

**Annual
Corporate
Evaluation
Report**

2005

**Evaluation Unit
International Development Research Centre**

June 2005

Annual Corporate Evaluation (ACE) Report 2005

Table of Contents

Section 1. Introduction.....	3
Section 2. Follow-up on Ongoing Activities	4
Section 3. Overview of Evaluation in 2004 – 05	6
3.1 Profile of Evaluators.....	7
3.2 Quality of Evaluation Reports.....	8
Section 4. Learning from Evaluation	9
4.1 Corporate Assessment Framework (CAF)	10
4.2 Capacity Building Strategic Evaluation	12
4.3 Dissemination Material	13
A) <i>Evaluation Highlight: The Intended Results of IDRC's Support of Networks: Extension, Excellence, Action and Autonomy</i>	13
B) <i>Patience Brings Rewards: The Lessons of the Asian Fisheries Social Science Research Network</i>	13
C) <i>Negotiating the New World of International Trade: Research Helps Latin America to Cope with an Expanding Trade Dialogue</i>	13
D) <i>Annual Learning Forum (ALF)</i>	13
ANNEX 1. Acronyms	i
ANNEX 2. Evaluation Reports Received by the Evaluation Unit.....	iii
ANNEX 3. Guide for Assessing Quality of Evaluations.....	v
ANNEX 4. Management Response	vii

List of Tables

Table 1. Sex of Evaluators 2002-2005.....	7
Table 2. North-South Affiliation of Evaluators, 2001-05.....	7
Table 3. Quality of Evaluation Reports, 2002-05	8

Section 1. Introduction

This year's Annual Corporate Evaluation (ACE) Report represents the first stage in an evolution of this report to a new format. As Governors will recall, last year we noted that the focus of the report was shifting from an overview of evaluation reports produced across the Centre, to a report centred on corporate performance that draws on strategic evaluations as well as the Corporate Assessment Framework. Project and program evaluations commissioned by the programs will be one of the inputs to annual reporting by Directors of Program Areas and Regional Directors. As indicated last year when we signalled the upcoming change in our report, Governor's comments on this first evolution of the report will be appreciated.

There are two important drivers behind the format of the report this year. First, we want to establish the corporate nature of the report by presenting material that emerges from corporate level studies. Second, in response to the oft-repeated comments from Governors that they appreciate – and indeed seek to know more of – the activities and outcomes of projects and programs, we are including some material in the format in which it has been disseminated. This year, these materials all relate to networks.

Section 2 provides an update on a number of activities on which we reported last year: progress on the project completion reporting system, external reviews, and the introduction of a new learning activity, the Annual Learning Forum (ALF).

Section 3 includes two regular features of our annual report: 1) a profile of evaluators; and 2) a quality assessment of evaluation reports. Because this is the final year of reporting on the last Corporate Strategy and Program Framework (CSPF), the tables include data presented in previous years so Governors can see change over time although we do not have data for all five years of issue. Related to this section is Annex 2, which lists of all the evaluations received since our last report. These are all entered into the Evaluation Inventory.

Section 4, 'Learning from Evaluations', presents findings from evaluation processes in new briefer formats, including updates on ongoing strategic evaluations, briefings on case studies and a newsletter. The case studies provide some depth on two networks that have had some policy influence. The newsletter reports on a Centre-wide learning event held in April.

Another element of the ACE report that is different this year is that a significant effort went into the development of the proposed Evaluation Unit Strategy. We present that strategy and the accompanying external review of the Unit, conducted by Dr Arnold Love, as an exceptional part of our report this year. These are bound separately but are integral to our evaluation reporting this year. The external review of the Evaluation Unit will be presented to Governors for

Annual Corporate Evaluation (ACE) Report 2005

information and the Evaluation Unit **Strategy 2005-2010** is on the agenda for the Governor's approval, both in June 2005.

Section 2. Follow-up on Ongoing Activities

a) The Backlog of Project Completion Reports

Governors will recall that the Office of the Auditor General has in the past criticized the Centre for its failure to ensure the timely completion of Project Completion Reports (PCRs). In January of this year, Rohinton Medhora sent a memo to the Board's Finance and Audit Committee reporting a reduction in the backlog of PCRs to eight. As he notes, this was achieved through "a collaborative and concerted effort by the R-PCR Working Group, Program Management and Staff". We can now report that at the end of the fiscal year, the backlog was reduced to zero. At the time of presentation of the proposal for the new project reporting system (see 'R-PCR' below), the Evaluation Unit was mandated to report to senior management twice per year on the backlog. If the backlog begins to grow significantly, the Unit would recommend a shift to a simpler accountability model for project reporting. It should be said that this is not our desired approach, and the initial stages of implementation of the new system reported below suggests that a cultural shift on project reporting has begun. The Unit will do everything it can to support that change and will report to the Board on progress.

b) The Rolling Project Completion Report

Last year, we reported on the testing of a new project completion reporting system, the "R-PCR", or Rolling Project Completion Report. This system of reporting based on qualitative interviews between Research Officers, Team Leaders or Directors and the responsible officer(s) calls for assessments at the beginning, middle and end of projects. It includes both learning and accountability elements. The R-PCR Working Group, a cross-organizational working group co-led by Program and Partnership Branch (PPB) and the Evaluation Unit, made its recommendations to senior management in December 2004 as planned. The recommendations were accepted and implementation, under the direction of the Vice-President of PPB, is well underway. We will actively monitor progress and propose adjustments as needed. The Unit will analyse the findings from the R-PCRs to contribute to corporate learning.

c) The Annual Learning Forum

Emerging from discussions on how the Centre learns and uses the knowledge in PCRs, the R-PCR Working Group proposed the concept of an Annual Learning Forum (ALF) at which staff would have an opportunity to reflect on the Centre's performance in order to improve the Centre's effectiveness. The idea was strongly endorsed by senior management. The first ALF was held in April 2005. It dealt with the topic of networks. As noted in the attached ALF newsletter (Section 4.3), staff from all branches participated and all Regional Offices were represented. In addition, "Regional ALFs" were held by Regional Offices in order

Annual Corporate Evaluation (ACE) Report 2005

to engage more of the regional staff in this reflection on Centre work. All the documents from the ALF are posted at: http://intranet.idrc.ca/en/ev-65289-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html. In addition to the materials available for the day, this site includes a virtual marketplace, the newsletter and a more detailed report (forthcoming). The ALF is jointly managed by the Evaluation Unit, the Policy and Planning Group and Programs and Partnership Branch management. Discussions are currently underway with senior management on the findings of the first ALF and what we learned about structuring for future ALFs.

d) External Reviews

The Evaluation Unit is currently managing a portfolio of external reviews including: four in the Information and Communication Technologies for Development (ICT4D) Program Area; the Governance, Equity and Health (GEH) in the Social and Economic Policy (SEP) Program Area; and, finally, the revision of the review of the People Land and Water Program Initiative (PLaW). The ICT4D reviews will be presented to the October Board meeting. The GEH review is scheduled for presentation to the Board of Governors in March 2006. The PLaW review has been successfully revised and found to be useful both as a documentation of PLaW support as well as in the definition of the new global program in Rural Poverty and the Environment (RPE).

e) Policy Study Dissemination

Just prior to the Board meeting last June, a number of Governors had the opportunity to participate in a forum on the policy study and its findings. Since then, a number of “Findings Workshops” have been held and additional publications prepared (see Section 4.3 for two examples of these). Discussions have been held in the Regional Offices, focused on how program staff might use the findings in improving their work with projects. The study has generated considerable interest through presentations to partner groups in Delhi and Dakar, to other donor partners as well as to other agencies, such as the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) in Canada, and the Wellcome Trust in the U.K. In addition to case material on over a dozen cases, an article on the methodology has appeared in the International Social Science Journal, and a chapter on findings from this study has been published in the book “Global Knowledge Networks and International Development” (edited by Diane Stone and Simon Maxwell, and published by Routledge). Additional materials will be published over the next year. Project and Regional Office staff are actively using these materials in their own discussions on policy-research links.

This study and the varied use of its material has highlighted the importance of dissemination of evaluation findings and has highlighted the value that such studies can have to the Centre both for program learning and for sharing our findings and approaches to research support. Their relevance to projects has been confirmed through the external review of the Evaluation Unit and commentary back from project leaders on their use of the materials.

f) Networks Study

This year, the Evaluation Unit initiated a strategic evaluation on research networks to support the work of the voluntary learning community within the Centre, the Network Working Group. Building on earlier evaluation work on research networks by Dr Anne Bernard (1996), the study concentrates on three core issues: the intended results of IDRC-supported networks, the sustainability of networks, and the coordination and governance of networks. The results of research networks, in terms of policy influence and capacity building, are being drawn from those strategic evaluations. Given IDRC's reputation and experience with research networks, this tacit and documented knowledge needs to be systematically consolidated and more readily accessible both within and outside the Centre.

Bringing to light the collective knowledge of IDRC on networks has involved a thorough review of IDRC documentation, a set of in-depth interviews with IDRC staff and network coordinators, an ongoing series of peer story-telling sessions, and the Annual Learning Forum (ALF) where staff from all branches shared their knowledge on how to effectively support research networks through programming, partnerships, evaluation, information management, technologies, and so on.

The outputs of these first components of the study are available on the Evaluation Unit website at <http://www.idrc.ca/evaluation/networks>. Over the next few months, the networks study will conduct a survey of 750 network coordinators and members supported over the past decade. The survey findings will:

- Provide an overview of the networks supported and demographic profile of network coordinators/members;
- Obtain network coordinators and members' assessment of the effectiveness of IDRC support; and,
- Document outcomes at the individual, organizational, and societal levels to which the networks have contributed.

The survey results and consolidation of the networks study findings will be presented to Governors next year.

Section 3. Overview of Evaluation in 2004 – 05

IDRC's Evaluation Unit (EU) gathers data about the evaluators employed by the Centre, assesses and monitors the quality of the evaluations produced, and monitors how evaluations are used. This is undertaken as part of on-going efforts to improve the quality and utility of the Centre's evaluation work. The findings from these activities are reported here annually and are used to refine the Centre's evaluation practice.

3.1 Profile of Evaluators

Data on the profile of who evaluates IDRC-funded activities is presented each year by way of information and to be able to track trends over time. IDRC's decentralized evaluation system means that evaluators are contracted by those closest to the activity, so a profile can only emerge through a regular analysis. For the Evaluation Unit, this is a tool to help us in building the evaluation capacity as well as the quality of evaluation at the Centre. This is the first year we have had three data sets so that we can begin to comment on trends over time. As illustrated in Table 1, in 2004-05, a total of 25 evaluators and 3 organizations

Table 1. Sex of Evaluators 2002-2005				
Evaluators	Total	04-05	03-04	02-03
Male	59	15	30	14
Female	41	10	23	8
Organizations	6	3	2	1
Total	106	28	55	23

were represented in the 17 reports received by the Evaluation Unit (The evaluations are listed in Annex 2). We see a fairly level trend wherein about 60% of evaluators are

male and 40% female. While the detail is not presented in the table, we can report that the majority of evaluators were private consultants (39%), followed by those affiliated with Universities (29%), members of NGO's (25%) and finally IDRC staff (7).

It is noteworthy that for the first time since we have been tracking this data, there is higher Southern representation than Northern among this year's evaluators (see Table 2). One mechanism for supporting the growing evaluation profession in the South is recruiting

southern evaluators to conduct evaluations of IDRC projects and programs. The Evaluation Unit will

Table 2. North-South Affiliation of Evaluators, 2001-05					
Evaluators	Total	04-05	03-04	02-03	01-02
North	80	12	31	12	25
South	58	16	24	8	10
Unknown	3	0	0	3	0
North-South ratio	1.4:1	0.8:1	1.3:1	1.5:1	2.5:1

continue to build capacity with partners in the South and support the work of Southern professional evaluation associations. At the same time it should be recognized that not all evaluators should be from the South; in many situations the use of an evaluator from the North can be quite appropriate. But because it is often easier to engage an evaluator who is close by, the balance is deliberately tipped towards encouraging the use of more consultants from the South.

3.2 Quality of Evaluation Reports

The Evaluation Unit (EU) assesses the quality of evaluation reports against criteria that have been created from the standards for program evaluation endorsed by the American Evaluation Association. These require that evaluations be utility-focused, feasibility-conscious, accuracy-based, and propriety-oriented (see Annex 3 for further details on how the EU assesses these areas of quality)¹. This section reports on the quality of the project/program evaluations received by the EU.

The overall quality profile of the evaluation reports that were assessed this year is presented in the Table 3 and compared with previous years of the CSPF for which we have data. It demonstrates some improvement over time, but also suggests the

Table 3. Quality of Evaluation Reports, 2002-05				
Aspect of Quality	Average Score %	%		
		04-05	03-04	02-03
OVERALL	61	64	59	60
Accuracy	75	80	77	67
Feasibility	65	73	66	57
Utility	62	62	52	73
Propriety	41	40	45	38

need for a more active campaign to improve evaluation quality. On average in most recent year reported, evaluation reports scored positively on 64% of all indicators of quality. The quality of evaluation reports

was uneven across each of the four separate dimensions of quality (utility, feasibility, accuracy and propriety).

Evaluation reports were **accurate** in that they presented conclusions and recommendations that were supported by evidence, and which had been derived through the application of appropriate and solid research methods. For example, Tussie and Tuplin's evaluation report this year, *The Knowledge Networking Program on Engendering Macroeconomics and International Economics* (2003) describes their focus on balancing qualitative and quantitative data, triangulation, and the use of multiple reviewers 'to broaden insight and reduce subjectivity' (p. 3).

Feasibility means that the methods and approaches were well matched to the questions and issues they set out to examine. Issues around resources, timing, perspectives represented, and information sources consulted can affect feasibility. Four of the reports this year were deemed to have insufficient detail to assess this aspect of quality. For clarity and future learning, it is important for evaluators to identify the evaluation issues/questions in their reports and discuss any methodology issues or limitations. The Evaluation Unit is relaying this message to staff commissioning evaluations.

¹ "The Program Evaluation Standards",
<http://www.eval.org/EvaluationDocuments/progeval.html>

Annual Corporate Evaluation (ACE) Report 2005

Utility is assessed to the degree that the reviewers identify the users and uses of the evaluation and describe how the users participated in the process. A good example of this is provided in Rutherford's report *The Ground-Work of EQUINET: An Assessment of Processes and Outcomes of a Regional Equity in Health Research Network* (2004), in which he outlines the intended users and uses:

The primary intended user of this evaluation is the Governance, Equity, and Health Program Initiative (GEH PI) team of IDRC. The intended use of this evaluation is to help GEH understand some of the broader issues surrounding networks as well as to inform Phase 3 of EQUINET's work. EQUINET itself, particularly its Steering Committee (SC), is the secondary user of this evaluation. The intended use for them is to have an outsider reflect on their processes and outcomes as a possible input to their processes of analysis of current and future work... Although the GEH PI generated the terms of reference for this evaluation, it did so with some consultation with the EQUINET Programme manager. (p.3)

Weaknesses in **propriety** tended to derive from the fact that evaluation reports seldom describe the ways in which they sought to add value to the project/program by building the evaluative capacity of either the users of the evaluation or those being evaluated. Only one report, *Agricultura Urbana en América Latina y El Caribe: Impactos y Lecciones de la Segunda Generacion de Proyectos de Investigación* (2004), received top marks for propriety. The intent to enhance the evaluation capacity of the users and of those being evaluated is a high standard, but is one which is an integral part of the Centre's approach. A regular assessment of this dimension of quality will help to ensure we work towards this standard. Ethical concerns raised in the reports can also affect propriety, however, there were no major ethical concerns from the reports received this year.

The EU will continue to assess future evaluations and collect data on quality. It is recognized, however, that evaluation reports do not always provide a full description of evaluation processes and procedures. In an effort to encourage evaluations commissioned by the Centre to include this information the EU has produced a series of Evaluation Guidelines and Highlights. This material is being promoted and disseminated throughout the Centre. We will also look at new ways to collect data on evaluation propriety and at new ways to ensure that the issues of propriety are well addressed.

Section 4. Learning from Evaluation

The first part of this section presents highlights of progress in some of the major corporate evaluation activities underway, including the Corporate Assessment Framework and the Capacity Building Strategic Evaluation. This is followed by the presentation of some substantive findings and outcomes of projects in the format that is used by the Evaluation Unit to communicate with Centre staff,

Annual Corporate Evaluation (ACE) Report 2005

partners and external audiences. All of the materials in Section 4.3 relate to networks.

4.1 Corporate Assessment Framework (CAF)

As previously reported to the Board, the Corporate Assessment Framework (CAF) allows SMC to ask for and assemble information related to the CSPF, to reflect on that information and to make informed decisions related to the management of IDRC. As noted in the external review of the Evaluation Unit, the CAF is still early in its development as an experimental tool and while generally well-received by SMC and the Board, it was felt that the CAF needed to be simplified so that it could be better grounded in the experience of programs and reduce the demands for resources. While the Evaluation Unit will continue to revise and consolidate the CAF and its operation, the assessment of its potential to contribute to informed decision-making will require at least two years of data collection and review.

4.1.1 Corporate Assessment Framework: Current Performance Area Studies

In 2004-05, studies were undertaken within six of the seven CAF performance areas. The Policy Influence performance area was not specifically addressed because of the recently completed policy study. The drafts of these various studies are now being finalized and between June and September of this year, SMC will be provided information related to the following performance areas:

- Capacity Building
- Donor Partnerships
- Evaluative Thinking
- Canadian Partnerships
- Strategic Intelligence
- Considerations of Gender

Some initial findings from the Indigenous Capacity Building and Strategic Intelligence performance areas are:

Indigenous Capacity Building performance area

In a study of capacity building underway for the CAF, it was noted that the Corporate Assessment Framework offers an operational definition of capacity building that could provide guidance towards a corporate understanding of and approach to capacity building. This could address some of the worries of an “inconsistent approach” to categorizing capacity building work expressed by various staff within the Centre.

Strategic Intelligence performance area: Countries in Transition Study

In support of the CAF strategic intelligence performance area, the Policy and Planning Group is completing a study of the Centre’s experience working in countries in political, economic or conflict-to-peace transitions. Drawing on eight case studies (Algeria, Burma, Cambodia, Kenya, Palestine, South Africa, Southern Cone, Vietnam), the study assesses the ways in which IDRC has approached “transitional” settings. Preliminary findings reveal that IDRC has often been opportunistic and prepared to work in high-risk contexts during pre- or

early transition periods, has fulfilled a distinct role often only possible through its arm length status, and has typically – but not always - adapted programming in flexible and timely ways.

- **Early and persistent** - In Palestine, Vietnam and South Africa, IDRC was adept at being early and responsive to changing dynamics and was able to support programming before formal Canadian bilateral support began. After an unpromising start under similar conditions in Cambodia, steady support for environment and natural resource management research over the last decade has produced returns. In Kenya, we may require a longer term perspective on the value of post-election support. Over 30 years of work in Palestine, IDRC programming has had to adapt to highly volatile political dynamics and has addressed associated risks.
- **Smart and supple** - The success of Centre transition approaches owes much to investments in strategic intelligence. In Vietnam, the Centre relied on a series of intelligence gathering visits to develop the Vietnam Sustainable Economic Development (VISED), an initially broad but flexible programming structure, permitting support to a large, diverse, and multidisciplinary set of research partners and activities which, with time, was shaped and narrowed in focus. In South Africa, years of interaction and fact finding and a demand led approach focused on the ANC, identified health, urban governance, economic policy, science and technology, and environment priorities. Policy research supported in all these fields fed directly into the post-apartheid government's policy formation and decision-making and Centre 'talent spotting' advanced the careers of a number of researchers who became high-level bureaucrats and Ministers in the new Government. By contrast, where the Centre made fewer investments in strategic intelligence, for instance in Cambodia in the mid-1990s where a one man office was established with little advance work, significant Centre funding and resource expansion barely advanced Centre programming.

4.1.2 Corporate Assessment Framework: External Review

In an effort to improve the utility of the CAF, an external review² was undertaken to assess the appropriateness and adequacy of its design. The external review cited a number of good design features:

- The CAF mixes both performance measures and evaluation studies for a balanced appraisal of Centre activities;
- The CAF's modularity and flexibility as a system is useful in managing corporate strategic performance in a diverse and decentralized programming framework; and
- The CAF's use of an 18-month planning and reflection cycle allows for a responsive framework that utilizes an iterative approach to data collection and use.

² Mayne, John (2004), *Evaluation of the Design of the IDRC Corporate Assessment Framework*, IDRC

Annual Corporate Evaluation (ACE) Report 2005

The report contained a number of useful suggestions that will be addressed:

- Shorten the performance area definitions to further distinguish them from the characteristics of good performance;
- Use the five year monitoring plan as a “framework” not a set monitoring plan; and
- Undertake an annual review that further documents how different CAF-generated data and information is “intended” to be used by SMC (this will supplement the already planned CAF activity of documenting how CAF information was actually used).

After October, SMC will begin to receive reports from the second year of CAF studies. In June 2006, Governors will receive a report on the findings from the CAF studies. By July 2006, the Evaluation Unit will begin a review of the CAF process and will report to Governors on progress in June 2007.

4.2 Capacity Building Strategic Evaluation

A primary use of the strategic evaluation of capacity building will be to assist Centre staff and managers in designing, supporting and monitoring projects and activities intended to develop or strengthen capacities. Through an in-depth analysis of a sample of projects and partners, the evaluation will contribute to the Centre’s corporate knowledge about the scope, characteristics and effectiveness of its support to capacity building.

An important first phase of this evaluation was the review of IDRC’s capacity building intentions in the last CSPF period, as expressed in project abstracts, objectives and appraisals (n=561). Additional background studies have explored the nature and practise of capacity building. These studies include document reviews as well as interviews with staff to explore their views and experience of capacity building.

The preliminary findings³ outlined below will guide the next stage of the study:

- There is an inconsistent approach to categorizing capacity building work in the Centre. This makes file reviews, analysis and learning difficult. In the review of IDRC research project files it was found that 26% of the research projects were classified as “capacity building sub-type” in the administrative management system (EPIK). Through in-depth analysis, however, it was found that a more realistic proportion of projects with explicit intent to build capacity is actually closer to 76%. This classification system needs to be addressed if IDRC is to use its project data system for understanding the types of projects it funds.
- For most IDRC staff the entry point for change in development research capacity is the individual. Despite this, a significant number of those interviewed wanted to focus their efforts at the institutional and organizational levels.

³ Lusthaus, Charles and Stephanie Neilson (2005), *Capacity building at IDRC: Some Preliminary Thoughts (Draft)*, Universal Management Group

The next phase of the study, to be completed in September 2005, will specifically identify the types of results occurring in IDRC projects and relate them to the effectiveness and effects of IDRC's investment in capacity building.

4.3 Dissemination Material

The theme of networks has been an important one to IDRC for most of its thirty-five years. As outlined earlier in this report, a significant effort is underway to codify the learning from IDRC networks. The documents that follow bring together findings from the policy study, the networks study, and staff reflection on network learning. *The Intended Results of IDRC's Support of Networks*, reports on the findings of a document review. Two case studies of networks from the policy study, one on the economics of the fishery in Southeast Asia, the other on the Latin American Trade Network, focus on outcomes of IDRC-supported research. The *Annual Learning Forum* newsletter reports on a one-day, all-staff learning event focussed on what we have learned about effectively supporting networks. This event involved staff from all Branches and while not all regional staff attended, the ENRM program staff members were able to combine participation in the ALF with their program meetings. The Regional Directors from all offices were present. A number of the regional offices carried out "Regional-ALFs" in their own regions prior to the main event in Ottawa.

The following dissemination materials are all available on the EU website and are presented here for Governors who wish to read them;

A) Evaluation Highlight: *The Intended Results of IDRC's Support of Networks: Extension, Excellence, Action and Autonomy*

- Website link: http://web.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/11156538321Highlight_4.pdf, [http://web.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/11156538801Highlight_4\(francais\).pdf](http://web.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/11156538801Highlight_4(francais).pdf)

B) *Patience Brings Rewards: The Lessons of the Asian Fisheries Social Science Research Network*

- Website link: http://web.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/11135041341AFSSRN_en.pdf, http://web.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/11135041821AFSSRN_fre.pdf

C) *Negotiating the New World of International Trade: Research Helps Latin America to Cope with an Expanding Trade Dialogue*

- Website link: http://web.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/11135104711LATN_en.pdf, http://web.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/11135105271LATN_fre.pdf

D) *Annual Learning Forum (ALF)*

- Website link: http://intranet.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/11135956281FInal_IDRC_newletter_05_07-final.pdf, http://intranet.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/11153967571IDRC_newletter_fr_05_1.pdf

Annual Corporate Evaluation (ACE) Report 2005

ANNEX 1. Acronyms

ACE	Annual Corporate Evaluation
Acacia	Communities and the Information Society in Africa
ALF	Annual Learning Forum
AREF	Annual Report on Evaluation Findings
BoG	Board of Governors
CA	Connectivity Africa
CAF	Corporate Assessment Framework
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resources Management (PI)
CFP	Cities Feeding People (PI)
CIES	Peru Consortium for Economic and Social Research
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CSPF	Corporate Strategy and Program Framework
DPA	Director of Program Area
EcoHealth	Ecosystem Approaches to Human Health (PI)
EEPSEA	Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia
EMS	Environmental Management Secretariat
ENRM	Environment and Natural Resource Management (PA)
EQUINET	Network for Equity in Health in Southern Africa
EU	Evaluation Unit
GEH	Governance, Equity and Health
ICA	Institute for Connectivity in the Americas
ICT4D	Information and Communication Technologies for Development (PA)
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IMFNS	International Model Forest Network Secretariat
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
MIMAP	Micro Impacts of Macroeconomic and Adjustment Policies (PI)
Minga	Alternatives to Natural Resource Management in LAC (PI)
MPRI	Mining Policy Research Initiative
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
OCEEI	Office for Central and Eastern Europe Initiatives
PA	Program Area
PBR	Peace Building and Reconstruction (PI)
PCR	Project Completion Report

Annual Corporate Evaluation (ACE) Report 2005

PI	Program Initiative
PLaW	People, Land and Water (PI)
PO	Program Officer
PPB	Programs and Partnership Branch
RD	Regional Director
RITC	Research for International Tobacco Control
RO	Research Officer
R-PCR	Rolling Project Completion Report
SEP	Social and Economic Policy (PA)
SISERA	Secretariat for the Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa
SMC	Senior Management Committee
SSHRC	Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council
SUB	Sustainable Use of Biodiversity (PI)
TEC	Trade, Economic and Competitiveness (PI)
TEHIP	Tanzania Essential Health Intervention Program
TIPS	Trade and Industrial Policy Secretariat

Annual Corporate Evaluation (ACE) Report 2005

ANNEX 2. Evaluation Reports Received by the Evaluation Unit

A) Project and Program Evaluation Reports, Received 2004-05

Title, Author(s), Date	PA : PI, Sec.	Projects Covered	Period Covered	Country/Region
1. Les Projets Urbains Développés au Sein du Programme Écosystèmes et Santé Humaine – CRDI : Études de cas : Centro Habana, Santiago de Cuba, Mexico, Katmandou, Laurent Lepage, 03/07/2004	ENRM: EcoHealth	101757, 100205, 003320, 003825, 003329	1997-2004	Cuba, Mexico, Nepal
2. Agricultura Urbana en América Latina y El Caribe: Impactos y Lecciones de la Segunda Generacion de Proyectos de Investigación, 2004	ENRM: CFP	004155, 100641, 100503, 100123, 101399	1998-2002	LAC
3. Connecting People and Organizations for Rural Development Through Multipurpose Community Telecenters in Selected Philippine Barangays: A Learning Evaluation Roger W. Harris, 07/2001	ICT4D: Pan Asia	004029	1998-2001	Philippines
4. External Evaluation: RITC Anne Bernard, 06/2004	SEP: RITC	Secretariat	1994-2004	Global
5. IDRC Webcasting Best Practises Intoinfo Consulting Gp., 18/06/2004	Corporate	Corporate	2003	Internal
6. Evaluation of the Small, Medium, and Micro Enterprise Policy Development Project Dr. Mary M. Lynch, 11/2003	SEP: SMME	100168	2000-2004	Egypt
7. Evaluation of IDRC's Project on Regulation and Supervision of Community Oriented Financial Intermediaries Dale W. Adams, 19/05/2004	SEP: MIMAP	100473	2000-2003	Benin, Canada, Colombia, Morocco, Philippines
8. Evaluation Report: The Knowledge Networking Program on Engendering Macroeconomics and International Economics Diana Tussie & Tracy Tuplin, 12/2003	SEP: TEC	101891	2003	Global
9. Evaluating Policy Influence of ICTs for Rural Areas: The MSSRF Information Villages Research Project	ICT4D: Pan Asia	003778, 100580	1997-2004	India

Annual Corporate Evaluation (ACE) Report 2005

Title, Author(s), Date	PA : PI, Sec.	Projects Covered	Period Covered	Country/Region
Zenda Ofir, Lise Kriel, 04/2004				
10. The Groundwork of EQUINET: An Assessment of Processes and Outcomes of a Regional Equity in Health Research Network Blair Rutherford, 31/05/2004	SEP: GEH	004378, 100954	1998-2004	Southern Africa
11. Post Project Evaluation of Greywater Treatment and Reuse Project in Tafila, Jordan: Final Report Plan:Net Limited, 13/08/2004	ENRM: CFP	100880	2001-2003	Jordan
12. Evaluation of the Secretariat for Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa (SISERA) Bannock Consulting Ltd. 06/2004	SEP: SISERA	Secretariat	1997-2003	Africa
13. Feedback to TEHIP: Selected Findings from the Policy Influence Case Study on TEHIP Terry Smutylo, 08/2004	SEP: TEHIP	001047	1996-2004	Tanzania
14. Characterization of Dgroups in Latin America: Final Report, Bellanet LAC Rosa Cheng Lo & Margarita Salas, 05/2004	ICT4D: Bellanet	Secretariat	2001-2004	Latin America
15. Evaluation of Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA): January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2004 Jeffrey R. Vincent, 05/03/2005	SEP: EEPSEA	Secretariat	2000-2004	Southeast Asia
16. From Disciplinary Research to Stakeholder Participation in Research for Development in Oil Crops James M. Mbwika, Boniface N. Mburu & Luis A. Navarro, 09/11/2004	ENRM: Sunset	900102, 890231, 880027, 900186, 055029, 880253, 890058, 870025, 870024, 900071, 928464, 928466, 002002	1981-1997	Global
17. IDRC Communications Division: Stakeholder Consultations Report on Public Affairs and Government Relations Activities 2000-2004 The Governance Network, 02/11/04	Corporate	Corporate	2000-2004	Canada

Annual Corporate Evaluation (ACE) Report 2005

ANNEX 3. Guide for Assessing Quality of Evaluation

1. UTILITY		2. FEASIBILITY	
<p>1.1 Were the users identified?⁴ Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1.2 Were the uses identified? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1.3. Did the report describe how users participated in the evaluation process?⁵ Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Who were the identified users? Comments?</p> <p>What was the planned use? Comments?</p> <p>How did users participate? Comments?</p>	<p>2.1 Were the evaluation issues/questions identified? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>2.2 Given what could have been done in the evaluation, was the design of the evaluation adequate to address those issues/questions? (e.g. resources allotted, timing, perspectives represented, information sources consulted) Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient detail to assess <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>What were the evaluation issues? Comments?</p> <p>If no, in what way was the design inadequate? Comments.</p>
3. ACCURACY		4. PROPRIETY	
<p>3.1 Given what was actually done in the evaluation, did the evaluation use appropriate tools and methods? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient detail to assess <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3.2 Did it apply the tools and methods well? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient detail to assess <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3.3 Is the evidence presented in the report? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>3.4. Overall, does the evidence substantiate the conclusions/ recommendations? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>If no, in what ways were the tools and methods inappropriate? Comments?</p> <p>If no, how were the tools and methods inappropriately applied? Comments?</p> <p>Comments?</p> <p>Comments?</p>	<p>4.1 Was there an expressed intent to enhance the evaluative capacity of the user(s) of the evaluation as a result of this evaluation? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4.2 Was there an expressed intent to enhance the evaluative capacity of those being evaluated as a result of this evaluation? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4.3 Did any of the content of the evaluation report raise ethical concerns? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4.4 Was this evaluation a part of the PI, Secretariat, or Corporate Project's evaluation plan? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>What was the intent? What was the result? Comments.</p> <p>What was the intent? What was the result? Comments?</p> <p>If yes, what are those concerns? Comments?</p> <p>Why? Why Not?</p>

⁴ *User* is different from the *audience* of the evaluation. *User* is more specific and requires an action on their part.

⁵ This differs from assessing whether the evaluation was participatory or not.

ANNEX 4. Management Response

The Senior Management Committee has reviewed the *Annual Corporate Evaluation Report (ACER) 2005*. The report reminds us of the extensive evaluation and learning activities that are conducted at the project, program and corporate levels in the Centre. In keeping with the rolling nature of the Program Framework, the past year featured the completion of some and start of other external reviews of Centre programs. This period also saw a significant change in the way the Centre handles project completion reports. These two items have already been discussed at previous Board meetings.

In the past two years, the *Annual Report on Evaluation Findings* (as it was then known) noted that the quality of evaluations was mixed. This year the results (Table 3 and Section 3.2) suggest “some improvement over time, but also [...] the need for a more active campaign to improve evaluation quality.” It is not clear how these numbers compare with assessments of the evaluation reports of other agencies, but we do support the recommendation in *ACER 2005* that the Evaluation Guidelines be applied in a more determined manner in the Centre than they have been in the past. Program managers and staff will pay more attention to this dimension of evaluations than has been the case in the past. As a procedural change, a standard format for contracts for evaluations will be drawn up, so that key requirements are explicit and uniform across every evaluation that the Centre commissions.

Finally, we note the new format (and title) of this Report. The *ACERs* are an important point in the nexus of issues that connect research to development in the Centre’s organization and work. The process of evaluation and continuous learning will continue to be refined, indeed enhanced, in future. Much evaluative learning and thinking is not captured by the snap shot nature of the *ACER*. The Corporate Assessment Framework, the strengthening of strategic assessments on cross-cutting issues, the re-vamped project completion report cycle and the institution of an Annual Learning Forum at the Centre will all contribute to this enhancement. We endorse the approach and intent of the *ACER 2005*, and welcome Governors’ views on it.