



**UNODC**

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

## **SUMMARY MISSION REPORT**

### **EVALUATION MANAGEMENT TRAINING IN LATIN AMERICA**

#### **INDEPENDENT EVALUATION UNIT (OED/IEU)**

**Name and Title**

Katherine ASTON, Consultant, OED/IEU  
Gaspard OSTROWSKI, Associate Expert, OED/IEU

**Location and Date**

Panama City, Panama, March 28-29, 2011  
Lima, Peru, March 31-April 1, 2011

**Background**

The two day training on Evaluation Management builds upon previous trainings delivered by IEU as well as the Integrated Programming Workshop held at UNODC HQ in February 2011. In order to address the project management cycle as a whole and to reaffirm the transversal position of evaluation, as well as in order to deliver IEU's training in a corporate approach, the training included curriculum from the Strategic Planning Unit (SPU) as well as Quality Assurance and Oversight Unit (QCOU) concepts related to Project/Programme Planning and Project Monitoring.. It was tailored to UNODC project managers in the field engaged in Evaluation, Integrated Programming and Implementation. The agenda is attached (Annex I).

Over 40 Staff Members were trained. The list is attached (Annex II). Staff from Panama, Mexico, Guatemala, Colombia, Guyana and Argentina attended the training in Panama City on March 28 and 29, 2011. Staff from Peru, Brazil, Ecuador and Bolivia attended the training in Lima on March 31 and April 1, 2011.



Before joining the training, participants were given pre-assessment questionnaires (Annex III) to assess their knowledge and their specific needs on the topic of evaluation. The modules of the training were tailored to the Project Managers' needs and knowledge and responded to the information from the pre-assessment questionnaires. As a baseline, IEU prepared pre test questionnaires (Annex IV) that were answered by the participants on the first day of the training. The knowledge acquired during the training was then tested with post test questionnaires identical to pre test questionnaires (Annex IV).

**Purpose**

The purpose of the training on Evaluation Management was to provide selected Project Managers from UNODC's Field Offices (FO's) with knowledge in evaluation management, processes and tools. The participants are now expected to serve as focal points in evaluation matter, further enhancing the learning and accountability benefits of evaluation from an organizational/institutional perspective. By sharing the knowledge they have acquired during the two day training with their colleagues, and together with IEU, they will also further strengthen the evaluation culture across the Organization. Finally, in support of developing and evaluation culture the benefits and uses of evaluation were conveyed.



**Lessons learnt and future opportunities**

**Finding 1:** IEU work is guided by UN evaluation norms and standards, United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). As a recently re-established unit, some documents, guidelines and support tools are in the process of being reviewed and potentially revised. Interaction with field staff has allowed IEU staff to fully understand their needs in relation to evaluation and use this information to further develop and revise guidance materials.

**Opportunities:** IEU will ensure that the feedback and comments received during the field training are used in the review and further development of its tools.



**Finding 2:** When planning and preparing the training, it is imperative that sufficient time is dedicated to coordination and liaising with the Representatives as well as the country coordinator (s) and colleagues at HQ. This coordination effort ensures that all expectations in relation to both logistics and substance are met by HQs and Field Offices. Despite the short time frame for the preparation of this particular field training, IEU was able to establish focal points in the field and developed strong working relationships with these focal points very early in the process. These working relationships assisted in the smooth coordination and delivery of the training.



**Opportunities:** IEU should continue to work closely with field offices and establish focal points in all country and regional offices. Based on this experience IEU has confirmed that the following topics are important to consider and address with Learning Focal Points in the field, Team Leaders and Representatives:

- Needs, purpose and scope of the training;
- Selection of participants according to a determined level of knowledge (precise targeting in line with the previously agreed objectives of the training);
- Organization of teleconferences between IEU and the hosting office (s) to discuss options on substance and arrangements with trainers;
- Dissemination of information and other documents to be used for the training before the arrival of the IEU staff member (s);
- Assistance through provision of relevant information on country/regional portfolios;
- Arrangement of logistics.

**Finding 3:** The Staff Development Unit (SDU) is a rich resource of information and assistance in the planning and delivery of training. Due to their experience and mandate in delivering training SDU is able to provide very necessary and useful guidance in the area of training preparation, delivery and follow up as well as understanding UNODC training mandates and requirements.

**Opportunities:** IEU should continue to work closely with SDU when planning and delivering training in the field. This will ensure that training provided to staff is the most appropriate and suitable to the training and learning plans of the field offices.

**Finding 4:** The organization of a field training, including preparation, coordination with local points and the delivery and the rhythm of the training is intense in terms of energy and time. The IEU training team composition and the skills of each individual trainer complemented each other and allowed for the provision of a dynamic and participatory training. In addition, the arrival of staff prior to the day of training allowed IEU staff to address last minute needs and unforeseen changes in regards to logistics and preparation.

**Opportunities:** When determining staff to travel and deliver a training, IEU should continue to analyze the skills of the unit staff and ensure the most appropriate staff members (at least two as in this case) for that particular training are involved. It is also good practice to dedicate one full day on the location of the training prior to the delivery of the training. This extra day allows of final coordination, preparation and problem-solving to ensure a smooth delivery of training.

**Finding 5:** Following discussions with participants and other staff members, IEU understands that due to the fast growing pace of UNODC's field offices, there is a real need for training on evaluation and other related project cycle management topics. There are many processes and tools in place to assist in identifying these needs. In addition, during discussions with field staff in the context of the Evaluation Management training, field staff expressed interest and enthusiasm for serving as focal points for evaluation and other topics within their offices and regions.

A case in point was the involvement of Mr. Alberto Bolaña in the Evaluation Management training. He thoroughly and successfully conveyed project cycle management information during the Evaluation Management training which he had previously received during a training at HQ.

**Opportunities:** The continued use and maintenance of the SDU training needs data base and Annual Training Plans will be extremely helpful in planning future trainings and identifying training needs. The use of focal points should further be encouraged. This would promote a train the trainers environment. This concept has been well documented through various project evaluations as well as in practice during this training as a successful process to promote continuous learning and use of new skills. The certification of targeted staff would also allow all UNODC to rely on focal points with particular skills. These focal points could then play a leading role in the specific topic trained, in this case, evaluation management, in their respective offices/regions.



**Outcomes:**

The outcomes of the Training are summarized as follows. The participants are able to:

- 1. Understand the independent positioning of the IEU and its role as a service provider
- 2. Design projects and programs incorporating evaluation component and lessons learnt
- 3. Initiate/Supervise Evaluations and use the normative tools produced by the IEU
- 4. Understand tools and techniques of setting up data collection strategies
- 5. Report from an evaluation perspective, including recommendations and lessons learned
- 6. Disseminate the findings of their evaluations

The pre and post questionnaires as well as the final training questionnaires (templates as well as the analysis are attached to the present report) proved that the training was an overall success and that the expected outcomes were achieved. The overall grades were extremely positive and the feedback received by the focal points as well as the representatives was overall very encouraging and positive. Project Managers found answers to their questions and judged the materials as well as the methods used to be relevant to their everyday professional needs and coherent with the proposed goals of the training.



Below is a brief summary of the content delivered during the two day training in both Panama and Peru used to meet the objectives.

**Objective 1: Understanding of the independent positioning of IEU and its role as service provider**

The independent positioning of IEU within UNODC and the consequences of this position on its work and decision making processes were explained. Definitions and relevant terminology were provided to the participants as per UNODC's criteria and in strict respect of UNEG Norms and Standards – which were also explained to the participants.

**Objective 2: Designing projects and programs and incorporating evaluation and lessons learnt**

The linkage between evaluation and project design was developed. In this regard, the importance of understanding the transversal and omnipresent role of evaluation in project management cycles was stressed through theory and exercises. The learning and accountability advantages of evaluation were emphasized.

**Objective 3: Initiate/Supervise Evaluations & use of normative tools produced by the IEU**

The participants were guided through the supervision of an evaluation from the planning stage until the completion of the evaluation. The role of the project manager during the process was clearly explained through the study of guidance on the planning an evaluation on time as well as the budget, the writing of terms of reference and the selection of consultants.

Objective 4: Understanding of tools and techniques of setting up data collection strategies

The role of the independent evaluator in providing appropriate methodologies and processes for a thorough evaluation was emphasized. Basic background knowledge was provided for project managers to be able to review these methodologies and ensure the qualifications of the independent evaluator to conduct the project evaluation.

Objective 5: Report on Evaluations including recommendations and lessons learnt

IEU Report Guidelines and necessary quality requirements were reviewed and participants completed a review and discussion of an evaluation report submitted to IEU by the Peru office.

Objective 6: Dissemination of evaluation findings

Evaluation was promoted as a tool for continuous learning and improved decision-making rather than as an obligatory exercise with little use. In order to understand the practical meaning of this, evaluation follow up process including the use of recommendations and the participation of stakeholders in the process were examined.



## Analysis: Panama

Table 1: Pre/post test results and analysis

Question:	Number Correct on Pre-Test	Percentage Correct	Number Correct on Post-Test	Percentage Correct
What are two main reasons for conducting an evaluation	5	28	6	33
When does a project require independent project evaluations?	0	0	4	22
What is triangulation and why would it be used in an independent project evaluation?	3	17	16	89
If a project does not meet any of the criteria for an independent evaluation, what must be submitted instead?	11	61	15	83
What is the estimated duration of an independent project evaluation?	1	6	16	89
Where do you find information about evaluation in UNODC ?	4	22	15	83
What is the role of the Independent Evaluation Unit in the independent project evaluation process?	5	28	14	78
What are the steps that should be taken following the completion of an Independent Project Evaluation?	2	11	13	72
What is the Core Learning Partnership and what is its role in an Independent Project Evaluation?	1	6	14	78
At what point during the project management cycle should evaluation be considered?	7	39	8	44

Table 2: Training Assessment Questionnaire results (1=fully agree to 5= fully disagree)

<b>A. Objectives of Training</b>	<b>Average Response</b>
I was given sufficient information about the objectives of the training before my arrival	2.26
The training course encouraged exchange of information and expression of ideas successfully.	1.57
The course covered the topics I needed to learn about.	1.42
The objectives of the course were achieved.	1.42
<b>B. Planning of the Training</b>	
I feel that the material covered in the training took into account what participants considered important to learn	1.53
<b>C. Training Methods</b>	
I found the different training methods listed below to be relevant and of good quality:	
Lectures and Presentations	1.47
Large Group Discussions/Brainstorming	1.84
Small Group Discussions/Group Work	1.79
The terminology and vocabulary used in the training were appropriate for the level and easy to understand	1.63
<b>D. The Training Environment and Atmosphere</b>	

The general atmosphere during the course enhanced the learning process.	1.95
The course fostered teamwork and cooperation among participants.	1.68
<b>E. The Trainers</b>	
Trainers have sufficient knowledge.	1.22
Trainers communicated well and encouraged questions and interaction.	1.37
Trainers were open, honest and fair to all.	1.16
Please write any other comments you have regarding the trainers:	
<b>F. Training Material and Time Management</b>	
The Modules listed below were covered adequately:	
Introduction of Evaluation in UNODC	1.72
Module 1: Evaluation and Project Design	1.37
Module 2: Planning an Evaluation	1.32
Module 3: Evaluation Methods	1.44
Module 4: Evaluation Report Writing	1.53
Module 5: Using the Evaluation Results	1.53
Module 6: Innovative Practices in Evaluation	1.58
Enough time was dedicated to each module	1.84
Enough time was given for participant feedback and questions	1.42

## Analysis: Peru

Table 1: Pre/post test results and analysis

Question:	Number Correct on Pre-Test	Percentage Correct	Number Correct on Post-Test	Percentage Correct
What are two main reasons for conducting an evaluation	2	11	10	53
When does a project require an independent project evaluation? (please circle all criteria that apply)	1	5	4	21
What is triangulation and why would it be used in an independent project evaluation?	3	16	17	89
If a project does not meet any of the criteria for an independent evaluation, what must be submitted instead?	12	63	18	95
What is the estimated duration of an independent project evaluation?	3	16	16	84
Where do you find information about evaluation in UNODC ?	7	37	16	84
What is the role of the Independent Evaluation Unit in the independent project evaluation process?	11	58	16	84
What are the steps that should be taken following the completion of an Independent Project Evaluation?	6	32	13	68
What is the Core Learning Partnership and what is its role in an Independent Project Evaluation?	2	11	16	84
At what point during the project management cycle should evaluation be considered	6	32	11	58

Table 2: Training Assessment Questionnaire results (1=fully agree to 5= fully disagree)

<b>A. Objectives of Training</b>	<b>Average Response</b>
I was given sufficient information about the objectives of the training before my arrival	1.75
The training course encouraged exchange of information and expression of ideas successfully.	1.45
The course covered the topics I needed to learn about.	1.65
The objectives of the course were achieved.	1.35
<b>B. Planning of the Training</b>	
I feel that the material covered in the training took into account what participants considered important to learn	1.85
<b>C. Training Methods</b>	
I found the different training methods listed below to be relevant and of good quality:	
Lectures and Presentations	1.8
Large Group Discussions/Brainstorming	1.95
Small Group Discussions/Group Work	1.9
The terminology and vocabulary used in the training were appropriate for the level and easy to understand	1.65

<b>D. The Training Environment and Atmosphere</b>	
The general atmosphere during the course enhanced the learning process.	1.45
The course fostered teamwork and cooperation among participants.	1.45
<b>E. The Trainers</b>	
Trainers have sufficient knowledge.	1.3
Trainers communicated well and encouraged questions and interaction.	1.65
Trainers were open, honest and fair to all.	1.25
Please write any other comments you have regarding the trainers:	
<b>F. Training Material and Time Management</b>	
The Modules listed below were covered adequately:	
Introduction of Evaluation in UNODC	1.65
Module 1: Evaluation and Project Design	1.45
Module 2: Planning an Evaluation	1.6
Module 3: Evaluation Methods	1.75
Module 4: Evaluation Report Writing	1.6
Module 5: Using the Evaluation Results	1.8
Module 6: Innovative Practices in Evaluation	1.6
Enough time was dedicated to each module	1.7
Enough time was given for participant feedback and questions	1.55

## Analysis of Pre and Post Tests

Based on the information and analysis of the pre and post tests, IEU can take two follow up steps prior to undertaking the next training. First, a review of the questions for clarity will be undertaken. This is especially necessary for any questions with a low correct response rate in both the pre and post-test. This low response rate in both implies that the question may have been unclear or misinterpreted by participants. In addition, curriculum related to questions which did not have a significant increase in correct response rates will be evaluated and improved. Finally, it is important to note that the pre and post tests were provided in English in Panama but in Spanish in Peru. This may also have been a factor in the overall increase in correct responses for Peru and will need to be reviewed prior to the next training session.

## Analysis of Training Assessment Questionnaires

Based on the information and analysis of the Training Assessment Questionnaire results, IEU believes the needs of the participants were matched. In addition, IEU understands that the modules, their content as well as the articulation of the training were highly appreciated by the participants.

## Conclusions

The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU), specifically, Gaspard Ostrowski and Katherine Aston are highly appreciative of and very thankful for Field Representatives and assigned focal points welcoming and supportive approach both during the preparatory phase and the implementation of the training. All the persons involved in the logistics as well as all participants showed an extremely high level of professionalism which was greatly valued by the trainers.

IEU is very happy to have had this excellent opportunity to work together with Alberto Bolaña from the Panama Office and to give the training a broader and more corporate approach. It is looking forward to further building relationships with Staff across the Organization and to further developing a network of evaluation focal points.

## Annex I: Agenda

### Day 1

Time	Subject	Method
0830 – 1000	Introduction and welcome Objectives and methods of the training Pre test questionnaires	Presentation (KA/GO)  Discussion
1000 – 1015	Break	
1015 – 1230	Lessons and key insights from Integrated Programming Workshop at HQ Use of UNODC's quality assurance tools in regards to monitoring	Alberto Bolana
1230 – 1330	Lunch	
1330 – 1400	<b>Introduction: Role of evaluation in the UN system and in particular in UNODC</b>  UNEG norms and standards Definitions / Types of Evaluation: Self Evaluation / Evaluation in the U.N.	Presentation (KA/GO)
1400 – 1515	<b>Module 1: Evaluation Planning</b>  Role of evaluation at the planning stage: Key Concepts (evaluability and baselines) Evaluation and the Project Cycle Exercise: UNODC cases studies on evaluation planning/project documents review	Presentation (KA/GO)  Interactive exercise
1515 – 1530	Break	
1530 – 1700	<b>Module 2: Evaluation Management</b>  Roles and responsibilities Guidelines for development of Terms of Reference for an Evaluation Exercise on ToR's	Presentation (KA/GO)  Plenary discussion  Interactive exercise
1700 – 1730	<b>Q&amp;A</b> about the day	Plenary discussion

## Day 2

Time	Subject	Method
0830 – 0900	Recapitulation of the previous day Planning an Evaluation on time Selection of Evaluators Exercise: evaluation planning and scheduling	Discussion Presentation (KA/GO) Interactive exercise
0900 – 1015	<b>Module 3 : Evaluation Methods Qualitative/Quantitative/Triangulation</b> Sampling and triangulation Evaluation questions in light of country/regional programs & DAC Criteria Analysis of data Exercise: Review of sampling methodology	Presentation (KA/GO) Plenary discussion Interactive exercise
1015 – 1030	Break	
1030 – 1230	<b>Module 4: Report Writing</b> Evaluation Report Guidelines Exercise: Evaluation Report review	Presentation (KA/GO) Group work
1230 – 1330	Lunch	
1330 – 1515	<b>Module 5: Use of evaluation results</b> Evaluation Follow up plan Management Response Modalities of the use of evaluation results	Presentation (KA/GO) Plenary discussion
1515 – 1530	Break	
1530 – 1700	<b>Module 6: Innovative practices in evaluation</b> Project evaluation in UNODC: Experiences & expectations Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness & Regional Programming Gender and Human Rights	Presentation (KA/GO) Plenary discussion
1700 – 1730	Q&A about the course Post – Test Evaluation Questionnaire	Plenary discussion

## Annex II: List of Participants

### Panama City, Panama

Name	Title	Office
Jessica E. Arango	National Consultant PANU73	ROPAN
Ivor Pitti Hernandez	National Coordinator GLOG80	ROPAN
Maria Noel Rodriguez	Project Coordinator PANX12	ROPAN
Juliana Erthal	National Strategic Analyst	ROPAN
Claudio Santorum	Programme Coordinator XCAU81	ROPAN
Ignacio de Lucas	Senior Programme Coordinator	ROPAN
Yael Bolaña	Project evaluation Coordinator	UNDP
Rubi Blancas	National Programme Officer	ROMEX
Maria Amparo Barrera	National Consultant MEXT99	ROMEX
Alejandro Castillo	NDS Regional Manager	ROMEX
Mariana Alegret Cendejas	Sub Coordinator – Reg. Project vs. Trafficking	ROMEX
Javier Hernandez	Project Coordinator	ROMEX
Carola Lew	Regional Project Coordinator	ROBRA - Argentina
Martha Eugenia Murcia	Programme Assistant	COCOL
Peter Faulhaber	Crime Prevention Adviser	Guyana y Trinidad
Enrique Marin	Investigation Analyst	ROPAN – Guatemala
Erick Cajar Grimas	Analyst - Dept os Treaties	Chancellery of Panama
Yessenia Sanchez	Accusatory System Implementation Coordinator	Chancellery of Panama
Maria Gloria Chanis	Coordinator of Special Projects	Public Ministry of Panama

### Lima, Peru

Name	Title	Office
Gabriela Vallejo	National Coordinator TD/EQU/143	ROPER - Ecuador
Gisele Moura Kitayama	Finance Associate	ROBRA
Nivio Caixeta Nascimento	Crime Prevention Officer	ROBRA
Nara Santos	Technical Advisor	ROBRA
Cesar Guedes	Representative	ROPER - COBOL
Carlos Alfredo Diaz Hervoso	National Programme Officer	ROPER - COBOL
Erika Bilbao-LaVieja	Coordinator	ROPER - COBOL
Federico Tong	Project Coordinator	ROPER
Ernesto Para y Guerra	Technical Director	ROPER
Gregorio Saenz	Project staff	ROPER
Hector Wong	Project Coordinator	ROPER
Humberto Chirinos Nunez	Technical Director	ROPER
Isabel Palacios	National Programme Officer	ROPER
James Shaw	Expert	ROPER
Lorenzo Vallejos Mazzini	Project Staff	ROPER
Walter Hoflich	Project Staff	ROPER
Veronica Garaycochea	Administrative Assistant	ROPER
Alfredo Rivera	Technical Director	ROPER
Miguel Arcayo	Technical Director	ROPER
Paloma Lumbre Benel	Project Staff	ROPER
Raul Garcia Blas	Project Coordinator	ROPER

### Annex III: Pre-Assessment Questionnaire

Name	Title	Index # <i>(if applicable)</i>	Grade
<b>Department/Section/Duty Station</b>		<b>Name of Supervisor</b>	

1. Have you previously attended a similar workshop or have you ever participated in any evaluation management training within or outside of UNODC, formally or informally? (if so, please explain)
  
2. What do you know about evaluation within UNODC?
  
3. Have you ever managed, participated in or been involved in any form or at any stage of an independent project evaluation process? (if so, please explain)
  
4. Have you ever completed a project self-evaluation? (if so, please explain)
  
5. Please indicate any specific questions regarding evaluation management. As regards evaluation what would you like to learn?
  
6. Is there any other information you would like to provide to give the trainer(s) a better sense of your familiarity with evaluation?

## Annex IV: Pre-Test and Post-Test Questionnaires

### Participants' information

I am based at :

	HQ:
	Field Office:

Gender:

	Female
	Male

### Questions

*The following questions are intended to evaluate the success of this training in building evaluation knowledge and capacity.*

1. What are two main reasons for conducting an evaluation?
2. When does a project require an independent project evaluation? (please circle all criteria that apply)
  - a. If the overall project budget is over \$500,000, if started before June 1, 2010 or \$1,000,000 if started after
  - b. If the project is longer than 4 years
  - c. If the project is expected to fall significantly short of the planned outputs and objectives
  - d. If the donor requests/requires an independent evaluation
3. What is triangulation and why would it be used in an independent project evaluation?
4. If a project does not meet any of the criteria for an independent evaluation, what must be submitted instead?
5. What is the estimated duration of an independent project evaluation?
  - a. 2-4 weeks
  - b. 1-2 months
  - c. 3-4 months
  - d. 6+ months
6. Where can information about evaluation in UNODC be found?
7. What is the role of the Independent Evaluation Unit in the independent project evaluation process?
8. What are the steps that should be taken following the completion of an Independent Project Evaluation?
9. What is the Core Learning Partnership and what is its role in an Independent Project Evaluation?
10. At what point during the project management cycle should evaluation be considered?