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First remarks…

Not specialist in Migration

…I know something about “the art” of Evaluation (a “process” that implies a political, ideological, methodological position and technical skills)

The position of my Evaluation Division “tries” to mainstream the PD in our evaluation processes

…Flexible and adaptative approach: I have changed my presentation to adjust to the ongoing process of the workshop...

The SIEF as an excuse to show the great picture of the evaluation choices…sorry if boring or theoretical but nothing more practical than a good theory
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A.1 Impact evaluation within the evaluation framework

Complexity vs Causality
Different models (intended/real), objectives, hidden agendas, interests, information needs
Contribution & Atribution analysis
Program Theory driven evaluation
Joint evaluations to adjust the different demands
Complexity: attribution & contribution analysis for impact assessment

...Complexity: NO LINEAR RELATIONS (CAUSE EFFECT)
Bidirectional links between Migration and Development
Bidirectional Links between Migration Flows and Migration Policies
Bidirectional Links with so many Contextual cause and effects

For understanding a complex model a contribution analysis could be needed (more qualitative than quantitative met. choices)

For responding to channelled relationships between a homogeneous input and a little number of measurable outcomes produced by a clear process an attribution analysis could be used (more quantitative than qualitative meth. choices)

But mixed methods could mix contribution and attribution analysis...
Program Theory of social policies

Usually a social policy has (1) a motivation and a rational; (2) a story to count.

The Motivation and rational form a “Theory”: inputs, activities, processes and services that produce changes that improve the life conditions of the target population.

The story of how a social policy works, implies a “Program Theory”: assumptions, hypothesis that contribute to this kind change.

This program theory helps to consider what, who, how and when to evaluate (what questions).”

The question of what could have happen without the social policy can introduce alternative stories that we should control (IE).
The evaluation must start with policy relevant questions (and not with evaluation tools or indicators): data and information do not speak by themselves, good answers only if good questions.

1. Evaluation questions (objectives / information needs on the agree program theory or model)
2. Evaluation Methods / Models (methodological choices)
3. Evaluation tools (indicators)
Evaluation Systemic approach

1. Context (Macro/Meso/Micro economical, environmental, social) e.g. Migration Flows

2. Structure (Resources/Organisation)

3. Process
   - Commitment
   - Capacity
   - Incentives
   - Coherence
   - Cooperation
   - Ownership
   - Alligment
   - Harmonisation
   - GpRD and MA

4. RESULTS (IE)
Focusing in different policy dimensions

Considering the Context, Structure and Processes…and not only focusing on results

Why/How are we expecting results
if the initial design/model is not correct/realistic?
if the processes are not well implemented?
if the structure is weak?
if the context is lethal for our program theory?
For both partner countries and donor countries and agencies
1. Secure high level political engagement
2. Reaffirm and reinforce the principles for the future
3. Move to strong country leadership with independent facilitation and a less elaborate international superstructure
4. Welcome and involve other forms of aid and other actors
5. Sustain the advances in joint international processes and accountability requirements

For policymakers in partner countries
6. Take full leadership and responsibility for further aid reforms in their own countries
7. Set out priorities for strengthening capacities and steering donor support
8. Put political priority and focused action on poverty, exclusion and corruption

For policymakers in donor countries
9. Close the gap between high stakes in aid and reform and a slow and wavering record of change.
10. Accept and manage risks, admit failures
11. Harness high level peer pressure for better collective donor performance
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A.2. Evaluation from the Government’s perspective

The evaluation from...

...the perspective of the Government and Public administrations

The need of (a) asking good questions from the correct actors and (b) managing the process of response to these questions...
THREE DIFFERENT PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIONS / COOPERATIONS...
...different information needs and questions

A) COOPERATION OF THE CENTRAL STATE ADMINISTRATION (MoFAC, MoF, MoA, MoT...)
B) DECENTRALISED COOPERATION:
1) 17 AUTONOMOUS COMMUNITIES (REGIONS) - AGENCIES
2) 8,115 MUNICIPALITIES (LOCAL ENTITIES)
3) OTHERS: PROVINCES, REGIONAL FUNDS, UNIVERSITIES...

Each stakeholder (public administration) is a microcosmos

HOW CAN WE GIVE COHERENCE, COORDINATION AND COMPLEMENTARITY TO THIS SYSTEM?
The value of evaluation: Mechanisms in the evaluation processes (evaluation culture)
The value of evaluation: Mechanisms in the evaluation processes (evaluation culture)
THE VALUE AND THE CHALLENGES OF THE EVALUATION OF THE PUBLIC POLICIES
(Spanish case: Principles for evaluation management)
# QUALITY AND EFFECTIVENESS AGENDA IN THE PUBLIC POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paris Declaration processes</th>
<th>Implications for the Monitoring and Evaluation of interventions and policies (e.g. Migration policy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Management for Development Results | 1. Centering dialogue on results  
2. Simple information systems  
3. Flexibility and adaptation  
4. Use of information for learning and decision making |
| Mutual Accountability | 1. Agreeing on a shared agenda (action)  
2. Monitoring progress (evidence)  
3. Debate dialogue negotiation (incentives) |
THE VALUE AND THE CHALLENGES OF THE EVALUATION OF THE PUBLIC POLICIES
(Spanish case: Principles for evaluation management)
Drivers of change in the organizational learning
1. Communities of Practice
2. Leadership: “champions of change”
3. Creating spaces and times for reflection
4. Team and Networking: The improvement of relations increases the legitimacy
5. From Paris to a shift to the Southern context
6. Change of the role of the agents
THE VALUE AND THE CHALLENGES OF THE EVALUATION OF THE PUBLIC POLICIES
(Spanish case: Principles for evaluation management)

DEMOCRACY, CIVIC ENGAGEMENT, PARTICIPATION

QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIPS

ACCOUNTABILITY

USE AND UTILITY EVALUATION

ENLIGHTENMENT LEARNING
Accountability

Evaluation of the implementation of the Paris Declaration: the achiles’ heel

Accountability is a virtuous circle in which interact in a cycle of life:

(1) **Standards / norms**
(2) **Transparency** (provision of information based on certain mechanisms).
(3) **Evaluation** (process of comparing the commitments made to the scope of the proposed objectives)
(4) **Sanction** (mechanisms by which actors (dis)approve the performance of the organization).
As important as the aid efficiency is the challenge of having a informed and sensible Civil Society. Awareness to the development policy and to the poverty problem, to the migration causes and implications...

Thus (organised and non organised) civil society **should demand and support** effectiveness in the national and international Agenda, in the migration models and policies...
Learning/Accountability are two sides of the same coin...

Without some kind of accountability there is no incentives for learning...

Without some kind of learning, the accountability loses utility, direction and sense...
THE VALUE AND THE CHALLENGES OF THE EVALUATION OF THE PUBLIC POLICIES
(Spanish case: Principles for evaluation management)
Sometimes participation is an antipolitic machinery, when:

i) Not consider necessary resources or just looking to increase efficiency

ii) It is rhetorical in practice

iii) Gives emphasis to the local without going to a global and political thought

iv) It is a form of control (manipulative legitimation)

v) It is not open to dispute and does not consider that there may be unforeseen consequences (lose of power, of security...).
THE VALUE AND THE CHALLENGES OF THE EVALUATION OF THE PUBLIC POLICIES
(Spanish case: Principles for evaluation management)
The evaluation report is not the end of our job...

Communication and use...NOT STILL SOLVED PROBLEM

“Why policy makers need better evidence for policymaking? How do we get better, more useable evidence from evaluation? “

(DAC SLM April 2011)
The evaluation use and The dynamics of the design and implementation of policies

- POLITICAL ARENA:
- (1) policies based on opinions
- (2) policies influenced by evidence, and
- (3) evidence-based policies.

The policy process is essentially political (not technical), so it must be able to balance between the political power and the technical knowledge so as to generate evidence.

For using evidences the key point is not the method but the question to respond

The evidence comes not only from the monitoring and evaluation processes
Factors affecting evaluation utilisation and influence

- Timining and focus on priority stakeholder issues
- Effective dissemination
- Clear and well communicated message
- Active engagement with national counterparts
- Demonstrating the value of evaluation as a political and policymaking tool
- Credibility and independency of the team
- Positive and non-threatening findings
- Evaluation capacity development
- Pursuing easy wins alongside harder challenges
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B. Spanish Impact Evaluation Fund

1. The Context of Impact Evaluation and SIEF
2. SIEF approach and strategies to Impact Evaluation
3. The SIEF Impact Evaluation program on Human Development sectors
4. Some products, results and lessons learnt
The different conceptions of “Impact Evaluation”: We need to agree the definition and scope before discussing about methodology process, indicators and results

Different definitions:

DAC: “primary or secondary effects, produced by a development intervention, positive and negative, directly or indirectly, intended or not intended

WB...
The World Bank approach to IE:

- Rigorous impact evaluations assess the specific outcomes attributable to a particular intervention or program.
- The key to evaluating the impact of an intervention is to construct a valid counterfactual.
- By comparing the counterfactual with the situation of the group that is affected by the intervention, the impact evaluation seeks to provide direct evidence of the extent to which the intervention changes outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Counterfactual</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes where the intervention is applied (Treatment group)</td>
<td>Outcomes where the intervention does not exist. (Comparison / control group)</td>
<td>Outcomes attributable to the intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classical evaluation framework</th>
<th>To judge</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Summative evaluation</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Direct decision makers</th>
<th>Policy decision (allocate means)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To improve</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Formative evaluation</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Program stakeholders</td>
<td>Modification, redeseging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research framework</td>
<td>To promote</td>
<td>Pilot program</td>
<td>Demostration</td>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>Develmnt community</td>
<td>Scaling up, replication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To understand</td>
<td>Causal relationship, hypothesis</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>Scientific community</td>
<td>Evidence, accumulation, theory building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Established in **2007** thanks to the **support** of:
- **United Kingdom**: $2.5 million since 2008.

**Main Goal:**
- To increase the quality of development programs through the generation and sharing of actionable **knowledge** about the **effectiveness** of programs affecting Human Development outcomes.

**Focus on:**
- Building global knowledge on **what works** to improve HD outcomes
- **Policy relevance** is key criteria
- Test **innovative** approaches/new questions
- Developing **communities of practice** around thematic **clusters**
- Favor prospective evaluations with experimental & quasi-experimental methods.
Why the WB? Wide range of thematic areas……with strong focus on Human Development programs
Human Development Network (HDN) approach to Impact Evaluation
Focused on strategic HD themes…

- **Human Development** = all social sector work.
- **Rigorous approach** to Impact Evaluation.
- **105** Impact Evaluations in HD, of which:
  - Education (30%)
  - Health (30%)
  - Social Protection (18%)
  - Cross-cutting (22%)
- HD IE is coordinated with broader efforts (DIME, 3IE)
SIEF Impact Evaluation program on Human Development sectors

- Program overview
  - Results strategy
  - Core areas of activity
  - Capacity building
  - IE research: cluster approach

- Early results and lessons learnt
SIEFIE program on HD sectors: Results strategy

**Inputs**
- **SIEF budget:** $18 million, of which:
  - Spain SIEF TF: $14.9 m;
  - Spain Externally Funded Staff Program TF: $0.6 m;
  - United Kingdom DFID Impact Evaluation TF: $2.35 m;
  - The World Bank: $0.15 m.
- **Human resources:**
  - SIEF team;
  - Cluster coordinators;
  - Faculty;
  - Reviewers;
- **Other:**
  - SIEF website.

**Activities**
- **Capacity building on IE:**
  - Workshops;
  - Clinics.
- **IE research:**
  - Individual IE studies;
  - Research clusters in 7 key HD areas: Performance-Based Contracting for Health Delivery; CCTs; Malaria Control; Active Labor Markets; Basic Education Accountability; HIV/AIDS Prevention; ECD.

**Outputs**
- **Evaluation experts, researchers, and managers trained on IE**
- **Individual and cluster IE studies produced and disseminated.**
- **Training materials on IE (handbook, videos and presentations) produced and disseminated.**
- **Increased evidence base on the impact of programs, and strengthened communities of practice in the 7 HD clusters.**
- **Access to SIEF findings and materials through the SIEF website.**
- **Aid effectiveness principles incorporated and promoted by SIEF**

**Outcomes**
- **Enhanced understanding and application of IE techniques:**
- **Increased knowledge sharing and policy dialogue on the impact of programs affecting HD outcomes:**
- **Evidence generated by SIEF is being used to increase the impact of HD programs.**
- **Enhanced application of Management for Development Results and other effectiveness principles**

**Long Term Outcomes**
- **Increase in the effectiveness of programs of the World Bank, partner countries & donors affecting Human Development outcomes.**
SIEF IE program on HD sectors: Core areas of work

- 3 core areas of work:
  - RIGOUR AND CREDIBILITY: Direct Support to Impact Evaluation research:
    - Direct support to **51 impact evaluations**, 36 of them grouped in **7 thematic clusters**.
    - Impact Evaluation Clinics
  - **CAPACITY: Capacity Building** on Impact Evaluation:
    - Regionally-based workshops
  - **POLICY WINDOW: Results Dissemination & Knowledge Sharing**:
    - Publications,
    - Training materials
    - Website: 
      - [www.maec.es](http://www.maec.es)
    - Conferences
## Capacity building on IE

### Regional workshops on Impact Evaluation (2010):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Countries Attending</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Project Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Cairo, Egypt</td>
<td>January 13-17, 2008</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managua, Nicaragua</td>
<td>March 3-7, 2008</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid, Spain</td>
<td>June 23-27, 2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manila, Philippines</td>
<td>December 1-5, 2008</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima, Peru</td>
<td>January 26-30, 2009</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amman, Jordan</td>
<td>March 8-12, 2009</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing, China</td>
<td>July 20-24, 2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarajevo, Bosnia</td>
<td>September 21-25, 2009</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>December 7-11, 2009</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathmandu, Nepal</td>
<td>February 22-26, 2010</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,530</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2200</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workshop features:
- Each, 150–200 participants: government, academic, IE experts, NGOs and other development partners.
- Technical/policy track sessions.
- Hands on: organized around project teams that develop their own impact evaluation concept note on projects they are working.
- Training toolkit, including videos on IE techniques being developed.

Challenges:
- Sustainability.; enhancing regional capacity.
The cluster approach

- Strategically improve knowledge base in **selected** thematic areas – **clusters**
- Generate a **global “evidence body”** of knowledge across different country context
  - Basis for meta-analyses; generating cross-country evidence on development effectiveness in key areas
- Build **communities of practice**:
  - Common questions, measurement tools
  - Cross-fertilization evaluation and policy teams
- Enhance **quality**:
  - External peer review to access funds
  - Cluster leaders provide Technical Assistance to evaluation teams and coordinate activities in their cluster

www.worldbank.org/sief
SIEF IE program on HD sectors: Strategic clusters

- Seven HD clusters:
  - Conditional Cash Transfers (CCTs)
  - Health Contracting / Paying For Performance (P4P)
  - Basic Education Accountability
  - Active Labor Market Programs / Youth Employment
  - Malaria Control
  - HIV/AIDS
  - Early Childhood Development (ECD)

- Challenges:
  - Effective results dissemination & knowledge sharing
  - Measuring results: Are IE findings applied?
SIEF IE program on HD sectors:
Lessons learnt – Some examples Validating stories (I)

Do Scholarships help students continue their education after completing primary school even in a low income setting? Yes, but this did not translate into measurable better learning outcomes.

Does linking teacher pay to student performance improve results? Yes, even modest bonus payments to teachers can boost education outcomes.
Can computers help students learn? Yes BUT it may require policymakers to do more as incentives to make sure the technology into the education process.

Do food supplements help children in times of economic crisis? Yes for 12–24 moths children. The program was no so successful for older children and for infants
The importance of mixed methods: qualitative and quantitative methodological choices

Considering the time and resource constraints

Launching an IE program takes time and capacities to: develop the infrastructure, design strategic tools, recruit the team, communication, use.

Impact evaluations are long-run projects highly dependent on programs being evaluated.

Dialogue with partners and donor countries is essential.
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C. Final remarks
Learning... Why a crime? Strategies for fighting against the crime of learning (Britton, 2005)

...Motive, Means and the Opportunity to learn?

- Motive = Incentives to learn
- Means and Opportunity = Capacity and Enabling Environment to learn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Share, show and explain failures and success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify barriers for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Interpersonal relationships and trust building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop team working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Introduce reflection periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create spaces for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build learning into existing systems and procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Evidence to policy…  
From policy to practice…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Participation and Voice</th>
<th>Constraints in Institutions and Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Learning Organisation</td>
<td>Finantial Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Evidence Decision Making</td>
<td>Perception Decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Lack of awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignement</td>
<td>Lack of coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harmonisation</td>
<td>Lack of standarisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accountability?  
Democracy?

Hierarchy and respect to the norm
Start with policy relevant questions (and not with evaluation tools or indicators): data and information do not speak by themselves, good answers only if good questions.

Quantitative Impact evaluation is valued as one of the alternative methodological choices.

Evaluation culture and use imply spaces for Accountability, Learning, Participation and PD like Relationships

Sometimes Complexity (Development & Migration flows and policies) (a) does not permit “attribution”; (b) needs of a mixed methods approach and a contribution analysis

Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation as part of a coherent cycle

Evaluation is a field of specialization. Need of mixed evaluation teams. Evaluations are (a) political and technical; (b) processes - not only reports-; (b) context specific; (c) weakness of the evaluation processes (information needs (questions), communication and use)

Proposals for not reinventing the wheel: joint evaluations (evaluation networks/divisions –experience of the implementation of the Paris Declaration), standards, Evaluation capacity building, IE Handbooks,...
What short of data is required?
“It depends” on the program model, questions and methodological choices...

What should policymakers be requiring of technical experts? All they want if possible…but some pre conditions (political matters are more challenging than technical ones):

What should experts should be requiring of policymakers?
Real leadership and commitment with a planning, monitoring and evaluation culture (failure/sucess):
– Agreeing on the political models, objectives, questions
– Common knowledge and agenda on realistic incentives and capacities
Gracias
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