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Preface

This important ECDG Guide to Evaluation Capacity Development integrates two major evaluation trends of the last decade: increased attention to capacity as a critical foundation for useful evaluation and systems thinking as a framework for understanding the dynamics of evaluation use. As the Guide makes clear, developing capacity through the lens of systems thinking begins with in-depth situation analysis. In utilization-focused evaluation, such in-depth situation analysis is essential for building readiness for evaluation and ensuring that the evaluation approach taken is appropriately matched to the situation.

The importance of building a strong foundation of readiness for evaluation is supported by four decades of research on factors related to and supportive of evaluation use. This Guide draws on and applies that research. Thus, the knowledge that research on evaluation has generated about how to enhance use points directly to the importance of developing and supporting evaluation capacity. Use doesn’t happen naturally, easily, or just because of good intentions. Use occurs when the foundation for use has been appropriately cultivated through capacity development.

Usefulness is one of the Principles identified in the IWA that is deemed to be necessary and sufficient for sound and fair ECD interventions. The other three Principles are ownership, relevance and integration (see Annex 1). These Principles provide the philosophical underpinning for the framework contained in the Guide.

The Principles and Framework, taken together, apply to a broad range of activities and processes that help create, strengthen, and sustain evaluation for individuals, teams, groups, networks, organizations, communities, sectors, countries and regions.

Such activities and processes may include training, mentoring, coaching, learning by doing, technical assistance, sharing practice guidelines, developing organizational policies and infrastructure, supporting communities of practice, preparing legislation, and promoting a favorable political environment to sustain evaluation.

Michael Quinn Patton, Director

*Utilization-Focused Evaluation*

---

2 [http://www.ecdg.net/partnerships-3/iwa-on-eval-cap-dev/iwa-on-ecd/]
Introduction

The international development community has been doing evaluation capacity development (ECD) for years with limited success\(^3\). ECDG believes that the limited success is due to the manner in which evaluation capacity development has been conceptualized.

Hierarchically Structured System

Conventional wisdom is that there is a hierarchical ECD system composed of three levels: individual, organizational and national. The image below depicts this conceptual framework.

The problem that ECDG has with the conceptual framework depicted below is that it is static. It shows the structure very well. HOWEVER, it gives no indication of the manner in which the three levels interact—the interconnections, if you will.

Does evaluation capacity development (ECD) at the individual level roll-up to the organizational level, and from there, to the country level? Or does ECD trickle down from the country level, through the organizational level, to the individual level? Both? Neither? If neither, then what?

---

**Methodological Fragmentation**

Furthermore, ECDG believes that some evaluation professionals focus on one level, to the exclusion of others, leading to a state of methodological fragmentation. Those who focus on the individual level believe that evaluation capacity is developed by providing workshops and seminars that enhance knowledge, skills and attitudes.

Those who focus on the organizational level believe that evaluation capacity is developed by facilitating changes in organizational design and culture that enable the achievement of a shared vision for evaluation. This was formerly the approach espoused by the Evaluation Capacity Development Group.

Those who focus on the national level believe that evaluation capacity is developed by strengthening institutions of governance to be more accountable, responsive, transparent and efficient. The World Bank and UNDP are leading proponents of this approach.

The profession has yet to find a way to mix methods in a way that will create synergies among the various levels. The confusion in the theory and practice of evaluation capacity development has precluded the international evaluation community from coming to agreement and allocating sufficient resources to address the issue properly.

**ECDG International Workshop**

In October 2011, ECDG, with funding from IDRC and GIZ, organized an international workshop to draft an agreement on ECD. The workshop brought ECD professionals together from all over the world to discuss and debate the issues. A set of ECD principles emerged from these discussions (see annex).

During the course of the workshop, a paradigm shift occurred for some participants. Some who were strong believers in a hierarchical system of ECD came to abandon it in favour of a new conceptual framework that began to emerge. It was a transformative experience for those participants.

The authors of the conceptual framework that is described in the IWA sought to apply some of the principles of Peter Checkland’s Soft Systems Methodology to the task of ECD. They encourage readers to view ECD situations in different ways, to work out some of the logical consequences of each perspective, and to compare them with the messiness of reality⁴.

---

This new conceptual framework, built upon the philosophical foundation of the IWA principles for ECD, is described in very general terms in the IWA\textsuperscript{5}. The purpose of this monograph is to operationalize some of the steps and to offer tools that would help readers carry out the ECD process.

\textsuperscript{5} International Workshop Agreement is available at: http://www.ecdg.net/partnerships-3/iwa-on-eval-cap-dev/iwa-on-ecd/
Step 1. Create a rich picture of the situation in which you want to develop evaluation capacity.

A rich picture of the situation in which ECD is to take place is required. The rich picture may include the following elements: structure, processes, people, conflicts, culture/climate and issues. There are different methods in which the rich picture can be expressed.

In Western culture, the most common method is through imagery, as described below. However, other methods, more common in different cultures, may also be appropriate. These may include: physical sensations (e.g. taste); sounds (e.g. music); thoughts (e.g. biases, positions, beliefs, identifications, attitudes and assumptions); and emotional responses (e.g. loving kindness).6

Whichever method is used, the rich picture should be created without privileging, predetermining, or presuming a particular perspective or point of view.7

Imagery

A rich picture may be created through imagery such as mind-maps, conversation maps and doodling. Below, the steps involved in creating a rich picture using the doodling technique are described.8

1. A broad cross-section of people within the organization is assembled to engage in the image creation. Group members discuss their perception of the current ECD situation. Clarification questions may be asked so that the data are as concrete as possible.

2. During the discussion, group members listen for key words that evoke images in their mind. Group members are invited to doodle on their notepads until they have produced an image on paper that they feel captures the key words.

3. Doodles are redrawn on flipchart paper attached to a wall. One by one these are presented to the group for interpretation. The values and assumptions implicit in the images are discussed and noted. The image that best represents the current ECD situation is selected.

Step 2. Describe the systems to be modeled.

Once rich pictures of the evaluation capacity development situation have been created, the stakeholders should be identified and the different ways in which they perceive the situation should be established.

One of the insights that emerged in the IWA is that there is great diversity among the stakeholders in the situation described by the rich picture. A partial list could include individuals, teams, large and small groups, communities, organizations, sectors, countries and regions.

ECDG has developed a template found below that may be used to identify the stakeholders. In addition, the change in evaluation capacity that each stakeholder desires, as well as the manner in which the change should be achieved, and the motivation behind the desired change can be recorded.

The information to complete the stakeholder analysis worksheet may be collected using a variety of methods that may include focus groups, key informant interviews and document analysis.

After the worksheet is completed, ECDG recommends writing short statements, such as the example found below, describing each system to be modeled:

“A system by which staff and volunteers are made responsible for and trained in evaluation in order to promote their personal growth, job satisfaction and work effectiveness.”

According to Williams and Hummelbrunner:

a common mistake made during this step is to confuse reality with the perspectives. People occasionally say, "But it is not the purpose of the programme to do this or that" or "This is not how I view it." They confuse the point. Perspectives are alternative ways in which SOME people MIGHT see the programme. The purpose of this step is to develop insights.

---

9 These, in SSM vernacular, would be Root Definitions.
**STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS WORKSHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Stakeholders</th>
<th>Desired change from the current situation</th>
<th>How the change should be achieved</th>
<th>Motivation behind the desired change (stakes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators or Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Consumers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The primary stakeholders identified above are hypothetical examples and not intended to be inclusive in every ECD situation.
Step 3. Use the descriptive statements to build models of the ECD process.

The next step is to use the descriptive statements from the previous step to build models of the ECD process\textsuperscript{11}.

This step is important because each model will reveal a logic for developing (or in some cases, for not developing) evaluation capacity\textsuperscript{12}.

These models will be the objects of subsequent analysis.

*How to build a Model of ECD*

One builds a model by identifying the sequential activities of the ECD process. The steps to model building are given below.

1. Select a stakeholder—choose a statement written to summarize the perspective of one stakeholder.

2. Brainstorm—on a flip chart, brainstorm a list of activities that would be part of the ECD process implied by the statement written to summarize the perspective of this stakeholder. Remember the brainstorming rules found in the text box below. Transfer each activity from the flipchart to a 3x5 stick-on-note.

### Brainstorming Rules

ECDG recommends the brainstorming technique described below for this step:

- All ideas are OK. Don’t censor your ideas.
- Aim for quantity, not quality.
- Unorthodox ideas are OK. They may generate usable approaches.
- Do not discuss or critique ideas at this time.
- It’s OK to build on others’ ideas.
- Say pass when you run out of ideas.

\textsuperscript{11} These, in SSM vernacular, would be activity models.

\textsuperscript{12} Boulding’s Law of Requisite Saliency (1966) states that there is an underlying logic awaiting discovery in each system design that will reveal the saliency of its factors.
3. Select an appropriate format—models can run either horizontally or vertically. Place flip chart paper on a wall according to the desired format. You'll probably need more paper than you might think you'll need.

4. Determine the boundaries—at the top of the flip chart paper, draw and label an oval to represent the first activity of the ECD process (boundary). Draw and label another oval at the bottom of the paper to represent the last activity.

5. Map the remainder of the activities—in between the boundaries; place the remaining activities in the process, written on the 3x5 stick-on-notes, on the flip chart paper in sequential order. Be sure to allow plenty of space in-between each note.

6. Check for reasonableness—remove duplicate and/or unnecessary activities and add any activities that may have been forgotten.
Step 4. Compare each ECD process that was modeled in Step 3 with the others and with the rich picture of the situation from Step 1.

The next step is to compare each ECD process that was modeled with the others and with the real world\textsuperscript{13}.

This step seeks to invoke Bohr’s Law of Complementarity (1928) which states that two different models of THE SAME system will reveal truths regarding the system that are neither entirely independent nor entirely compatible.

The comparison of models should answer the question: How are the ECD processes implied by the various stakeholder perspectives the same and how are they different? Special attention should be given to recurring themes and to contradictions.

The next comparison would be of the models with the real world (as perceived by those carrying out this analysis). This comparison should answer the question: How well does each model correspond to the real world?

The ultimate aim of this step is to find a version of the real world situation and ways to improve it that will accommodate the interests of different stakeholders with different perspectives\textsuperscript{14}.


Step 5. Based on these comparisons, identify ways of developing evaluation capacity.

Based on the comparisons conducted in Steps 1-4, leverage points can be identified to make changes in the real-world situation. Donella Meadows\textsuperscript{15} identified, in inverse order of magnitude, the places within a system where a small shift in one thing can produce big changes in everything. Below, Meadow’s concepts are applied to ECD.

9. Numbers or parameters

When ECDG was organizing the ECD workshop, some bi-lateral donors declined funding because they devote their entire budgets for ECD to sending a few people to an international evaluation-training programme.

If an ECD system is stagnant, putting additional financial and human resources into it will not help. For this reason, such parameters are very low on the list of leverage points.

8. Material stocks and flows

ECDG’s observation is that when there are only one or two people with evaluation expertise within a system, they become isolated and are unable to affect change within the system.

It would be important to increase the flow in order to build the stock to achieve a critical mass of people with evaluation expertise within the system under consideration.

7. Regulating negative feedback loops

A common example of a negative feedback loop is a furnace. When the temperature drops below the threshold set on the thermostat, the furnace blows hot air into the room.

Systems are teleological—in other words, they are goal-driven. Often times, within a system, goals are expressed through purpose and vision.

ECDG’s experience is that many systems do not have a purpose and vision for ECD; there is no setting on the thermostat, and thus they are unable to harness the power of negative feedback loops.

6. Driving positive feedback loops

Dan Kim has identified a system’s archetype called success to the successful. The more that a system is able to use its evaluation capacity to enhance its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, the more evaluation capacity it will develop.

Some countries, such as South Africa and Malaysia, have reached a tipping point in evaluation capacity development. Now, the momentum they have achieved carries them forward. We need to determine how best to tip systems.

5. Information flows

The survival of a system depends on two types of processes: integrative and adaptive. First of all, the parts of a system must be integrated and function properly. Second, the system must be able to adapt to changes in its environment.

ECDG’s experience is that systems often monitor and evaluate the latter process—they evaluate their projects and programmes. A mechanism could usefully be put in place to provide information flows on internal processes, as well. Mainstreaming.

4. The rules of the system (incentives, punishment, constraints)

According to Meadows, the rules of a system define its scope, boundaries and degrees of freedom. Rules change behavior. Power over the rules is real power.

This is probably why there is such a proliferation of ECD toolkits, guidelines, tip sheets and best practices. Everyone is trying to define the rules. This has led to fragmentation within the profession regarding ECD.

3. The power of self-organization

Self-organization means changing any aspect of a system lower on this list—adding or deleting new physical structure, adding or deleting negative or positive feedback loops or information flows or rules. The ability to self-organize is the strongest form of system resilience. It is the ability to survive change by changing.

According to Glenda Eoyang,16 three conditions are necessary for self-organization in human systems. A container must be built that distinguishes the self-organizing system from its environment. The container must be filled with agents that are different from one another—but not too different. And, an exchange of information,

---

energy or materials must occur that establishes the framework for a new system-wide pattern to self-organize.

2. The goals of the system

Systems are teleological—in other words, they are goal-driven. The goal of a system pressures or weakens everything further down the list, to conform to that goal. It is imperative that the purpose and vision driving the evaluation mechanism be well aligned with the goals and objectives of the system.

1. The mindset or paradigm out of which the goals, rules and feedback structure arise

Paradigms are the sources of systems. From them come goals, information flows, feedbacks, stocks and flows. People who manage to intervene in systems at the level of paradigm hit a leverage point that totally transforms systems.

Buckminster Fuller said, “You never change things by fighting the existing reality. To change something, build a new model that makes the existing model obsolete.”

0. The power to transcend paradigms17

The highest leverage of all is to keep oneself unattached in the arena of paradigms, to realize that NO paradigm is "true," that even the one that sweetly shapes one’s comfortable worldview is a tremendously limited understanding of an immense and amazing universe.

---

Examples
Example 1

Step 1. Create a rich picture of the situation in which you want to develop evaluation capacity.

This rich picture depicts a situation in which staff members seek to increase their capabilities (i.e. knowledge skills and attitudes) by attending workshops and conferences. This creates brisk business for the conference organizer and workshop facilitators. However, the reality is that, while the evaluators who attended the conference may have changed, the organisations to which they will return have not.
Step 2. Describe the systems to be modeled.

**STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS WORKSHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Stakeholders</th>
<th>Desired change from the current situation</th>
<th>How the change should be achieved</th>
<th>Motivation behind the desired change (stakes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane Smith (NGO staff)</td>
<td>Increase capabilities i.e. knowledge, skills and attitudes</td>
<td>Workshops and seminars</td>
<td>Personal growth, job satisfaction and work effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Tao (NGO)</td>
<td>Support trained individuals</td>
<td>Change in organizational structures and culture</td>
<td>Better management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop facilitators</td>
<td>More trained individuals</td>
<td>Workshops and seminars</td>
<td>Sell books and consulting gigs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Evaluation Association</td>
<td>More professional development workshops</td>
<td>Conference pre- and post-sessions</td>
<td>Fulfil mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary statements**

Jane Smith may see ECD as:

“A system to support individuals who are seeking to increase their capabilities for career development purposes.”

The United Tao may see ECD as:

“A system to support staff who have received evaluation training by modifying the organizational design and culture in order to promote better management.”

Facilitators may see ECD as:

“A system to train individuals through workshops and seminars in order to sell books and get consulting gigs.”
The Continental Evaluation Association may see ECD as:

“A system to increase the number of professional development workshops during annual conferences in order to better fulfill its mission.

Step 3. Use the descriptive statements to build models of the ECD process.

*Jane Smith's model*

![Step 3: Jane Smith's model](image)

*United Tao's model*

![Step 3: United Tao's model](image)

*Workshop facilitator’s model*

![Step 3: Workshop facilitator’s model](image)

*Continental Evaluation Association's model*

![Step 3: Continental Evaluation Association's model](image)
Step 4. Compare each ECD process that was modeled in Step 3 with the others and with the rich description of the situation in Step 1.

The Smith, workshop facilitator and CEA models of ECD are well aligned.

Individuals, like Smith, seek to increase their capabilities attend workshops conducted by facilitators that are offered by the CEA prior to its conferences.

United Tao is out of the loop and does not know how to support staff, like Smith, who has received training at workshops.

Step 5. Based on these comparisons, identify the most effective ways of developing evaluation capacity.

United Tao should hire facilitators to train individuals ON-SITE and to oversee changes in organizational structures and culture that would support staff who receive training. Attendance at CEA sessions should be a supplement.
Example 2

Step 1. Create a rich picture of the situation in which you want to develop evaluation capacity.

This rich picture depicts a situation in which the Kalamazoo Homeless Shelter has no internal evaluation capacity. They currently rely, some might say over-rely, on independent consultants for evaluation. The problem is, when the consultant walks out the door, she takes all of the evaluation capacity with her and KHS is hopelessly lost.
Step 2. Describe the systems to be modeled.

**STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS WORKSHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Stakeholders</th>
<th>Desired change from the current situation</th>
<th>How the change should be achieved</th>
<th>Motivation behind the desired change (stakes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Evaluator</td>
<td>NGOs dependent on external capacity</td>
<td>No internal capacity</td>
<td>Consulting fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHS Board of Directors</td>
<td>More evaluation information</td>
<td>Demand of the President</td>
<td>Oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHS President</td>
<td>Evaluation integrated into project cycle</td>
<td>Change in organizational structures and culture</td>
<td>Better management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHS Staff &amp; Volunteers</td>
<td>Responsibility for evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation integrated into job description</td>
<td>Personal growth, job satisfaction and work effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHS Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Greater empowerment</td>
<td>On-the-job-training</td>
<td>More relevant, efficient and effective services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary statements**

External evaluators may see ECD as

“A system that continues to depend on external capacity in order to ensure continued employment and revenue.”

Kalamazoo Homeless Shelter (KHS) Board of Directors may see ECD as

“A system by which the Board seeks to obtain more evaluation information from the President of KHS so that it can fulfill its oversight role.”
KHS President may see ECD as:

“A system by which the President can integrate evaluation into the project cycle by changing KHS’s organizational structures and culture in order to better manage the NGO.”

KHS Staff and Volunteers may see ECD as

“A system by which staff and volunteers are made responsible for and trained in evaluation in order to promote their personal growth, job satisfaction and work effectiveness.”

KHS Beneficiaries may see ECD as

“A system by which beneficiaries become more involved in evaluation in order to make KHS services that they receive more relevant, efficient and effective.”
Step 3. Use the descriptive statements to build models of the ECD process.

**External Evaluator model**

- Respond to call for proposals
- Conduct the evaluation
- Leave and take evaluation capacity

**KHS Board of Directors model**

- Demand more evaluation information from KHS President
- Use information for oversight

**KHS President model**

- Determine vision for evaluation
- Put structures in place to support vision
- Promote a culture of evaluation

**KHS Staff and Volunteers model**

- Integrate evaluation into job description
- On-the-job training
- Monitor through performance appraisal

**KHS Beneficiaries’ model**

- Participate in evaluations
- Increase capabilities
- Use capabilities to improve service delivery
Step 4. Compare each ECD process that was modeled in Step 3 with the others and with the rich description of the situation in Step 1.

Currently KHS is suffering from the tyranny of external evaluation. External consultants conduct evaluations and when they leave, they take all of the evaluation capacity with them.

The Board of Directors, President, Staff and Volunteers, and Beneficiaries have models of ECD with complementary differences.

Step 5. Based on these comparisons, identify the most effective ways of developing evaluation capacity.

KHS should put in place an internal evaluation system to improve accountability and management. Staff should be made responsible for evaluations—in fact, M&E should be made part of their job descriptions.18

The role of external evaluators should evolve. Instead of conducting evaluations, they should now be hired as "critical friends" to assist with on-the-job training of staff, volunteers and beneficiaries (see ECDG Toolkit, Chapter 10).

Example 3

Step 1. Create a rich picture of the situation in which you want to develop evaluation capacity.

This rich picture depicts a situation in which the government of a developing country provides just enough evaluation information to keep development assistance flowing but not enough to expose any corruption. Donors have tired of giving money without receiving adequate evaluation information and are ready to bring in independent consultants—an idea that government resists. Citizen groups are tired of corruption and want to see reform.
Step 2. Describe the systems to be modeled.

**STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS WORKSHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Stakeholders</th>
<th>Desired change from the current situation</th>
<th>How the change should be achieved</th>
<th>Motivation behind the desired change (stakes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USSR Agency for International Development</td>
<td>Reliance on international evaluators</td>
<td>Train government officials to manage logistics of int'l evaluator missions</td>
<td>Control of Official Development Assistance (ODA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Evaluators</td>
<td>Encourage donor reliance on int'l consultants</td>
<td>More consulting gigs</td>
<td>Consulting fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Belle Terre</td>
<td>Sufficing strategy</td>
<td>Resist efforts of donors to impose external control</td>
<td>Corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens of Belle Terre for Change</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>On-the-job training</td>
<td>More accountable, responsive, transparent and efficient government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary statements**

United Sovereign States of Richelieu Agency for International Development (USSR AID) may see ECD as:

“A system by which donors seek to control Official Development Assistance (ODA) through the use of international consultants in order to optimize the value for money on behalf of their taxpayer constituents.”

International evaluators may see ECD as

“A system to be used by international evaluators to receive employment contracts from donors in order to generate revenue.”
Republic of Belle Terre may see ECD as

“A system through which national government supports evaluation just enough to continue the flow of ODA but not enough to demonstrate any accountability.”

Citizens of Belle Terre for Change may see ECD as

“A system to be used by citizens, who are the ultimate beneficiaries of ODA, to empower themselves in order to ensure that government uses ODA to fund projects that are relevant, efficient, effective, impactful and sustainable.”

Step 3. Use the descriptive statements to build models of the ECD process.

**USSR AID model**

- Neglect National Govt ECD
- Rely on Intl Evaluators
- Make continued ODA contingent on following recs of Intl evaluators

**International Evaluator model**

- Respond to call for proposals
- Conduct the evaluation
- Leave and take evaluation capacity

**Republic of Belle Terre model**

- Provide just enough evaluation information to continue the flow of ODA but not enough to demonstrate accountability

**Citizen of Belle Terre for Change model**

- Participate in evaluations
- Increase capabilities
- More accountable, responsive, transparent and efficient government
Step 4. Compare each ECD process that was modeled in Step 3 with the others and with the rich description of the situation in Step 1.

Comparing the USSR AID and the Republic of Belle Terre models of ECD, it is obvious that there is a contradiction around the issue of accountability. The leaders of Belle Terre may resist external accountability as vigorously as USSR AID tries to impose it. Therefore, donor’s and national government’s attempts to develop evaluation capacity may be working at cross-purposes and may nullify each other.

Step 5. Based on these comparisons, identify the most effective ways of developing evaluation capacity.

A real situation that may accommodate the interests of all stakeholders could be one in which USSR AID seeks to promote the ECD of Citizens of Belle Terre for Change to hold the national government accountable for the use of ODA and give up trying to impose external accountability. As Buckminster Fuller once said, “Don’t fight forces. Use them.”
Example 4

Step 1. Create a rich picture of the situation in which you want to develop evaluation capacity.

This rich picture depicts a situation in which the UN seeks to comply with the Paris Declaration’s mandate to develop national evaluation capacity. Working directly with national governments is often ineffective because of high staff turnover. However, there is a system of regional and national evaluation organisations that offer professional development opportunities to their members.
Step 2. Describe the systems to be modeled.

**STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS WORKSHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Stakeholders</th>
<th>Desired change from the current situation</th>
<th>How the change should be achieved</th>
<th>Motivation behind the desired change (stakes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN agencies</td>
<td>More national evaluation capacity development</td>
<td>Strengthen regional and national evaluation organizations</td>
<td>Country-led evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>Move away from direct funding of governments to develop national evaluation capacity</td>
<td>Seek new funding modalities</td>
<td>Control ODA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Governments</td>
<td>Meet demand for higher accountability without having to create and maintain an internal evaluation system</td>
<td>Externalize evaluation function</td>
<td>Continue flow of ODA while lowering costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOCE</td>
<td>Develop the organizational capacity of regional and national evaluation organizations</td>
<td>Changes in organizational structures and culture</td>
<td>Fulfil mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and National Evaluation Organizations</td>
<td>Develop the evaluation capacity of members</td>
<td>Conference pre- and post-sessions</td>
<td>Fulfil mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>Increase capabilities i.e. knowledge, skills and attitudes</td>
<td>Workshops and seminars</td>
<td>Personal growth, job satisfaction and work effectiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary statements

UN agencies may see ECD as:

“A system for using evaluation organizations to develop national evaluation capacity by expanding the definition of national to mean more than government as a way of increasing country-led evaluation.”

Donors may see ECD as:

“A system that offers an alternative to providing direct funding of government to develop national evaluation capacity.”

National governments may see ECD as

“A system to meet the demands for more accountability without having to create and maintain an expensive, internal evaluation systems.”

The International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE) may see ECD as

“A system to develop the organizational capacity of regional and national evaluation organizations to built the evaluation capacity of their individual members.”

Regional and national evaluation organizations may see ECD as

“A system to develop the evaluation capacity of their individual members.”

Individuals may see ECD as

“A system by which individuals seek to increase their capabilities for career development purposes.”
Step 3. Use the descriptive statements to build models of the ECD process.

**UN Agency model**

- Form partnership
- Funding and activities
- New National systems

**Donor model**

- Discontinue funding national govt efforts to create internal EC systems
- Search for new funding modalities

**National Government model**

- Phase out internal evaluation system
- Externalize the evaluation function

**IOCE model**

- Help R&N Eval Orgs to determine vision for evaluation
- Help them to put structures in place to support vision
- Help them to promote an organizational culture

**Regional & National Evaluation Organization model**

- Call for proposals
- Workshop selection
- Registration
- Conference

**Individual model**

- Identify required capabilities
- Assess current capabilities
- Enroll in workshop to fill the gap
Step 4. Compare each ECD process that was modeled in Step 3 with the others and with the rich description of the situation in Step 1.

A comparison of models shows that donors and national governments have reached a tipping point—it is time for a new model.

UN agencies' model is to work through the IOCE to develop the capacity of regional and national evaluation organizations. They, in-turn, would develop the capacity of individual, local evaluators who could provide evaluation services to donors and national government.

A comparison of the models with the real world as depicted in the rich situation shows that the IOCE, itself has weak capacity, and is not able to develop the capacity of regional and national evaluation organizations.

Step 5. Based on these comparisons, identify the most effective ways of developing evaluation capacity.

The most effective way to develop capacity in this situation is to strengthen the sequential interdependencies.

UN agencies would develop the capacity of the IOCE which, in-turn,

would develop the capacity of regional and national evaluation organizations which, in-turn,

would develop the capabilities of its members who, in-turn,

would provide evaluation services to national governments (and others) which, in-turn,

would provide accountability information to donors.
## IWA Principles for Evaluation Capacity Development Checklist

This checklist can be applied to interventions in order to determine how well they incorporate the principles that are believed to be both necessary and sufficient for sound and fair ECD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Fully met</th>
<th>Partially met</th>
<th>Not met</th>
<th>Cannot determine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
<td>The Ownership principle is intended to ensure that key stakeholders take active responsibility for the ECD intervention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Self-determination.</strong> Stakeholders’ participation in ECD programs in order to meet their own needs and act on behalf of themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Political support.</strong> Powerful interests with control over objectives, priorities and resources supporting the ECD agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Control.</strong> Those whose capacity is being developed guide and supervise the process of ECD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Leadership.</strong> ECD efforts being lead by common agreement between suppliers and beneficiaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Fully met</td>
<td>Partially met</td>
<td>Not met</td>
<td>Cannot determine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ethics.</strong> Safeguarding the rights of stakeholders to self-determination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mutual recognition.</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholders’ acknowledgement and appreciation of others’ contributions to the ECD effort.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>The principle of Relevance recognizes that ECD interventions need to be grounded in a local context and aligned with Ownership priorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pertinence.</strong></td>
<td>The ECD intervention is consistent with locally identified aspirations, and aligned with expressed needs and social and behavioural norms of the cultures involved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance.</strong></td>
<td>The planned ECD intervention is considered to be both meritorious and a current priority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement and equity.</strong></td>
<td>ECD requires that people actively participate in the process and that the views of all participants are respected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strength.</strong></td>
<td>ECD interventions aim to build upon local strengths and target functional needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy.</strong></td>
<td>Encouraging decision-makers and public opinion to value the benefits of ECD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Fully met</td>
<td>Partially met</td>
<td>Not met</td>
<td>Cannot determine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>The Integration principle emphasizes that effective ECD interventions are designed from a system-wide (not fragmented) perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Purpose.</strong> The ECD intervention has clearly specified objectives including functional results to be achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Diagnostics.</strong> ECD interventions are based on sound diagnostics, while taking an adaptive / flexible approach to development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Comprehensiveness.</strong> ECD interventions consider the full scope of capacity-building (supply, demand, and institutional infrastructure), across a range of levels (individuals, groups, organizations or national systems). The final ECD design then forms part of a comprehensive system of governance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Coherence.</strong> ECD should be based on evaluation policies and practices in government that form a logical framework of interlocking relationships and processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Commitment.</strong> Stakeholders understand the implications of the ECD intervention and are ready to join forces within the context of these principles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Fully met</td>
<td>Partially met</td>
<td>Not met</td>
<td>Cannot determine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usefulness</strong></td>
<td>The Usefulness principle specifies that ECD is not an end in itself, but rather a means for mainstreaming the ongoing production and use of effective evaluations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Application**   | In particular ECD leads to evaluation activities that support improvements to:  
- Policies and programs, and/or  
- Program management, and/or  
- Resource allocations, budgeting, and/or  
- Government control, coordination, and/or  
- Accountability and transparency, and/or  
- Participation by civil society. |          |               |         |                  |
<p>| <strong>Demand</strong>        | ECD guides the supply of evaluation feedback that matches the demand from stakeholders and their ability to make use of evaluation results. As demand increases over time, this is responded to with greater levels of supply and institutional infrastructure. |          |               |         |                  |
| <strong>Anchoring</strong>     | ECD supports evaluation functions located (or anchored) where the demand and users are, in order to support use. |          |               |         |                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Fully met</th>
<th>Partially met</th>
<th>Not met</th>
<th>Cannot determine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flexibility</strong></td>
<td>Different countries/agencies have different starting points, constraints and aspirations, and hence rigid blueprints for ECD reform are not appropriate. Cautious evolving experimentation is the way to proceed, as ECD is not a linear process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of value</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholders see the benefits from ECD as outweighing the costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>The benefits of ECD continue over time even as governments and officials change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result focus</strong></td>
<td>ECD initiatives are regularly monitored and evaluated in order to promote a focus on results and accountability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These four global principles are a guide for those who plan and design ECD interventions, those who evaluate such interventions, those who make use of the results of these evaluations, and those who wish to contribute to the ongoing discussion of ECD principles. This IWA acknowledges that these principles are not all equally applicable to all ECD interventions. Professional judgment must be applied, and practitioners are encouraged to carefully consider the importance of each principle in each particular ECD context.