagues who are interested in applying participatory evaluation techniques to their projects. Thus, it will also be useful for Government counterparts, project leaders and consultants who need to have a better understanding of how a participatory evaluation works and how it fits into UNDP programming.

## Organization of the Handbook

This volume provides the information needed, and helps to develop the sensitivity and skills required, to support evaluations that place greater emphasis on stakeholder participation in the evaluation process. It is divided into five parts.

Parts one to four, which present an overview of the participatory evaluation approach, include:

- a brief description of the evolution of the participatory approach;
- a comparison of participatory evaluation with more conventional evaluation approaches;
- a discussion of the role of participation in UNDP;
- a description of the framework of a participatory evaluation and a discussion of some of the practical issues involved in doing such an evaluation.

Part five consists of a stand-alone package developed around the case study MONEY AND MAMBAS. It describes an attempt at undertaking a participatory evaluation of a rural water supply and sanitation project and focuses on the practical aspects of applying participatory evaluation techniques:

- Pre-planning, including negotiation of the TOR, assessing the participatory evaluation context and identifying enabling and inhibiting factors surrounding that context;
- Collaborative planning with stakeholders;
- Data-gathering and analysis;
- Reflection and follow-up.

This case study is presented as a training module which can be the subject of a mini-workshop to introduce staff to the practice of participatory evaluation. We suggest that this exercise can be accomplished within 3 to 4 hours.

A glossary of basic terms, examples of some of the basic tools that can be used in participatory evaluations as well as lists of manuals and resource persons, groups and institutions are presented in the annexes.

## Part One:

### Participatory Evaluation: An Overview

#### **Evolution of the Participatory Approach**

The emergence of what has become known as the participatory evaluation approach reflects much wider experimentation in development that has been taking place in various parts of the world since the 1970s. It has primarily involved development practitioners and social researchers in a wide variety of fields, e.g., adult education, sociology, rural development, agriculture and applied research. Only now has it entered the policy-making spheres of large development agencies.

What is increasingly being called participatory development began for some with the critical analysis of society and the inequities it generates, leaving the poor voiceless and dominated. For others, participatory development is less ideological or philosophical: it started with the exploration of more responsive techniques and approaches at the grass-roots level, involving the poor, project stakeholders and beneficiaries. For those involved specifically with evaluation, there has been a growing dissatisfaction with conventional modes of assessment that claim to be scientifically neutral and unbiased yet have had very little impact on how development activities are carried out.

The following pioneers or schools of thought have contributed to the emerging field of participatory development and, more specifically, to participatory evaluation.

#### **Participatory Action Research**

Participatory action research (PAR) has its origins in the work of social scientists from developing countries who have been experimenting with PAR over the past 20 years. Influenced by such authors as Paulo Freire, Orlando Fals-Borda and Mohammad Anisur Rahman, the "basic ideology of PAR is that self-conscious people, those who are currently poor and oppressed, will progressively transform their environment by their own praxis. In this process others may play a catalytic and supportive role but will not



dominate" (Fals-Borda, 1991:13). Along similar lines, Paulo Freire, in his book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, outlines an educational philosophy that actively involves the poor in critically analysing their social situation, thus creating the potential for them to transform their environment. Once considered radical, the work of these authors is gaining increasing prominence and is credited with critically challenging mainstream thinking and influencing the development of participatory development.

### **Rapid Rural Appraisal and Participatory Learning and Action**

Rapid rural appraisal (RRA) first emerged in the late 1970s, spearheaded by Robert Chambers at the University of Sussex, England, in response to lengthy assessment methods used in development. RRA enables donors to seek information and insight quickly from local people about local conditions. Over time, RRA sought to be less extractive and more participatory in the collection of information by involving local people in data-gathering and analysis through the use of popular education methods, such as mapping; transect walks; scoring and ranking with seeds, stones or sticks; and institutional diagramming. As the emphasis shifted from collecting data quickly to the involvement of end-users and learning from the experience, RRA became known as participatory learning and action (PLA). PLA activities have been undertaken in over 130 countries by development practitioners, NGOs and donors.

### **Farming Systems Research**

Research in this field emerged in the 1970s, mainly in response to concerns about the skewed benefits of the Green Revolution. In contrast to research station experiments, which were difficult to replicate in the field, systems research supported farmer-managed trials in which rural people selected alternatives for experimentation and implementation. It recognized the breadth of knowledge farmers had of their own interrelated systems of production and livelihood and supported experiments conducted by the farmers.

### **Self-Evaluation and Beneficiary Assessments**

The term "self-evaluation" is most often used to describe a process of permanent, internal evaluation involving staff at all levels or beneficiaries with a view to generating information that can inform decision-making. NGOs, such as World Neighbors, academics and donors have been experimenting with the concepts of self-evaluation and beneficiary assessment. As a result of its experiences with beneficiary assessments, the

World Bank views them as essential to building programmes that are responsive and relevant to recipients of Bank loans, providing Bank managers with the tools to improve the quality of development operations.

As mentioned previously, all of these approaches and schools of thought have influenced the emerging field of participatory development.

## Part One:

# Participatory Evaluation: An Overview

### **Evolution of the Participatory Approach**

The emergence of what has become known as the participatory evaluation approach reflects much wider experimentation in development that has been taking place in various parts of the world since the 1970s. It has primarily involved development practitioners and social researchers in a wide variety of fields, e.g., adult education, sociology, rural development, agriculture and applied research. Only now has it entered the policy-making spheres of large development agencies.

What is increasingly being called participatory development began for some with the critical analysis of society and the inequities it generates, leaving the poor voiceless and dominated. For others, participatory development is less ideological or philosophical: it started with the exploration of more responsive techniques and approaches at the grass-roots level, involving the poor, project stakeholders and beneficiaries. For those involved specifically with evaluation, there has been a growing dissatisfaction with conventional modes of assessment that claim to be scientifically neutral and unbiased yet have had very little impact on how development activities are carried out.

The following pioneers or schools of thought have contributed to the emerging field of participatory development and, more specifically, to participatory evaluation.

### **Participatory Action Research**

Participatory action research (PAR) has its origins in the work of social scientists from developing countries who have been experimenting with PAR over the past 20 years. Influenced by such authors as Paulo Freire, Orlando Fals-Borda and Mohammad Anisur Rahman, the "basic ideology of PAR is that self-conscious people, those who are currently poor and oppressed, will progressively transform their environment by their own praxis. In this process others may play a catalytic and supportive role but will not dominate" (Fals-Borda, 1991:13). Along similar lines, Paulo Freire, in his book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, outlines an educational philosophy that actively involves the poor in critically analysing their social situation, thus creating the potential for them to transform their environment. Once considered radical, the work of these authors is gaining increasing prominence and is credited with critically challenging mainstream thinking and influencing the development of participatory development.

## **Rapid Rural Appraisal and Participatory Learning and Action**

Rapid rural appraisal (RRA) first emerged in the late 1970s, spearheaded by Robert Chambers at the University of Sussex, England, in response to lengthy assessment methods used in development. RRA enables donors to seek information and insight quickly from local people about local conditions. Over time, RRA sought to be less extractive and more participatory in the collection of information by involving local people in data-gathering and analysis through the use of popular education methods, such as mapping; transect walks; scoring and ranking with seeds, stones or sticks; and institutional diagramming. As the emphasis shifted from collecting data quickly to the involvement of end-users and learning from the experience, RRA became known as participatory learning and action (PLA). PLA activities have been undertaken in over 130 countries by development practitioners, NGOs and donors.

## **Farming Systems Research**

Research in this field emerged in the 1970s, mainly in response to concerns about the skewed benefits of the Green Revolution. In contrast to research station experiments, which were difficult to replicate in the field, systems research supported farmer-managed trials in which rural people selected alternatives for experimentation and implementation. It recognized the breadth of knowledge farmers had of their own interrelated systems of production and livelihood and supported experiments conducted by the farmers.

*When PLA is well done, "local people, and especially the poorer, enjoy the creative learning that comes from presenting their knowledge and their reality. They say they see things differently. It is not just that they share knowledge with outsiders. They themselves learn more than anyone knew alone. The process is then empowering, enabling them to analyze their world, and can lead into their planning and action. It is not the reality of the outsider which is transferred and imposed but theirs which is expressed, shared and strengthened. In this final reversal, it is more the reality of local people than that of outsider professionals that counts".*

*Robert Chambers, 1994*

## **Self-Evaluation and Beneficiary Assessments**

The term "self-evaluation" is most often used to describe a process of permanent, internal evaluation involving staff at all levels or beneficiaries with a view to generating information that can inform decision-making. NGOs, such as World Neighbors, academics and donors have been experimenting with the concepts of self-evaluation and beneficiary assessment. As a result of its experiences with beneficiary assessments, the World Bank views them as essential to building programmes that are responsive and relevant to recipients of Bank loans, providing Bank managers with the tools to improve the quality of development operations.

As mentioned previously, all of these approaches and schools of thought have influenced the emerging field of participatory development.

# Participatory Evaluation

Participatory evaluation, a dimension of participatory development embodying many of the same concepts, involves the stakeholders and beneficiaries of a programme or project in the collective examination and assessment of that programme or project. It is people centred: project stakeholders and beneficiaries are the key actors of the evaluation process and not the mere objects of the evaluation.

Participatory evaluation is reflective, action-oriented and seeks to build capacity by:

- ?providing stakeholders and beneficiaries with the opportunity to reflect ?on a project's progress and obstacles;
- ?generating knowledge that results in the application of lessons learned ?and leads to corrective action and/or improvements;
- ?providing beneficiaries and stakeholders with the tools to transform their environment.

## Functions of Participatory Evaluation

Participatory evaluation thus serves four key functions, some of which concern the stakeholders and beneficiaries while others relate to the funding agencies.

- **It helps to build the capacity of stakeholders to reflect, analyse and take ?action.** While such analysis should occur throughout the life of a project, ?it is never too late to involve project recipients in evaluations at mid-term or even at the end of a project. UNDP staff may also witness their ?own growth and enrichment through their involvement in the evaluation process.
- **It contributes to the development of lessons learned that can lead to ?corrective action or improvements by project recipients.** When project ?stakeholders are involved in analysing problems, constraints and ?obstacles, they can often propose solutions. Their sense of ownership of ?the process, of final recommendations and of action plans makes them ?much more likely to introduce necessary changes.

- It provides feedback for lessons learned that can help programme staff ?to improve programme implementation. A participatory evaluation not ?only looks into the past but also guides projects into the future.
- **It helps to ensure accountability to stake-holders, managers and donors ?by furnishing information on the degree to which project objectives ?have been met and how resources have been used.** Answers to these

?questions will help programme managers make critical decisions about  
?continuing or terminating a project's funding.

The focus on lessons learned is an essential dimension of participatory evaluations. Such evaluations should help to guide projects into the future by giving stakeholders the tools with which to take corrective action. In addition, lessons learned should provide donors with the insight and tools to improve programme delivery and management

### **Differences between Participatory and More Conventional Evaluations**

Participatory evaluations differ from more conventional evaluations in several critical ways. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate some of these differences.

As shown in Figure 1, conventional evaluations have been more donor focused and donor driven. The donor is the key client, providing financial support and defining the TOR for the evaluation. Participation of project stakeholders in the definition of the TOR is minimal. More often than not, the evaluation is carried out more to fulfil a management or accountability requirement than to respond to project needs. An outside expert or evaluator is hired to conduct the evaluation.

The evaluator collects the data, reviews the project or programme and prepares a report. In most cases, stakeholders or beneficiaries play a passive role, providing information but not participating in the evaluation itself. The process can be considered more linear, with little or no feedback to the project.

In a participatory evaluation, the role and purpose of the evaluation change dramatically. Such an evaluation places as much (if not more) emphasis on the process as on the final output, i.e., the report. The purpose of the evaluation is not only to fulfil a bureaucratic requirement but also to develop the capacity of stakeholders to assess their environment and take action.

Stakeholders and beneficiaries do more than provide information. They also decide on the TOR, conduct research, analyse findings and make recommendations. The **evaluator** in conventional evaluations becomes more of a **facilitator** in participatory evaluations, animating workshops, guiding the process at critical junctures and consolidating the final report, if necessary, based on the findings of the stakeholders. The process is much more circular, as shown in Figure 2.

Participatory evaluations also call into question the notions that only scientific inquiry provides valid information and that outside experts or those independent of the project or programme somehow hold the ultimate truth. Participatory evaluations recognize the wide range of knowledge, values and concerns of stakeholders and acknowledge that these should be the litmus test to assess and then guide a project's performance.

While the participatory approach to evaluation poses its own challenges, it has the capacity to empower recipients. The active participation of stakeholders can result in new knowledge or a better understanding of their environment. It is this new knowledge and understanding that can enable them to make changes they themselves have discovered or advocated. Stakeholders feel a sense of ownership of the results which does not come from an outsider or a donor.

#### LEVELS OF END-USER PARTICIPATION IN EVALUATION

| Dimensions of evaluation/Levels of participation | Low   | Medium  | High  |
|--|---|---|---|
| Evaluation initiator                             | Commissioned or obligatory evaluation typically part of programme development. Meets institutional needs. Evaluation done to, on or about people. | External evaluator invites end-users to assist in one or more evaluation task(s).   | Evaluation in which end-users collaborate with external facilitator or among themselves to assess, review and critically reflect on strategies formulated for them. |
| Purpose  | Justify or continue funding. Ensure accountability. Levels of funding or sustained support.   | Gain insights into development activity from end-users' perspective. Shift focus from institutional concerns to end-user needs and interests. | Promote self-sufficiency and sustainability by linking end-users to evaluation planning cycle. Develop relevant, effective programme decision-making                |

|                                       |  |   |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
|                                       |  |   | based on end-user views, opinions, recommendations. Increase ownership in & responsibility for success-failure of development interventions.   |
| Questions-maker(s) ?                  | Agency heads, administrators, outside clientele, persons distances from evaluation site.   | End-users with external evaluator at various stages of evaluation generally determined by the evaluator.  | End-users, external facilitator, persons most affected by development intervention.  |
| 5 Method(s)                           | Established research designs, statistical analyses, reliance on various quantitative methods. Product (findings) oriented (mathematical in nature). Dominated by math whiz kids.                   | Qualitative methods favored but also includes quantitative methods. Values a process focussed on open-ended inquiries. Uses methods that give voice to voiceless. | Relies on highly interactive qualitative methods but does not disregard quantitative tools. "The process is the product". Inventiveness and creativity encouraged to adapt the methods to the context being evaluated. |
| Evaluator's versus Facilitator's Role | Evaluator takes lead in designing evaluation. Formulates questions/survey forms with no input from those evaluated. Steers overcome by setting design. Assumes objective, neutral, distant stance. | Evaluator works collaboratively at various stages with end-users. Is partner in evaluation and imparts evaluation skills. Shares lead with end-users.             | Evaluator becomes more of a facilitator. Facilitator acts as catalyst, confidante, collaborator. Takes lead from end-users. Has few if any pre-determined questions.   |
| Impact/Outcome                        | Reports, publications  | Shared data-gathering but   | End-user more capable of   |



|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
|  | circulated in house. Findings rarely circulated among end-users. Findings loop into planning stage with little input from end-users. | limited participation in data analysis. End-user views loop into planning stage. Increased understanding of end-user experiences. | meaningful decision-making based on effective involvement in evaluation. Findings become property of end-users or community. Participation in analysis is critical. |
|--|--|---|---|

The purpose, methods, role of the evaluator and impact of the evaluation will vary considerably depending on the type of evaluation and the level of participation of donors, stakeholders and beneficiaries, as shown in the following table. In evaluations with a high degree of participation by stakeholders and beneficiaries, for example, the stakeholders rather than the donors become the question-makers and the evaluations are driven by the stakeholders and recipients.

### **Rationale for a Participatory Approach to Evaluation**

All too often conventional evaluation reports sit on shelves or desks and have little or no impact on project beneficiaries or development practice either in the field or at headquarters. This can be attributed in part to a lack of input or feedback from those whose lives are affected by a programme or project, who have their own perceptions of what they need and how things should be done, yet who have little or no opportunity to make their views known.

Participatory evaluations breathe life into more conventional evaluation approaches by involving project stakeholders in all aspects of the evaluation: designing the TOR, collecting and analysing data, formulating recommendations and making changes in the implementation of a project's activities. In addition, supplementing more formal methods of inquiry, such as standard questionnaires or one-on-one interviews, with nonformal techniques can yield richer information than the use of only formal methods. As a result of the active involvement of stakeholders in reflection, assessment and action, a sense of ownership is created, capacities are built, beneficiaries are empowered and lessons learned are applied both in the field and at the programme level, increasing effectiveness. There is growing evidence that sound, sustainable development requires their participation throughout the development process in project planning, decision-making, implementation and evaluation.

# Participatory Evaluation

Participatory evaluation, a dimension of participatory development embodying many of the same concepts, involves the stakeholders and beneficiaries of a programme or project in the collective examination and assessment of that programme or project. It is people centred: project stakeholders and beneficiaries are the key actors of the evaluation process and not the mere objects of the evaluation.

*Participatory evaluation is people-centred: project stakeholders and beneficiaries are the key actors of the evaluation process and not the mere objects of the evaluation.*

Participatory evaluation is reflective, action-oriented and seeks to build capacity by:

- ?providing stakeholders and beneficiaries with the opportunity to reflect ?on a project's progress and obstacles;
- ?generating knowledge that results in the application of lessons learned ?and leads to corrective action and/or improvements;
- ?providing beneficiaries and stakeholders with the tools to transform their environment.

## Functions of Participatory Evaluation

Participatory evaluation thus serves four key functions, some of which concern the stakeholders and beneficiaries while others relate to the funding agencies.

- **It helps to build the capacity of stakeholders to reflect, analyse and take ?action.** While such analysis should occur throughout the life of a project, ?it is never too late to involve project recipients in evaluations at mid-term or even at the end of a project. UNDP staff may also witness their ?own growth and enrichment through their involvement in the evaluation process.
- **It contributes to the development of lessons learned that can lead to ?corrective action or improvements by project recipients.** When project ?stakeholders are involved in analysing problems, constraints and ?obstacles, they can often propose solutions. Their sense of ownership of ?the process, of final recommendations and of action plans makes them ?much more likely to introduce necessary changes.

### ***First to Fourth Generation Evaluation***

*In their book, **Fourth Generation Evaluation**, the authors Guba and Lincoln present a new generation of evaluation that “moves beyond mere science—just getting the facts—to include the myriad human, political, social, cultural, and contextual elements that are involved”. They embrace a more qualitative approach to evaluation. The following summarizes the various generations of evaluation described by the authors:*

*First-generation evaluation emerged in the 1900s and can be characterized as measurement-oriented, associated with the scientific management movement in business and industry. Tests were commonly used to measure the progress of students in schools or time and motion studies were carried out to determine the most productive methods of working. The role of the evaluator was technical, providing tools or instruments for measurement.*

*The second generation concentrated more on description and led to programme evaluations. Going beyond measurements, it focused more on the achievement of objectives and analysis of strengths and weaknesses. The role of evaluator went beyond the technical to include that of describer.*

*Third-generation evaluation was characterized by efforts to include judgement as an integral part of evaluation. Thus, evaluators also became judges.*

*Fourth-generation evaluation refers to the most recent evolution in evaluation practice and involves negotiation. Pointing out “that to approach evaluation scientifically is to miss completely its fundamentally social, political and value-oriented character”, it incorporates stakeholders more centrally into the evaluation process by taking into account their “claims, concerns and issues”. The evaluator becomes an orchestrator of the negotiation process with stakeholders who participate in designing, implementing and interpreting the evaluation. Stakeholders are not viewed as subjects of experiments or objects of study but rather as participants in the evaluation process.*

***Project recipients and stakeholders should be involved in understanding the internal dynamics of their project, its successes and failures, and in proposing solutions for overcoming obstacles.***

- It provides feedback for lessons learned that can help programme staff ?to improve programme implementation. A participatory evaluation not ?only looks into the past but also guides projects into the future.
- **It helps to ensure accountability to stake-holders, managers and donors ?by furnishing information on the degree to which project objectives ?have been met and how resources have been used.** Answers to these

?questions will help programme managers make critical decisions about  
?continuing or terminating a project's funding.

The focus on lessons learned is an essential dimension of participatory evaluations. Such evaluations should help to guide projects into the future by giving stakeholders the tools with which to take corrective action. In addition, lessons learned should provide donors with the insight and tools to improve programme delivery and management

### **Differences between Participatory and More Conventional Evaluations**

Participatory evaluations differ from more conventional evaluations in several critical ways. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate some of these differences.

As shown in Figure 1, conventional evaluations have been more donor focused and donor driven. The donor is the key client, providing financial support and defining the TOR for the evaluation. Participation of project stakeholders in the definition of the TOR is minimal. More often than not, the evaluation is carried out more to fulfil a management or accountability requirement than to respond to project needs. An outside expert or evaluator is hired to conduct the evaluation.

The evaluator collects the data, reviews the project or programme and prepares a report. In most cases, stakeholders or beneficiaries play a passive role, providing information but not participating in the evaluation itself. The process can be considered more linear, with little or no feedback to the project.

In a participatory evaluation, the role and purpose of the evaluation change dramatically. Such an evaluation places as much (if not more) emphasis on the process as on the final output, i.e., the report. The purpose of the evaluation is not only to fulfil a bureaucratic requirement but also to develop the capacity of stakeholders to assess their environment and take action.

Stakeholders and beneficiaries do more than provide information. They also decide on the TOR, conduct research, analyse findings and make recommendations. The **evaluator** in conventional evaluations becomes more of a **facilitator** in participatory evaluations, animating workshops, guiding the process at critical junctures and consolidating the final report, if necessary, based on the findings of the stakeholders. The process is much more circular, as shown in Figure 2.

Participatory evaluations also call into question the notions that only scientific inquiry provides valid information and that outside experts or those independent of the project or programme somehow hold the ultimate truth. Participatory evaluations recognize the wide range of knowledge, values and concerns of stakeholders and acknowledge that these should be the litmus test to assess and then guide a project's performance.

### *Key Characteristics of a Participatory Evaluation*

- *draws on local resources and capacities;*
- *recognizes the innate wisdom and knowledge of end-users;*
- *demonstrates that end-users are creative and knowledgeable about their environment;*
- *ensures that stakeholders are part of the decision-making process;*
- *uses facilitators who act as catalysts and who assist stakeholders in asking key questions.*

While the participatory approach to evaluation poses its own challenges, it has the capacity to empower recipients. The active participation of stakeholders can result in new knowledge or a better understanding of their environment. It is this new knowledge and understanding that can enable them to make changes they themselves have discovered or advocated. Stakeholders feel a sense of ownership of the results which does not come from an outsider or a donor.

### LEVELS OF END-USER PARTICIPATION IN EVALUATION

| Dimensions of evaluation/Levels of participation | Low   | Medium  | High  |
|--|---|---|---|
| Evaluation initiator                             | Commissioned or obligatory evaluation typically part of programme development. Meets institutional needs. Evaluation done to, on or about people. | External evaluator invites end-users to assist in one or more evaluation task(s).   | Evaluation in which end-users collaborate with external facilitator or among themselves to assess, review and critically reflect on strategies formulated for them. |
| Purpose  | Justify or continue funding. Ensure accountability. Levels of funding or sustained support.   | Gain insights into development activity from end-users' perspective. Shift focus from institutional concerns to end-user needs and interests. | Promote self-sufficiency and sustainability by linking end-users to evaluation planning cycle. Develop relevant, effective programme decision-making                |

|                                       |  |   |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
|                                       |  |   | based on end-user views, opinions, recommendations. Increase ownership in & responsibility for success-failure of development interventions.   |
| Questions-maker(s) ?                  | Agency heads, administrators, outside clientele, persons distances from evaluation site.   | End-users with external evaluator at various stages of evaluation generally determined by the evaluator.  | End-users, external facilitator, persons most affected by development intervention.  |
| 5 Method(s)                           | Established research designs, statistical analyses, reliance on various quantitative methods. Product (findings) oriented (mathematical in nature). Dominated by math whiz kids.                   | Qualitative methods favored but also includes quantitative methods. Values a process focussed on open-ended inquiries. Uses methods that give voice to voiceless. | Relies on highly interactive qualitative methods but does not disregard quantitative tools. "The process is the product". Inventiveness and creativity encouraged to adapt the methods to the context being evaluated. |
| Evaluator's versus Facilitator's Role | Evaluator takes lead in designing evaluation. Formulates questions/survey forms with no input from those evaluated. Steers overcome by setting design. Assumes objective, neutral, distant stance. | Evaluator works collaboratively at various stages with end-users. Is partner in evaluation and imparts evaluation skills. Shares lead with end-users.             | Evaluator becomes more of a facilitator. Facilitator acts as catalyst, confidante, collaborator. Takes lead from end-users. Has few if any pre-determined questions.   |
| Impact/Outcome                        | Reports, publications  | Shared data-gathering but   | End-user more capable of   |

|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
|  | circulated in house. Findings rarely circulated among end-users. Findings loop into planning stage with little input from end-users. | limited participation in data analysis. End-user views loop into planning stage. Increased understanding of end-user experiences. | meaningful decision-making based on effective involvement in evaluation. Findings become property of end-users or community. Participation in analysis is critical. |
|--|--|---|---|

The purpose, methods, role of the evaluator and impact of the evaluation will vary considerably depending on the type of evaluation and the level of participation of donors, stakeholders and beneficiaries, as shown in the following table. In evaluations with a high degree of participation by stakeholders and beneficiaries, for example, the stakeholders rather than the donors become the question-makers and the evaluations are driven by the stakeholders and recipients.

*The question-makers in participatory evaluations are the stakeholders.*

### **Rationale for a Participatory Approach to Evaluation**

All too often conventional evaluation reports sit on shelves or desks and have little or no impact on project beneficiaries or development practice either in the field or at headquarters. This can be attributed in part to a lack of input or feedback from those whose lives are affected by a programme or project, who have their own perceptions of what they need and how things should be done, yet who have little or no opportunity to make their views known.

*Emphasis is placed on the beneficiaries and stakeholders not as providers of information but as active participants in the evaluation process.*

Participatory evaluations breathe life into more conventional evaluation approaches by involving project stakeholders in all aspects of the evaluation: designing the TOR, collecting and analysing data, formulating recommendations and making changes in the implementation of a project's activities. In addition, supplementing more formal methods of inquiry, such as standard questionnaires or one-on-one interviews, with nonformal techniques can yield richer information than the use of only formal methods. As a result of the active involvement of stakeholders in reflection, assessment and action, a sense of ownership is created, capacities are built, beneficiaries are empowered and lessons learned are applied both in the field and at the programme level, increasing effectiveness. There is growing evidence that sound, sustainable development requires their participation throughout the development process in project planning, decision-making, implementation and evaluation.

