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Introduction

A central theme in the field of evaluations is evaluation use. It has been noted that evaluations have not acted as catalysts for change. What is now emerging is a focus on organisational learning and evaluation influence. Evaluation influence is “the capacity or power of persons or things to produce effects on others by intangible or indirect means.” (Kirkhart, 2000, 7). These processes of evaluation influence and organisational learning are less tangible than the traditional instrumental use. The research presented in this overview gives references to and insight in enhancing and undermining factors in organisational learning processes. Factors include: organisational context, organisational culture, and organisation structure. Organisational context deals with management commitment, incentives and resources (Alkin and Taut, 2003). Organisational culture refers to attitude and behaviour within the organisation (ALNAP, 2006; Amo and Cousins, 2007). Whereas organisation structure deals with distribution of power and the positioning of monitoring and evaluation throughout the organisation (ALNAP, 2006).

This document offers an overview of publications dealing with utilisation of monitoring and evaluation in general and organisational learning in particular. This overview is prepared as a background document to the conference ‘Improving the use of monitoring and evaluation processes and findings’, 20-21 March 2014, and organised by the Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen UR in collaboration with Learning by Design, GIZ, Hivos and ICCO. An attempt has been made to categorise the publications presented in this research by appointing key words. A key words approach has been chosen over a themed based classification, as most publications cover more than one theme.
Annotated bibliography

Key words: utilisation factors, awareness, types of use

This article introduces the concept of evaluation use by sketching a broader conceptual framework; including and clarifying related notions of evaluation knowledge, knowledge use and evaluation influence, and discussing their implications.

Alkin and Taut distinguish two types of use: findings use and process use.
Findings use includes instrumental, conceptual and legitimised use. Process use exists of instrumental, conceptual and symbolic use. Alkin and Taut identify factors influencing evaluation use and/or evaluation knowledge, the evaluation factors being: 1) Context factors, i.e. pre-existing evaluation bounds, contractual obligations, financial constraints, inter- and intra-organisational characteristics, and community factors), 2) Human factors, both evaluator and user characteristics, 3) Evaluation factors, the personal characteristics and actions of the evaluator, for example, the evaluator’s commitment to use, willingness to involve users, political sensitivity, credibility, rapport with users etc.

"[They] found that learning has two components that interact with each other: knowledge acquisition and accumulation on the one hand, behaviour acquisition and modification on the other hand. In the case of findings use, the former type of learning dominates. In the case of process use, however, the conduct of the evaluation itself also enables potential users to acquire new skills and to modify their behaviour." (Ibid., 6). The authors also build on the work of Kirkhart (2000) making a distinction in awareness, time and source, which determine the evaluation impact within the program context. Awareness of evaluation’s intended and unintended impacts is seen as a defining characteristic in evaluation use.

Key words: utilisation factors, (political) environment, case study, humanitarian action

This sixth edition of the Review of Humanitarian Action directly addresses why the lessons from humanitarian experience have not been learned and therefore have not acted as catalysts for improving humanitarian action.

The authors discuss the RAPID approach (Research and Policy in Development), which identifies four key factors that influence utilisation of monitoring and evaluation. These four key factors are: 1) Quality of the evaluation process and product. This implies a clear and agreed upon purpose and design, participation of the users, good planning, quality of the evidence, mechanisms for follow-up to outset a clear allocation of individual responsibilities and quality interaction with the evaluator. 2) Organisational culture and structure. This key factor includes the promotion of a learning culture by senior staff member. Attention to performance should be integral to the working practise. The organisation has an individual or unit dedicated to learning. Furthermore, functional knowledge mechanisms are required. 3) Relational factor, which necessitates a constructive relationship between the evaluator and the organisation, a mediating role for the evaluation unit, and linkages between the organisation and its broader networks. 4) External influences, pertains to reputation, funding and pressure from the beneficiaries.

In addition, the review addresses the limitations the utilisation focused evaluation (UFE) approach has due to geographical distribution of the stakeholders. There is a limit
to the frequency of UFE based evaluations and the changes it results in. The function of evaluations should be to identify the strength and weaknesses of the evaluated programs.


Key words: Process use, organisational learning

The authors focus on the operationalisation of process use in empirical research and describe the type of research that has been carried out in this area. The article includes a conceptual framework of evaluative inquiry and organisational learning. “Evaluative inquiry is conceived as an organisational support structure that leads to particular organisational consequences, namely evaluation consequences manifested as knowledge production, use of findings, and process use. Process use, in turn, is thought to enhance organisational readiness for evaluation through augmenting organisational capacity to do and use evaluation” (Ibid., 6).

A table with different definitions of process use is offered. The definition of Preskill and Caracelli focusses on cognitive and behavioural changes. “Process use refers to the cognitive and behavioural changes resulting from users’ engagement in the evaluation process. Process use occurs when those involved in the evaluation learn from the evaluation process itself.” (Preskill and Caracelli, 1997, 217). Forss, Rebien, and Carlsson (2002) defined process use with some more practical characteristics. Process use is the “utility to stakeholders of being involved in the planning and implementation of an evaluation” (Ibid., 30), and evidenced by learning to learn, developing professional networks, creating shared understanding, strengthening project, boosting morale. Based on all definitions presented the authors distinguish four aspects of process use (Table 1.3):

- Learning
- Action or behaviour
- Attitude and affect
- other

Although the term process use had by then emerged in the conceptual and theoretical literature it would take a few more years before it found its way, in a direct sense, into the empirical studies sampled for review.


Key words: utilisation, evaluation influence, partnership functioning, evaluation context

This article provides an analysis of key concepts that are important for evaluation influence within public sector partnerships. Evaluation influence includes evaluation use as well as changes at the individual, interpersonal and collective level (Mark and Henry, 2003). The model presented in the paper focuses on evaluation attributes, the role of the partnership on the evaluation outcome it also builds on the notion that evaluation influence is impacted by many contextual factors. The contextual factors identified are: resources dedicated to evaluation, accountability requirements, support for evaluation, traditional policies and management, policy context and competitive markets. The model extends theories of evaluation influence in considering the role of the individual characteristics, stakeholder evaluation behaviour, and partnership context. It suggests that the evaluator plays an important role in evaluation influence as they influence the evaluation attributes.
“With respect to the evaluation attributes, the model highlights the importance of the evaluation approach and design, the evaluator, and the evaluation outputs. Specifically, the model identifies a participatory approach, the evaluator and the credibility, timeliness, responsiveness, and technical quality of evaluation outputs as important for influence.” (Ibid., 11) The study also sees stakeholder engagement as a positive factor in evaluation influence.

Key words: utilisation, institutional distance, organisational structure, types of use

The study compares different evaluation cases and their institutional design in Switzerland. The method used for this comparison is called qualitative comparative analysis. Based on this the study concludes that the institutional distance between the evaluator and the evaluatees does not always influence utilisation. The utilisation of an evaluation seems to depend on the type of utilisation (instrumental use, conceptual use, symbolic use, process-related use, general use). It is with formative evaluation that institutional distance matters least. It is in process related use that the institutional distance influences utilisation, and a smaller distance is preferred. Furthermore, summative evaluations seem to succeed best where those responsible have a certain routine for dealing with evaluations at their disposal.

Key words: evaluation design, method, budget and time constraints

This paper aims to help evaluators choose the right method given the budget and time constraints in place. The focus is on credible evaluations and mainly offers technical insights in evaluation methods to enhance the quality of the evaluation. A good quality evaluation must develop a credible set of indicators, have a sound counterfactual, and must be in accordance with accepted statistical procedures.

Key words: evaluation culture, case study

Evaluation cultures draws upon a sample of reflections, drawn from organisational practices, nationally centred political cultures, and ethnic cultures, as a framework for understanding how culture influences the work of evaluation. Two main conclusions seem to emerge. First, there is no single, uniform, and homogenous national evaluation culture. Second, the idea of a unified transnational culture of evaluation is an illusion.

Key words: utilisation, effective-use

Bonbright's note is written for professionals in the international development sector. The main message is that it is not the method of evaluation that matters. In fact evaluation success depends on the utilisation. No matter what plans are in place, it is the internal...
(how learning is encouraged) and external incentives (growing climate of accountability), which reinforce effective use of evaluations.


*Key words: utilisation, stakeholders, intended use*

This paper offers practitioners the tools to carry out a stakeholder analysis to identify the needs, interests, powers, priorities, etcetera. The aim of the framework is not only to understand the stakeholders’ perspective, but also apply the knowledge in such a way that intended use by primary users increases. With this perspective the paper falls in the UFE-approach. The techniques per evaluation steps are as following:

- **Evaluation planning:** list evaluation stakeholders; basic stakeholder analysis technique; power versus interest grids; stakeholder influence diagrams; bases or power.
- **Evaluation design:** participation planning matrix; purpose network or hierarchy.
- **Data collection:** stakeholder role plays
- **Analysis:** evaluation recommendation support versus opposition grids; stakes and inclination towards evaluation; recommendation attractiveness versus stakeholder capability grid.
- **Decision-making and implementation:** evaluation recommendation implementation strategy development grid.

The key message is to think strategically about which analyses are to be undertaken, why, how, by whom, when, and how to change the direction when needed.


*Key words: case study, decision making, government bodies, organisational change, utilisation, types of use*

This dissertation adds to the literature on —Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) grant evaluation use by assessing (1) the extent to which project directors of state grants use evaluation results (i.e., instrumental use, conceptual use, persuasive use, and/or process use), (2) the extent to which the evaluations of the state GEAR UP grant programs have had an influence at the individual, interpersonal, and collective levels, and (3) what factors have an impact on the use of those results (i.e., quality of the evaluation, decision and policy setting factors).

Additionally, this dissertation provides insight into GEAR UP administrators’ expectations for evaluation use among state GEAR UP grant project directors and support systems for evaluation use.

Results indicate that GEAR UP project directors are using their evaluations primarily for decision-making and educational purposes and to a lesser extent for persuasive and process use-related purposes. Project directors reported evaluation influence at the individual, interpersonal, and collective levels. Both implementation factors and decision and policy setting factors had an impact on project directors’ decisions to use their programmes’ evaluations. Furthermore, State GEAR UP project directors would like for the National Council for Community Education Partnerships (NCCEP) to provide training (i.e., evaluator led-workshops, workshops that define terms, training on non-evaluator uses of evaluation) in order to promote their understanding of the evaluation. Most of the
former (NCCEP) staff interviewed had high expectations for use of evaluation results by state project directors. Former NCCEP staff members were able to provide a number of examples of cases where states were using their programme’s evaluations. All of the former NCCEP staff members interviewed said that they thought project directors had been encouraged and trained to promote use. Former NCCEP staff also identified a number of barriers to directors’ use of their programs evaluations and provided some suggestions for addressing these barriers.


Key words: types of use, organisational learning, case study

This book discusses evaluation use, including an integrated theory of influence and perspectives on organisational learning Caracelli and Preskill detail a comprehensive theory of influence that provides a conceptual framework encompassing both process and results-based use, intended and unintended use, and episodic and instrumental use.


Key words: evaluation influence, decision making

Christie presents a simulation study with actual evaluation data. The study can be placed in the first level of the framework of Henry and Mark (2003), the individual evaluation influence level of process use. Three types of evaluation were presented to participants in the study: longitudinal data, case study data and anecdotal data. The participants had to make a decision based on the presented information. In this way the study examined decision makers’ actions, which are behaviours, and the extent to which prior beliefs about a program’s effectiveness may affect an action or behaviour. However, it did not examine attitudes. The study shows that all types of information influence the decision making process, but longitudinal and case study data had a stronger influence than anecdotal data.


Key words: utilisation

This paper offers insights on the current state of evaluations in philanthropic organisations. The paper is based on voluntary interviews with such organisations and addresses the evaluation activities, perception on timelines and the evaluation budget and the use of the evaluations. The authors argue that evaluation seems to be deeply rooted in philanthropic organisations; it is no longer a trend that might fade away. Furthermore, evaluation is more and more used in the development of programs and strategies. However, utilisation remains a challenge to the organisations. An important question foundations ask themselves is: What does dedication to “learning activities” mean for the foundation?


Key words: evaluation context, utilisation
The use of evaluation results is at the core of evaluation theory and practice. This article proposes a framework for better understanding the embedded relations between evaluation context and choice of an evaluation model and use of results. The framework draws on previous studies and has two axes: cost sharing and polarisation. According to the authors organisations will invest energy and resources in knowledge exchange processes to the extent that they perceive this investment to be profitable. The way in which the system is polarising is the key to understanding the nature of on-going coalitions. This framework for understanding utilisation should be able to predict the impact of evaluation results. Contandriopoulos and Brousselle argue that the evaluation context presents affects both the appropriateness of the evaluation model implemented and the use of results. They state that evaluation context deserves a paper on its own and factors influencing evaluation context are not mentioned in this paper.


*Key words: process use*

This volume is a multifaceted exploration of process use; it includes methodological, empirical, and conceptual inquiries as well as rich narrative forays into the domain of evaluation practice.


*Key words: utilisation*


*Key words: public sector, programme evaluation, government bodies, effectiveness, evaluation use.*

This chapter reviews the Canadian case of assessing the worth of public programmes and policies and using the resulting value judgments to drive funding decisions. The author provides a brief overview of the Canadian Strategic Review initiative, and considers implications of this federal government approach to valuation. The author argues that never before has the evaluation function within the federal government been so directly linked to an expenditure management system that requires such a definitive valuation of programmes and initiatives. Because of this direct link, programme evaluations are expected to give answers to questions like: Is the program a government priority? And at the same time: Does the societal need for which the program was designed still exist? Because of limited resources and contracted time programme evaluations rarely are able to investigate the second question, and are often confined to matching programme goals to government priorities. Furthermore, programme evaluations are expected to assess *effectiveness* and *economy,* as they are expected to assess the “resource utilisation in relation to the production of outputs and progress toward expected outcomes” (Dumaine 2012: 70, Table 6.2, Issue 5). This would require a fundamental shift in organisational culture of the government, as evaluators should then be able to access detailed finance
and operational data. According to the author meaningful evaluation processes are at stake if in this context, evaluation simply is becoming a test that programme managers either pass or fail, as the allocation of resources in the next term depends on it. The author concludes that for the evaluation function to meet expectations and maintain its fundamental purpose of being a participatory process to assist program managers in learning and improving their programs, some fine-tuning will be necessary.

**European Commission (2007).** *Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulations – improving evaluation.*

*Key words: case study, utilisation*

This policy brief identifies areas of improvement to strengthen evaluation and its use as a part of the smart Regulation approach. The European Commission aims at improving consistency and clarity, embedding fitness checks, promoting and evaluation culture, improved planning, improve evaluation design, building in quality. Furthermore evaluation is seen as a task of the entire organisation.


*Keywords: utilisation strategies, politics*

The report of Eyben et al. gives a summary of the conference proceedings on the politics of evidence. In the report they make a distinction between: 1) big “E”, evidence of what works or not and under which circumstances and 2) small “e”, evidence about performance and results monitoring. They found that organisations are often focussed on small “e” with high transaction costs instead of prioritising learning (called Big “E” and evidence artefacts). “Evidence artefacts are concerned with finding out what works best and therefore delivering value for money” (Ibid: 2). Artefacts refers to organisational processes and protocols based on formal and informal rules and norms. Politics are everywhere and is more than just power relations it drives organisational dynamics. Political context include: social relations, trust, loyalty, strategic decisions and mindsets. To enhance utilisation and to reduce perverse effects (such as questionable ethics, unclear utility and wasted resources) it is important to recognise one’s power to make a difference. The strategy put forward in the report is an approach around circles of influence:

- **Innermost circle:** one’s own power to change things by resistance and/or creative compliance
- **Next circle:** Engaging one-on-one with others to develop creative relationships of trust.
- **Outer circle:** Influence organisational structures through coalitions between organisations.


*Key words: dissemination, use, value, evaluation of use, relevance*

All evaluations have a cost but not necessarily a value. Their value does not depend on their cost but on their use, and this article discusses factors affecting the use of evaluations. These factors could be taken into account in order to increase and improve the use made of evaluations and, consequently, their value. The use of evaluations should
not be taken for granted. There are several things that can be done to promote greater and better use of evaluations.

Feinstein (2002) first shortly discusses some useful distinction in terms of types of use: instrumental and cognitive use; evaluation for accountability or for learning (not mutually exclusive); apparent, actual and potential use; and evaluation for persuasion.

The main factors influencing use of evaluations are, according to the author:

- **Relevance of the evaluations** (to which extent does an evaluation address the issues that are considered of importance by the ‘clients’ (wide concept) of the evaluation?)
- **Quality of their dissemination** (the appropriateness of the means used to facilitate access to the evaluation)

The author proposes the following relation between use, relevance and dissemination: if there is no relevance or no dissemination, there is no use. Factors that influence the relevance of an evaluation include: the timeliness of the evaluation (making findings available when decisions are taken), involving stakeholder to increase perceived relevance, and the credibility of the evaluation which depends on the methodology and the perceived quality of the evaluation team. Factors influencing the quality of dissemination include the user-friendliness of evaluations and mechanisms or channels used for the communication of findings. Other factors influencing use are the evaluation-use capacity and incentives to use evaluations.

Two key issues for the evaluation of the use of evaluations are discussed:

- **Lags**: refraining from judgment on the evaluation use because the evaluation might still be used (apocalyptic fallacy) or judging too early as the evaluation has not been used so far, but might be used in the future (premature killing).
- **Attribution**: The fact that there is consistency between the evaluation findings and recommendations and what was done after the evaluation is not necessarily an indication of use (post hoc fallacy)


Key words: utilisation, stakeholder engagement, organisational outcomes, role of the evaluator

This paper presents the results of a cross-sectional survey on evaluation use completed by 1,140 U.S. American Evaluation Association members. Findings suggest a fair level of agreement on several dimensions of use including stakeholder involvement, factors that influence use, and the varied roles of the evaluator. Barriers to use include human factors (evaluator and user characteristics), contextual factors (resources and organisational structure) and evaluation factors (quality).


Key words: utilisation, stakeholder engagement
This paper draws on experiences in large international organisations, such as the World Bank. The paper suggests that to enhance utilisation, stakeholder engagement, understanding the needs of the stakeholders and delivering the results at the right moment (timeliness) are of vital importance.

*Key words: evaluation goals, social betterment*

Since the publication of Patton's influential work on utilisation-focused evaluation use has been the primary goal of evaluation. Henry proposes a different approach by stating that social betterment should be the goal of evaluation. In this way use becomes a means by which to achieve social betterment. He argues that societies need information that helps selecting one course of action over another. To achieve social betterment three functions have to be performed: 1) Determining the common good. "Evaluations can support and inform the determination of a common good by providing an empirical check on the claims of need and the extent or consequences of a social problem." (Ibid., 87). 2) Selecting a course of action. Evaluations provide information on the consequences of different actions. 3) Adapting the course of action. "Evaluation can assess the strengths and weaknesses of the implementation of a chosen course of action and the organisation as well as situational barriers to implementing the action." (Ibid., 89). So, social betterment is achieved by setting priorities and assessing the policy context rather than looking for the most immediate opportunities for use. The policy environment is therefore a guide-post for evaluation. "Ultimately, the potential of evaluation is more likely to be realised if informing rather than influencing policies and programs is the criteria for success."(Ibid., 96).

*Key words: evaluation influence*

This paper of Henry presents examples of influences of evaluations “Evaluations can influence perceptions about social problems, the election of social politics, and adapting policy implications.” (Ibid., 515). Henry refers to evaluation influence as a change between the pre-evaluation state and the post-evaluation state. Henry builds on some of his earlier works identifying three functions through which an evaluation can lead to social betterment (the ultimate purpose of evaluations):

1) **Determining the common good.** This is about raising a social problem. Examples of specific evaluations for determining the common good are: National Assessment of Educational Progress; Surveillance studies; Outcomes performance indicators; Needs analysis; Social indicators.

2) **Selecting a course of action.** This is about choosing a policy or program. Examples of specific evaluations for selecting a course of action are: Project High Scope; Fort Bragg Continuum of Care for Mental Health Services; Tennessee STAR experiments; Chicago Child-Parent Centre; DARE evaluations.

3) **Adapting the course of action.** This is about improving a policy or organisation. Examples of specific evaluations for adapting the course of action: Pre-K Longitudinal Study; Cost, Quality and Outcomes Study; Impact of Resource Utilisation on Educational Outcomes.

Henry concludes that based on the presented cases “the processes that influential evaluations can set off include changing attitudes or behaviours, persuading
others, justifying policies and public expenditures, empowering change agents, and placing an item on the public agenda, among others.” (Ibid., 524). Henry also states that high technical quality is one of the most important factors to achieve evaluation influence.


*Key words: evaluation influence, process use, organisational learning*

This paper goes beyond the concept of ‘use’ by developing the concept of ‘evaluation influence’ which describes the change process through which evaluation affects attitudes, beliefs, action and social betterment. According to the authors the theory of evaluation influence should focus on “the subset of evaluation consequences that could plausibly lead towards or away from social betterment.” (Ibid., 295). They offer a framework for studying evaluation influence that distinguishes three levels of evaluation influence: the personnel, interpersonal and collective level. For each level they set out mechanisms through which evaluation produces influence:

- **Individual level**: attitude change, salience, elaboration, priming, skill acquisition, and behavioural change.
- **Interpersonal level**: justification, persuasion, change agent, social norms, and minority-opinion influence.
- **Collective level** (public and private organisations): agenda setting, policy oriented learning, policy change, and diffusion.


*Key words: utilisation, organisational change*

This paper focuses on the paradox of evaluation; evaluations are carried out to improve policies, but they rarely do so. First he describes how this paradox is inherent in the nature of evaluation. Second, organisational context should be addressed more to resolve the paradox.

Højlund distinguishes findings use and process use. The article refers to symbolic-and legitimising use and justificatory use.

“The problem might be that the evaluation use literature often focuses on the evaluation itself – its implementation, its outputs, its conditioning factors, etcetera – and largely ignores the organisational context. However, on the organisational level, there might be forces at play that are so strong that they overrule a persuasive evaluation result and cancel instrumental use.” (Ibid., 29). Identified predictors of institutional adaptation are: cultural constrains in the environment, uncertainty in the environment, and normative expectations in the environment. It is possible to roughly graduate the external pressure that an organisation is under into a high or a low category. Pressures are considered high if the organisation is strongly influenced or dependent upon other organisations for survival in an uncertain environment (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). In the opposite case, the pressure is low. Based on the degrees of internal propensity to evaluate and external pressure four categories (extreme positions) of adaptation can be identified:

- **Coercive adaptation**: high external pressure, low internal propensity to evaluate.
- **Mimetic adaptation**: high external pressure, high internal propensity to evaluate.
- **Normative adaptation**: low external pressure, low internal propensity to evaluate.
- **Voluntary adaptation**: low external pressure, high internal propensity to evaluate.
The author argues that in order to explain all types of evaluation uses, including non-use and justificatory use, the focus needs to be on the evaluating organisation and its conditioning factors, rather than on the evaluation itself.

**ITIG- Utilisation of Evaluations- Bibliography**

*Key words: overview, utilisation*

One of the issues currently debated in the field of evaluation is utilisations of evaluations or otherwise. The research conducted on this issue provides insights into the phenomenon and also throws light on how the utilisation of evaluation findings could be increased. The body of research deals with an entire range of issues relating to evaluation utilisation. An attempt has been made to collate and classify this research into some meaningful categories.


*Key words: utilisation factors, modelling*

Johnson presents a meta model (a model developed from models) that depicts evaluation use as occurring in an international environment stated in an external environment. The model includes general factors considered most important in evaluation utilisation, the factors being:

- **Behavioural use.** Changes in action due to evaluation results.
- **Cognitive use.** Includes changes in attitudes, beliefs and knowledge. These changes come about from participating in the evaluation.
- **Complexity theory.** It includes here, feedback, self-organisation and non-linear relationships.
- **Competing information.**
- **Dissemination.** This relates to interpersonal and intergroup communication.
- **Evaluator characteristics.** This includes both personal and research characteristics of the evaluator.
- **Expectations.** Includes summative and formative thinking.
- **External environment and the context of the evaluation.** The external context consists of external stakeholders, law, macro-culture in a society and the human resources available to the organisation.
- **Individual characteristics.** Here we can distinguish change seekers and bureaucrats.
- **Internal environment and context of the evaluation.** Organisational culture and structure and the internal political environment.
- **Interests and ideology.** Do the findings support the organisations beliefs?
- **Network organisation.** This relates to interactions and structures connecting individuals in the organisation.
- **Organisational characteristics.** Here we distinguish organic versus mechanic organisations.
- **Organisation culture.** This can also be called ‘ways of doing’
- **Organisational learning.** This includes formal and informal patterns in an organisation as well as room for adjustments.
- **Participation.** This is the degree to which people are involved in the program.
- **Politics.** Refers to the political climate which includes power relations and levels of resistance and openness to change.
- **Truth and utility tests.** Are the evaluation results trusted?

Key words: review, utilisation factors

Johnson et al. present a systematic review of previous studies in the field of evaluation use, using Cousins' and Leithwoods' 1986 framework for categorising empirical studies of evaluation use conducted since that time. The findings suggest that engagement, communication and interaction with stakeholders is critical to the use of evaluation.


Key words: policy influence, theory of change

This note focuses on monitoring and evaluation of policy influence. To understand how you can monitor policy influence Jones starts with defining policy change. Policy change is a highly complex process shaped by a multitude of interacting forces and actors. “Policy is understood as a series of documents and decisions that are best described as a set of processes, activities or actions.” (Ibid., 1) Five key dimensions of possible policy impact are: attitudinal change, discursive commitments, procedural change, policy content, and behaviour change.

Jones distinguish three types of influencing activities: 1) Evidence and advice, 2) Public campaigns and advocacy, and 3) Lobbying and negotiation. Theory of Change (ToC) is an essential tool to monitor and evaluate policy influence and should be developed as early as possible. Again a distinction is made between the different types of ToCs:

- *Causal chain.* Describes a succession of elements and the causal connection between them.
- *Dimensions of influence:* Looks at the different dimensions of change.
- *Actor-oriented theories:* Focus on the behaviour change of different actors.


Key words: impact evaluation, evaluation use, case study, policy influence, evaluation capacity building, stakeholder engagement

This ODI report builds on an earlier scoping study that made recommendations on improving both production and use of impact evaluations and that focused on clustering, coordination, knowledge management, capacity strengthening and communication and uptake. This objectives of this ODI report are (a) to determine how amenable impact evaluations are to different types of projects, programmes and policies; (b) to look at various methods used in impact evaluations, (c) to analyse how impact evaluations re disseminated and communicated, (d) to assess the use and influence of impact evaluations, and (e) to make recommendations to improve impact evaluation production and use. The report presents an overview of conclusions and policy implications on strategic coordination, funding, knowledge management, capacity strengthening mechanisms and improving the communication and uptake of impact evaluations.
For strategic coordination on impact evaluation products and use, Jones et al. conclude that there is a need to broaden the strategic framework beyond the level of project interventions to a wider policy-level. Method-wise they advise to focus beyond a narrow debate on specific experimental methodologies and compartmentalized professions towards mixed and plural analytic approaches. They advise policy funding to incentivize evaluation staff to (a) disseminate evaluation findings beyond the academic realm to policy and practitioner audiences, and to media; and to (b) publish both negative and positive results to promote learning and accountability. When it comes to knowledge management, agreements on common database formatting, updating and circulations are required to promote knowledge sharing and transparency. In order to avoid that impact evaluations are donor-driven or supply-oriented tools only, Jones et al. stress the need to support evaluation capacity development in developing countries, and give suggestions on how to do so. The report sees the need for a clear decision framework that outlines whether, what and when to evaluate, and asks NONIE to take responsibility to summarize issues of plausibility and suitability to move debates toward a common ground. Best practice case studies demonstrate that early involvement of stakeholders, the support of high-profile champions, and attracting political agents that are interested in learning is key to facilitate the uptake of impact evaluations.

The report concludes that for evaluations to successfully affect policy transfers, the main ingredients are (a) the presence of a critical mass of evaluations, (b) a combination of impact and process information, (c) a drive for technical rigour, and (d) the inclusion of cost data.


Key words: utilisation factors

This study examines the factors that affect the utilisation of performance measurements. The study is the result of a survey carried out under state and local government officials. Based on hypothesis testing the author concludes that policy adaptation is driven more heavily by factors from rational and technocratic theory (information, goal orientation and external requirements), whereas actual implementation is influenced by political and cultural factors. This suggests that the political and institutional contexts are defining for utilisation. Political factors include: internal interest groups, external interest groups and unions, and risk taking and attitude (organisational culture).


Key words: Evaluation influence

The paper of Kirkhart is the first influential conceptual paper that offers an inclusive understanding of evaluation influence. She defines influence as: "the capacity or power of persons or things to produce effects on others by intangible or indirect means." Influence is broader than use, creating a framework with which to examine effects that are multidirectional, incremental, unintentional, and instrumental" (Ibid., 7). Her integrated theory of influence has three dimensions: source of influence (result-based and process-based influence), intention (extent to which the evaluation influence is purposefully
directed; intended versus unintended) and time (immediate influence, end of cycle influence, long term influence). These three elements make influence a multi-faceted concept. Kirkhart also lays out potential use of the integrated influence framework. A practical usage of the framework could be to map influence surrounding a particular evaluation. This can help to identify early effects associated with the program.


*Key words: utilisation, empirical study, types of use*

Much has been written about evaluation utilisation from a theoretical perspective, but relatively less emphasis has been given to empirical studies that examine how the findings from given evaluations are utilised. The current study examined the nature and extent of utilisation of the findings from an ongoing evaluation of a key component of a major national primary mental health care initiative in Australia. The initiative is known as the Better Outcomes in Mental Health Care (BOiMHC) program, and the component involves 111 Access to Allied Psychological Services (ATAPS) projects, which provide mental health care to people who might otherwise have difficulty accessing such services. Nine reports have been produced during the evaluation of the ATAPS projects, and the current study explored how various stakeholders have used the first eight of these reports, via semi-structured interviews with 10 purposefully sampled respondents. The study revealed that the findings in the reports have been put to instrumental use (e.g. influencing decisions about program modification), conceptual use (e.g. furthering the knowledge base regarding the delivery of primary mental health care in general) and symbolic or legitimative use (e.g. confirming the original philosophy behind the BOiMHC program). Various reasons may account for this wide range of uses, including the fact that every effort has been made to identify all relevant stakeholders, garner their support for the evaluation from the outset, and communicate the evaluation findings to them in a relevant manner. The study provides empirical evidence that evaluation findings can be widely utilised, provided they are geared to the needs of the relevant stakeholders.


*Key words: effectiveness, accountability, use of evidence, humanitarian action, dissemination, instrumental use*

The failure to generate and use evidence in policy and response makes humanitarian action less effective, less ethical and less accountable. The authors note that even when high quality evidence is available, decisions are often driven by other (personal) considerations. It is therefore important the evidence should be *used* by decision-makers in the field of humanitarian action but also in public policy there is a need to integrate evidence more systematically into practice. This is not a new topic, it has been around since the 1990s, but there still appear to be room for improvement. This paper defines evidence as: information that helps to substantiate or prove/disprove the truth of a specific proposition (p. 7).

The authors come to the conclusion that evidence matters: the use of good quality evidence improves the effectiveness and accountability of humanitarian action, and is in
accordance with humanitarian ethics and principles. The paper proposes the use of six main criteria for the quality of evidence:

1. Accuracy - Is the evidence a good reflection of the real situation?
2. Representativeness – To which degree does the evidence accurately represent the condition of the larger group of interest?
3. Relevance - To which degree does a piece of information relate to the proposition that it is intended to prove or disprove?
4. Generalisability of conclusions – To which degree can the evidence from a specific situation be generalised beyond that response to other situations (and particularly to situations in other countries at other times)?
5. Attribution - Does analysis demonstrate a clear and unambiguous causal linkage between two conditions or events?
6. Clarity around context and methods – To which degree is it clear why, how, and for whom the evidence has been collected?

They find a difference between the direct ‘instrumental’ use of evaluations and their longer term, indirect role in influencing humanitarian policy. The authors find that evaluations are often used instrumentally (for the immediate redesign of the programmes or projects evaluated). ‘Hard to implement’ recommendations are less likely to be used. ALNAP has researched the factors that lead to instrumental use and the most important seems to be a close engagement of the decision-makers with the evaluation process and many humanitarian organisations are now using methods to support this type of engagement. The paper finds that evaluations are only one source of evidence for policy development and their influence on policy is often limited by the fact that evaluations can be hard to find (in part a result of a reluctance on the part of agencies to circulate evidence that reflects badly on their programmes), and by the natural resistance to change displayed by individuals and organisations in the humanitarian sector. Evaluations are more likely to inform policy in situations where there is already pressure for change.

The paper concludes that to improve the use of evidence the following principles should be guiding for evaluators: accessibility (evidence in short reports in jargon-free language, infographics), timeliness (make relevant) evidence available at critical points in the decision-making process), broad circulation of evidence through a variety of media. Decision-makers can improve the use of evidence by establishing clear decision-making processes and ensuring that there are incentives for the use of evidence.


This study presents the Integrative Evaluation Capacity Building (ECB) Model. The model consists of three blocks: needs, activities and results. This includes different factors influencing the evaluation capacity.

- **Needs:** Reasons-Motivations; Goals-Objectives; Context, Resources and Strengths (Individual and organisational).
- **Activities:** Strategies; Implementation; Evaluation of ECB.
- **Results:** Individual level (attitudes, knowledge, behaviour); organisational level (PPP, leadership, organisational culture, mainstreaming, resources); program outcomes; negative outcomes; lessons learned.

Additions to this framework are: explicit inclusion of collaborative and participatory aspects to most elements of the model and inclusion of program outcomes.

Key words: case study, impact evaluation, utilisation, communication

In this case study the authors look at how the dissemination of evaluation findings, specially focusing on timing, led to improvements in the programme design as well as a major shift in the government’s commitment to increase funding and expand the coverage of the programme. Two main learning points from this case are: 1) Government-commissioned evaluations can improve policy management and 2) Timing of the release of the findings is extremely important.


Key words: utilisation, context

This study does not aim to identify the “important” characteristics for utilisation, but rather adopts a focus on context bound mechanisms of use. Lederman uses a matrix of pressure for change and level of conflict to identify four mechanisms of evaluation use in different contexts: 1) *Evaluation as an awakener*. Low pressure, low conflict. Provided that the evaluation is of good quality and presents new results the evaluation can lead to change and awakening of people. 2) *Evaluation as a trigger*. High pressure, low conflict. “In a consensual environment where stakeholders are aware of problems that must be solved, evaluations are assumed to trigger change only if they are of good quality.” (Ibid., 12). 3) *Evaluation as a conciliator*. Low pressure, high conflict. In a situation of conflict an evaluation can only bring change if it is of good quality and shows something new that is out of the area of disagreement. 4) *Evaluation as a referee*. High pressure, high conflict. In this case conclusions of a good quality evaluation will only be accepted by some part of the stakeholders.

According to this approach, it is a combination of factors and the context instead of a single condition leading up to a certain outcome. “Depending on the context, the perceived novelty value and quality of an evaluation seem to matter more or less. This is likely to be true for most of the factors that are related to evaluation use and has implications for research on this subject. It is high time that we do not just control for contextual factors but make context explicit.” (Ibid., 17).


Key words: utilisation

Leviton states that the empirical field of evaluation use is thin. This has implication for theoretical frameworks as they are often based on empirical evidence. Leviton offers alternative techniques to evaluate and enhance evaluation use. She argues that a stronger focus on the context is required. Here, context includes the social construction of policies, programs and realities.

“Users’ personal and collective “bodies of evidence” may be correct or incorrect, complete or incomplete, and individual users may or may not be aware of these deficits. Where the users are aware that they do not have information, we call the deficits “uncertainty.” Where users are unaware, we call any deficits “flawed assumptions.” (Ibid.,
Mapping flawed assumptions and uncertainty gives insight in the decision making process. Another method that could be explored is one of mental modelling. “A user’s decision context depends on a mental model of the program, including specific practices within a program, the nature of the social problem being addressed, and the workings of the policies that control the program, the characteristics and behaviours of both the service providers and recipients.” (Ibid., 529). This may help to identify deficits in knowledge.

Leviton emphasises that what we do not know, the area of uncertainty, has a big influence on decision making. She concludes: “High payoff evaluations are likely to be those for which the questions have been framed by a structured process. These are likely to reduce uncertainty about important issues and test assumptions about policy, programs, social needs, and service delivery.” (Ibid., 534).

Key words: utilisation, types of use

For evaluations to be called utilised there are two criteria: 1) there must be serious discussion about the results of the program evaluated. 2) “There must be evidence that in the absence of the research information, those engaged in policy or program activities would have thought or acted differently.” (Ibid., 527). Where impact just includes the modifications made in the program utilisation also involves the relevance of the findings. The authors suggest to categorise use based on cycles of bureaucratic decision-making and policy revision. Based on a review Leviton and Hughes define five cluster variables that affect use, namely:

- The relevance of evaluation to the needs of potential users;
- The extent of communication between potential users and producers of evaluations;
- Translation of evaluations into their implications for policy and programs;
- Credibility or trust placed in evaluations;
- Commitment or advocacy by individual users.

Key words: institutionalisation, influence

The paper of Levy focuses on institutionalising or sustaining change related to new perspectives in the practices of governments and other organisations involved in the development practises. The author defines institutionalisation as “the process whereby social practices become sufficiently regular and continuous to be describes as institutions.” (Ibid., 1). Though Levy focuses on gender, the framework she presents is applicable to other processes of institutionalisation too, such as monitoring and evaluation. The framework consists of the following elements (applied to monitoring and evaluation instead of gender):

- ‘Delivery’ of programmes and projects. This focuses on the extent to which the process of programmes or project formulation and implementation is aware of monitoring and evaluation.
- Experiences and interpretation of the reality.
- Pressure of political constituencies. This focuses on the extent to which political constituencies include monitoring and evaluation in their formulations, implementations and practises. This is critical to on-going institutionalism.
These three factors are a re-enforcing triangle and are critical for sustained change. Other elements influencing these factors are:

• Representative political structures. To what extent are there policies formulated, implemented and evaluated regarding.
• Political commitment to integrate monitoring and evaluation activities.
• Resource (budget)
• Policy frameworks within your organisation and partner organisations.
• Procedures in different stages of programme cycles.
• Mainstream location of responsibility monitoring and evaluation. Is it clear who is responsible for monitoring and evaluation within the organisation?
• Staff development
• Methodology. Do the methodologies applied incorporate monitoring and evaluation?
• Research. Is monitoring and evaluation part of applied research?
• Theory-building. Do the staffs have access to monitoring and evaluation information?


Key words: utilisation, case study, practitioners’ experiences

The book offers insights from evaluators, who share their challenges and strategies. The different findings are synthesised in the final chapter reaching to several valuable insights:

• Independence may improve the credibility but does not guarantee the quality.
• Evaluation procedures and staff should not be isolated it requires commitment of the entire organisation to improve evaluation’s utility. Active engagement plays an important role in this process.
• Stakeholder engagement is key.
• It is critical to set out rules and procedures in an early stage, i.e. ToR.
• Timeliness is a concern in many organisations.

Furthermore this book offers discussion questions to its readers at the end of every chapter.


Key words: utilisation factors

The chapter of Mark is built around the concept ‘evaluation as assisted sense making’. “The basic idea is that evaluation can contribute by extending, enhancing, and checking the natural sense making that people engage in about educational policies, programs and practices.” (Ibid.,55). An important notion razed by mark is that evaluation is not unidimensional. Moreover, the road to evaluate consequences is not linear, it can follow many pathways. Potential purposes for evaluations are: the empowerment of stakeholders, the development of learning organisations, the creation of forums for democratic deliberation, the advancement of social justice, and the enhancement of practical wisdom as good practise judgement (Ibid., 62).

Mark uses the three by five classification system, which has three levels of analysis: individual, interpersonal and collective level. The system identifies five types of consequences:

• Cognitive and affective consequences: changes in thoughts, feelings and attitude.
• Behavioural consequences: changes in action.
• Relational consequences: changes in relationship structures and the organisational process.
• General consequences: changes in mechanisms such as elaboration.
• Motivational consequences: changes in goals and aspirations.

The evaluator’s role is to assist in human sense making. This includes evoking several changes as there are many pathways to change.

Mark also discusses Randomised Controlled Trials (RCT). He admits they can influence pathways of evaluations. Yet there are many other varied pathways by which evaluation can contribute to sense making.

*Key words*: evaluation outcomes, evaluation theory, use, evaluation influence

Mark and Henry state that though use has been extensively researched the underlying mechanisms have not. The authors present an evaluation logic model (Cousins, 2003) and a classificatory model which together lead to a new comprehensive model of evaluation influence. The mechanisms underlying evaluation influence consists of four categories: 1) General influence processes. These are the fundamental drivers of change. 2) Cognitive and affective processes. This refers to shifts in thoughts and feelings. 3) Motivational processes. This refers to goals and aspirations. 4) Behavioural processes. These are changes in actions and are often long-term outcomes.

The comprehensive evaluation influence framework consists of elements of Cousins framework and the mechanisms that were previously mentioned.

**Evaluation inputs**
- Evaluation context:
- Decision / policy settings
**Evaluation activities**
- Stakeholder selection and participation
- Evaluation planning and design
- Data collection and analysis
- Developing conclusions and recommendations
- Report generation
- Information dissemination
**Evaluation outputs**
- Knowledge attributes: responsiveness, credibility, sophistication, communication, and timeliness.
- General mechanisms: elaboration, heuristics, priming, salience, skill acquisition, persuasion justification, minority-opinion, policy consideration, standards setting, policy discussion and deliberation, and coalition formation.
**Intermediate and long-term outcomes**
- Cognitive/affective: salience, opinion valence, descriptive norms, agenda setting
- Motivational: personal goals, social rewards, incentives, and market forces.
- Behavioural: individual practice, program continuation, termination or expansion, and policy adaptation.

Ideally the process results, through the intermediate and long-term outcomes in social betterment.

Key words: accountability, performance measurement

This five-year study is an assessment of expectations and actual uses of annual performance reports by selected decision makers in British-Columbia, Canada. The findings support the idea of the paradox in public performance reporting: public reporting of targeted performance measures, although it may improve symbolic accountability, undermines the usefulness (and thereby utilisation) of the reported performance information for performance management.


Key words: adaptive management, evaluation, result chains, theory of change

A result chain is a diagram that depicts the assumed causal linkages between an intervention and desired impacts through intermediate results. Result chains help organisations make their assumptions behind an action explicit and positions the team to develop relevant objectives and indicators to monitor and evaluate whether their actions have the intended impact. This approach fits in the theory of change framework.


Key words: types of use, instrumental use, enlightenment use, policy influence, organisational learning, case study, dissemination

This article is a case study of how evaluation findings of a mid-term evaluation of the World Bank Institute’s (WBI) efforts to help reduce corruption in Tanzania and Uganda were utilized. It offers insights into and presents examples of how evaluation was used in an instrumental and in an enlightenment way by both programme designers and implementers. The article makes a link with knowledge generalization and shows the importance of designing effective and suitable strategies for the dissemination of evaluation results for a wide range of users. Marra concludes that the best way to encourage the use of evaluation results is the early involvement of programme staff and to have them participate in defining the study, and in interpreting results, whilst producing regular reports for programme staff whilst the evaluation is in progress.


Key words: empirical study, utilisation, government bodies, organisational factors

The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993 and the George W. Bush administration’s Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) established new routines that were intended to foster performance management practices. Using survey data the author finds that organisational factors, namely leadership commitment to results,
learning routines led by supervisors, the motivational nature of the task, and the ability to link measures to actions,

*Key words: behaviour change, health*

This report focuses on individual behaviour change interventions aimed at changing behaviour that can damage people’s health. Lessons that can be taken from the health sector approach are that for sustained behaviour change to occur both the individual and the community has to change. So, in terms of evaluations this would mean that to change individual’s behaviour in an organisation change has to occur and especially be promoted throughout the organisation.

*Key words: evaluation influence, pathways, case study*

An evaluation has four potential functions: assessing the merit or worth of a program, serving as a tool for compliance and oversight, contributing to the knowledge base, or guiding the improvement of a policy or program. Metadata can give insight in how effectively evaluations served one of these purposes (Ibid., 32). This paper presents a case study of summative metadata evaluation at the INGO CARE. “The central analysis for the evaluation and interview data employs Henry and Mark’s (2003) ‘pathways’ of evaluation influence as the basis for examining how an evaluation affects an INGO from start to finish.”(Ibid., 34). The three pathways are individual-, interpersonal- and collective-level influence. This case study shows evidence of influence at the individual level, however the data did not support influence at an interpersonal level and collective level. The findings suggest that engaging individuals in the evaluation process makes them care more about the findings.

*Key words: strategic learning, utilisation*

Learning is a strategy when foundations engage in the complex environments and concerns. The article has a focus on philanthropic organisations and strategic learning. “Although more data than ever are available to foundation strategists, we heard persistent ant concerns about how this actually gets used to inform strategy.” (Ibid., 50). The authors identify three self-induced ‘traps’ that hamper foundations in advancing the learning needed to guide strategy in these complex environments. 1) Linearity and certainty bias 2) The autopilot effect. This occurs when organisations distance themselves from their strategies. 3) Indicator blindness approaches.

According to Patrezi et al. a shift in the mind-set of the foundations is required to enhance strategic learning capacities. In short this requires foundations to identify and acknowledge sources of uncertainty. Detailed guiding principles are:

- Articulate and test assumptions
- Multiple perspectives and courses of action are possible
- Evolve strategy by learning from doing.
- Treat context as though it matters
• Improvement through making sense of what you see and learn
• Measure what matters instead of measure what you can.

Furthermore, a disciplined process to support strategic learning is required. The authors recommend organisations to engage outsiders (i.e. an external facilitator) in the process as this will bring in reflection. “Taking complexity seriously means that learning be built on cycles of acting, sense making, and drawing implications for action as action is the essence of strategy.” (Ibid., 62)

Key words: utilisation, overview

This book of Patton offers an extensive overview of different themes in utilisation focussed evaluation.

Key words: UFE, method, checklist

Based on Michael Quinn Patton’s best-selling Utilisation-Focused Evaluation, this briefer book provides an overall framework and essential checklist steps for designing and conducting evaluations that actually get used. The UFE is based on the principle that evaluation should be judged on its usefulness to intended users. UFE has two essential elements: 1) The primary intended users must be clearly identified and they must be engaged in the evaluation from the very beginning 2) It is the role of the evaluator that intended use and the primary intended users guide all decisions made in the evaluation process.

Key words: developmental evaluation, evaluation types, strategic learning, innovation

In this paper Preskill and Beer explore ways in which evaluation approaches constrain innovation and offer lessons about development evaluation (DE). Preskill and Beer identify two traditional evaluation approaches: 1) Formative evaluations, which typically focus on process and implementation. 2) Summative evaluations, which focus on the effect of a specific program. New and innovative programs that experiment with solutions to complex problems require use of DE. Preskill and Beer use the definition of innovation of the Centre for Social Innovation: “Innovation is a novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, and sustainable or just than present solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than individuals.” (Ibid., 2). The uncertain and unpredictable process of innovation requires a need for strategic learning. Learning for social impact means a need for strategy development as well as evaluation, which together form a learning loop. “Social innovation is a fundamentally different approach to change than implementing program models with a known set of elements or ‘ingredients’.” (Ibid., 5). The focus is on exploring what triggers change. DE is a process of exploring, creating and emerging and has the following characteristics: 1) A focus on social innovations where there is no accepted model for solving the problem. 2) Continuous learning is embedded in the process. 3) It has an emergent and adaptive design that allows you to respond to emerging issues. 4) The evaluator has the role of strategic learning partner. 5) It brings a complex system orientation to evaluation.
DE requires an innovative to be truly in development. So DE works best when you are: 1) Exploring the creation of a new model. 2) Developing an initiative in an on-going manner and will never settle into a fixed model. 3) Replicating a program in a new context which requires adaptation. 4) Running system change initiatives. 5) Responding rapidly and adaptively to a sudden crisis.

There are four conditions for successful DE.

• **Condition 1**: The organisation's leadership is willing to take risks, be flexible, and make necessary changes to the initiative.
• **Condition 2**: The organisation's values and culture support innovation, continuous learning, and adapting to its environment.
• **Condition 3**: The organisation provides sufficient time, people, and financial resources for on-going inquiry.
• **Condition 4**: The organisation is committed to open communications and ensuring that information is accessible and used internally and externally.


*Key words: Evaluation capacity building, learning, model*

This paper presents a model of ECB that can be used for designing and implementing capacity building activities and processes. The model captures organisational learning capacity which has two major set influencing factors, namely: 1) Evaluation knowledge, skills and attitudes (ECB strategies). 2) Sustainable evaluation practices (organisational culture and structure). These two sets of factors lead up to a transfer of knowledge, which to the background of leadership, cultures, systems and communications, leads up to capacity building.


*Key words: organisational learning, learning culture*

For a learning organisation to occur, it is critical that an environment for learning is established and maintained. Preskill sees a new role for the evaluator: “This role definition requires the evaluator to become part of the change process by blending the role of organisational development consultant and evaluator.” (Ibid., 292). Central to Preskill’s model are reflection, dialogue and action planning.

The model is based on the idea that we have failed to consider organisational context and culture in evaluation processes. The first set is to establish a learning culture. This requires preparing organisation member for this by clarifying what organisational culture means for the organisation and what this requires their specific role. This is critical to succeed in creating a learning organisation. The process of organisational learning should be facilitated by the evaluator by which he or she makes use of the following six stage model: 1) Evaluate needs and goals, 2) Evaluate HRD design, 3) Evaluate operation 4) Evaluate learning, 5) Evaluate usage and endurance of learning, and 6) Evaluate pay off. When evaluation members experience success from their involvement in organisational learning this shows them how the transfer of their learning is critical to the organisation’s success. It is important to understand that organisational learning takes time to occur.


Key words: organisational learning

Preskill and Torres present an instrument to measure the readiness for organisational learning and evaluation, the ROLE. The ROLE consists of questions grouped into six major dimensions. These include: Culture, Leadership, Systems and Structures, Communication, Teams, and Evaluation. Three additional questions are included to provide information about the respondent and the organisation. A low score indicates that learning from evaluation might not succeed.


Key words: organisational learning, evaluator's role

In this article Preskill and Torres focus on transformative learning in organisational context. Transformative learning is “most likely to occur when organisation members engage in collaborative, dialogic, and reflective forms of evaluation practices.” (Ibid., 27). To create opportunities for transformative learning from evaluations it is necessary to identify and work with perceptions, beliefs and attitude.

The authors suggest that evaluation should build on communities of practice. “Communities of practice” is a method for bringing people together to facilitate the work and learning of employees. They are most effective when they:

• Have the time and space for learning
• Pay attention to goals and significant organisational events
• Have accurate and complete information
• Are able to weigh evidence and assess arguments
• Are open to alternative perspectives
• Reflect critically on presuppositions and their consequences
• Trust the process of with others
• Are able to accept informed, objective, and rational consensus as a legitimate test of validity
• Take action on organisational issues. (Ibid., 29)

The transformative learning approach to evaluations has implications for the role of the evaluator. It requires the evaluator to:

• Use a clinical approach. This demands a focus in the current needs, context, and history and changing circumstances of an organisation.
• Spanning traditional program and evaluation boundaries. Guiding program staff in dialogue and reflection processes that initially focus on evaluation findings, but then move into dialogues about the specifics of action planning.
• Diagnosing organisational capacity for learning from evaluative inquiry. The evaluator takes into account culture, leadership, forms of communication, and systems and structures of the organisations. This requires a formal assessment next to the traditional informal assessment and helps to set out realistic expectations for learning.

“Evaluation that is collaborative, reflective, and dialogic is a mechanism for creating communities of evaluation practice that can take organisations members down this path of learning, which is both intentional and transformative.” (Ibid., 53).


Key words: organisational learning
This book presents a case for changing the purpose and methodology of organisational evaluation.


*Key words: utilisation factors, process use*

This study identifies several factors that appear to affect process use. The five categories of factors were as follows:

- **Facilitation of evaluation processes.** How meetings are facilitated is critical to enhancing stakeholders' learning from and about evaluation
- **Management support.** Managers need to support learning in the organisation.
  - Verbally support employee involvement in evaluation studies.
  - Provide incentives and rewards for participating in evaluation studies.
  - Expect employees to share their learning from the evaluation process with others.
  - Recognise and reward employees for implementing evaluation findings.
- **Advisory group characteristics.** The characteristics of individuals (apart from personality) in a group influence the group dynamic. The characteristics being:
  - Experiences with the program being evaluated
  - Interest in the evaluation process
  - Motivation to participate in the evaluation
  - Role in the evaluation process and their understanding of their roles as well as the group's role
  - Position, rank, experience
  - Previous experience with evaluation
  - Previous training and education in evaluation
- **Frequency, methods and quality for communications.** The more occasions there are to share experiences the more likely it is that learning will take place. Factors that are important for good quality communications are:
  - Frequency and length of communications and interactions during the evaluation
  - Amount of interaction after the evaluation's completion
  - Methods of communication during the evaluation
  - Methods of reporting evaluation findings
  - Quality of oral and written communications
- **Organisation characteristics.** There are often constraints within the organisations that hinder learning and full participation. The following organisational factors affect process use:
  - Degree of organisational stability
  - Support of previous evaluation work
  - Location and ownership of the evaluation function
  - External demands, constraints, threats
  - Extent to which the organisation's culture supports ongoing learning
  - Extent to which the organisation supports developing evaluation capacity


*Key words: UFE, practical guide, case study*
This paper offers a practitioner-oriented experience of UFE. It lays out all the twelve steps discussing them with real examples, coming from five different projects. Therefore the paper gives a good illustration of the method. Take home messages: 1) If you try UFE for the first time work with an experienced mentor 2) Ensure preparedness and readiness of the evaluator and the primary users. 3) Timeliness. “A challenge may be to alert potential projects interested in UFE to the conditions before committing to supporting them” (Ibid., 85).


Key words: case study, evaluation of use, utilisation factors

This article focuses on factors that promote the utilisation of evaluations in the humanitarian sector. Existing studies on utilisation are used to describe the different types of use made of evaluation (instrumental, conceptual, process learning, and legitimising) and the types of misuse (ritual, mis-use and non-use). Additionally, a range of factors are described that promote use, which are grouped in four areas: quality, organisational, relational and external. Quality factors that promote utilisation include design, participation and ownership, planning, evidence, follow-up mechanisms, and evaluator credibility. The intensity of the linkages between the researchers and policy-makers and establishing relationships based on mutual respect and trust are important relational factors that promote utilisation. Organisational factors include culture, structure and knowledge management. Utilisation is further explored through four new case studies: 1) the MFS Holland policy and approach on nutrition, 2) CAFOD on the review of strategic priorities, 3) USAID Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) and the UK Department for International Development (DFID) joint evaluation of the Humanitarian Information Centres (HICs), and 4) the Inter-agency Real-Time Evaluation of the Humanitarian Response to the Darfur Crisis 2005. It is concluded that our narrow perception of utilisation does not do justice to the rich and often indirect use and influence of evaluation. Lastly, the article considers the implications for the future of learning and accountability mechanisms in the humanitarian sector.


Key words: process use, longitudinal design

The authors examine how process use has been measured and present a case of a longitudinal study. “When process use is explicitly assessed, it is frequently done so by measuring whether an evaluation project contributed to new knowledge about evaluation methods (e.g., acquiring skills in data analysis), changes in feelings and attitudes about evaluation (e.g., reduced anxiety about evaluation), and emergent behaviours regarding institutionalising evaluation within the organisation (e.g., changing internal processes, such as record keeping, to facilitate ongoing evaluation).” (Ibid., 2). The case study found that changes in learning appear quickly, whereas changes in attitude are much slower. Changes in behaviour were not found. “Changes in learning, followed by attitude change, and then a lag for action/behaviour are consistent with some theories of behaviour change.” (Ibid., 8). However the study does not pinpoint the underlying mechanisms that contribute to process use.
This paper offers a realist approach and proposes ten steps to make evaluations better. The authors argue that there is a need to go beyond a formulaic approach to program evaluation design that often does not address the complexity of the programs. Instead, the complexity of the program needs to inform the design of the evaluation. The ten steps are the following:

- Identify the **components of the program**.
- Identify the **program theory**.
- Does the **evidence base** support the program theory linkages?
- Analyse the **anticipated performance trajectory**.
- Identify the **kind of learning** the evaluation should provide.
- Identify **pathways of influence** in decision-making processes.
- Identify the **evaluation design**.
- Check whether the method matches with the identified **learning goal**.
- **Recommendations** as a result of the evaluation.
- **Program performance and sustainability**: what is the relationship?

This paper is the result of personal experiences in independent evaluation units in large organisations (U.S. general Accounting Office and the World Bank). To make the evaluations useful the evaluator must consider three key questions: 1) who will use the evaluation 2) what will they need from the Evaluation? 3) When will they need the information? The authors suggest that to improve utilisation attention needs to be paid to the multiplicity of audience and stakeholders, the divergent information needs, and the timeliness of their work.

Toulemonde analyses different evaluation cultures within Europe. First of all he shows how evaluation culture differs in countries due to different context and influences. Despite their differences, lessons from evaluation studies seem to be universally applicable and not exclusive to certain cultures. However, to accept and utilise evaluation results a deeply democratic evaluation culture is required at all administrative levels. So evaluation culture should be an integral part of the entire organisation.
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