

CF/HST/1985/055

UNICEF HISTORY PROJECT
HIST 55
March 1986

CF/HST/1985-055

A CHRONICLE OF
EVALUATION AT UNICEF
1948 - 1984

Herman D. Stein

Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio

(60 + 26)

INDEX

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	1
CHAPTER I - EVALUATION	2
Evaluation and Evaluative Research	2
Evaluative Research in UNICEF	4
Requirements for Evaluative Research	6
Monitoring and Evaluation	7
CHAPTER II - TO 1964	9
Early Approaches	9
Responsibilities for Evaluation Reports	13
Board Reactions	18
CHAPTER III - 1964-1984	19
Resistance and Movement	19
Statistics	25
Evaluation for Emergencies	28
Programme Analysis and Evaluation Section	30
Technical Information Referral Service	31
Board Reviews of Evaluation	32
The Report of M. Bertrand	35
Internal Audit	36
Headquarters Emphasis in the 1980's	39
1984 Overview and Aftermath	40

CHAPTER IV - IMPRESSIONS	45
Dispersion of Monitoring and Evaluation Responsibilities	45
Problems and Progress	47
Program Evaluation Section	page 50

APPENDIX

Table I - Evaluation Functions and Sources Responsible
Interviews
Footnotes and Other References
Bibliography
UNICEF Documents, pre-1984
UNICEF Documents, 1984

FOREWORD

This statement, tracing and commenting on the course of evaluation thinking and practice in UNICEF, was suggested by Mr. John Charnow, as an internal report under the auspices of the History Project. It is based on a review of Board and Staff documents, a number of interviews, and my experience at UNICEF, as consultant, during the period 1962-1983. The chronicle starts at UNICEF's beginnings and ends at 1985. I appreciate the cooperation of all who were interviewed, and of the staff of the UNICEF library.

CHAPTER I - EVALUATION

Evaluation and Evaluative Research

Defining terms at the beginning of a discussion is frequently necessary, even at the risk of seeming pedantic. To clarify how one is using terms such as "Development" or "Community Participation" when there is no single universally accepted usage is, for example, essential to avoid ambiguity and confusion in serious international discourse. However, there is probably no technical term of social science in popular currency that has been subjected to a broader range of interpretation, and therefore, to more definitional battering, than "Evaluation."

The only common element in the various ways this term is used is that it signifies judgment of merit or achievement. From this point on there is a basic split in usage, between "evaluation as the general process of judging the worthwhileness of some activity, regardless of the method employed" and evaluation equated with "evaluation research as the specific use of scientific method for the purpose of making an evaluation".

In this discussion, "evaluative research" is employed

not as synonymous with evaluation but as a special form of evaluation, usually more costly and more time-consuming than other forms, and would not include, for example, those² relying on expert opinion or intuitive judgement .

To make this distinction - between "Evaluation" as an omnibus term for many methods of judging success or failure, progress or decline, favorable or unfavorable results, as against specifying "Evaluative Research" when referring to a form of evaluation requiring scientific rigor with all the controls this implies - is to resolve a large part of the misunderstandings that arise. When social scientists write about evaluation, they almost always concentrate on evaluative research, while laymen (including Board members), administrators and practitioners in both domestic and international social programs tend to refer to evaluation in its more generic and amorphous sense.

Thus, Wholey, Rossi, and Freeman equate evaluation with evaluation research, while a training text on evaluating village level programs expressly downplays the systematic³ research component . At the UNICEF Executive Board discussions, it is likewise uncommon for the necessary distinction to be made between evaluation in its generic sense, and evaluative research as an approach to scientific method and precision.

Authorities on evaluative research do not typically proclaim that it is always the most appropriate approach.

Thus, Weiss suggests that it is not worth doing:

- a) when there are no questions about the worthwhile-ness of the programme.
- b) when the programme has no clear orientation,
- c) when there is no agreement on what the programme is trying to achieve; and,
- d) when there is not enough money or qualified staff to conduct the evaluation.

To these one may add:

- e) when field conditions or absence of data make it unfeasible.

But the rigor of evaluative research is justified, as Weiss asserts:

- a) when outcomes to be evaluated are complex and hard to observe,
- b) when the decisions to follow are important and expensive,
- c) when evidence is needed to convince other people about the validity of the conclusions.

Evaluative Research in UNICEF

Formal evaluative research has in fact been very much the exception for UNICEF, for reasons of expense, practicality and a measure of scepticism about utility.

Indeed, as a matter of policy, such research has been, with rare exceptions, ruled out as a legitimate investment for the agency.

The first explicit statement found in a UNICEF document regarding evaluative research is in the Executive Director's "Note to the Board," 1963, where he recommended that it be prohibited for UNICEF on two grounds. One was that it was too expensive, and second, that it was the province of specialized agencies.

The next significant statement was in the 1974 preface (prepared by Heyward and Stein) to the section on "Assessment of Projects" of the 1966 Field Manual. This section has not yet been revised.

The preface, which provides the first guidelines to expenditures on evaluation, discusses purposes in programme planning, in monitoring inputs, assessing outputs, evaluating outcomes and relating them to impact on long-range goals. It also considers in some detail prospective appraisal and retrospective evaluation, and differentiates among experimental, pilot and demonstration projects, action research, surveys and other assessment approaches. The statement then indicates when evaluative research may be warranted and where it may not be. It specifies that, if undertaken, it should be the government which should be the

auspice for such effort, and even so, "UNICEF will not necessarily contribute to the funding of evaluative research in every case." The accent was most cautious. Indeed direct UNICEF investment in evaluative research, in the strict sense here used, has not taken place, except peripherally (as in the current IMO project in Nigeria referred to on pages 41 and 48).

Requirements for Evaluative Research

The literature on evaluative research in social programs has become vast. Unlike other forms of evaluation, at its core such research requires:

- a) an explicit definition of objectives, including underlying assumptions,
- b) measurable criteria to be developed related to the objectives,
- c) determining the extent to which the objectives are reached,
- d) methods, including controlled situations where possible, to determine how far any observed changes are due to the programme activity,
- e) identifying negative side effects or other unanticipated consequences.

Cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analyses, it may be added, are extensions of evaluative research .

Some of these elements are both necessary and possible in forms of evaluation other than evaluative research, but not all. Moreover, other forms of evaluation may judge aspects of a programme such as efficiency, adherence to regulations, administrative competence or morale. Evaluative research, in the sense it is employed in this document and by researchers in social programmes, is dedicated to the evaluation of outcomes and impact. Other elements may be treated, but essentially as they are relevant in explaining outcomes and impact.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring is closely related to evaluation, but not identical with it. Monitoring is mainly concerned with inputs - e.g.; checking to see whether supplies arrived on time, in correct quantity, at anticipated cost. Monitoring includes spotting problems, reporting them, seeing they are corrected. Data arising from monitoring activities are necessary for evaluation purposes.

Monitoring and evaluation in the history of UNICEF have been applied to a broad array of purposes with different emphases at different times, different methods and varying auspices.

The purposes may be categorized as follows:

Monitoring UNICEF programme inputs

Evaluating programme outputs

Monitoring fiscal management at Headquarters and
Field

Monitoring Field Office programme management

Helping to strengthen national capacity for data
collection, monitoring and evaluation

Providing data collection and statistical analysis

Monitoring global themes

Those conducting the activities related to these purposes have included various departments at UNICEF Headquarters, regional and field offices, divisions of the United Nations, specialized agencies, the UNDP, donor countries, ministries of the national governments, universities in the countries involved, and advisors. This distribution of responsibilities has varied over time with changing policies and practices.

CHAPTER II - TO 1964

Early Approaches

5
At the Executive Board Meeting in June, 1963, a number of delegates emphasized the importance of more regular evaluation of projects assessed by UNICEF. They recognized that there had been evaluation activity but wanted "a more systematic procedure." The Board was sufficiently concerned with the subject to ask that a background paper be prepared by the Executive Director and that the subject be placed on the agenda of the 1964 session. This background paper, reviewing the evaluation history of UNICEF and the subsequent discussions of the Executive Board, is a bench-mark in the progress of UNICEF's activity in evaluation.

The paper referred to the point at which the General Assembly reconstituted the Board of UNICEF as from 1 January 1951, after the Emergency Relief phase, and broadened its terms of reference to emphasize long-range needs of children in developing countries. It was in 1951 that the Board first expressed the need to receive "evaluations of the achievements of the projects in relation to their objectives," while recognizing that most projects were only beginning and that it would take some time before their

requests could be fulfilled.

In the 1951 document⁶ there is reference to "another form of evaluation," that of "direct observation by Board members in the field," a theme which has been picked up intermittently in subsequent UNICEF history. Members of the Executive Board had not only been engaged in observation tours - an activity encouraged by John Charnow, Secretary of the Board - but key figures from donor countries often spent extra days in the field for more intensive study. Members of National Committees also frequently made field tours.

The notion of having prospective appraisals conducted by experts to determine what would be technically feasible was introduced by Dr. Ludwik Rajchman in the early days of UNICEF history. As the specialized agencies of the United Nations grew in their professional capacities and authority, they became the technical arbiters of programs in their respective fields in which UNICEF was engaged. In the October, 1956, Board session, emphasis was given to the necessity of close collaboration with the specialized agencies, which would be responsible for evaluation of the "practical aspects" of the projects. Specialized agencies were indeed heavily involved in technical assessment of UNICEF-assisted projects in the 1950's and 1960's. The 1959⁷ summary of major trends in UNICEF Programme Aid makes repeated reference to standard-setting by the specialized

agencies and their responsibility for technical review. Evaluation does not appear as a category of UNICEF aid or UNICEF responsibility.

The emphasis, at the 1963 Executive Board session, was on project evaluation or appraisal. Three main approaches had been taken up to this time. One consisted of retrospective appraisals by the specialized agencies, of UNICEF-assisted projects that fell in their domains - health, nutrition, education, social welfare.

A second was what the Executive Director referred to as "informal evaluation" at field level. Representatives in field offices were counted on to observe the progress of projects, and prepare written reports. Headquarters staff would assist and participate in such reviews. Since the culture of the organization emphasized practicality and pragmatism, and UNICEF staff had a well-deserved reputation for integrity, hard work, and being conscientious, these reports, whether written or verbal, were relied on. When necessary to achieve a more thorough appraisal, individual consultants were brought in to help.

A third approach was "prospective evaluation." More commonly referred to as "prospective appraisals," the objective was to assess the future value of certain types of programs. This initiative led to a broad-gauged review of the needs of children, which involved twenty-four

governments and five technical agencies.

The Executive Director emphasized that evaluation in the field by UNICEF staff had to be based on "informed, personal judgment", in the main, because quantitative data simply were not available.

Moreover, such retrospective appraisal of individual projects was most difficult because the agency was essentially a "junior partner." Administration of projects was, after all, the responsibility of national authorities. Draft evaluation reports conducted under UNICEF auspices had indeed been modified in order not to cause embarrassment to governments. "UNICEF cannot go to countries to help them with projects and then later publicly criticize the execution of the projects." That is why UNICEF published only regional assessments of given types of projects, rather than specifying assessment of distinct projects.

The Executive Director's report therefore recommended, with the subsequent strong endorsement of the Executive Board, that effort be put into assisting the countries themselves to evaluate their own programs - an effort which was slow to take off but became built in almost everywhere that UNICEF operated by the mid-seventies.

He also proposed that one or two special reports evalu-

ating a type of program assistance be considered at each Board session, with a view to covering the main types of program assistance about every seven years. Further, it was recommended that each project have a built-in evaluation specified in the plan of operations.

Perhaps most important, the report recognized that further emphasis on evaluation required more expenditure for this purpose, including support for strengthening evaluative capacity within governments.

With respect to evaluation research, however, the official position taken remained this should be outside the province of UNICEF, but, where needed, should be carried out by the technical agencies. "It is not appropriate for UNICEF to engage in evaluative research in order to determine the soundness of a programme in a specialized field. To pursue the example given [whether BCG vaccination prevents T.B.], it has been on the basis of an affirmative opinion from the specialized agency concerned (WHO) that UNICEF has assisted BCG vaccination campaign in developing countries."

Responsibilities for Evaluation Reports

The Executive Director noted that evaluations of many kinds had been undertaken during the preceding period. In the 1963 statement they are characterized as:

- a) Efficiency of management
- b) Technical soundness of programs
- c) Training
- d) Impact on development (retrospective)
- e) Prospective evaluations (or appraisals).

Efficiency of Management - These reviews were conducted mainly through the Board's Committee on Administrative Budget, the reports of the Board of Auditors and the administrative and operations services budget proposal made by the Executive Director. For example, the introduction to the latter proposals began to analyze work load in relation to staffing each year since 1953.

In September 1959, the Committee on Administrative Budget agreed that it would be desirable to examine in detail the total administrative structure of UNICEF and the use of staff, even though they did not feel that any special problem necessarily existed. They were generally impressed with the efficiency of the UNICEF Secretariat but they wanted to have an independent administrative review of UNICEF. At that time the Secretary-General appointed a deputy director of the UN Office of Personnel, Mr. Laurence Michelmore, to conduct the survey which was begun early in 1960 and completed in October of 1960.

Technical Soundness of Programs - In many cases this

subject was approached by the Joint Committee of UNICEF with FAO and WHO. In 1958, this Joint Committee on Health Policy agreed that periodic assessment and reviews should be presented to the JCHP and the UNICEF Executive Board, with WHO preparing the technical aspects of these reports. Thus, there have been reviews by WHO in the field of malaria in 1952, in 1959, and in 1961. A number of reports assessed progress in BCG anti-tuberculous vaccination campaigns over the years as well as progress reports on yaws, leprosy and trachoma.

The use of special consultants was illustrated by the report on Maternal and Child Health by WHO which was prepared with the help of a special consultant, Dr. Jesse Berman. This report resulted in the request that a study be made of MCH centers in each region with particular attention to the extent in which both child care and nutrition education was incorporated in the programs.

Additional surveys of progress were made by WHO in the fields of environmental sanitation, in child feeding, and milk conservation. The latter two were made by FAO and the FAO-WHO-UNICEF Protein Advisory Group. PAG was continuously involved with the technical problems of nutritional safety and suitability.

Training - Training was the subject of a special review

in 1961, and referred principally to surveys undertaken with the co-operation of WHO and FAO with respect to health personnel, nutrition training, milk conservation and in the area of family and child welfare the Bureau of Social Affairs prepared a special report.

Impact on Development - Because of the difficulties in obtaining base-line information for retrospective evaluation, the UNICEF Board had not requested reports. However, the issue of impact on development in particular countries was referred to when Board members visited a number of countries. The reports were to be under the general auspices of the Program Committee of the Board. Under this rubric would fall evaluation of different types of programs within a country and also the evaluation by countries themselves of projects for which they received international assistance. But, very little information of this kind, if any at all, had been presented to the Executive Board, and in no instance was evaluative research proposed for impact assessment.

Prospective Evaluation (or Appraisal) - A number of reports had been prepared in the preceding decade indicating how UNICEF assistance might fit into a country's economic and social development program. For example, in 1952, a report on milk conservation in underdeveloped areas (upper and eastern Mediterranean, by an FAO consultant) and another on "Improvement of Infant and Child Nutrition on the Basis

of Local Foods." In 1959 the Board considered "Possibilities of UNICEF Aid for Social Services for Children." on the basis of a report by a Bureau for Social Affairs consultant. Similarly, a report on a "Study of Possible UNICEF Aid to Primary Education" was prepared by UNICEF in consultation with UNESCO. And, in 1961 itself a "Survey of the Needs of Children" was conducted with the cooperation of the BSA, ILO, FAO, UNESCO, and WHO, for purposes of prospective appraisal of individual projects.

The objectives of evaluation as discussed in the 1963 paper were defined as "accountability" on the one hand and "planning" on the other. The paper indicated that more had apparently been done about the planning objective than in providing evidence for accountability. One reason for this had been the difficulty of getting objective data which "proved results", in contrast to criteria for determining the effectiveness of assistance for disease control campaigns - e.g. malaria, tuberculosis, yaws, leprosy, trachoma. Making empirical judgments as to whether countries had been helped to strengthen their permanent services bearing on maternal and child health was much more elusive. "Applied nutrition" as a program was more difficult to assess than whether school meals were provided. Moreover, separating out the particular impact by such programs of the small amount of assistance from UNICEF, given the overall government budget and other external assistance, was extremely

difficult.

Board Reactions

Reactions from the Board in discussion of the Executive Director's 1963 report were positive about previous efforts but insistent about the need for a more systematic approach. Nevertheless, there was no disposition to alter the premise that it was outside the scope of UNICEF to engage in evaluative research. The most that could be encouraged was for UNICEF to join with the technical agencies in making program reviews.

The theme of support for project evaluation by countries themselves received strong endorsement, and reference was repeatedly made to Resolution 991 (XXXVI) of ECOSOC, which encouraged this approach. The Board was specific in identifying the various bodies and mechanisms that could be involved in evaluation by governments, and which could now be directly assisted; and also specified the various national institutions outside of Government which could be involved.

CHAPTER III - 1964-1984

Resistance and Movement

While there were more program reviews and individual project assessments produced following the 1964 Board meeting, progress by field offices to help strengthen evaluative capacity within national governments was sluggish. The subject of evaluation generally remained a low priority in practice for some years, despite formal acceptance of Board policy and executive statements.

In a memorandum on policy developments from Adelaide Sinclair, Deputy Executive Director (Programme) in March, 1964⁸, she states that there will henceforth be two levels of assessments. One - assessments of aid categories on a global basis, which would have to be organized in cooperation with the relevant specialized agencies. The second - project assessments to be undertaken by field offices. She states:

"Of course there has always been a certain amount of this kind of assessment, but in the future we must take this much more seriously both in the planning and in the implementation of projects. Plans of operation in the future

should always provide some specific assessment of each project, designating the national authority which will make the assessment, where appropriate, indicating the time when this will be done, and always indicating the criteria which are expected to be used and for which a base line may need to be established."

These instructions were elaborated in considerable detail in May, 1964⁹. Nevertheless, implementation was very slow.

This lack of movement was due to several factors. One was the mystification surrounding the term "evaluation," particularly on the part of those staff whose academic background did not include experience with systematic evaluation activities. A second was the lack of consistent support and specific requirements from Headquarters. Despite genuine conviction about the importance of more systematic evaluative activity in connection with projects, so many other pressures intervened at Headquarters and even more in the field, that the subject remained on the back burner, coming to light principally in the form of individual retrospective project assessments.

Monitoring delivery of program inputs and examination of operational methods, the latter often with the participation of the technical agencies, were given attention. How-

ever, there was little effort to promote a statistical base within countries, or training for planning groups in the relevant ministries on evaluation methodology.

Third, field staff, including most regional directors, were skeptical about the utility of systematic evaluation of projects. The pragmatic quality of UNICEF, which stood it in good stead with a "can do" approach, and laid the groundwork for an enviable reputation for hard-headed effectiveness, also carried with it a skepticism about "academic" approaches, including theorizing and measuring. The motif was "do it first and think about it later - if you have time," virtually an emergency orientation. This pragmatic and adrenalin-charged mind-set has indeed served the agency well at many stages of its history, and no one wanted this organizational character trait lost; but something more was needed.

In this connection, Banner, et al, comment: "Evaluation and operations are mutually exclusive orientations in a practical sense. It would be difficult to find an aggressive, effective administrator who placed a high priority on quality evaluation"¹⁰. (This observation clearly pertains to evaluation, not to monitoring, which is entirely consistent with aggressive administration.)

Fourth, there was still a lingering reliance on the

specialized agencies to do what was necessary technically in evaluations. Since the Bellagio Round-Table Conference in 1963, there was less dependence on the agencies for program guidance and authorization, although their advice was solicited. With respect to programme evaluation, however, the agencies were heavily relied on.

Fifth, there was no Headquarters section whose sole responsibility was to stimulate and oversee the project evaluation function, providing guidance directly or through consultation for field offices where needed. Such an office was not created until 1976, with the establishment of a Programme Analysis and Evaluation Section (PAES).

Proponents of something more by way of UNICEF responsibility in evaluation at Headquarters included Newton Bowles and E. J. R. Heyward, who took early initiatives, and later Charles Egger who helped implement the approaches. I was actively involved in these issues, as a consultant since 1962, since my background included evaluation of social programs and reviewing evaluation research .

The Regional Directors Programme Conference of June, 1968, testifies to the state of evaluation priority in the context of life in the field. It became clear that while there were a few reasonably adequate project evaluations, this was hardly the norm, and very little had been done

about strengthening national capacity.

At this conference I was asked to introduce the subject, and attempted to "de-complexify" the subject by distinguishing between evaluating the means and ends of a project¹², and by indicating the merits and limitations of expert views as a primary means of judgment. There was a positive response from the Regional Directors, but emphasis once again on the difficulties of any evaluation without data.

The conference report states:

"Newton Bowles said that in placing this item before the Directors' Conference, Headquarters wanted to try once more to break through the impasse in implementing the Executive Board's policy which places first priority on helping countries evaluate their own projects."

This conference both recognized and seemed to have helped break the impasse.

In July, 1968, Dr. Egger issued a directive¹³ to concentrate on new action with respect to evaluation. He stated that while there was some progress in carrying out global program assessments, "There has been relatively little success in assisting governments to undertake systematic, built-in project evaluation. We must ask ourselves

why this is so and what we can do to stimulate serious project evaluation by the government."

Emphasis was now put on applying project evaluation to a relatively few selected projects, rather than attempting to apply it to all projects. Greater emphasis was given to the importance of pragmatism, relating evaluation to the means at hand as well as to the importance of the activity. A classification was prepared of targets for evaluation and approaches to evaluation. Targets included technique, programme project and programme organization. Approaches included effectiveness evaluation, empirical research, expert judgment, and organizational evaluation. There was also a discussion of traps to avoid in engaging in each of the evaluation approaches. This Expro was intended to clarify and reassure. The effect was not great, perhaps because there was still an overly intellectual tone to the text, and perhaps because it was still painless for field personnel to ignore such Expros.

Considerable thought went into this Expro, but I doubt that it held more than academic interest for most of the field staff, even though it was intended to demystify the subject. The organizational commitment, while present in principle at Headquarters, simply was not visible to much of the field in reality. There were neither rewards if the message of the directive was followed, nor sanctions, if the effort was not made. Nothing much would change until there

were direct instructions to specific field offices with enough consultation to help them move to evaluation efforts with government offices with respect to UNICEF-assisted projects. There would have also to be a location at Headquarters which was dedicated to oversight specifically for such activity.

During the first few years of the 1970's, emphasis was placed on preparing Board presentations for Country Planning covering a period of several years rather than a year at a time. In a message on programme evaluation to field offices in April, 1973¹⁴, Dr. Egger stated "The result is that our assistance to a particular country may not be evaluated for some time." Again the Expro asks "What is evaluation anyway? For what purpose, covering what inputs against what targets or goals?" In order to help, the Expro provides information from AID documents and from a discussion held with AID staff.

Statistics

A Statistics presence began in December, 1973, with what was to have been a ten month assignment for Leo Goldstone, who then was heading the Division of Statistics on Education for UNESCO. He was seconded to the UN Statistics Office to design a statistics program for UNICEF and to help the UN Statistics Office strengthen its own program in social statistics. At that time, Tarlok Singh was heading a

Planning Division in UNICEF, and Goldstone worked with him. The initial "temporary" assignment to help with developing a statistics program has continued to the present day.

There was no clear understanding at Headquarters about what a statistics program should be, and only scattered interest except from Heyward and Tarlok Singh. Goldstone was encouraged by Heyward to visit Country Offices in all regions before Goldstone himself could recommend what should be done. These visits resulted in a meeting with the Regional Directors and eventually the decision to set up a Statistics assistance programme in selected countries and Regional Offices, with the use of Regional and Country Advisors, rather than to establish a full-fledged statistics unit in Headquarters, akin to those in other agencies of the United Nations.

Statistics still retains a marginal presence at Headquarters, although it is more fully accepted than in the past. The Statistics Advisor continues to be paid through the United Nations, and the Statistics budget comes from the IFP.

Statistics received strong reaffirmation as a result of M. Bertrand's report in 1980¹⁵ which called for a stronger quantitative basis for UNICEF's planning and programming, and contained detailed recommendations for improving the

statistical data base.

A by-product of the programme developed in UNICEF was the encouragement of the UN Statistics Office since 1979 to stimulate the establishment of national household survey programmes in several countries. These have been successfully carried out with considerable UNICEF support.

The Nairobi unit, under the leadership of Kenneth Williams, has conducted scores of sample household surveys in countries of East Africa, issues a regular publication, and provides statistical consultation to a number of governments in the region.

At the end of 1984, there were six Regional and Country Advisors. Three of the Regional Offices had not opted to have a Statistics Officer, and apparently there has been no Headquarters insistence that they do so. In keeping with the decentralized, loose programme originally established, the Statistics Officers in the field report not to the Headquarters Statistic Officer, but to the Regional Directors for those serving in the Regional Offices, and to the representatives at the country level. The Headquarters Statistics Advisor consults, visits and provides support, but not official direction. There is a generally collegial rather than hierarchical relationship between him and those in the field.

Statistical capacity has been essential to systematic evaluation efforts by providing a data base. In Nigeria and the Sudan, the case studies on evaluation submitted to the Executive Board in 1984 would not have been possible without the work performed with the governments by the UNICEF statistics advisors in those countries. One of the most important sources of objection to evaluative activity, the paucity of data against which to measure change, has been significantly reduced by the statistics staff, working with government departments.

Quite distinct from the Headquarters statistics advisor and regional and country statistics advisors, there is a section on statistics within the Programme Division. Its function is essentially to determine, as far as possible, how much is spent in each programme category. It is part of the UNICEF internal monitoring machinery.

Evaluation for Emergencies

There is very little reference to evaluation in UNICEF documents with respect to the handling of emergencies with which UNICEF has been engaged over the years. However, at the present time the Field Manual section on "Emergencies" does have reference to assessment, monitoring, phasing out and evaluation.

There was indeed evaluation of an informal kind during the various periods of UNICEF's work in emergencies, including the earliest period in Europe. In 1948 the "Food For Work" plan was experimented with in Byelo-Russia. The same concept was picked up again in Algeria in the emergency work of 1958 and was reintroduced in Ethiopia during the famine of 1984-5.

In the new Field Manual (1984), prospective evaluations are referred to, and in effect represent the function of a systematic assessment plan. Among the criteria in evaluating effectiveness in emergencies is how "fair" UNICEF succeeds in being to all of the interests involved, as well as what was accomplished as a result of UNICEF interventions. The assessment of efficiency includes the speed attained by UNICEF in delivering its help, the logistical planning and the effectiveness of what was accomplished.

The Field Manual indicates that final evaluations may be undertaken either by staff members or by outside individuals or institutions, but should be planned for at the very outset of an emergency so that the entire process can be followed. The elements to be covered include arrangements for warning and preparedness, the clarity and comprehensiveness of the initial assessment of needs and programming required, the coverage of sectoral needs, the design and implementation of a monitoring programme, the organization

of the emergency effort, the specific role of UNICEF staff, and the utilization of other individuals and groups.

Programme Analysis and Evaluation Section

In the ten years between 1974 and 1984, there was a mounting interest and investment in monitoring and evaluation. In 1976, for the first time, a section explicitly devoted to these functions was formed in Headquarters, with a view to its being a driving force in guiding and stimulating evaluation throughout the agency, and serving, as well, as a symbolic recognition of the agency's commitment to it. The notion of having such a unit in Headquarters had been around for at least two years, but the time had not been considered propitious to staff it until then. The section was placed within the Programme Division. Its first head was Nailton Santos, whose background was in programme planning. He was quickly joined by Ed Lannert who later succeeded him as head of the unit.

Very soon after the section was organized, it was renamed the Programme Analysis and Evaluation Section, a designation Santos preferred to Evaluation Section. The emphasis for the first few years was, in fact, less on evaluation than on programme planning and analysis. The premise was that without more rational programme planning, including expectations of results at given time intervals, programme evaluation would not have a sound base. Seminars

were therefore undertaken in different regions to systematize programme planning and analysis.

Technical Information Referral Service

In the aftermath of the highly acclaimed International Year of the Child, consideration was given by the Executive Board and staff to possible follow-up to consolidate the gains. One of the proposals, strongly favored by the PAES, was to form a Technical Information and Referral Service. Initially, its aim was simply to "provide information about sources of technical and operational information to which those inquiring could be referred." It was a way of capitalizing on the wealth of information on resources generated by the IYC, and an effort to establish UNICEF as a central resource for referral, without UNICEF itself having to provide technical information, unless it concerned UNICEF itself.

Along with other follow-up activities approved by the Executive Board, the TIRS was in principle approved. In a memorandum of 22/02/81 prepared by Ed Lannert, its specific function was as follows:

"The service will aim primarily at developing and operating a system for the build-up and dissemination of external and internal information on sources of ideas, methods and techniques from experience that will help

policy-makers, planners and practitioners, in their actions benefiting children. Special attention will be given to making more effective and efficient use of UNICEF's experience with social services programmes at grass-roots level; sharing experience that is cross-sectoral; and to monitoring and diffusing national policy developments that impact on the condition of children."

In a short time, however, the emphasis in the management of the TIRS shifted to the utilization of information, from both UNICEF and non-UNICEF experience, including NGO's, for UNICEF programming, and internal UNICEF purposes. (The center of UNICEF activity for TIRS also moved from the Office for Europe in Geneva, to New York.) In turn, this function - carried within the Programme Planning and Programme Development Division's PAES - lessened in priority and became incorporated into an overall Management Information System. Meanwhile, however, a measure of energy and resources during the early 1980's became deflected from the management of evaluation activities at Headquarters to the development of programme management information, including information about evaluation. One of the products of the PAES was an inventory of studies and evaluations from 1979 to 1983¹⁶.

Board Reviews of Evaluation

At its 1976 session, soon after the Programme Analysis and Evaluation Section was formed, the Board engaged in a

review of UNICEF support of evaluative activities, and approved a three-year program to strengthen its work in that field. The report that the Board heard from the Executive Director indicated that support was provided for ministries in several countries for their evaluative activities, and that a number of prospective appraisals were conducted relating to specific projects including strengthening the information base required. There was also clearly a stepped-up utilization of universities and institutes within countries for evaluation purposes.

The Executive Director's report also presented a review of the more systematic training of UNICEF staff in project preparation and assessment which included workshops at Headquarters and in the field. The paper indicated certain problems in developing a programme for systematic evaluation, problems which made it difficult to accomplish all that had been envisioned. The paper identified, among the constraints, the fact that many government ministries did not really believe that strengthening their evaluation capabilities was a priority need at their stage of development of services; the absence of national personnel trained in either monitoring or evaluation methodology; insufficient indicators for measuring outcomes benefiting children as a significant factor everywhere, and a natural reticence of officials to engage in retrospective evaluations, because of the risk that these may expose

problems. It was also evident that much more needed to be done with UNICEF staff itself, in preparing them for the management and follow-up of monitoring and evaluation activities.

One of the major conclusions in the Board discussion was that it was essential for both UNICEF staff and national officials to engage in training for evaluation and that there ought to be wider dissemination of retrospective evaluation results. In addition, the paper affirmed the importance of having well-elaborated programme designs which would make an investment in monitoring and evaluation more fruitful.

By the time of the Board review of evaluation in 1982, it was evident that considerable progress had been made to strengthen country level monitoring and evaluation of UNICEF-assisted programmes, with a great deal of support given to the participation of government agencies and other institutions. A sample analysis of evaluation activities assisted by UNICEF country offices during 1981, however, suggested that the bulk of assistance still went to prospective studies, surveys and field research, with the aim of improving programme formulation. As against the 60% of activities supported for such purposes, 40% were devoted to retrospective evaluations. At the same time, a great deal more attention than previously was devoted to supporting activities for improving monitoring of programmes.

The Report of M. Bertrand

In a comprehensive, wide-ranging report in 1980 on planning and programming for children at the country level, M. Maurice Bertrand of the Joint Inspection Unit presented his analysis of the role of UNICEF in overall development efforts. He examined problems of planning and programming at the country level, of monitoring and evaluating programme implementation and results, conducting research, and removing bottlenecks in information concerning the situation of children, and made a score of recommendations.

However, the Executive Board, while impressed with the report, was cautious about what several delegates felt was an inordinate emphasis on information building, with a possible diversion of resources from programme delivery. As Ed Lannert noted in his evaluation overview of February, 1984, the Board comments represented a wish to strike a balance between the financial resources required to improve information and those needed to fulfill the potential for increased programme effectiveness. Delegates emphasized the need to develop simple and inexpensive methods of data collection. The Board emphasized the importance, as well, of maintaining the action-oriented approach characteristic of UNICEF, and the direction of delivery of basic services, even where information programming might be inadequate.

In effect, M. Bertrand's report was a "succes d'estime," respectfully received for its comprehensiveness, its logical argument, its high intellectual quality and systematic approach, but not, for the most part, accepted in its practical implications. Still, it remains a bench-mark in its searching examination of the evaluation issue for UNICEF within the context of the agency's developmental role.

Internal Audit

Internal Audit in UNICEF dates back to 1948 when two auditors were engaged and outposted to Bangkok and Paris to provide meticulous review of vouchers, financial reports and receipts governing the receiving and distribution of supplies. As Tony Meager reported in his memorandum of June, 1984, "This type of auditing was aimed at ensuring accuracy and integrity of financial reporting."

Internal Audit was part of the Comptroller's Division of UNICEF for its first twenty years. During that period it had a gradual increase of responsibilities, dealing more with systems and internal control procedures and performing audits aimed at improving the economy and efficiency of UNICEF operations in addition to examining the financial reports.

In 1968, upon the recommendation of the UN Board of External Auditors, the Internal Audit service became part of the Office of the Executive Director to ensure its independence. It reported to the Executive Director through E.J.R. Heyward as Senior Deputy Executive Director for Operations.

A turning point for the IAS came in 1973. It was foreshadowed by Mr. Labouisse's Progress Report which reviewed activity in project evaluation, global assessment, the development of statistics and social indicators for measuring change. At that point, internal audit of project assistance was also reviewed, and the connection between Internal Audit and evaluation of programme was signalled. In 1973 the IAS moved formally to the evaluation of programme performance with a systematic review of "UNICEF programme input" and an increasingly formal review of outputs of programme operation, termed "programme audits".

Financial auditing relates to efficiency, programme auditing to effectiveness. This was a dramatic expansion of function for the IAS, which since 1973 broadened still further to include management audits as well as more formal assessment of outputs.

The relationship of IAS to programme performance quickly developed into monitoring and evaluation, both of inputs

and outputs, through on-site observations. While strengthening self-evaluation of governments was UNICEF's objective, the major initiatives for evaluation of projects with which UNICEF assisted usually rested with UNICEF, along with efforts to inject external objectivity into the process by involving national institutions and universities. The IAS participated in this initiative as it was taken by field offices.

While some in the IAS have regarded programme auditing as evaluation of the effectiveness of UNICEF activity within government programmes, others do not regard it so. The latter view programme audits as essentially operational - that is, examining programme design, and helping the country office tie up loose ends. They maintain that since programme audits normally do not involve government counterparts, evaluation of outcomes - let alone impact - is not, in fact, possible.

At this writing, the explicit evaluative activity of Internal Audit is being restrained, except for its participation in the agency-wide evaluations of the global impact of the Child Survival Development Revolution and of worldwide programme audits such as it performed in 1982-3 on water/sanitation programmes. The trend is towards emphasizing once more the traditional role of internal audit to control financial matters in the country offices. Nevertheless, there remain exceptions to this principle.

Headquarters Emphasis in the 1980's

Board interest and pressure about evaluation continued to mount during the early 1980's, as the entire UN system gave the subject more attention.

In June of 1982, Richard Jolly, Deputy Executive Director for Programmes, sent a memorandum to regional directors and representatives on the subject of "Strengthening Of Programme Evaluation." In this message he first summarized previous activity and indicated the actions now called for to improve the "planning, management and use of evaluations." He asked that country offices make sure that an evaluation plan become part of every programme submission to the Executive Board, and indicated what basic information should be incorporated within such plans. The criteria were identified for the selection of ongoing programmes for evaluation. Certain programmes were designated as priorities for evaluations for the period 1983-84 from a global perspective. These were: rural water supply and sanitation; UNICEF-assisted training programmes; and area development projects (pilot projects).

In addition to indicating how the evaluation should be organized and the terms of reference needed for its preparation, the message emphasized the importance of preparing a

plan of action for using the evaluation results.

In December, 1983, Richard Jolly issued an EXD ¹⁷, designed to consolidate policies on evaluative studies, and specify guidelines for implementation. Thus, there was a restatement of the policy that UNICEF does not support long-term basic research, but may assist applied research on a practical level. To try to guide and co-ordinate activities in this field, a Committee was established on Applied Research and Evaluations, to be chaired by Mr. Jolly.

Efforts at more systematic monitoring, both within UNICEF operations in government projects with which UNICEF was cooperating, apparently were increasing and did not require any unusual Headquarters admonitions or appeals.

1984 Overview and Aftermath

Ed Lannert prepared an overview of evaluative activities in UNICEF for the Executive Board of 1984 ¹⁸. He records the gains and shortcomings of the experience. A global inventory of evaluations was established, so that there would be a "memory bank" of project experience, but systematic use of evaluation reports were not yet consistently undertaken throughout the organization. Necessary posts for evaluation had been established in the Programme Development and Planning Division, but the evaluation system needed strengthening at regional and

country levels. Retrospective evaluations and ongoing programme evaluations had steadily increased from 1980 to 1982, but difficulty continued in attributing improvements in child well-being to specific programme or project interventions, and cost-effectiveness of UNICEF-sponsored programs required greater attention.

The overview describes certain "organizational roles" with respect to evaluation, but only hints at the organizational ambiguities which emerged as the accent on evaluative undertakings was sharpened. Thus, while regional offices have no specific responsibilities in this area they do provide "encouragement and support." However, only in some regional offices is such support strong. Applied research and statistics are shared by the Division of Program Development and Planning and the Division of Program Field Services. The Office of Internal Audit is also involved in assessing both effectiveness and efficiency and carries out special management audit assignments. Reference is made to the statistical advisors deployed by UNICEF, but more than half are in one region, East Africa, where they helped develop the National Household Survey Capability Program. Finally, there is reference to UN specialized agencies commissioned to perform specialized tasks related to evaluation, the cooperation of bilateral donors and utilizing the experience of the Joint Inspection Unit and the International Fund for Agricultural Development.

At the 1984 Executive Board session there were two case studies of evaluation, one, an analysis of programme experience in the Indonesian National Family Nutrition Improvement Programme¹⁹, and the other "The UNICEF-Assisted Rural Drinking Water and Sanitation Project in Iwo State, Nigeria"²⁰. The first was in too early a stage to provide a retrospective evaluation, but illustrated ongoing programme assessment. The second represented a major innovation in UNICEF-supported evaluation, since it involved as rigorous an evaluation research methodology as could be applied under field conditions.

21

The report of the 1984 Programme Committee indicated some skepticism on the part of the Executive Board about how aggressively UNICEF was moving with respect to evaluation. Thus, the representatives of Netherlands, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the United Kingdom "had encouraged the secretariat to increase the use of outside consultants, who would provide greater objectivity and inject fresh ideas."

There was, however, little attention given to the subject of diverse organizational roles in evaluation. Rather, a principal theme was for continuing "a practical and pragmatic approach." There was some disagreement on how far UNICEF should go in the statistical field, and emphasis on making more use of information collected. One of the

more unusual observations in Executive Board deliberations was that of the United States delegate, who argued that studies evaluating impact, which entailed applied research and other rigorous approaches - as in the case study from Nigeria - should be pursued despite their relative costliness. This, however, did not appear to be a general view.

22

In an EXD following this Board meeting Mr. Jolly builds on the message of 1982, and emphasizes that the Executive Board's concern about evaluation at this time was influenced, in addition to the normal reasons for its past and continuing interest, by the current difficult world-wide economic situation. In effect, the shrinking resources of major contributors led to demands for increased accountability for the use of their donations. He referred also to the greater pressure within the entire United Nations system for strengthening monitoring and evaluation.

Therefore, the EXD urged that the evaluation component of programme submissions to the Executive Board should be elaborated in more detail, that each office institutionalize an annual programme implementation review with government, that more attention be given to evaluations in annual reports, that each office prepare an overall monitoring and evaluation plan for projects in the country programme, and that all evaluations financed by UNICEF should contain an

executive summary. Responsibility was placed on the country offices for initiating and following up on evaluation activities, with the regional offices and Headquarters playing a supporting role.

CHAPTER IV - IMPRESSIONS

Dispersion of Monitoring and Evaluation Responsibilities

The accent on monitoring and evaluation, in the ten years from 1974 to 1984, had clearly increased considerably throughout UNICEF. However, their functions had become more differentiated, and the responsibility for carrying out these functions had by 1984 become diffuse. This was despite the fact that the core responsibility was to lie within the Programme Development and Planning Division to guide country offices. The functions can be characterized as:

Monitoring Programme Inputs - who checks that what is supposed to be provided for projects is actually supplied, on time;

Monitoring Programme Outputs - who checks whether the programmes achieve their immediate purpose;

Auditing Fiscal Management - who checks whether the budgets allocated to field offices are properly used, with adequate fiscal control;

Auditing Field Office Management - who judges and reports whether the field offices are efficiently managed, and their total resources well deployed;

Strengthening National Capacity - who helps the countries achieve greater evaluative capacity themselves for their own projects benefiting children, whether or not the projects are UNICEF related;

Monitoring Global Themes - who attempts to assess whether the global efforts in which UNICEF participates are progressing - whether in water and sanitation programmes or the Child Survival and Development Revolution;

Data Collection and Analysis - who sees to it that the bench-mark data needed for evaluation are obtained and brought up to date.

These functions are spread among eight sources, five of which are within UNICEF itself. (See Table I)

The national governments with which UNICEF cooperates bear a vital and increasing share of the responsibility, with lesser participation by the UNDP and specialized agencies, and occasionally from donor countries for special projects.²³ National and regional institutions are increasingly drawn into evaluation of UNICEF-assisted projects, and bi-lateral agencies also provide their expertise.

Within UNICEF the Programme Division Advisory Services and the Programme Division Field Service carry a significant share, along with the field offices themselves which are mainly responsible. The statistics advisors, at

Headquarters, and in the regional and field offices carry the statistics responsibilities, and Internal Audit, has gradually assumed considerable authority in several areas.

It was not surprising that a need was felt for coordinating machinery, in this instance a Coordinating Committee established in 1985, and headed by Dr. Jolly. It was also evident that the entire subject of monitoring and evaluation would continue to take on different shapes, with the combination of changing internal requirements - especially the monitoring of the Child Survival and Development Revolution initiated by Mr. Grant - and external pressures, from the Executive Board and the U.N. system.

Problems and Progress

Over the years, considerable progress has been made to move programme monitoring and evaluation into the mainstream of UNICEF work, if not to center stage. They are today widely accepted in the field as activities which are significant and recognized as such by Headquarters.

To achieve this progress, several kinds of resistance have had to be overcome, particularly with respect to retrospective evaluation, in a process which still continues. One has been the lingering doubt that effort and resources spent on either prospective or retrospective evaluation are

as useful as their expenditure on programme itself, given the restrictions of both staffing and funds. Another has been the uncertainty that the methods used for retrospective evaluation are sound, or that field personnel are equipped to direct this activity. Third, is the concern that such evaluation, which must of necessity reveal shortcomings as well as achievements, may be embarrassing to personnel of the government agencies themselves, and thus might best be left alone.

Monitoring of programme inputs has not encountered similar resistance, and has become an accepted staple in the array of field activities, both by UNICEF staff and government agencies. Monitoring does not conflict with the historic, pragmatic style of UNICEF - "Let's get the job done that we know is needed without spending time on measuring it" - for it is regarded as part of the job. Procedures for monitoring are incorporated in many, and probably most programmes.

Resistance, however, has not been the dominant reaction from the field in recent years. Not only has it decreased in all regions, but positive initiatives have taken place. In several countries (e.g. - Ethiopia) by the 1980's) training workshops on evaluation were conducted, monitoring was improved, and the annual programme reviews with government counterparts were used to stimulate selective, joint evaluative activities.

In the broad thematic areas, such as water/sanitation, monitoring and evaluation have become increasingly systematized - from the monitoring of inputs (e. g. - how many hand pumps provided); outcome and utilization (how many people have the hand pumps and are using them); to evaluation research of impact on health of various water/sanitation programmes.

UNICEF continues to stay away from evaluation research as part of its own investment, but draws heavily on such research for its programmes and for applied research which feeds into basic research. Thus, the applied research scheme built into the IMO project in Nigeria (reported to the Executive Board in 1985), where water, sanitation and health education were all incorporated into the total programmatic effort in this state. UNICEF pays for the applied research, related to the projects with which it cooperates. This research is under the guidance of the London School of Tropical Hygiene and Medicine. Meanwhile, basic evaluation research on impact studies in water/sanitation and health is being conducted by the Ross Institute in London. It draws on and contributes to the applied research.

It is important to note that UNICEF over the years has acquired essential resources in key staff, who can connect

basic research to practical implementation, and translate from one to the other - e.g. - Lester Teply (retired) and Hossain Ghassemi in nutrition, Martin Beyer in water/sanitation, Roger Goodall in oral rehydration, Stephen Joseph in immunization. It is evident how important such professional/scientific connections should be in the mounting of the programmes and in the conduct of their evaluation.

One of the developments that will very likely be important for the future is the participation of the community in monitoring and evaluation of outcomes, as well as in programming. Such efforts have been undertaken sporadically in the past and have been encouraged²⁴, but have not taken root substantially except for participation in self-surveys. The spread of primary health care, which places responsibility for local management on communities, may accelerate participation, especially in monitoring and programming.

Program Evaluation Section

While efforts at leading and coordinating evaluation activity are nominally centered in the Programme Evaluation Section of the PDPD, responsibility for conducting such activity is increasingly in the field and has, in fact, become broadly diffused. The mandate of the PES has become less clear over the years.

The statements about evaluation projected, in progress, or completed that are included in the annual reports submitted by country representatives are summarized each year (and presumably used by the countries).

Their implications for broader programming use need to be analyzed, as all attest. Some means have been attempted, such as meetings of staff to consider the implications of these evaluations, but they have not resulted in any regular or systematic review, or measures taken for implementation. The three person staff engaged, in part, in direct evaluative activity (the rapid assessment surveys, for example) relating to the CSDR globally, as well as trying to respond to field requests, is not equipped to handle much more.

The PES is planning, with the training section, to provide training for field staff in the evaluation area, akin to the efforts for training provided a decade ago in programme planning. This seems to reinforce the premise that evaluation activity should lie principally with the field offices, rather than with centralized administration. It is a premise that appears increasingly to be necessary and is widely shared.

The notion of a conflict has been posed in having PES

responsible to the Programme Division within which it is located. A parallel has been drawn in likening this relationship to the potential conflict that would ensue if Internal Audit were located in the Comptroller's Division. Indeed, the suggestion has been made that the programme evaluation function similarly should be separated from the Programme Division and located within Internal Audit, which has assumed overlapping functions.

However, the present review of the history of this activity has revealed no conflict of interest or bias in activity by the PES by virtue of its location in the Programme Division, so long as its main functions are guidance to country offices or support for strengthening country evaluative activities. Such bias could conceivably result if PES were to conduct programme evaluations itself. However, this has not been its inherent function, although there have been lapses.

When there is a global thrust for UNICEF, such as with the CSDR, all efforts are mobilized. This includes evaluation resources both at Headquarters and the field. The year 1985 saw the effort to balance these resources as between the global imperative and more general programme initiatives. The PES itself was engaged in both, and reflected the effort to allocate its resources accordingly.

Thus, the current director of the PES, Twig Johnson,

initiated a program of "rapid appraisals," or case studies of specific CSDR-related interventions. These are supplemental to monitoring and evaluation studies of the components of CSDR, and are qualitative in nature, attempting to answer questions of "what works, what does not work, and why in the process of implementation."²⁵

The future of the PES, as of 1985, seemed to lie in encouraging the field offices to conduct evaluation efforts, wherever relevant, to seek to help provide them with necessary resources, secure competent technical advice for the field where needed, comment on results of their evaluation activities, and try to extract lessons that can enhance programme developments generally, and therefore should be diffused to the field. This conception of function would conform in principle with what Ed Lannert was trying to achieve during the latter part of his tenure as head of PES.

The scores of references from field offices, now emerging each year in their annual reports, form the raw material for valuable analysis of what works and what does not, under a variety of field conditions. The PES is at this juncture the logical instrument for extracting the most useful lessons from this material, through its own and through co-opted resources. With feed-back to the Programme Divisions and to the field - via cooperative activity with

the Training section as well as through inter-departmental contact and special reports - these lessons can enrich programme activity appreciably, although much has been learned to date. Such knowledge may also be diffused into the development field generally, through formal publications, as well as to all other bodies related to the work of UNICEF.

Headquarters initiatives will continue to be necessary for global thematic assessments - prospective, on-going, and retrospective. The heart of evaluative activity for UNICEF, however, still lies in the countries themselves and with field offices. Government departments in many countries have become more proficient in developing their own monitoring and evaluation capabilities, benefitting significantly from some twenty years of gradually increasing cooperation by UNICEF in such activity. After many years of fits and starts in this area of their responsibility, field offices are increasingly in a position to take necessary initiatives with competence, and to have such initiatives recognized and reinforced within the organization.

TABLE I. Evaluation Functions and Sources Responsible.

FUNCTIONS	HEADQUARTERS OFFICES					UNICEF FIELD OFFICES	UNICEF REGIONAL OFFICES	UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES	DONOR GOVERNMENTS
	NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS	PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING	PROGRAM FIELD SERVICES	INTERNAL AUDIT	STATISTICS				
Monitoring Program Input	X			X		X			
Monitoring Program Output	X	X			X				X (1)
Auditing F.O. Fiscal and Program Management				X					
Strengthening National Capacity (Monitoring Evaluation Statistics)	X		X		X	X			
Data Collection and Analysis	X				X	X			
Monitoring Global Themes		X		X	X				
Supporting Field Offices		X	X		X	X			

INTERVIEWS

Manou Assadi-Baiki	14 January 1986
Manzoor Ahmed	13 January 1986
Jacques Beaumont	4 May 1984, 8 March 1985
Martin Beyer	13 January 1986
Boris Blanco	19 December 1985
Erich Buenger	8 March 1985
Howard Dale	3 July 1984
Tarique Farooqui	12 November 1984
Leo Goldstone	12 November 1984
Burhan Ilercil	3 July 1984
Twig Johnson	8 March 1985
Ed Lannert	25 May 1985
Dr. Nyi-Nyi	14 January 1986
Johanna Strieck	14 January 1986
Eimi Watanabe	12/13 November 1984 19 December 1985

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Suchman, page 31.
2. Weiss, passim.
3. Clark and McCaffery.
4. Wholey.
5. E/ICEF1963//486
6. E/ICEF/178/Rev.1 - referred to on page 6 of E/ICEF/1963/486.
7. E/ICEF/337/Rev.2
8. EXPRO-62
9. EXPRO-66
10. Banner, Doctors, and Gordon, page 10.
11. When in Tanganyika in 1962-3, I was struck by the fact that an applied nutrition project was being conducted by FAO without an evaluation plan for gauging the effectiveness of results. I became involved in that phase of the project. I then learned that UNICEF had no evaluation scheme for projects they assisted, nor did governments. This subject was discussed at Head-quarters with the Executive Director and the Deputy Executive Directors, and continued to be part of my consulting agenda in UNICEF for many years.
12. DIR/CON/MIN/June 1968.
13. EXPRO-152.
14. EXPRO-213.
15. E/ICEF/L.1413
16. TIRS 84/03.
17. EXD-2869.
18. E/ICEF/1984/L.3.
19. E/ICEF/1984/L.3/Add.1.
20. E/ICEF/1984/L.3/Add.2.
21. E/ICEF/1984/P/SR.5
22. EXD-2878.

23. Note should be taken of the suggestions made by several of the delegations of donor countries represented on the Executive Board to become more involved in evaluation, beyond their current participation in noted projects. Some staff consider such increased and formal responsibility potentially constructive, as "an educational process for donors." Others view such a development with concern, interpreting the general approach of such donor countries as emphasizing fiscal controls, rather than over-all programmatic values, including qualitative elements.

24. Note, for example, following articles in Assignment Children:

Participatory Research and Basic Needs (entire issue)
Volume 41, 1978

Ahmed, Manzoor: "Community Participation, The Heart of Primary Health Care," Volume 42, April/June, 1978

Cano, Manuel Tejada: "From the Child to Community Participation," Volumes 47/48, Autumn, 1979.

25. "Framework for the Monitoring and Evaluation of CSDR," 27/2/85.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Banner, David K.; Doctors, Samuel I.; and Gordon, Andrew C.: The Politics of Social Program Evaluation, Ballenger Publishing Company, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1975.
- Casley, D. J. and Lury, D.A.: A Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation of Agriculture and Rural Development Projects, World Bank, November, 1981.
- Clark, Noreen and McCaffery, James: Demystifying Evaluation, World Education, New York, 1979.
- Evaluating Social Action Projects, UNESCO, 1980.
- Evaluation Handbook, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., Second Edition, September, 1972.
- Rossi, Peter H. and Freeman, Howard E.: Evaluation, A Systematic Approach, Sage Publications, Second Edition, 1982.
- Schulze, William D. and Kneese, Allen V.: "Risk in Benefit - Cost Analysis", pp. 263-270 in Evaluation Studies, 1982.
- Sechrest, Lee and Yeaton, William H.: "Assessing the Effectiveness of Social Programs," In Evaluation Studies - Review Annual, Russell Sage Foundation, 1982, pp. 151-166.
- Suchman, Edward A.: Evaluative Research, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1967.
- Weiss, Carol H.: Evaluation Research, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1972.
- Wholey, Joseph S.; Scanlon, John W.; Duffy, Hugh G.; Fukumoto, James S.; and Vogt, Leana M.: Federal Evaluation Policy, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C., 1970.

UNICEF Documents, pre 1984

E/ICEF/337/Rev.2

17 August 1959

Major Trends in UNICEF Programme Aid: Excerpts from UNICEF
Executive Board Reports

E/ICEF/486

4 November 1963

Possible Ways to Strengthen Evaluation
(notes by the Executive Director)

includes: Annex I - Bibliographical note (pp. 1-34)
Annex II - Economic and Social Council resolution 991
(XXXVI), Evaluation of programmes (pp.1-2)

E/ICEF/492

January 1964

Report on ways to strengthen evaluation

EXPRO-62

9 March 1964

Policy Developments in 1964 - News from Bangkok
(pp. 4-5)

EXPRO-66 (from Adelaide Sinclair)

8 May 1964

Revision and Evaluation of Programmes and Projects
(pp. 1-3)

UNICEF FIELD MANUAL

December 1966

Volume I - Assistance Policies

Assessment of Projects - Book A, Chapter 2, Annex (pp. 1-42)

E/ICEF/563

June 1967

Project assessment

DIR/CON/MIN
June 1968
Minutes of the Regional Directors Conference

EXPRO-152
10 July 1968
Evaluation of Projects
(pp. 1-7)

E/ICEF/605
April-May 1970
Procedure for global programme assessments

EXPRO-213
25 April 1973
Programme Evaluation
(pp. 1-3)

E/ICEF/629
April-May 1973
Strengthening national evaluation capacity

UNICEF FIELD MANUAL
July 1974
Volume I - Assistance Policies
Assessment of Projects - Book A, Chapter 2, Preface (pp. 1-12)
includes: Book A, Chapter 2, (pp. 1-14,) December 1

Proceedings of the One-Day Seminar (by H.D. Stein) on Evaluation
and Monitoring, Kathmandu, Nepal, Nepal Planning Commission
20 October 1976

Ahmed, Manzoor: "Community Participation, The Heart of Primary
Health Care," Assignment Children, Volume 42
April/June 1978

Participatory Research and Basic Needs, entire issue of
Assignment Children, Volume 41
1978

Cano, Manuel Tejada: "From the Child to Community Participation"
Assignment Children, Volumes 47/48
Autumn 1979

E/ICEF/L.1413
11 April 1980
Problems of Programming
UNICEF Planning and Programming for Children at the Country Level.
(A report by Maurice Bertrand, Joint Inspectors Unit)

EXD-2843
23 June 1982
Strengthening of Programme Evaluation
(from Richard Jolly, Deputy Executive Director, Programmes)

EXD-2865
27 July 1983
re: Improving Programme Monitoring and Evaluation
(from Richard Jolly, Deputy Executive Director, Programmes)

EXD-2869
20 December 1983
Management and Use of UNICEF-assisted Applied Research and Studies

UNICEF Documents, 1984

from "Emergencies"

Assessment (pp.27-31)

Monitoring Programme Implementation (pp.43-44)

Phasing Out & Evaluation (pp.45-46)

Policy Review Documents

E/ICEF/1984/L.3

22 February 1984

Overview of Evaluative Activities in UNICEF (pp. 1-32)

E/ICEF/1984/L.3/Add.1

24 February 1984

The Indonesian National Family Nutrition Improvement Programme:
Analysis of Programme Experience (pp. 1-35)

E/ICEF/1984/L.3/Add.2

22 February 1984

The UNICEF-Assisted Rural Drinking Water and Sanitation Project
In IMO State, Nigeria (pp. 1-19)

TIRS 84/03

17 April 1984

Inventory of Studies and Evaluations, 1979-1983

Report of the Executive Board

E/1984/19 and

E/ICEF/1984/12

Supplement No. 9

(meeting held 24 April-4 May)

E/ICEF/1984/P/SR.5

2 May 1984

UNICEF Executive Board 1984 Regular Session - Programme Committee
Summary Record of the 5th Meeting (pp. 1-10)

E/ICEF/1984/P/SR.6

3 May 1984

UNICEF Executive Board 1984 Regular session - Programme Committee
Summary Record of the 6th Meeting (pp. 1-17)

A.E. Meager
6 June 1984
History of UNICEF Internal Audit - draft (pp. 1-12)

UN Secretariat News
15 June 1984
"Crisis of credibility" (on pp. 7-8)

EXD/IC: 84-08
22 June 1984
UNICEF 1984 Post-Board Staff Meeting Report (pp. 1-5)
(meeting held 7 May 1984)

attached: letter from Jack Charnow, dated 10 July 1984 (JC/274/84)

E/ICEF/1984/P/L.34/Rev.1
9 July 1984
Report of the Programme Committee on Its Session Held 27 April -
2 May 1984 (pp. 1-9)

EXD-2878
12 July 1984
Programme recommendations To Be Submitted To The 1985 Executive Board
(pp. 1-5)

attached: CPP Tables I-III
Aspects of Programme Submissions Requiring Special
Attention (pp. 1-5)

E/ICEF/670/Rev.3
22 August 1984
An Overview of UNICEF Policies, Organization and Working Methods
(pp. i-106)

Letter from Wolfgang Gottelmann, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the
Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations to James Grant
28 August 1984

UNICEF Interoffice Memorandum from L. Goldstone to J. Charnow
10 September 1984
UNICEF history: statistics (second version) (pp. 1-6)

Zena Harman
10 September 1984
Notes for Executive Director's Statement at National Committee Reunion,
15 October 1984 (pp. 1-3)

Carl Tinstman
2 November 1984
Summary Conclusions from 1 November 1984 Executive Staff Meeting
discussion on Management Information Planning in UNICEF (1 page)
Preliminary Draft - Outline of Information Management Planning Project
(two pages)

Twig Johnson
27 February 85
Framework for Monitoring and Evaluation of CSDR