

Evaluation Policy

November 2021

Annex I: AC/UNITAR/2021/07

23 November 2021

Geneva, Switzerland

Evaluation Policy

Title	Evaluation Policy
Creator	Planning, Performance Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit
Consultation	Evaluation Advisory Board (30 September 2021), Management (6-19 October 2021) and Board of Trustees (18-19 November 2021)
Date approved	19 November 2021
Audience	UNITAR and CIFAL staff members and personnel
Applicability	Applies to all activities of UNITAR and CIFAL Global Network, including programmes, projects and hosted partnerships
Replaces	Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework (AC/UNITAR/2017/08)
Is part of	UNITAR results-based management framework
Related documents	Operational Guidelines for Evaluation UNITAR Managing for Results Policy (AC/UNITAR/2021/06)

Contents

<u>Introduction</u>	4
Evaluation definition	4
Purposes	5
Guiding Norms and Standards	5
Criteria	5
<u>Evaluation Categories and Requirements</u>	6
Evaluation Requirements	8
Exceptions to evaluation requirements	8
Discretionary Evaluations	9
Evaluation Planning, Costing and Management	9
<u>Transparency, Dissemination and Disclosure</u>	10
<u>Evaluation Capacity Development</u>	10
<u>Knowledge Management and Organizational Learning</u>	11
<u>Roles and Responsibilities</u>	11
Executive Director	11
Planning, Performance Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit	12
Programme Management	13
Other Stakeholders	13
<u>Coverage, Scope and Implementation</u>	13
<u>Review</u>	13
<u>Annex 1 – Glossary of Terms</u>	14

Introduction

1. The United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) is a dedicated training arm of the United Nations with the mission to develop the capacities of individuals, institutions and organizations in countries and among other United Nations stakeholders through high-quality learning solutions and related knowledge products and services to enhance decision-making and to support country-level action for overcoming global challenges. Under its strategic framework, UNITAR programming is guided by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the outcomes of other major United Nations conferences. In addition to the set of strategic objectives that structures the Institute's work, the framework acknowledges the important role that evaluation plays for accountability, learning and quality improvement.
2. This policy defines the institutional and governing arrangements for evaluation at UNITAR. Specifically, the policy covers the purpose, scope, categories, requirements, management and roles and responsibilities for evaluation. The overall purpose of this policy is to contribute to strengthened accountability in delivering results, learning and quality of UNITAR programming.
3. The policy replaces the modalities for evaluation that were part of the former Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework (AC/UNITAR/2017/08). While evaluation is closely related to monitoring, issuing the present policy as a distinct document flows from internal reflection on the need to reduce the blurring of the two functions, the practices of other organizations with maturing evaluation functions, recommendations from the peer review of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and endorsement by the UNITAR Evaluation Advisory Board.

Evaluation definition

4. UNITAR adopts the UNEG definition of evaluation as “an assessment, conducted as systematically and impartially as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy topic, sector, operational area or institutional performance. It analyses the level of achievement of both expected and unexpected results by examining the results, chain, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.”¹ The intention of evaluation is to provide credible and useful information, in view of determining the worth or significance of the undertaking, incorporating lessons learned into decision-making and enhancing the overall quality of the Institute's programming and operations. The definitions of other terms used in this policy are found in Annex 1.
5. In addition to an oversight function, evaluation constitutes an important element of results-based management (RBM) and is complementary to monitoring and measurement exercises, as well as other RBM processes such as strategic planning and risk management. Findings from prospective evaluation (or related processes such as appraisal or baseline studies), for example, are useful in defining indicators for monitoring purposes. Moreover, findings from monitoring progress towards results can help identify important evaluation questions.

¹ United Nations Evaluation Group Norms and Standards (2016), <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>. The OECD DAC criterion on coherence was added subsequent to the UNEG Norms and Standards.

Purposes

6. Evaluation serves the following purposes:
 - a. **Accountability:** As an organization receiving funds in the form of voluntary contributions from public and private donors, in addition to funds from fee-based training and other services, the Institute is answerable to its sources of funding for delivering results. Evaluation provides donors with assurances on the degree to which UNITAR achieves its results.
 - b. **Organizational learning and quality improvement:** Evaluation is as an opportunity to learn how to do things better, more effectively, with greater relevance and coherence, with more efficient utilization of resources and with greater and more sustaining impact. The results of evaluations need to contribute to knowledge management and learning, and serve as the basis for enhancing the quality of UNITAR products and services.
 - c. **Improved decision-making:** Results from evaluations provide the basis for informed, responsible decisions. Such decisions may include, for example, scaling up, replicating or phasing out a programme, project or undertaking; adjusting learning objectives; redesigning content, changing methodologies, assessment activities or modes of delivery; engagement with partners, etc.

Guiding Norms and Standards

7. The capacity development and evaluation communities have developed guiding principles and good-practice norms and standards to ensure that evaluations meet quality requirements. As a member of UNEG, UNITAR aspires to meet the [UNEG Norms and Standards \(N&S\) for Evaluation](#) and the [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#). UNITAR recognizes that the extent to which its evaluation function is aligned with the N&S and guidelines depends on various factors, including the size and scale of projects, funding and other considerations.
8. UNITAR also applies the [UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations](#). In accordance with the UN System-Wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UNSWAP), the UNITAR Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) Policy and the UN System-wide Policy on Disability Inclusion, UNITAR assigns importance to the principles of GEEW and will strive to incorporate GEEW, human rights and the needs of vulnerable groups (including persons with disabilities) and beneficiaries from countries in special situations in its evaluative undertakings.

Criteria

9. The Institute adopts the six Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee criteria for evaluation. These are broadly defined as follows:
 - a. **Relevance:** The degree to which an undertaking responds to the needs and priorities of the targeted beneficiaries, a contextual situation to be addressed and donor priorities.
 - b. **Coherence:** The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.
 - c. **Effectiveness:** The extent to which an undertaking has achieved its objectives.

- d. **Efficiency:** The cost effectiveness of transferring inputs into outputs taking into consideration alternative approaches.
 - e. **Impact:** The cumulative and/or long-term effects of an undertaking or series of undertakings which may produce positive or negative, intended or unintended changes.
 - f. **Sustainability:** The likelihood that benefits derived from an undertaking will continue over time after its completion.
10. Not all criteria necessarily apply to all evaluations and that decisions on which criteria apply to a given undertaking should be based on the type of evaluation, the objective/purpose of the evaluation, consultations with the evaluation's stakeholders, the main evaluation questions and considerations related to methodology, feasibility and resources.

Evaluation Categories and Requirements

11. The Institute undertakes two broad categories of evaluations: independent² and self-evaluations.

Independent evaluation

12. Independent evaluations are conducted and/or managed by the Institute's Planning, Performance Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit (PPME) and include the following:
- a. mandated independent project evaluations (in accordance with this policy),
 - b. other independent evaluations, such as strategic, cluster or programme evaluations, at PPME's discretion within its approved budget and on the basis of consultations with the Evaluation Advisory Board and management; and
 - c. discretionary independent evaluations at the request of the Executive Director or a division or programme unit.
13. Other evaluative exercises undertaken by PPME may include rapid impact assessments, joint evaluations, meta-evaluations and peer reviews of self-evaluations for quality assurance purposes. PPME also acts as UNITAR's primary focal point for any independent evaluation undertaken by external entities (e.g. donors or other partners). The purpose of independent evaluations

Self-evaluation

14. Self-evaluations are assessments conducted by the Institute's divisions, programme units and other entities. While such exercises are not independent and not necessarily in-depth, self-evaluations should contain some degree of evaluative thinking beyond measurement of results. For the most part, self-evaluations are undertaken at the project level, but they may include any subject under an entity's purview. While self-evaluation has similarities with the monitoring function and while the results of self-evaluations may be integrated into narrative reporting, the exercise should seek to ask and respond to key evaluation questions and include critical analysis and reflection based on the data collected with the purpose to promote learning and inform quality improvement.

² Independent evaluation is conducted by entities free from control and undue influence of those responsible for the design and implementation of an undertaking.

Factors that trigger evaluation

15. As a general rule, all donor-funded projects are subject to some form of evaluation. Given the Institute's emphasis on training and the scale of much of its programming, most evaluations take the form of self-evaluations. Independent evaluation of projects and pooled-funded projects/programmes is triggered by a budgetary threshold or period. The requirements for self-evaluation and independent evaluation are specified in paragraph 22, below.
16. With a view to providing opportunities for learning across programmes, PPME also undertakes cluster or strategic evaluations within its activity budget. Criteria for the selection of such evaluations include the cumulative budgetary value of the cluster, strategic alignment, visibility, time and resource requirements and opportunity for learning and quality improvement.
17. UNITAR recognizes the linkages between independent and self-evaluations, and that the evaluation of some undertakings may include both approaches. For example, larger, multi-year projects may contain important self-evaluation exercises, with an independent terminal evaluation scheduled at the project's end. The two processes may be highly complementary, with the results of self-evaluations providing opportunities for learning and input into narrative reporting and project improvement during delivery, and the mandated independent evaluation providing overall accountability and learning that can feed into organizational knowledge management practices.
18. Independent and self-evaluations may be undertaken individually (i.e. in the absence of any partners), jointly (with at least one other partner e.g. donors) and/or through participatory (i.e. involving stakeholders and/or beneficiaries) approaches.

Timing of Evaluations

19. Evaluation may be performed at different times and address different elements of the results chain and include formative or other types of process-related mid-term assessments, evaluations of outputs, and/or summative evaluations focusing on outcomes and impact. Given the Institute's concentration on learning-related programming, it is useful to distinguish between intermediate outcomes (e.g. enhanced knowledge and skills of beneficiaries) and institutional outcomes (e.g. strengthened organizational capacities as the result of applied knowledge/skills, increased policy coherence or efficiency, etc.).
20. When a donor agreement or project document does not specify the timing of an independent evaluation, the timing is decided closely with the programme unit in order for the exercise to be as useful as possible. This decision takes into account a number of factors, such as the project being a pilot initiative testing a new design that can be improved, replication or subsequent phase of the project or possible upscaling.

Evaluation Requirements

21. The following evaluations are required:

a) Mandatory independent evaluation

- i. All projects budgeted at \$1.5 million are subject to an independent evaluation.³
- ii. Hosted partnerships or programmes receiving pooled project funding shall be subject to an independent evaluation once per two programme budget cycles (four years).

b) Mandatory self-evaluation

- iii. Evaluation to obtain beneficiary reaction for all project training events of two days or more in duration.⁴
- iv. Evaluation of learning outcomes (e.g. strengthened knowledge or skills) for all project training events of two days or more in duration.⁵
- v. Evaluation of institutional capacity outcomes (e.g. increased individual performance and/or organizational capacities resulting from the application of knowledge, skills and awareness) for all training projects budgeted at \$300,000 or more.⁶
- vi. Evaluation of organizational or other impacts resulting from increased individual performance for all training projects budgeted at \$400,000 or more.⁷
- vii. Outcome evaluation for non-training-related projects budgeted between \$500,000 and \$1.5 million.⁸

Exceptions to evaluation requirements

22. The Institute acknowledges that not all undertakings necessarily merit evaluation, and some may not be feasible for political or other reasons. Exceptions to the requirements under paragraph 21 include:

- i. high-level political or special events/projects as defined in Annex 1;
- ii. projects which are subject to an evaluation by the donor or another agency e.g. projects financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) when an evaluation is foreseen by a GEF implementing agency; and

³ This threshold is based on the budget amounts recorded in donor agreements. In case of multi-donor projects, the threshold is determined by combining the different donor contributions (in which case evaluation costs may be shared proportionally across donors).

⁴ Equivalent to Level 1 of the Kirkpatrick/Phillips Evaluation Framework for training evaluation. This requirement also applies to learning-related events delivered on a fee-basis including events contributing to the award of Master or executive diplomas.

⁵ Equivalent to Level 2 of the Kirkpatrick/Phillips Evaluation Framework. This requirement also applies to learning-related events delivered by UNITAR or with partners on a fee-basis, including events contributing to the award of Master or executive diplomas.

⁶ Equivalent to Level 3 of the Kirkpatrick/Phillips Evaluation Framework, and based on the amount of the project budget as recorded in the donor agreement.

⁷ Equivalent to Level 4 of the Kirkpatrick-Phillips Evaluation Framework and based on the amount of the project budget as recorded in the donor agreement.

⁸ Based on the amount of the project budget values as recorded in the donor agreement. For projects funding the delivery of outputs that are part of other projects, the evaluation of such projects should assess outputs in relation to the intended outcomes of the relevant project.

iii. projects implemented in multiple phases, which are only subject to a mandatory independent evaluation once during the project's life cycle, even if the budget of more than one phase exceeds the \$1.5 million threshold.

23. The requirements and exceptions above shall not prejudice any evaluation requirements or preferences that a donor of a project or undertaking may have or governing bodies of hosted partnerships. Any decision to waive the mandatory requirements not falling under the exceptions above shall be supported in writing.

Discretionary Evaluations

24. Apart from the requirements enumerated in paragraph 21, other evaluations may be desirable to provide information on a project or undertaking's implementation (e.g. formative evaluation, mid-term review, legacy evaluation, etc.) or contribution to higher-level achievements (e.g. impact evaluation, return on investment evaluation). Such evaluations are discretionary, unless specifically required by a donor.

Evaluation Planning, Costing and Management

Evaluation Planning

25. All donor-funded projects should be conceived in a results-based manner and include a 'theory of change' or 'pathway to impact' on how activities and outputs are expected to produce outcomes and impact.

26. All donor-funded projects subject to evaluation should include a clause in the project document/proposal specifying evaluation requirements in accordance with this policy. In the absence of such a document, the relevant donor agreement should specify evaluation requirements or make reference to the evaluation policy.

27. For independent evaluations, including mandated independent project evaluations and other independent evaluations, PPME shall maintain a rolling evaluation work plan. Terms of reference will be prepared using international standards and good practice, and include the following elements: the context and purpose of the evaluation, scope, main evaluation questions, methodology (data collection tools and analysis), work plan, products of the evaluation, intended use of results and qualifications, timeframe, schedule of deliverables, reference to gender equality and human rights, ethics, professional requirements, etc.

Evaluation Costing

28. The costs to carry out evaluation vary depending on the purpose/type/scope of the evaluation, evaluation questions to be addressed, data collection methods and other factors. Adequate resources should be identified and made available for both independent and self-evaluations and be reflected in budgets.

29. Mandatory independent evaluations (paragraph 21a) should be costed at 2.5 per cent of the project's or hosted partnerships net budget, unless otherwise determined by PPME in consultation with the relevant programme unit or hosted partnership, and be identified on a separate budget line in project budgets. Costs for independent evaluation are distinct from project monitoring, self-evaluation and narrative reporting costs. In the event of a terminal/final project evaluation, the modalities governing commitments and expenditures of evaluation costs should be discussed and agreed with the respective donor(s) at the time

of formalizing the donor agreement, taking into consideration the project implementation and the agreement periods.

Evaluation Management

30. In conducting evaluations, UNITAR acknowledges that different evaluation designs as well as quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods for data collection and analysis exist. The most appropriate design(s), method(s) and approach should be selected, taking into consideration the evaluation question(s), scope, criteria, human and financial resource requirements and availability, as well as guiding principles and good practice standards. In some cases, rapid impact assessment (e.g. impact stories) may be a useful way to assess impact for smaller-sized projects.
31. For independent evaluations, PPME organizes an evaluation entry conference to clarify the process, roles and procedures throughout the evaluation and an exit conference to discuss findings and draft recommendations to promote evaluation utility. The context of the evaluand (ongoing, ending, phasing out, etc.) will be taken into account to issue actionable recommendations aimed at improving the project, future projects, the overall programme, and general UNITAR strategies.
32. All independent evaluations undertaken by consultants should include a peer review by PPME for quality assurance purposes prior to finalization.
33. All independent evaluations undertaken by consultants should include a response from management in relation to the evaluation's findings, conclusions, and recommendations and lessons-learned.

Transparency, Dissemination and Disclosure

34. This evaluation policy shall be publicly available on the UNITAR website.
35. In due consultation with the Executive Director and Management, PPME may issue and disclose final evaluation reports without prior clearance from other UNITAR Management or functions.
36. Reports from independent and external evaluations will be accessible in a public depository with a view to ensure transparency and facilitate knowledge management and application of lessons learned.

Evaluation Capacity Development

37. Evaluation is an important function in both national and international public service. The policy framework recognizes the importance of strengthening evaluation capacities within UNITAR for an enhanced self-evaluation function. PPME regularly organizes in-house learning opportunities and announces external opportunities as they arise. .
38. As recognized by the UNEG N&S and General Assembly resolution 60/237 of 14 December 2014, building national evaluation capacities at the country level is important for development activities. PPME will contribute to such efforts upon request and in accordance with the principle of national ownership.

Knowledge Management and Organizational Learning

39. As one of the main purposes of evaluation, the creation, storage, management, dissemination and uptake of knowledge is essential. In view of promoting evaluation use, organizational learning and contributing to quality improvement of the Institute's products and services, a learning forum will be organized annually to share lessons learned on evaluation processes and outcomes.

Roles and Responsibilities

40. The Institute has a shared system of roles and responsibilities in performing evaluation functions. Roles and responsibilities of other actors not listed below will be defined in the operational guidelines.

Board of Trustees

41. In accordance with its statutory requirements and on the basis of submissions from the Executive Director, the Board of Trustees considers and adopts the UNITAR programme budget, which includes the staffing and programme budget of PPME. The Board of Trustees also formulates principles and policies to govern the activities and operations of the Institute, including the evaluation policy.

Evaluation Advisory Board

42. The Evaluation Advisory Board (EAB) advises the Executive Director and the Director of the Division for Strategic Planning and Performance/Manager of the Planning, Performance Monitor and Evaluation Unit, reviews the present evaluation policy and provides recommendations on matters related to the planning, conduct, follow-up and use of evaluations, in accordance with its Terms of Reference.

Executive Director

43. The Executive Director provides the overall direction, leadership and management of UNITAR. In conjunction with this policy, the roles and responsibilities of the Executive Director include:
- a. Safeguarding the integrity of the evaluation function and its independence, and promoting a strong evaluation culture amongst senior management;
 - b. Approval of the proposed budget and staffing of PPME and submission of the UNITAR programme budget to the Board of Trustees for consideration and adoption;
 - c. Submission of other reports as may be requested to the Board of Trustees for consideration;
 - d. Participating in the Evaluation Advisory Board in an ex officio capacity; and
 - e. Requesting PPME to undertake independent evaluations in accordance with the present policy.

Planning, Performance Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit

44. Under the Division for Strategic Planning and Performance and with the Division Director reporting directly to the Executive Director, the Planning, Performance Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit acts as the custodian of the evaluation function. The unit's roles and responsibilities are the following:
- a. Oversees the application of the policy, identifies bottlenecks and constraints and makes recommendations for updating the requirements or other elements of the policy, in line with international good practice, lessons learned as well as the evolving programming and operational needs and characteristics of UNITAR;
 - b. Facilitates regular interaction with directors, managers, programme unit evaluation focal points and other staff, collects feedback and facilitates learning on the policy;
 - c. Acts as secretariat of the EAB;
 - d. In consultation with the EAB, Executive Director and Management, prepares and maintains evaluation plans within the established budgetary appropriations;
 - e. Conducts/manages independent evaluations in accordance with the present policy and ensures that evaluations are impartial, credible and useful, and that any bias present is minimized. In instances where the independence of PPME may be compromised, ensures that a disclaimer is duly acknowledged;
 - f. In due consultation with the Executive Director and Management, issues and discloses final evaluation reports to concerned evaluation stakeholders without prior clearance from Programme Management or other functions;
 - g. Acts as focal point for any external evaluation being undertaken by a donor or other partner;
 - h. Undertakes periodic peer reviews of self-evaluations for quality assurance purposes;
 - i. Conducts research and engages in critical and analytical reflection as well as issues recommendations to management for compliance with the policy;
 - j. Prepares and maintains operational guidelines to support the implementation of this policy;
 - k. Develops and promotes standards for evaluation and quality assurance;
 - l. Prepares a self-evaluation meta report based on a review of completed self-evaluations;
 - m. Maintains a public repository of evaluation reports with a view to ensuring transparency and facilitating the integration of lessons learned and best practices into the broader concept of knowledge management;
 - n. Oversees the development and maintenance of an intranet-based knowledge management tool to store, manage and disseminate lessons-learned from evaluations and performance reporting exercises;
 - o. Promotes knowledge management, organizational learning and lessons learned by keeping abreast of innovative practices in the field of evaluation, identifying relevant techniques, tools and methods, and providing divisional units with guidance on the use of respective tools and methods;
 - p. Commits to sharing best practices and lessons learned to enhance the quality of the Institute's products and services;
 - q. Organizes meetings on presentation and discussion of evaluation findings and suggested recommendations to increase organisational learning and the spirit of co-creation;
 - r. Follows up on the implementation of recommendations after evaluation end; and
 - s. Collaborates and coordinates with UNITAR divisional entities and other United Nations agencies and organizations on issues related to evaluation, and contributes to efforts to strengthen national evaluation capacities upon request.

Programme Management

45. Programme management is a generic term comprising the director or manager-level posts of all entities, including programmes units offices and secretariats of hosted partnerships. Programme management's roles and responsibilities are the following:
- a. Undertakes evaluation functions in accordance with the present policy, including planning and conducting self-evaluations;
 - b. Informs donors and implementing partners of the Institute's evaluation requirements when preparing and negotiating project agreements and modalities for cooperation and, in consultation with PPME, ensures that evaluation modalities are specified in project documents or donor agreements including modalities for covering commitments and expenditures for mandated terminal project evaluations;
 - c. Appoints a member of its staff or personnel to serve as evaluation focal point to help ensure that the requirements of the policy are applied and that evaluation's accountability and learning purposes are achieved;
 - d. Budgets and allocates the required resources for evaluations in accordance with policy requirements, including for mandated independent evaluations of projects/pooled funded projects and sets such funds aside to ensure timely evaluations;
 - e. Informs PPME of the scheduling of evaluations on a rolling basis as projects are funded and implemented;
 - f. Shares evaluation reports with evaluation stakeholders including donors, interviewees and survey respondents among others;
 - g. Follows-up on findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons-learned of independent evaluations in the form of a management response;
 - h. Implements accepted evaluation recommendations and informs PPME when implemented; and,
 - i. Commits to sharing best practices and lessons learned with a view to further strengthening the quality of the Institute's products and services.

Other Stakeholders

46. UNITAR also recognizes the importance of other evaluation stakeholders such as evaluation consultants, implementing partners, donors, project consortium members, beneficiaries and other relevant evaluation stakeholders.

Coverage, Scope and Implementation

47. The policy applies to the entirety of the Institute's operations and programming at headquarters and out-posted offices, hosted partnerships and the CIFAL Global Network.
48. A set of operational guidelines will support the application of the requirements in this policy.

Review

49. The policy will be reviewed periodically and amended when required to account for adjustments and other elements as required, based on the evolving nature of the evaluation function and taking into consideration international good practices.

Annex 1 – Glossary of Terms

Accomplishment

The achievement of specific results producing changes in behaviour or developmental conditions. See outcome.

Activity

Any action undertaken or work performed with the objective of transforming inputs into measurable outputs.

Baseline

Data describing a situation to be addressed by an undertaking which serve as the starting point for measuring performance.

Beneficiaries

Individuals, entities or groups which may be targeted or not and which may benefit directly or indirectly from a programme, project or other undertaking.

Best practices

Planning, organizational and/or managerial methods, processes, techniques or other practices which have produced consistent superior results to those achieved by other means.

Coherence: The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.

Corporate evaluation

Independent evaluations undertaken and/or managed by the Planning, Performance Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit.

Divisional entities

A collective term that refers to the Institute's programmes, offices, units and other administrative entities.

Effectiveness

The extent to which a programme, project or other undertaking achieves its planned results (outputs outcomes and/or goals).

Efficiency

The cost effectiveness of transforming actions into outputs, taking into consideration alternative paths.

Evaluability

The extent to which an activity, project, programme or other undertaking can be subject to evaluation in a credible and reliable manner.

Evaluation

"An assessment, conducted as systematically and impartially as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy topic, sector, operational area or institutional performance. It analyses the level of achievement of both expected and unexpected results by examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability." (UNEG 2016)

Event

A major activity organized in the form of a briefing, conference, course, fellowship programme, lecture, meeting, seminar, workshop, side-event, webinar, etc. and announced on the Institute's online events management system.

Ex ante evaluation

An evaluation performed prior to the implementation of an undertaking. See baseline.

Ex post evaluation

An evaluation performed after the implementation of an undertaking.

Formative Evaluation

A type of evaluation conducted during the implementation of a project or other undertaking with the aim to provide information that will guide project improvement. This type of evaluation typically focuses on determining whether a programme is being implemented according to plan.

Hosted partnership

A partnership pre-existing outside of UNITAR with a governance structure (e.g. steering committee or board), leadership (i.e. an appointed head) and funding to which UNITAR agrees to provide a platform in order to operate and conducts its work subject to consistency with the UNITAR Statute and other conditions defined in an agreement between UNITAR and the partnership's governance structure.

Indicator

A quantitative or qualitative measure of programme performance that is used to demonstrate change and which details the extent to which results are being or have been achieved.

Intermediate outcome

Effects produced as the result of intermediate outcomes. E.g. increased organizational effectiveness as the result of the application of knowledge or skills by beneficiaries or as the results of other intermediate outcomes.

Institutional outcome

Subsequent effects of products and/or services (outputs) delivered. E.g. increased level of knowledge or skills retained after training or knowledge and skills applied on the job as a result of training.

Impact

The totality and/or long-term effects of an undertaking. Effects may be positive or negative, intended or unintended.

Kirkpatrick-Phillips Approach

An approach that categorizes evaluation data based on five levels to evaluating training, including Level 1 (reaction and planned action), Level 2 (learning and confidence), Level 3 (application and implementation), Level 4 (impact/organizational change) and Level 5 (ROI). The approach to training evaluation has evolved over time, building initially on the work of Raymond Katznel and John Donald Kirkpatrick (covering Levels 1 to 4) and later on Jack J. Phillips and Patti P. Phillips adding financial data, Level 5, and creating a model that supports implementation utilizing quantitative and qualitative methodologies (see also ROI Methodology).

Knowledge management

The systematic processes, or range of practices, used by organizations to identify, capture, store, create, update, represent and distribute knowledge for use, awareness and learning across the organization (JIU 2016).

Lessons learned

A generalization derived from an evaluation and applicable to a generic rather than a specific situation.

Measurement

The process of using a rule or scale that assigns categories or numbers to define or quantify specific attributes or dimensions of data, in order to assess, analyse and understand results.

Output

Final products or services delivered.

Outcome

Changes in behaviour or development conditions.

Project

A set of planned and interrelated activities designed to achieve specific objectives within a given budget, period of time and operating framework.

Programme

A set of sub-programmes, projects and/or activities producing outputs and accomplishments with a defined budget and under a set of specific objectives linked to the Institute's mandate and organizational goals.

ROI Methodology

An evaluation approach developed by Phillips. It supports the collection and analysis of data reported in the Kirkpatrick/Phillips framework. The model coupled with the supporting standards ensures that data captured at the different levels are reliable. The implementation of the model does not require data collection and analysis at the higher levels for all programs. Rather, higher levels of evaluation are most suitable for high cost, strategic and operationally aligned projects for which impact, and sometimes ROI, are important results.

Self-evaluation

Evaluation conducted by the Institute's programme units or other divisional entities of their own undertakings primarily for the purpose of learning and quality improvement.

Summative evaluation

A type of evaluation intended to provide information about the merit, worth and impact of a programme or project (OIOS). Summative evaluation is usually conducted at the end of a programme or project to determine if anticipated results were achieved.

Undertaking

A general term for any programme, project, activity, policy, strategy, etc. which may be subject to evaluation.