



# *i*-eval

## *Flash news*

### *EVAL highlights*

*EVAL is pleased to share the sixth edition of **i-eval Flash news** with you. Through this quarterly electronic bulletin we provide readers with updates, news, and information on publications and upcoming events related to evaluation. You are invited to alert us about any news item that you wish to include in the next issue at [EVAL@ilo.org](mailto:EVAL@ilo.org).*

### ***Governing Body discussions of ILO evaluation activities 2012***

During the 316<sup>th</sup> session of the Governing Body last November, the Evaluation Unit (EVAL) presented its [Annual Evaluation Report 2011-12](#) providing an overview of the yearly output of project evaluations, as well as the high-level strategic evaluations completed. The report offered an account of progress made on ILO's new Evaluation Strategy of March 2011 and commended the headway made by the Office in its plans to implement evaluation recommendations on results-based management and accountability - notably those related to priority setting and team work.

The three high-level evaluations undertaken by EVAL during 2012 - [Independent evaluation of the ILO's strategy for integrating inclusive employment policies](#); [Independent evaluation of the ILO's sector-specific approach to Decent Work](#); and [Independent evaluation of the ILO's Decent Work Country Programme for India: 2007-2012](#) - stimulated discussions on positive and negative outcomes, support and obstacles, and lessons learned related to the evaluated interventions. The resulting consensus was to adopt all recommendations put forward in the high-level evaluation reports.

In their feedback, the Members of the Governing Body stressed the importance of reinstating the Evaluation Advisory Committee, tasked with ensuring adequate follow-up to recommendations for these high-level evaluations. It was also suggested that EVAL should achieve a stronger and more systematic focus to identify policy-related lessons in evaluations and to increase the scope of impact evaluation to measure results on the ground. The meeting concluded with a GB endorsement of the topics proposed for high-level evaluations in 2013 listed below.

### ***2013 High-level Evaluations***

- Independent evaluation of the ILO's strategy to promote sustainable enterprises and decent work [ Outcome 3]
- Independent evaluation of ILO's strategy to benefit workers and enterprises from improved safety and health conditions at work [Outcome 6]
- Independent cluster evaluation of selected Decent Work Country Programmes in the Arab States

## Innovation & Research

### Completed Studies –

#### **Rating Systems in International Evaluation**

EVAL's latest Think Piece is on [evaluation rating systems](#), written by Ms. Kanika Arora of the Maxwell School at Syracuse University, and Dr. William Trochim of Cornell University. The authors explore the challenges of implementing an evaluation ratings system, provide recommendations to ensure quality of ratings used in the ILO, and discuss approaches to achieve reliability and validity. There are sections on designing and implementing ratings systems, choice of criteria, choice of response categories, and a section devoted to level or scale of measurement. The paper concludes with an examination of the challenges posed by aggregation and the use of weights for certain criteria.



toward the achievement of expected results; to evaluate and report on performance; and to better integrate lessons learned into management decisions; and

- ✓ To identify and disseminate lessons learned in the formulation of CPOs with a focus on policy priorities both at the country and organizational levels.

This assessment will be conducted in coordination with PROGRAM.

**High-level Evaluation Protocols:** EVAL will review the practices and approaches used to conduct high-level evaluations (HLEs) of ILO's strategies and Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs). The current comprehensive set of policy guidelines and support guidance notes and checklists will be applied to existing HLE protocols to identify clear and standardized procedures. These protocols will be ready for use in completing high-level evaluations planned for 2013.

#### **Meta-analysis of decent work results from independent project evaluations 2011-12:**

In response to growing recognition that evaluations provide credible and useful feedback to the ILO on its effectiveness in advancing the Decent Work Agenda, the EVAL will, for the second time, conduct a biennial meta-analysis of its independent project evaluations completed in 2011 and 2012. These constitute centralized and decentralized evaluations managed by ILO, and may include some joint projects. All project evaluations included in the meta-analysis link to and support the ILO's efforts to achieve the objectives laid out in DWCPs and the SPF. The meta-analysis will be conducted by an external evaluation expert without ties to the ILO. The report will be completed in July 2013 and findings will be reported in the next ILO Annual Evaluation Report.

#### **A structured review of key evaluation results and other relevant impact studies on employment**

will be undertaken toward the end of 2013. Discussions are underway with the technical departments concerned on the scope and focus of the review.

### Upcoming Studies –

#### **Structured review of key evaluation results and lessons learned related to Social Dialogue interventions (2002-2012):**

EVAL is undertaking a synthesis review of social dialogue evaluations and other related studies, using the services of the German management consultancy *Wilke, Maack und Partner*. The working paper aims to identify strengths and weaknesses of social dialogue interventions in the ILO and beyond, and to determine what trends, lessons learned, and good or bad practices which emerge from the reviewed materials. The key findings will provide evidence on what works, and why and hopefully feed into the recurrent discussions on social dialogue during the upcoming International Labour Conference. A draft of the report is currently under review, and the final version should be available by the end of the first quarter of 2013.

#### **Evaluability of Country Programme Outcomes:**

The purpose of the research is to assess the "evaluability" of Country Programme Outcomes (CPOs) and determine the extent to which the CPOs are designed and able to demonstrate effectiveness in achieving programme and budget (P&B) outcomes. The assessment has three main objectives:

- ✓ To conduct a comparative evaluability review of the P&B results framework for the last two biennia to identify strengths and weaknesses, and to establish logical linkages to the Strategic Programme Framework (SPF);
- ✓ To improve management effectiveness and accountability by defining realistic results to monitor progress

... — ...



## Impact Evaluation Round Table



In November 2012 EVAL convened its first round table of ILO impact evaluation (IE) experts and practitioners. The meeting discussed a newly designed impact evaluation, implemented by World Vision, which sought to measure the effects of a specific income diversification

livelihood approach to reduce child labour in sugarcane areas of 11 provinces in the Philippines. The study is part of a wider strategy on building a knowledge base to promote effective policies and interventions through impact evaluations. Their work is carried out by ILO-IPEC and Understanding Children's Work (UCW), an inter-agency project funded by the ILO, the World Bank and UNICEF.

ILO-IPEC, through the Global Evaluation and Monitoring Project (GEM), are providing technical advice as part of the IPEC strategy to provide monitoring and evaluation technical support to partners working on child labour. The proposed IE design was presented by Claudia Ibarguen from the USDOL-funded GEM Project. It is based on an experimental approach that will randomly assign eligible households to two groups: an intervention group which for 18 months will receive a menu of support services including income diversification, and a control group which will receive all services *except* income diversification. The impact evaluation analysis will be based on data from a baseline questionnaire, followed by an end-line survey 18 months later. This is complemented with monitoring data and qualitative information as part of the new integrated, comprehensive monitoring and evaluation strategy, with a focus on outcomes and contribution of projects to broader impact.

The roundtable meeting also served as part of a broader technical peer review by UCW and IPEC. The discussion focused on the handling of ethical issues and the logical fit between the impact question and methodological approach, both of which were considered to be adequate. Roundtable participants offered suggestions for improvements. Some were uncertain regarding the assumption that improved incomes would lead to higher school attendance in these rural communities and others cautioned that the take-up of income diversification activities may be lower than assumed in the design.

Discussants also questioned the timing of the end-line survey, pointing to seasonality differences as well as the time needed for impacts of income diversification to materialize. Finally, several participants considered that the heterogeneity of effects should be analysed more in depth to determine which groups could potentially be more likely to benefit from such a livelihood intervention.

Those interested in learning more about the IE study design are encouraged to contact [ibarguen@ilo.org](mailto:ibarguen@ilo.org).

A second roundtable planned for February 2013 will focus on recently completed impact monitoring studies of various measures aimed to change HIV/AIDS knowledge, attitudes and practices of targeted workers. Data has been collected and analysed in 17 countries through baseline and end-line surveys. In March 2013 a third roundtable is also planned to discuss the design of an impact evaluation of an educational and livelihood child labour intervention in rural areas of Peru. A fourth roundtable planned for April will discuss a proposed systematic review of quantitative evidence of impact linked to initiatives to support youth employment.

...

### Voluntary Organizations for Professional Evaluation (VOPEs)

A mapping exercise of VOPEs was undertaken by the International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation ([IOCE](#)) and [EvalPartners](#). A total of 158 VOPEs were identified -- 135 at national level, and 23 at regional and international levels. Work is continuing to verify contact information generated by the survey.

Case studies focusing on the three levels of capacity development (enabling environment; institutional capacity, and individual capacity) and the cross-sectorial priority of equity and gender-responsive evaluation systems are also available.

The mapping exercise provides current and useful information for anybody seeking evaluators in the listed countries, as well as contact information to enable emerging VOPEs to develop in a relevant, influential, effective and efficient manner.

For additional information, please contact [IOCE](#), [EvalPartners](#), or [Jim Rugh](#).

## Evaluation News from the Regions

### Europe and Central Asia: *Enhancing the use of country programme reviews*

The ILO evaluation policy and strategy stipulates systematic assessments of decent work country programs (DWCPs). The Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia has been strengthening its DWCP assessment practices by applying and testing approaches and formats in different countries, taking into consideration local contexts and realities in Kyrgyzstan, Macedonia, Armenia, Kazakhstan, and Serbia. These assessments include high-level independent evaluations in Kyrgyzstan (2010) to internal DWCP reviews in Armenia and Kazakhstan (2012), and a more narrow review of RBSA funded DWCP outcomes in the case of Serbia (2010) and Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (2012). The ILO and the constituents are working together to build on the findings from these evaluations when formulating a new DWCP, a new project document or RBSA project proposal. The reviews revealed a number of noteworthy features, lessons and conclusions, as outlined below.

**Constituent ownership of DWCP outcomes:** Assessments indicate a high level of constituent ownership over the Decent Work agenda in all the countries concerned. This is seen as a result of strong engagement by constituents in the design and formulation of country programmes, as well as an enabling environment created by the ILO for constituent contributions. In many cases, the draft DWCPs were not only subject to full consultation with the three parties, but were drafted by the constituents, and only afterwards streamlined by the Office to reconcile them with outcome-based workplans and the strategic programme framework.

**Use of evaluation findings from internal reviews:** There is evidence of improved use of evaluation findings, specifically by the constituents, for priority setting in core technical areas. For example, in Armenia the evaluation findings were presented at the new DWCP development workshop and were subsequently integrated into discussions on the next programme's objectives. In Kazakhstan, the review has not been finalized yet, but a request from the constituents has already been received to include the participation of the evaluation expert in their own tripartite meeting to help integrate the findings into consultations on the next DWCP. In Kazakhstan, constituents have shown genuine interest to be involved in the follow-up to recommendations generated by the internal DWCP reviews.

**RBSA funded outcomes:** All RBSA funded outcomes were found to have contributed to achieving the DWCP outcomes they supported. The overall management and procedures for coordination of various DWCP



components by the Country Offices proved to be adequate and successful.

**Programme flexibility:** Most of the assessments indicated that gradual or regular adjustment of programmes, based on lessons learned, would be beneficial. The DWCP implementation plan, including outcomes and indicators, could be adjusted as a result of an annual review, depending on the dynamics of the situation, and emerging risks and opportunities.

**Understanding the cultural context and the role of language:** Cultural contexts and the translation of English terms into local languages has posed some challenges to building consensus on programming, operational and evaluation activities in the region. An English-based professional environment does not always produce terminology and agreements that can be understood in a local context or language. For example, the term “evaluation” is typically translated into Russian as “otsenka” which refers to “grading”, like in a school environment or conducting an inspection. The translation does not include other dimensions of evaluation, such as collaborative efforts to identify learn lessons, or good or bad practices, which become meanings that are lost in translation. These translation issues must be taken into account to ensure that all parties contributing to a DWCP fully understand concepts emerging primarily out of English. For instance, the terms “outputs - outcomes - impact” all refer to results, while in Russian these terms are translated as “activities - objectives – goals,” causing the Russian translation to overlook the focus on ‘results’.

**Cooperation with local evaluation consultants:** The benefits of engaging a local consultant, or at least a consultant who speaks a local language, while conducting an assessment of a country programme is an important consideration. While local evaluation experts may have less experience or may require more supervision as compared to international evaluators, their insights into the local socio-economic situation, understanding of the local language, context and realities on the ground can be essential to the successful conduct of DWCP evaluation. Not only does this improve the quality of the evaluation, it also serves as an investment in national evaluation capacity, contributing to strengthened skills and communities of evaluation practice in DWCP countries. Additionally, building up national expertise through engaging local evaluation consultants can offer governments, social partners and implementing partners a pool of local evaluation resource persons capable of assisting our constituents in their own assessments, support and follow-up with other evaluation activities.



***Independent Project Evaluations from Europe and Central Asia 2011-2012***

*(summaries are available through the hyperlink, full reports from [EVAL@ilo.org](mailto:EVAL@ilo.org))*

Consolidating the legal and institutional foundations of social dialogue in the countries of Western Balkans and Moldova - Final Evaluation - Countries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina,, Moldova, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro	<a href="#">RER/07/08/AUT</a>
Increasing Protection of Migrant Workers in the Russian Federation and Enhancing Development Impact of Migration in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia - Final Evaluation - Countries: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Russian Federation	<a href="#">RER/08/05/EEC</a>
From the crisis towards decent and safe jobs in Central Asia and Southern Caucasus - Mid Term Evaluation - Countries: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan	<a href="#">RER/09/05/FIN</a>
Regulating labour migration as an instrument of development and regional cooperation – Final Evaluation - Countries: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan	<a href="#">RER/06/14/EEC</a>
Strengthening social partnership in the Western Balkans - Final Evaluation - Countries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro	<a href="#">RER/06/09/EEC</a>
Youth migration, reaping benefits and mitigating the risks in Albania - Final Joint Evaluation	<a href="#">ALB/08/01/UND</a>
Support to National Efforts for the Promotion of Youth Employment and Management of Migration in Serbia - Final Joint Evaluation	<a href="#">SRB/09/50/UND</a>
Harnessing sustainable linkages for the SMEs in Turkey's textile sector - Final Joint Evaluation	<a href="#">TUR/10/50/UND</a>
Gender equality in the World of Work in the Ukraine – Final Evaluation	<a href="#">UKR/08/02/EEC</a>
Review of RBSA projects in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2010-2011	<a href="#">MCD-RBSA Evaluation</a>

***Decent Work Country Programme Internal Reviews from Europe and Central Asia 2011-2012***

*( full reports available from [EVAL@ilo.org](mailto:EVAL@ilo.org))*

Decent Work Country Programme Review of Kazakhstan: 2010-2012	November 2012
Decent Work Country Programme Review of Armenia: 2007-2011	October 2012
Decent Work Country Programme Review of Albania: 2008-2011	November 2011

## *Evaluation News from the Sectors*

### ***The ILO Green Jobs Programme***

As part of the [UN Green Jobs Initiative](#), the ILO's mandate is to ensure that green jobs are decent jobs that can help reduce poverty while protecting the environment. The [ILO Green Jobs Programme](#) works with countries to support the transition of enterprises, workplaces and labour markets to sustainable, low-carbon strategies while providing decent work. Greener jobs help to reduce consumption of energy and raw materials, limit greenhouse gas emissions, minimize waste and pollution, and protect and restore ecosystems. This article highlights evaluation findings from two project evaluations and concludes with a list of planned evaluations.

### ***Green jobs and enterprise development: ILO's initiatives in Thailand and the Philippines (US\$1.3 m)***

With funding from Japan's Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare since 2009, the ILO has supported its tripartite partners in Thailand and the Philippines to build capacity and understanding that would better respond to the challenges of climate change and related environmental concerns. A 2013 evaluation of this initiative profiles what has worked and what the ILO can do differently during the next phase of the project. The project was designed to respond to environmental threats to development in the Asia-Pacific region, by addressing the triple bottom line of **economic** sustainability, **environmental** sustainability and **social** sustainability. Based on labour and management inputs, the project has concentrated its efforts on electronics, automobile and construction industries in the Philippines, and tourism, automobile and electronics industries in Thailand.

The targeted training and capacity building efforts that reinforced labour and management cooperation were found relevant to addressing the adverse impacts companies are facing. Uptake of new practices within individual enterprises was found to differ in some part due to the existing organizational culture, the level of environmental practices already in place and the commitment of senior management. Changes in enterprise practices were mainly in energy savings measures and occupational safety and health improvements.



The evaluation noted delays in agreement by the enterprises to participate in the study. Several larger companies involved had already introduced technical measures requiring significant investment. The evaluation speculated that enterprises further down the supply chain would likely have less established approaches to environmental practices and access to fewer resources, and would likely benefit more from ILO support.

In terms of project design for phase two, greater clarity is needed to identify what capacity is to be built, and to specify workplace outcomes to be achieved with regard to social dialogue. The evaluators call for fine tuning of strategies and outcomes that are customized for each country, followed by improved clarifications of roles and expectations for all stakeholders. Tripartite partners should fully participate in the next phase's design and the ILO should explore collaboration beyond its constituent base, such as related government ministries and industry associations.

Although all of the project outputs were achieved, the evaluators found that knowledge levels of partners were uneven related to issues of climate change in the workplace. They noted that existing labour-management negotiation practices were weak and there was limited experience with joint problem-solving, leading to constraints in the achievement of environmental outcomes. To address this, the evaluation proposed that gaps be jointly identified and capacity development targets jointly agreed between management, unions and project management. It was also recommended that gender aspects of work functions should be assessed to adequately cover any cross-cutting environmental and health hazards.

Project management and resource efficiency were found to be high, but articulation of the results framework and better monitoring and evaluation to foster learning among partners are still needed. Findings concluded that tripartite constituents have demonstrated overall increased levels of knowledge and capacity to address

## *Evaluation News from the Sectors (cont'd)*

environmental issues in the workplace and promote sustainable enterprises. It was, however, noted that there was less evidence of how partners participate and influence debate on mitigating climate change. Linking the greening of enterprises to the larger environmental context is critical to sustain achievements made at the enterprise level, and it was recommended that this should be a major focus for the next phase of ILO support.

### **Green Jobs in Asia (AU \$3 m)**

This Green Jobs in Asia (GJA) project, funded by Australia, covered Bangladesh, Indonesia, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and the Philippines and took place between August 2010 and August 2012. The evaluation focused on relevance and validity of the project design, achievements related to the immediate objectives, emerging impact of the key activities implemented, and lessons learned.

The project was found to be conceptually well designed but with an overambitious timeframe and geographic scope. Work with non-traditional partners and a focus on specific sectors were found to be effective in building understanding and commitment. Constituents provided favourable feedback but a clear grasp of the concept of “green jobs” was not clearly understood by many. The evaluation recommended that discourse and clarification on the relationship of green jobs to “green economies” perhaps needed to take place to guide future work in this area. Although the Green Jobs Employment models developed under the project highlighted new requirements for businesses, the connections between green jobs with green business or greener enterprises, and indeed greener economies, should be well explained in future project designs.

The centralized approach to designing country studies was questioned by the evaluators. Future research would benefit from being commissioned at the country level, involving co-implementation with local partners, for example, establishing collaboration with national academic institutions or consultancy firms. The evaluation noted that the materials generated in the project should be useful and important references for further work and investments in green jobs in Asia. Local involvement in training development and delivery were strengths of the project.

There was a high level of interest in learning from the various presentations, workshops and training provided through the project, especially with a view to replication and upscaling within the same sectors, as well as across geographic areas. Evaluators concluded that future effort in this area would build on the solid foundation established by the GJA project, and likely yield tangible impacts in terms of decent employment and environmental management, as well as lessons for climate change mitigation more broadly.

... — ...

### ***Green jobs evaluations***

*The following evaluations linked to “green jobs” have summaries that can be accessed through the hyperlinks. Full copies of the reports are available to ILO officials from [EVAL@ilo.org](mailto:EVAL@ilo.org).*

- *Green production and trade to increase income and employment opportunities VIE/09/53/UND - Midterm Joint Evaluation ([Jan 2012](#))*
- *Green jobs in Asia RAS/10/50/AUS – Midterm Evaluation ([Feb 2012](#))*
- *Green jobs in Asia RAS/10/50/AUS – Final Evaluation ([Dec 2012](#))*
- *Green jobs and enterprise development: ILO’s initiatives in Thailand and the Philippines RAS/11/57/JPN - Final independent evaluation ([Jan 2013](#))*

#### ***Forthcoming:***

- *Ending forced labour, generating green jobs: An approach for the promotion of social inclusiveness and sustainable development in Brazil BRA/11/51/FLA - Final evaluation (Mar 2013)*
- *Green production and trade to increase income and employment opportunities VIE/09/53/UND - Final Joint Evaluation (Jun 2013)*

## Evaluation Guidance

Several pieces of guidance have been updated recently as EVAL improves processes to collect lessons learned and identify emerging good practices. The Guidance Note on **Ratings in Evaluation** has been completely revised and the Guidance on **Management Follow-up** now includes more detail on finalizing follow-up. The list below provides links to the revised documents and EVAL looks forward to receiving suggestions and feedback from our network of evaluation users, practitioners and focal points.

### Guidance notes

- Guidance No. 2 – [Mid-term evaluations](#)
- Guidance No. 3 – [Evaluation lessons learned](#)
- Guidance No. 6 – [The Evaluation Manager: Duties and Responsibilities](#)
- Guidance No. 8 – [Ratings in evaluation](#)
- Guidance No. 9 – [Internal Evaluations of Projects](#)
- Guidance No. 15 – [Management follow-up for independent project evaluations](#)

### Checklists

- Checklist No. 1 – [Writing the terms of reference](#)
- Checklist No. 2 – [Rating the quality of terms of reference](#)
- Checklist No. 5 – [Preparing the evaluation report](#)
- Checklist No. 6 – [Rating the quality of evaluation reports](#)
- Checklist No. 9 – [Impact Evaluation Planning](#)



## Evaluation Learning Activities & Events

### ILO Evaluation Learning Activities

#### ➤ Training and certifying evaluation managers



The Evaluation Unit is in the final stages of completing the training module to certify selected ILO staff as Evaluation Managers. The certification will support staff development as described in IGDS Number 287 (Version 1) and therefore will be eligible for funding from central training credits under HRD's responsibility, and the devolved funds allocated to individual work units within sectors, departments, regions and field offices.

Participants will be identified by the Regional M&E Officers or Sectoral Evaluation Focal points and should be endorsed for training by their respective supervisors. The certification programme will be a three-day workshop with a guided practice component. A pilot workshop is foreseen for February to be held at the ILO. The training will be made available through Turin mid-2013 and may be rolled out to the regions. For more information contact [EVAL@ilo.org](mailto:EVAL@ilo.org).



### ➤ **Evaluation e-learning Module**

For the ILO audience interested in broad evaluation matters, the EVAL has updated its **e-learning module**, aligning it with the new ILO policy guidelines which were adopted in early 2012. The new e-learning module, co-produced with Turin, provides an interactive e-learning experience for ILO Officials wishing to become more familiar with the conduct and use of evaluation in the ILO. Discussions are being held with HR/Talent about incorporating this course to form a part of the HR/Talent Learning Management System (LMS). The LMS will allow the ILO to upload online training and to track completion, time spent learning and some other statistical information. For more information on evaluation training in the ILO, contact [EVAL@ilo.org](mailto:EVAL@ilo.org)



## **External Knowledge Sharing, Events and Webinars:**

### ➤ **Courses and meetings:**

#### **Short Course on Impact Evaluation Design, 18-22 March 2013, Institute of Development Studies, UK**

This 5-day course on Impact Evaluation Design will provide researchers, project managers and practitioners with the necessary methodology and practical knowledge to meet the growing demand for rigorous evaluation of development programmes. A particular focus will be on the design of studies before the intervention is implemented. More information can be found on the IDS [website](#).

#### **International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET): *Building Skills to Evaluate Development Interventions* - June 10 - July 5, 2013 Ottawa, Canada**

IPDET's curriculum provides a core evaluation skills course (June 10-21) and supplemental workshops (June 24-July 5). The Core Course provides participants a comprehensive overview of development monitoring and evaluation. Fifteen instructional modules are presented, designed for those with little prior evaluation experience or training, or those seeking to refresh and update their knowledge. In the two weeks following the Core Course, participants may choose from 26 workshops on a variety of methodological and thematic topics. Participants can attend any combination of weeks in the program or individual workshops. See the IPDET [website](#).

#### **Short Course on "Impact Evaluation for Evidence Based Policy in Development", 8-19 July 2013, University of East Anglia, UK**

This course is aimed at early to mid-level professionals, post-graduate students and academics with interests in/or working with international agencies, governments in developing and developed countries, think-tanks, NGOs and other donor organisations. Details are available on the University of East Anglia [website](#).

#### **Short Course on Monitoring & Evaluation: Applying Human Rights Based Approaches, 15-19 July 2013, International Human Rights Network, National University of Ireland, Maynooth, Ireland**

This programme aims to enhance the substantive knowledge and practical skills of bi-lateral and multi-lateral development partners, programme managers, sector personnel (such as Health, Education, Justice), and consultants in applying Human Rights Based Approaches to monitoring and evaluation. See the IHRN [website](#).

### ➤ **Meetings**

**International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS) – IDEAS Global Assembly 2013**, Evaluation and inequality: Moving beyond the discussion of poverty, Barbados, 6-9 May 2013. See the IDEAS [website](#).

**News on evaluation in the UN and the wider development community:**

➤ **UN Development Group (UNDG)**



The Office of Knowledge Management, Monitoring and Evaluation of the UN Development Operations Coordination has announced new knowledge resources available through [the UNDG website](#). This new page features UN coordination resources, UN databases of lessons learned and good practices, UN pages relating to knowledge management and selected external resources. You are invited to send suggestions on any additional resources that might be included on the website to Mr. Ian Thorpe at [ian.thorpe@undg.org](mailto:ian.thorpe@undg.org). For those officials interested in UNDG country-level monitoring and evaluation policies and approaches, see the [UNDG Toolkit](#). A search on “evaluation” will provide FAQs and links for evaluation in the UNDAF context.

➤ **UN Women Evaluation Policy**

The Evaluation Office of UN Women announced their new [UN Women Evaluation Policy](#) (UNW/2012/12) which was approved by the UN Women Executive Board in its 2nd Regular Session (2012/9) in 2012. The policy has been developed by the Evaluation Office in consultation with other evaluation offices within the UN system, UN Women Senior Management, and Executive Board members.



The evaluation policy is consistent with UNEG and international standards for evaluation and adapted to the characteristics and mandate of UN Women. The policy governs the evaluation function of UN Women and applies to all UN Women supported initiatives and its administered funds. It covers both the promotion of United Nations system-wide evaluation on gender equality and women’s empowerment and the corporate and decentralized evaluations of operational, normative support and coordination work undertaken by the organization.



➤ **Partnership and technology fosters M&E knowledge sharing**

EvalPartners is providing access to material presented at the International [EvalPartners Forum](#) on “Civil Society’s Evaluation Capacities” held in Chiang Mai, Thailand, December 2012, attended by more than 80 participants. The Forum facilitated the sharing of good practice and lessons learned by Voluntary Organizations for Cooperation in Evaluation (VOPEs) (see p. 3 of this newsletter) and other key stakeholders engaged in Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD). The Chiang Mai Declaration was signed by the participants, expressing their commitment to EvalPartners objectives and principles (the declaration is available in Arabic, English, French, Spanish, Russian).

Evaluation Unit (EVAL)  
International Labour Office  
CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland

Email: [eval@ilo.org](mailto:eval@ilo.org)  
Editor-in-Chief: Guy Thijs, Director  
Executive Editor: Janet Neubecker

