Chapter 1 : Strategic Planning: 6 Steps involved in Strategic Planning Process â€" Explained!

The program evaluation process goes through four phases â€" planning, implementation, completion, and dissemination and reporting â€" that complement the phases of program development and implementation. Each phase has unique issues, methods, and procedures. In this section, each of the four phases.

Learn the four main steps to developing an evaluation plan, from clarifying objectives and goals to setting up a timeline for evaluation activities. Why should you have an evaluation plan? When should you develop an evaluation plan? What are the different types of stakeholders and what are their interests in your evaluation? How do you develop an evaluation plan? What sort of products should you expect to get out of the evaluation? What sort of standards should you follow? After many late nights of hard work, more planning meetings than you care to remember, and many pots of coffee, your initiative has finally gotten off the ground. You have every reason to be proud of yourself and you should probably take a bit of a breather to avoid burnout. If your initiative is working perfectly in every way, you deserve the satisfaction of knowing that. If adjustments need to be made to guarantee your success, you want to know about them so you can jump right in there and keep your hard work from going to waste. For these reasons, evaluation is extremely important. This might seem like the best way to go about it at first glance-- evaluation is a huge topic and it can be pretty intimidating. Unfortunately, if you resort to the "cookbook" approach to evaluation, you might find you end up collecting a lot of data that you analyze and then end up just filing it away, never to be seen or used again. Instead, take a little time to think about what exactly you really want to know about the initiative. Your evaluation system should address simple questions that are important to your community, your staff, and last but never least! Try to think about financial and practical considerations when asking yourself what sort of questions you want answered. The best way to insure that you have the most productive evaluation possible is to come up with an evaluation plan. Here are a few reasons why you should develop an evaluation plan: As soon as possible! The best time to do this is before you implement the initiative. After that, you can do it anytime, but the earlier you develop it and begin to implement it, the better off your initiative will be, and the greater the outcomes will be at the end. Remember, evaluation is more than just finding out if you did your job. It is important to use evaluation data to improve the initiative along the way. For community health groups, there are basically three groups of people who might be identified as stakeholders those who are interested, involved, and invested in the project or initiative in some way: What are the types of stakeholders? It also includes the people directly affected by it--your targets and agents of change. Check out all your current funders to see what kind of information they want you to be gathering. This includes researchers and evaluators that your coalition or initiative may choose to bring in as consultants or full partners. Such researchers might be specialists in public health promotion, epidemiologists, behavioral scientists, specialists in evaluation, or some other academic field. Of course, not all community groups will work with university-based researchers on their projects, but if you choose to do so, they should have their own concerns, ideas, and questions for the evaluation. Same thing with your researchers and evaluators: Each type of stakeholder will have a different perspective on your organization as well as what they want to learn from the evaluation. Every group is unique, and you may find that there are other sorts of stakeholders to consider with your own organization. Take some time to brainstorm about who your stakeholders are before you being making your evaluation plan. What do they want to know about the evaluation? While some information from the evaluation will be of use to all three groups of stakeholders, some will be needed by only one or two of the groups. Grantmakers and funders, for example, will usually want to know how many people were reached and served by the initiative, as well as whether the initiative had the community -level impact it intended to have. Community groups may want to use evaluation results to guide them in decisions about their programs, and where they are putting their efforts. University-based researchers will most likely be interested in proving whether any improvements in community health were definitely caused by your programs or initiatives; they may also want to study the overall structure of your group or initiative to identify the conditions under which success may be reached. What decisions do they need to make, and how would they use the data to inform those decisions? You and

your stakeholders will probably be making decisions that affect your program or initiative based on the results of your evaluation, so you need to consider what those decisions will be. Consider what sort of decisions you and your stakeholders will be making. Community groups will probably want to use the evaluation results to help them find ways to modify and improve your program or initiative. Grantmakers and funders will most likely be making decisions about how much funding to give you in the future, or even whether to continue funding your program at all or any related programs. They may also think about whether to impose any requirements on you to get that program e. University-based researchers will need to decide how they can best assist with plan development and data reporting. That may sound like a lot, but remember that evaluation is an essential tool for improving your initiative. When considering how to balance costs and benefits, ask yourself the following questions: What do you need to know? What is required by the community? What is required by funding? There are four main steps to developing an evaluation plan: Clarifying program objectives and goals Developing evaluation questions Setting up a timeline for evaluation activities Clarifying program objectives and goals The first step is to clarify the objectives and goals of your initiative. What are the main things you want to accomplish, and how have you set out to accomplish them? Clarifying these will help you identify which major program components should be evaluated. One way to do this is to make a table of program components and elements. Developing evaluation questions For our purposes, there are four main categories of evaluation questions. How well was the program or initiative planned out, and how well was that plan put into practice? Is there diversity among participants? Why do participants enter and leave your programs? Are there a variety of services and alternative activities generated? Do those most in need of help receive services? Are community members satisfied that the program meets local needs? Possible methods to answer those questions: Assessing attainment of objectives: How well has the program or initiative met its stated objectives? How many people participate? How many hours are participants involved? How much and what kind of a difference has the program or initiative made for its targets of change? How has behavior changed as a result of participation in the program? Are participants satisfied with the experience? Were there any negative results from participation in the program? Impact on the community: How much and what kind of a difference has the program or initiative made on the community as a whole? What resulted from the program? Were there any negative results from the program? Do the benefits of the program outweigh the costs? Behavioral surveys, interviews with key informants, community-level indicators. Here is a brief overview of some common evaluation methods and what they work best for. Monitoring and feedback system This method of evaluation has three main elements: This is best done through member surveys. Member survey of goals: Member survey of process: Member survey of outcomes: Goal attainment report If you want to know whether your proposed community changes were truly accomplished-- and we assume you do--your best bet may be to do a goal attainment report. Have your staff keep track of the date each time a community change mentioned in your action plan takes place. Later on, someone compiles this information e. For example, if your coalition is working on an initiative to reduce car accidents in your area, one risk behavior to do a survey on will be drunk driving. Interviews with key participants Key participants - leaders in your community, people on your staff, etc. Interviewing them to get their viewpoints on critical points in the history of your initiative can help you learn more about the quality of your initiative, identify factors that affected the success or failure of certain events, provide you with a history of your initiative, and give you insight which you can use in planning and renewal efforts. Community-level indicators of impact These are tested-and-true markers that help you assess the ultimate outcome of your initiative. For substance abuse coalitions, for example, the U. Studying community-level indicators helps you provide solid evidence of the effectiveness of your initiative and determine how successful key components have been. Setting up a timeline for evaluation activities When does evaluation need to begin? Or at least at the beginning of the initiative! Outline questions for each stage of development of the initiative We suggest completing a table listing: Key evaluation questions the five categories listed above, with more specific questions within each category Type of evaluation measures to be used to answer them i. Type of data collection i.

Chapter 2 : Evaluation and Program Planning - Journal - Elsevier

Part I discusses the principles of evaluation and its role in the planning process. Part II examines recent UK studies in the use of evaluation in urban and regional planning problems. Part III summarizes the main findings and offers recommendations on how plan evaluation should be carried out in future plan-making processes.

Implementation Schedule Implementation is the process that turns strategies and plans into actions in order to accomplish strategic objectives and goals. How will we use the plan as a management tool? How and when will you roll-out your plan to your staff? How frequently will you send out updates? Who is your strategy director? What are the dates for your strategy reviews we recommend at least quarterly? What are you expecting each staff member to come prepared with to those strategy review sessions? Use the following steps as your base implementation plan: Establish your performance management and reward system. Set up monthly and quarterly strategy meetings with established reporting procedures. Set up annual strategic review dates including new assessments and a large group meeting for an annual plan review. Below are sample implementation schedules, which double for a full strategic management process timeline. Your Bi-Annual Checklist Never lose sight of the fact that strategic plans are guidelines, not rules. Every six months or so, you should evaluate your strategy execution and plan implementation by asking these key questions: Will your goals be achieved within the time frame of the plan? Should the deadlines be modified? Are your goals and action items still realistic? Should your goals be changed? What can be gathered from an adaptation to improve future planning activities? Why Track Your Goals? Having a stake and responsibility in the plan makes you feel part of it and leads you to drive your goals forward. Successful plans tie tracking and updating goals into organizational culture. Accountability and high visibility help drive change. This means that each measure, objective, data source and initiative must have an owner. Changing goals from In Progress to Complete just feels good! Once agreed upon, this topic should be developed to conclusion. Holding meetings helps focus your goals on accomplishing top priorities and accelerating growth of the organization. Although the meeting structure is relatively simple, it does require a high degree of discipline. Strategy Review Session Questions: What were our three most important strategic accomplishments of the last 90 days â€" how have we changed our field of play in the past 90 days? What are the three most important ways we fell short of our strategic potential? In the last 90 days, what are the three most important things that we have learned about our strategy? We are looking for insight to decision to action observations. In many organizations, retreats have a bad reputation because stepping into one of the many planning pitfalls is so easy. Holding effective meetings can be tough, and if you add a lot of brainpower mixed with personal agendas, you can have a recipe for disaster. Executing your strategic plan is as important, or even more important, than your strategy. Critical actions move a strategic plan from a document that sits on the shelf to actions that drive organizational growth. The sad reality is that the majority of organizations who have strategic plans fail to implement. You remain in this phase of the strategic management process until you embark on the next formal planning sessions where you start back at the beginning. Remember that successful execution of your plan relies on appointing a strategy director, training your team to use OnStrategy or any other planning tool , effectively driving accountability, and gaining organizational commitment to the process. Clients executing their plans with OnStrategy: A Dose of Strategy.

Chapter 3 : Planning (and Evaluation)

summative evaluation before the intervention begins as part of the planning process, which helps to clarify program goals and reasonable outcomes. Taken together, you and your research team should know why the evaluation is being undertaken (i.e., performance.

Specific challenges non-profit organisations face with planning. Common problems arising from ineffective approaches to planning. How to approach planning - Six key ways to ensure that planning is useful and contributes to effective results. How to plan - Eight Basic planning steps. What do you use planning and evaluation for? Planning and evaluation are vital for organisations. Planning is a process of deciding in advance where we want to get to our goal and how we will get there. Evaluation enables us to assess how well we are doing and to learn from this. This guide is written for non-profit organisations that play a developmental or service role. Planning and evaluation are particularly important for these organisations because they exist to make a significant contribution to society: Planning helps us to decide what that contribution should be and how to achieve it. Evaluation enables us to judge whether we have had the impact we planned, contributed to changing the situation we wanted to change and whether or not we achieved our goal. Why is planning important? It helps us to identify our goals clearly. It makes us decide clearly and concretely what we need to do to have the effect on society that we want. It helps us make sure that we all understand our goal and what we need to do to reach it by involving everyone in the planning process. It makes us all work in a goal-oriented way rather than in a loose or ad-hoc way where we just respond to issues and crises with no clear plan or goal. Planning helps us see in advance those things that can help us achieve our goal and those things that can prevent us from achieving our goal and work out what to do about them. Planning helps us to be accountable for what we do. Planning helps us decide how best to use our resources people, time, money, information, equipment so that they make the most significant contribution to achieving our goal. Planning lays the basis for us to assess and evaluate our achievements effectively. Why is evaluation important? Evaluation helps the whole organisation to identify how we could improve what we are achieving, take action to build on successes and avoid repeating failures. Effective evaluation enables us to use what we have learned from our experience to improve what we are achieving. Important things to know about planning and evaluation The diagram above seems to make planning a simple question of working out how we get from where we are now to where we want to be. It seems as simple as using a road map to move from one place to another. That is fine if you know exactly where you are and where you want to be and you have a reliable map of the roads you must take to get there. If you have these things, an adequate means of transport and you use your map, you can simply set off. Although knowing where we are, where we need to be and how to get there are the basic things we need to know to plan effectively, planning for organisations that aim to promote development or deliver a service is seldom as easy as this. For example, the extent to which people acquire greater economic or political access to power; gain in confidence or awareness, or are enabled to struggle for rights, access or justice. The following are specific challenges that most development or service organisations face that make careful planning and how we do our planning very important: Complex goals for changing society, which are difficult to specify and measure exactly, or have different meanings for different stakeholders. If your goals are very broad and complex, as they often are with development work, it is often difficult to say in advance exactly what the desired future situation must look like. It is also difficult to say in advance what will definitely be needed to achieve it. Goals such as "gender equity", "sustainable community development" or even "effective and affordable health care" are examples. Different or conflicting values and expectations among the different groups involved. For example, the community you serve may be expecting you to provide resources when your organisation is geared to assist communities to access the resources themselves. Or, if the goal is gender equity, for some this may mean more equal access to services for women but for others it may mean more equal power for women in society and it may be seen as threatening existing privilege or custom by still others. Many different stakeholders that may have different needs, interests and concerns and therefore believe they have different priorities. For example, a civic organisation serving both

established households and informal settlements may find the views of these groups are different about what should be prioritised. Difficulties in measuring achievements. It is often difficult to find completely objective ways of measuring what has been achieved. It is often more important to look at "how well" rather then "how many" things were achieved. For example, we may be able to show that we have run 20 training courses but it is much more difficult to show that people are "empowered" or have the required "capacity" as a result. This means different people may have different views on what it means to achieve these goals effectively. Non-profit organisations often need to give as much attention to choosing the best way or the means of achieving goals as to the goals ends themselves. These organisations often have goals that involve a positive change in society that benefits and empowers their target group in sustainable ways. This often means building capacity and commitment through involving target communities. It means giving attention to including groups that are not already powerful and articulate, and ensuring, by the way we do the work, that these groups have the capacity and power to take the work forward in sustainable ways. The connection between the effectiveness of our services and the resources we get is weak or non-existent. If a business is producing things no one wants, we can usually expect that it will not make money and will eventually close down. The connection between resources to continue the work and how well we do it is far less clear with most other organisations. Because the purpose of non-profit organisations is to have a positive impact on society by assisting those in need, the direct users of their services often cannot afford to pay for them. Non-profit organisations usually get most of the money and other resources they need for their work from donors, government or volunteers, not from the direct users of the service. Therefore, It is harder for development organisations to assess how well they are doing. However, non-profit organisations will still have to make the best possible use of scarce resources even though they do not face competition and the same pressures to reduce the costs that for-profit organisations face. The success of our work often depends on other organisations or people. For example, NGOs doing education work rely on the learners being committed to the learning; civics rely on the community for support and commitment and on government to create an enabling environment for civic action; health educators rely on their target audience to act on their advice and on government programmes to support their work. Most non-profit organisations rely on donors in some way or another for resources. Many non-profit organisations also rely on the work of other non-profit organisations. Common problems arising from ineffective planning These challenges often mean that the plans developed are not very useful and effective. The following are some of the common problems experienced: The difficulties we experience, arising from the complexity of our goals and the number of other groups and circumstances that can affect our success, lead to demoralisation and a sense of powerlessness to effect meaningful change. We are not able to say what we have achieved, only what we have done. All these problems can lead to a waste of precious resources needed to improve the lives of people and to weakening the confidence others have in our organisation. The following guidelines are intended to help non-profit organisations to meet the challenges we face and to develop plans that effectively assist us to make a positive contribution to our society. There are two parts to the guidelines: This section gives you ideas on how to approach planning and to avoid some of the common problems non-profit organisations experience. It outlines six issues related to the way we plan that are important for effective planning in non-profit organisations. If you need more information on how to achieve these six things effectively, just click on the overall heading or on each item for more detailed advice and suggestions. You will also be able to access an example at the end of this section. This section outlines eight basic steps that are useful in any kind of planning process. It also gives you ideas on how to prepare to plan and how to summarise your plan. If you want more advice on any or all of the steps, just click on the overall heading or each item for more detailed advice and information on how to do each step. How to ensure planning is useful and contributes to effective results There are six main issues that are important to remember about how planning is done. These will help you make sure your planning meets the challenges outlined above, avoids common problems and that your plans are useful and effective. You can click on the heading of part 3 or on any of the sub-headings in this section if you want to read more about the topic. This includes examples, practical ideas and more advice and guidance. You will find an example of the approach using an organisation we have called Molayezo at the end of this guide. Planning and evaluation

must be participative. Everyone who must make a key contribution to the work of the organisation should be included. There are two key reasons for this. Firstly, it enables you to draw on different ideas and experience to make better decisions. Secondly, it allows you to build commitment to these decisions by including all those who will need to contribute to the successful implementation of the planning decisions. Participation will ensure that everyone fully understands the strategy and plans and are committed to achieving the decisions that have been made. You will need to identify and analyse all key stakeholders that can affect whether you achieve your purpose and decide whether and how they should be included. Guidance on how to do a stakeholder analysis is available in the section on Preparing to plan. Planning and evaluation must be systematic. You have to ensure you have thought through and agreed on all key issues before moving on to the next step. For example, you need to be clear about the results you intend to achieve before you start making decisions about what action you will take. Non-profit organisations exist to make a difference to society, not just to do things. Everything you do must be relevant to the results you intend to achieve. You may also sometimes need to move back to previous steps in the planning process, if the later planning suggests you need to rethink some earlier decisions. For example, you may realise that the action you would need to be able to take is not realistic. This may lead you to decide that you will have to alter your decisions about what results you can realistically expect to achieve. Effective planning seldom moves in one straight line but this does not mean it should not be systematic. The guidelines on how to achieve each of the basic planning steps outlined in the next section are based on this approach. All planning should be strategic. This means that you should use your planning processes to find the best ways of making a difference and the best approach to doing this.

Chapter 4 : Evaluation: What is it and why do it? | Meera

Evaluation in the Planning Process examines the role of evaluation in the overall planning process and the implications of evaluation for the organization and management of studies. Emphasis is placed on the nature of evaluation and the functions it should fulfill in the urban and regional planning process, as well as the interrelationships.

Rational decision-making or planning follows a series of steps detailed below: This step includes recognizing the problem, defining an initial solution, and starting primary analysis. Examples of this are creative devising, creative ideas, inspirations, breakthroughs, and brainstorms. The very first step which is normally overlooked by the top level management is defining the exact problem. Though we think that the problem identification is obvious, many times it is not. The rational decision making model is a group-based decision making process. If the problem is not identified properly then we may face a problem as each and every member of the group might have a different definition of the problem. Generate all possible solutions[edit] This step encloses two to three final solutions to the problem and preliminary implementation to the site. In planning, examples of this are Planned Units of Development and downtown revitalizations. This activity is best done in groups, as different people may contribute different ideas or alternative solutions to the problem. Without alternative solutions, there is a chance of arriving at a non-optimal or a rational decision. For exploring the alternatives it is necessary to gather information. Technology may help with gathering this information. Generate objective assessment criteria[edit] Evaluative criteria are measurements to determine success and failure of alternatives. This step contains secondary and final analysis along with secondary solutions to the problem. Examples of this are site suitability and site sensitivity analysis. After going thoroughly through the process of defining the problem, exploring for all the possible alternatives for that problem and gathering information this step says evaluate the information and the possible options to anticipate the consequences of each and every possible alternative that is thought of. At this point optional criteria for measuring the success or failure of the decision taken needs to be considered. The rational model of planning rest largely on objective assessment. Choose the best solution generated[edit] This step comprises a final solution and secondary implementation to the site. At this point the process has developed into different strategies of how to apply the solutions to the site. Based on the criteria of assessment and the analysis done in previous steps, choose the best solution generated. These four steps form the core of the Rational Decision Making Model. Implement the preferred alternative[edit] This step includes final implementation to the site and preliminary monitoring of the outcome and results of the site. Monitor and evaluate outcomes and results[edit] This step contains the secondary and final monitoring of the outcomes and results of the site. This step takes place over a long period of time. Modify future decisions and actions taken based on the above evaluation of outcomes. The model must be applied in a system that is stable, The government is a rational and unitary actor and that its actions are perceived as rational choices, The policy problem is unambiguous, There are no limitations of time or cost. Indeed, some of the assumptions identified above are also pin pointed out in a study written by the historian H. Drake, as he states: In its purest form, the Rational Actor approach presumes that such a figure [as Constantine] has complete freedom of action to achieve goals that he or she has articulated through a careful process of rational analysis involving full and objective study of all pertinent information and alternatives. At the same time, it presumes that this central actor is so fully in control of the apparatus of government that a decision once made is as good as implemented. There are no staffs on which to rely, no constituencies to placate, no generals or governors to cajole. By attributing all decision making to one central figure who is always fully in control and who acts only after carefully weighing all options, the Rational Actor method allows scholars to filter out extraneous details and focus attention on central issues. For this purpose, Simon identifies an outline of a step by step mode of analysis to achieve rational decisions. Intelligence gatheringâ€" data and potential problems and opportunities are identified, collected and analyzed. Identifying problems Assessing the consequences of all options Relating consequences to valuesâ€" with all decisions and policies there will be a set of values which will be more relevant for example, economic feasibility and environmental protection and which can be expressed as a set of criteria, against which performance or consequences of each

option can be judged. Choosing the preferred option—" given the full understanding of all the problems and opportunities, all the consequences and the criteria for judging options. The main steps involved in making a rational decision for these authors are the following: The comprehensive organization and analysis of the information The potential consequences of each option The probability that each potential outcome would materialize The value or utility placed on each potential outcome. According to Wiktorowicz and Deber values are introduced in the final step of the rational model, where the utility of each policy option is assessed. Many authors have attempted to interpret the above-mentioned steps, amongst others, Patton and Sawicki [8] who summarize the model as presented in the following figure missing: Defining the problem by analyzing the data and the information gathered. Identifying the decision criteria that will be important in solving the problem. The decision maker must determine the relevant factors to take into account when making the decision. A brief list of the possible alternatives must be generated; these could succeed to resolve the problem. A critical analyses and evaluation of each criterion is brought through. For example, strength and weakness tables of each alternative are drawn and used for comparative basis. The decision maker then weights the previously identified criteria in order to give the alternative policies a correct priority in the decision. The decision-maker evaluates each alternative against the criteria and selects the preferred alternative. The policy is brought through. The model of rational decision-making has also proven to be very useful to several decision making processes in industries outside the public sphere. Nonetheless, many criticisms of the model arise due to claim of the model being impractical and lying on unrealistic assumptions. For instance, it is a difficult model to apply in the public sector because social problems can be very complex, ill-defined and interdependent. The problem lies in the thinking procedure implied by the model which is linear and can face difficulties in extra ordinary problems or social problems which have no sequences of happenings. This latter argument can be best illustrated by the words of Thomas R. There is no better illustration of the dilemmas of rational policy making in America than in the field of health…the first obstacle to rationalism is defining the problem. Is our goal to have good health — that is, whether we live at all infant mortality , how well we live days lost to sickness , and how long we live life spans and adult mortality? Or is our goal to have good medical care — frequent visits to the doctor, wellequipped and accessible hospitals, and equal access to medical care by rich and poor alike? However, as Thomas states the rational model provides a good perspective since in modern society rationality plays a central role and everything that is rational tends to be prized. Step 2 highlights the need to understand which factors should be considered as part of the decision making process. At this part of the process, all the economic, social, and environmental factors that are important to the policy decision need to be identified and then expressed as policy decision criteria. For example, the decision criteria used in the analysis of environmental policy is often a mix of — Ecological impacts — such as biodiversity , water quality , air quality , habitat quality , species population , etc. Economic efficiency — commonly expressed as benefits and costs. Distributional equity — how policy impacts are distributed amongst different demographics. Factors that can affect the distribution of impacts include location, ethnicity, income, and occupation. Operational practicality — the capacity required to actually operationalize the policy. Legality — the potential for the policy to be implemented under current legislation versus the need to pass new legislation that accommodates the policy. Uncertainty — the degree to which the level of policy impacts can be known. Ultimately though, the set of decision criteria needs to embody all of the policy goals, and overemphasising the more easily definable or measurable criteria, will have the undesirable impact of biasing the analysis towards a subset of the policy goals. For example, decision makers may tend to give "more weight to policy impacts that are concentrated, tangible, certain, and immediate than to impacts that are diffuse, intangible, uncertain, and delayed. Decision methods for policy analysis — Step 5[edit] Displaying the impacts of policy alternatives can be done using a policy analysis matrix PAM such that shown in Table 1. As shown, a PAM provides a summary of the policy impacts for the various alternatives and examination of the matrix can reveal the tradeoffs associated with the different alternatives. Once policy alternatives have been evaluated, the next step is to decide which policy alternative should be implemented. This is shown as step 5 in Figure 1. At one extreme, comparing the policy alternatives can be relatively simple if all the policy goals can be measured using a single metric and given equal

weighting. In this case, the decision method is an exercise in benefit cost analysis BCA. At the other extreme, the numerous goals will require the policy impacts to be expressed using a variety of metrics that are not readily comparable. In such cases, the policy analyst may draw on the concept of utility to aggregate the various goals into a single score. With the utility concept, each impact is given a weighting such that 1 unit of each weighted impact is considered to be equally valuable or desirable with regards to the collective well-being. Under this decision making regime, some or all policy impacts can be assigned thresholds which are used to eliminate at least some of the policy alternatives. In their example, one criterion "is to minimize SO2 emissions" and so a threshold might be a reduction SO2 emissions "of at least 8. As such, any policy alternative that does not meet this threshold can be removed from consideration. If only a single policy alternative satisfies all the impact thresholds then it is the one that is considered a "go" for each impact. Otherwise it might be that all but a few policy alternatives are eliminated and those that remain need to be more closely examined in terms of their trade-offs so that a decision can be made. Considering the steps of Patton and Sawicki model as in Figure 1 above, this paper only follows components 1 to 5 of the rationalist policy analysis model: Defining The Problem â€" the report identifies transportation fuels pose two important challenges for the European Union EU. First, under the provisions of the Kyoto Protocol to the Climate Change Convention, the EU has agreed to an absolute cap on greenhouse gas emissions; while, at the same time increased consumption of transportation fuels has resulted in a trend of increasing greenhouse gas emissions from this source. Second, the dependence upon oil imports from the politically volatile Middle East generates concern over price fluctuations and possible interruptions in supply. However, this paper does not exactly talk about the social impacts, this policy may have. It also does not compare the operational challenges involved between the different categories of biofuels considered. Identifying Alternative Policies â€" The European Commission foresees that three alternative transport fuels: Evaluating Alternative Policies â€" Biofuels are an alternative motor vehicle fuel produced from biological material and are promoted as a transitional step until more advanced technologies have matured. By modelling the efficiency of the biofuel options the authors compute the economic and environmental costs of each biofuel option as per the evaluation criteria mentioned above. If the production of European biofuels for transport is to be encouraged, exemption from excise duties is the instrument that incurs the least transactions costs, as no separate administrative or collection system needs to be established. A number of entrepreneurs are producing biofuels at the lower margin of the costs specified here profitably, once an excise duty rebate is given. It is likely that growth in the volume of the business will engender both economies of scale and innovation that will reduce costs substantially. Therefore, they all have to be considered. The model assumes that we have or should or can obtain adequate information, both in terms of quality, quantity and accuracy.

Chapter 5 : Social Research Methods - Knowledge Base - The Planning-Evaluation Cycle

Making evaluation an integral part of your program means evaluation is a part of everything you do. You design your program with evaluation in mind, collect data on an on-going basis, and use these data to continuously improve your program.

The ones best suited to organize strategic planning process are business school graduates. More specifically, MBA graduates. Their finely tuned coursework will help them develop the skills needed to succeed. The process of achieving that vision is called strategic planning. Even the smallest companies have to engage in some level of strategic planning if they want to create a formidable, enduring business model. Environmental Scanning Environmental scanning is the process of gathering, organizing and analyzing information. How a company goes about this process depends on many factors, including long-term goals and size. A large company may decide to form a smaller committee comprised of cross-functional team members, while a small company may limit it to the executive team. By identifying existing processes, challenges, and potential solutions, you can begin to formulate a winning strategy. Strategy Formulation Based on the information gathered during environmental scanning, you should hopefully have a clear picture of what needs to be addressed in order to accomplish your business goals. You can also build on things you found are working well to date. From there, you can begin prioritizing your objectives and formulate individual strategies to address each one. By the end of this process, you should have a list of measureable goals and objectives and a series of steps designed to accomplish each one. Simply put, strategy formulation is the process an organization uses to reach the most appropriate and plausible course of action to achieve its goals. Strategy Implementation The most important part of implementing a strategy may be communicating it clearly to begin with. Each individual should understand how their role contributes to the bigger picture. Strategy Evaluation Every organization should strive for continuous improvement, and so part of the strategic planning process is taking a moment to monitor and adjust as needed. Strategy evaluation involves setting and adjusting benchmarks as needed, gathering feedback and measuring performance. The results of strategy evaluation can help establish best practices and inform future strategies. Properly managing this four-step process is critical to managing a successful business.

The Process of Participatory Evaluation Planning evaluation plan. Part II of this workbook includes exercises, worksheets, tools, and a Developing an.

The various stages in the process of planning are as follows: Therefore, establishment of organizational or overall objectives is the first step in planning. Setting objectives is the most crucial part of planning. The organizational objectives should be set in key areas of operations. They should be verifiable i. The objectives are set in the light of the opportunities perceived by managers. Establishment of goals is influenced by the values and beliefs of executives, mission of the organization, organizational resources, etc. Objectives provide the guidelines what to do for the preparation of strategic and procedural plans. Objectives constitute the mission of an organisation. They set the pattern of future course of action. The objectives must be clear, specific and informative. In order to set realistic objectives, planners must be fully aware of the opportunities and problems that the enterprise is likely to face. Developing the planning premises: Before plans are prepared, the assumptions and conditions underlying them must be clearly defined these assumptions are called planning premises and they can be identified through accurate forecasting of likely future events. They are forecast data of a factual nature. Assessment of environment helps to reveal opportunities and constraints. Analysis of internal controllable and external uncontrollable forces is essential for sound planning premises are the critical factors which lay down the bounder for planning. They are vital to the success of planning as they supply per tenant facts about future. Contingent plans may be prepared for alternate situations. In practice, several constraints or limitations affect the ability of an organization to achieve its objectives. These limitations restrict the smooth operation of plans and they must be anticipated and provided for. The key areas of Imitations are finance," human resources, materials, power and machinery. The strong and weak points of the enterprise should be correctly assessed. Deciding the planning period: Once the broad goals, planning premises and limitations are laid down, the next step is to decide the period of planning. The planning period should be long enough to permit the fulfillment of the commitments involved in a decision. This is known as the principle of commitment. The planning period depends on several factors e. Formulation of policies and strategies: But, the subordinates should be consulted as they are to implement the policies and strategies. Alternative plans of action should be developed and evaluated carefully so as to select the most appropriate policy for the organization. Available alternatives should be evaluated in the light of objectives and planning premises. If the evaluation shows that more than one alternative is equally good, the various alternatives may be combined in action. Several medium range and short-range plans are required to implement policies and strategies. Such plans are required for the implementation of basic plans. Operational plans reflect commitments as to methods, time, money, etc. These plans are helpful in the implementation of long range plans. Along with the supporting, plans, the timing and sequence of activities is determined to ensure continuity in operations. Different plans must be properly balanced so that they support one another. Review and revision may be necessary before the plan is put into operation. Moreover, the various plans must be communicated and explained to those responsible for putting them into practice. The participation and cooperation of subordinates is necessary for successful implementation of plans. A system of continuous evaluation and appraisal of plans should be devised to identify any shortcomings or pitfalls of the plans under changing situations.

Chapter 7 : Writing an Evaluation Plan | Research at Brown | Brown University

Often, evaluation is construed as part of a larger managerial or administrative process. Sometimes this is referred to as the planning-evaluation calendrierdelascience.com distinctions between planning and evaluation are not always clear; this cycle is described in many different ways with various phases claimed by both planners and evaluators.

Each of these stages raises different questions to be answered by the evaluator, and correspondingly different evaluation approaches are needed. Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman suggest the following kinds of assessment, which may be appropriate at these different stages: This includes identifying and diagnosing the actual problem the program is trying to address, who or what is affected by the problem, how widespread the problem is, and what are the measurable effects that are caused by the problem. For example, for a housing program aimed at mitigating homelessness, a program evaluator may want to find out how many people are homeless in a given geographic area and what their demographics are. Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman caution against undertaking an intervention without properly assessing the need for one, because this might result in a great deal of wasted funds if the need did not exist or was misconceived. Needs assessment involves research and regular consultation with community stakeholders and with the people that will benefit from the project before the program can be developed and implemented. Hence it should be a bottom-up approach. In this way potential problems can be realized early because the process would have involved the community in identifying the need and thereby allowed the opportunity to identify potential barriers. The important task of a program evaluator is thus to: First, construct a precise definition of what the problem is. This is most effectively done by collaboratively including all possible stakeholders, i. Including buy-in early on in the process reduces potential for push-back, miscommunication, and incomplete information later on. Second, assess the extent of the problem. Evaluators need to work out where the problem is located and how big it is. Pointing out that a problem exists is much easier than having to specify where it is located and how rife it is. But indicating how many children it affects and where it is located geographically and socially would require knowledge about abused children, the characteristics of perpetrators and the impact of the problem throughout the political authority in question. This can be difficult considering that child abuse is not a public behavior, also keeping in mind that estimates of the rates on private behavior are usually not possible because of factors like unreported cases. In this case evaluators would have to use data from several sources and apply different approaches in order to estimate incidence rates. There are two more questions that need to be answered: Having identified the need and having familiarized oneself with the community evaluators should conduct a performance analysis to identify whether the proposed plan in the program will actually be able to eliminate the need. For example, whether the job performance standards are set by an organization or whether some governmental rules need to be considered when undertaking the task. There are three units of the population: The difference or the gap between the two situations will help identify the need, purpose and aims of the program. Identify priorities and importance In the first step above, evaluators would have identified a number of interventions that could potentially address the need e. This must be done by considering the following factors: And to also assess the skills of the people that will be carrying out the interventions. Identify possible solutions and growth opportunities Compare the consequences of the interventions if it was to be implemented or not. Needs analysis is hence a very crucial step in evaluating programs because the effectiveness of a program cannot be assessed unless we know what the problem was in the first place. However, research in South Africa increasingly shows that in spite of increased education and knowledge, people still often do not practice safe sex. This is why it is important to read research that has been done in the area. Explicating this logic can also reveal unintended or unforeseen consequences of a program, both positive and negative. The program theory drives the hypotheses to test for impact evaluation. Developing a logic model can also build common understanding amongst program staff and stakeholders about what the program is actually supposed to do and how it is supposed to do it, which is often lacking see Participatory impact pathways analysis. Of course, it is also possible that during the process of trying to elicit the logic model behind a program the evaluators may discover that such a model is either incompletely developed, internally contradictory, or in

worst cases essentially nonexisistent. This decidedly limits the effectiveness of the evaluation, although it does not necessarily reduce or eliminate the program. An evaluator should create a logic model with input from many different stake holders. Logic Models have 5 major components: Resources or Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Short-term outcomes, and Long-term outcomes [13] Creating a logic model helps articulate the problem, the resources and capacity that are currently being used to address the problem, and the measurable outcomes from the program. Looking at the different components of a program in relation to the overall short-term and long-term goals allows for illumination of potential misalignments. Creating an actual logic model is particularly important because it helps clarify for all stakeholders: Assessment in relation to social needs [7] This entails assessing the program theory by relating it to the needs of the target population the program is intended to serve. If the program theory fails to address the needs of the target population it will be rendered ineffective even when if it is well implemented. Rutman , Smith , and Wholly suggested the questions listed below to assist with the review process. Are the program goals and objectives feasible? Is the change process presumed in the program theory feasible? Are the procedures for identifying members of the target population, delivering service to them, and sustaining that service through completion well defined and suffiient? Are the constituent components, activities, and functions of the program well defined and sufficient? Are the resources allocated to the program and its various activities adequate? Assessment through comparison with research and practice [7] This form of assessment requires gaining information from research literature and existing practices to assess various components of the program theory. The evaluator can assess whether the program theory is congruent with research evidence and practical experiences of programs with similar concepts. Assessing implementation[edit] Process analysis looks beyond the theory of what the program is supposed to do and instead evaluates how the program is being implemented. This evaluation determines whether the components identified as critical to the success of the program are being implemented. The evaluation determines whether target populations are being reached, people are receiving the intended services, staff are adequately qualified. Process evaluation is an ongoing process in which repeated measures may be used to evaluate whether the program is being implemented effectively. This problem is particularly critical because many innovations, particularly in areas like education and public policy, consist of fairly complex chains of action. Many of which these elements rely on the prior correct implementation of other elements, and will fail if the prior implementation was not done correctly. This was conclusively demonstrated by Gene V. Glass and many others during the s. Since incorrect or ineffective implementation will produce the same kind of neutral or negative results that would be produced by correct implementation of a poor innovation, it is essential that evaluation research assess the implementation process itself. Assessing the impact effectiveness [edit] The impact evaluation determines the causal effects of the program. This involves trying to measure if the program has achieved its intended outcomes, i. Program Outcomes[edit] An outcome is the state of the target population or the social conditions that a program is expected to have changed. Thus the concept of an outcome does not necessarily mean that the program targets have actually changed or that the program has caused them to change in any way. Outcome change refers to the difference between outcome levels at different points in time. Program effect refers to that portion of an outcome change that can be attributed uniquely to a program as opposed to the influence of some other factor. Measuring Program Outcomes[edit] Outcome measurement is a matter of representing the circumstances defined as the outcome by means of observable indicators that vary systematically with changes or differences in those circumstances. It further helps you to clarify your understanding of your program. But the most important reason for undertaking the effort is to understand the impacts of your work on the people you serve. This can involve using sophisticated statistical techniques in order to measure the effect of the program and to find causal relationship between the program and the various outcomes. Assessing efficiency[edit] Finally, cost-benefit or cost-efficiency analysis assesses the efficiency of a program. Evaluators outline the benefits and cost of the program for comparison. An efficient program has a lower cost-benefit ratio. There are two types of efficiency, namely, static and dynamic. While static efficiency concerns achieving the objectives with least costs, dynamic efficiency concerns continuous improvement. Events or processes outside of the program may be the real cause of the observed outcome or the real prevention of the anticipated outcome. Causation is

difficult to determine. One main reason for this is self selection bias. For example, in a job training program, some people decide to participate and others do not. Those who do participate may differ from those who do not in important ways. They may be more determined to find a job or have better support resources. These characteristics may actually be causing the observed outcome of increased employment, not the job training program. Evaluations conducted with random assignment are able to make stronger inferences about causation. Randomly assigning people to participate or to not participate in the program, reduces or eliminates self-selection bias. Thus, the group of people who participate would likely be more comparable to the group who did not participate. However, since most programs cannot use random assignment, causation cannot be determined. Impact analysis can still provide useful information. For example, the outcomes of the program can be described. Thus the evaluation can describe that people who participated in the program were more likely to experience a given outcome than people who did not participate. If the program is fairly large, and there are enough data, statistical analysis can be used to make a reasonable case for the program by showing, for example, that other causes are unlikely. Reliability, validity and sensitivity in program evaluation[edit] It is important to ensure that the instruments for example, tests, questionnaires, etc. According to Rossi et al. Sensitivity[edit] The principal purpose of the evaluation process is to measure whether the program has an effect on the social problem it seeks to redress; hence, the measurement instrument must be sensitive enough to discern these potential changes Rossi et al. Only measures which adequately achieve the benchmarks of reliability, validity and sensitivity can be said to be credible evaluations. It is the duty of evaluators to produce credible evaluations, as their findings may have far reaching effects. A discreditable evaluation which is unable to show that a program is achieving its purpose when it is in fact creating positive change may cause the program to lose its funding undeservedly. The steps described are: Evaluating Collective Impact[edit] Though program evaluation processes mentioned here are appropriate for most programs, highly complex non-linear initiatives, such as those using the collective impact CI model, require a dynamic approach to evaluation. Collective impact is "the commitment of a group of important actors from different sectors to a common agenda for solving a specific social problem" [20] and typically involves three stages, each with a different recommended evaluation approach: CI participants are exploring possible strategies and developing plans for action.

Chapter 8 : Rational planning model - Wikipedia

Evaluation and Program Planning is based on the principle that the techniques and methods of evaluation and planning transcend the boundaries of specific fields and that relevant contributions to these areas come from people representing many different positions, intellectual traditions, and interests. In order to further the development of.

This Chapter [PDF â€" KB] The program evaluation process goes through four phases â€" planning, implementation, completion, and dissemination and reporting â€" that complement the phases of program development and implementation. Each phase has unique issues, methods, and procedures. In this section, each of the four phases is discussed. Planning The relevant questions during evaluation planning and implementation involve determining the feasibility of the evaluation, identifying stakeholders, and specifying short- and long-term goals. For example, does the program have the clarity of objectives or transparency in its methods required for evaluation? What criteria were used to determine the need for the program? Is the program gathering information to ensure that it works in the current community context? Defining and identifying stakeholders is a significant component of the planning stage. Stakeholders are people or organizations that have an interest in or could be affected by the program evaluation. They can be people who are involved in program operations, people who are served or affected by the program, or the primary users of the evaluation. The inclusion of stakeholders in an evaluation not only helps build support for the evaluation but also increases its credibility, provides a participatory approach, and supplies the multiple perspectives of participants and partners Rossi et al. Stakeholders might include community residents, businesses, community-based organizations, schools, policy makers, legislators, politicians, educators, researchers, media, and the public. For example, in the evaluation of a program to increase access to healthy food choices in and near schools, stakeholders could include store merchants, school boards, zoning commissions, parents, and students. Stakeholders constitute an important resource for identifying the questions a program evaluation should consider, selecting the methodology to be used, identifying data sources, interpreting findings, and implementing recommendations CDC, Once stakeholders are identified, a strategy must be created to engage them in all stages of the evaluation. Ideally, this engagement takes place from the beginning of the project or program or, at least, the beginning of the evaluation. The stakeholders should know that they are an important part of the evaluation and will be consulted on an ongoing basis throughout its development and implementation. The relationship between the stakeholders and the evaluators should involve two-way communication, and stakeholders should be comfortable initiating ideas and suggestions. One strategy to engage stakeholders in community programs and evaluations is to establish a community advisory board to oversee programs and evaluation activities in the community. This structure can be established as a resource to draw upon for multiple projects and activities that involve community engagement. An important consideration when engaging stakeholders in an evaluation, beginning with its planning, is the need to understand and embrace cultural diversity. Recognizing diversity can improve the evaluation and ensure that important constructs and concepts are measured. Evaluation during program implementation could be used to inform mid-course corrections to program implementation formative evaluation or to shed light on implementation processes process evaluation. For community-engaged initiatives, formative and process evaluation can include evaluation of the process by which partnerships are created and maintained and ultimately succeed in functioning. Top of Page Completion â€" Summative, Outcome, and Impact Evaluation Following completion of the program, evaluation may examine its immediate outcomes or long-term impact or summarize its overall performance, including, for example, its efficiency and sustainability. For example, control of blood glucose was an appropriate program outcome when the efficacy of empowerment-based education of diabetes patients was evaluated Anderson et al. In contrast, the number of people who received the empowerment education or any program service would not be considered a program outcome unless participation in and of itself represented a change in behavior or attitude e. Similarly, the number of elderly housebound people receiving meals would not be considered a program outcome, but the nutritional benefits of the meals actually consumed for the health of the elderly, as well as improvements in their perceived quality

of life, would be appropriate program outcomes Rossi et al. Program evaluation also can determine the extent to which a change in an outcome can be attributed to the program. If a partnership is being evaluated, the contributions of that partnership to program outcomes may also be part of the evaluation. The CBPR model presented in Chapter 1 is an example of a model that could be used in evaluating both the process and outcomes of partnership. Once the positive outcome of a program is confirmed, subsequent program evaluation may examine the long-term impact the program hopes to have. For example, the outcome of a program designed to increase the skills and retention of health care workers in a medically underserved area would not be represented by the number of providers who participated in the training program, but it could be represented by the proportion of health care workers who stay for one year. Reduction in maternal mortality might constitute the long-term impact that such a program would hope to effect Mullan, Top of Page Dissemination and Reporting To ensure that the dissemination and reporting of results to all appropriate audiences is accomplished in a comprehensive and systematic manner, one needs to develop a dissemination plan during the planning stage of the evaluation. This plan should include guidelines on who will present results, which audiences will receive the results, and who will be included as a coauthor on manuscripts and presentations. Dissemination of the results of the evaluation requires adequate resources, such as people, time, and money. Finding time to write papers and make presentations may be difficult for community members who have other commitments Parker et al. In addition, academics may not be rewarded for nonscientific presentations and may thus be hesitant to spend time on such activities. Additional resources may be needed for the translation of materials to ensure that they are culturally appropriate. Although the content and format of reporting may vary depending on the audience, the emphasis should be on full disclosure and a balanced assessment so that results can be used to strengthen the program. Dissemination of results may also be used for building capacity among stakeholders.

Chapter 9 : Program evaluation - Wikipedia

The management planning process starts with defining a big picture vision and should then set achievable steps and benchmarks for realizing that vision.

Writing an Evaluation Plan An evaluation plan is an integral part of a grant proposal that provides information to improve a project during development and implementation. For small projects, the Office of the Vice President for Research can help you develop a simple evaluation plan. If you are writing a proposal for larger center grant, using a professional external evaluator is recommended. Do all grant proposals require an evaluation plan? Not all grant proposals require an evaluation plan. If one is required, it will generally be listed in the program announcement. Most often, larger, more involved grant proposals will require an evaluation plan, while a smaller, single-investigator proposals will not. If you are unsure whether your proposal requires an evaluation plan, please contact us. What elements should be included in an evaluation plan? There are two types of evaluation plans. The components of your evaluation plan may depend on the type you use. We can help you prepare and review both types of evaluation plans outlined below. A formative evaluation does the following: Assesses initial and ongoing project activities Begins during project development and continues through implementation Provides new and sometimes unanticipated insights into improving the outcomes of the project Involves review by the principal investigator, the steering or governance committee, and either an internal or external evaluator depending on grant requirements A summative evaluation does the following: Assesses the quality and success of a project in reaching stated goals Presents the information collected for project activities and outcomes Takes place after the completion of the project Involves review by the principal investigator, the steering or governance committee, either an internal or external evaluator, and the program director of the funding agency All evaluation plans should identify both participants those directly involved in the project and stakeholders those otherwise invested by credibility, control or other capital , and should include the relevant items developed in the evaluation process. What does the evaluation process entail? The evaluation process can be broken down into a series of steps, from preparation to implementation and interpretation. Develop a conceptual model of the project and identify key evaluation points. Create evaluation questions and define measurable outcomes. Develop an appropriate evaluation design. In developing an evaluation design, you should first determine who will be studied and when, and then select a methodological approach and data collection instruments.