Unit – 9

PROGRAMME EVALUATION

Contents

Programme Evaluation

9.1 Introduction

Evaluation is the final step in extension programme development. In sequential order, its number is at the last but least to none considering the importance in extension programme. By evaluation, extension worker comes to know whether or not the programme was successful.

This unit exclusively focuses on evaluation. The unit sets with clarifying the concept of evaluation. The need and importance of evaluation is highlighted. A comprehensive discussion of various types of evaluation is given. Four paradigms of evaluation are described in detail. Conducting and reporting evaluation is also discussed. At the end, some activities and self-assessment exercises are also given for students to work.

9.2 Objectives

1. Describe the concept of programme evaluation.
2. Realize the need and importance of conducting evaluation.
3. Describe various types of evaluation.
4. Elaborate 4 paradigms of evaluation.

9.3 Evaluation Defined

The word "evaluation" is derived from the French word 'EVALUER' which means to give "value".

The evaluation is generally defined as "a process of collecting information, and applying standards or criteria in drawing conclusions, forming judgements or making decisions".

1. Process--dynamic, everchanging, continuous and systematic.

2. Information collection-- concerning the ext. programme or activity being evaluated.

3. Application of some standards or critaria-- objectives of the programme.

4. Conclusions or forming judgments or making decisions -- passing on judgement

9.4 Evaluation in the Context of Extension.

Extension evaluation can be defined as:

1. A continuous and systematic process of assessing the value or potential value of extension programme[1].

2. Evaluation in extension means a review of results achieved in relation to the extension given, on the basis of certain established criteria" (Van Den Ban & Hawkins; 1996:205).

9.5 Need and Importance of Evaluation

Evaluation is a crucial step in extension programme development. It through this process that various stakeholders determine whether or not the extension education programme achieved its objectives. It helps to know the strengths and it also identifies the weaknesses of the extension programme. It provides information about the short falls, causes of failure and aids in rectifying the situation. Hence, it assists in decision making concerning the continuation, redirection, or re emphasis of the present extension educational programme in a farming community. Thus, evaluation is an integral and essential part of extension programme development and it can not be overlooked. Its importance is well

[1] Un-published paper; A lecture delivered by Dr. Muhammad. F. El-Shazly, on Monitoring and Evaluation of Extension Programmes at a short training course at IATI, Garhi Dopatta, AJK from 27 Nov. to 9 Dec. 1993.

established as is clear from the following points :

- Evaluation provides sound basis for the careful planning of future extension programme.
- It ensures the accountability of all those involved in extension programme.
- It provides for the rational evidence to the public and help them to know whether or not the funds are being used rationally in the best interest of the local people and for their betterment.
- It also gives confidence and assurance to those who are performing their duties effectively and efficiently.
- It also provides justification for the concerted efforts to be made for the uplift of the farming community.

9.6 Types of Programme Evaluation

A brief description of various types of programme evaluation are described below:

i. Adversary –Oriented Evaluation

In this type of evaluation, the evaluator tries to get both sides (positive and negative views) argued, one side by advocates (those in favour) and other by adversaries (those who oppose it).

ii. Autocratic Evaluation

This is the type of evaluation in which the valuator retains ownership of the evaluation study and reports findings to the sponsoring agency and in academic journals.

iii. **Bureaucratic Evaluation**

This is the type of evaluation in which the bureaucratic agency sponsoring the evaluation, not the evaluator, controls the evaluation information and "owns" the evaluation report.

iv. **Consumer-Oriented Evaluation**

Evaluation conducted to find out the views of consumers through checklists and consumers criteria.

v. **Context Evaluation**

Evaluation designed to serve planning decisions. Determining what needs are to be addressed in an extension education programme helps in defining objectives for the programme. It is a type of management -oriented Evaluation.

vi. **Democratic Evaluation**

This is the type of evaluation in which the evaluator performs an information service to the whole community, with neither the evaluator nor sponsoring agency having any special claim on the findings.

vii. **Expertise-Oriented Evaluation**

It is the type of evaluator which depends primarily upon professional expertise to judge an evaluation object.

viii. **External Evaluation**

Evaluation conducted by an evaluator from outside the organization with in which the object of the study is housed.

ix. **Formative Evaluation:**

Evaluation designed and used to improve an object, especially when it is still being developed.

x. **Good-Free Evaluation**

Evaluation of outcomes in which the evaluator functions without knowledge of the purposes or goals of the objective. The rationale for this type of evaluation can be summarized as follows: The goals of an evaluation object are sometimes little more than rhetoric and seldom reveal its objectives. In addition, many important programme outcomes do not falls in the category of goals or objectives any way. The most important function of goal-free evaluation is to reduce bias and increase objectivity. In this type of evaluation the evaluator purposefully avoids becoming aware of the programme goals. He focuses on actual outcomes rather than intended programme outcomes. He has minimal contact with the programme manager.

xi. **Illuminative Evaluation.**

It is the type of naturalistic and participant oriented evaluation. It involves intensive study of an extension education programme as a whole. Its purpose is to illuminate problems, issues, and significant programme features.

xii. **Input Evaluation**

Evaluation designed to serve structuring decisions. Determining what resources are available, what alternation strategies for the programme should be considered, and what plan seems to have the best potential for meeting needs facilitates design for programme procedures. It is a type of management -oriented Evaluation.

xiii. **Internal Evaluation**

Evaluation conducted by a staff member from within the organization being studied.

xiv. **Management – Oriented Evaluation**

The management – oriented evaluation in extension education is meant to serve decision-makers. Its rationale is that evaluative information is an

essential part of decision making.

xv. **Materials Evaluation**

Evaluation that assesses the merit or worth of content related physical items, including books, films, tapes, other instructional products.

xvi. **Meta Evaluation:**

Evaluation of an evaluation.

xvii. **Monitoring**

The kinds of activities involved in monitoring vary widely from periodic checks of compliance with policy to relatively straight forward 'tracking' of service delivered and 'counting' of clients (Patton, 1982 P 44).

xviii. **Naturalistic and Participant –Oriented Evaluation**

This type of evaluation is aimed at observing and identifying all (as many as possible) of the concerns, issues, and consequences integral to extension educational enterprise. It enforces the involvement in the evaluation of those who are participants in the object being evaluated. The evaluation portrays the different values and needs of all individuals and groups served by the programme.

xix. **Objective –Oriented Evaluation**

The distinguishing feature of on objective –oriented evaluation is that the purposes of some agricultural extension education activity are specified, and then evaluation focuses on the extent to which these purposes are achieved.

xx. **Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation**

Participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM & E) is a learning tool that helps participatory groups to strengthen their problem –solving capacity and achieve self reliance. It is the basis of ensuring effectiveness of participatory development. Its purpose is to support the learning of the group of learners in order that they could transform their own life. The trend of PME can only be promoted and practiced if concrete efforts are made to encourage

conditions which will support the active role of learners (farmers) and their field educators (extension workers) in integrating evaluation as an on-going part of extension education efforts.

xxi. **Process Evaluation**

Evaluation designed to serve implementing decisions. How well is the programme being implemented? What revisions are needed? Once these questions are answered, procedures can be monitored, controlled, and refined. It is a management-oriented evaluation.

xxii. **Product Evaluation**

Evaluation designed to serve recycling decisions. What results are obtained? How well were needs reduced? What should be done witn the programme after it has run its course? The questions are important in judging programme attainments. This is a management – oriented evaluation.

xxiii. **Programme Evaluation**

Evaluation that assesses activities which provide services on a continuing basis.

xxiv. **Project Evaluation**

Evaluation that assesses activities that are forwarded for a defined period of time to perform a specified task. Some examples are a three day training workshop, or a two year development effort.

xxv. **Qualitative Evaluation**

Evaluation in which the evaluator presents facts in narrative forms.

xxvi. **Quantitative Evaluation**

Evaluation in which the evaluator presents facts in numerical forms..

xxvii. **Summative Evaluation:**

Evaluation designed to present conclusions about the merit or worth of an object and recommendations about whether it should be retained, altered, or eliminated:

xxviii. Transactional Evaluation

It aims at drawing attention to the effects of disruption in an organization on incumbents in the roles in the system undergoing change. It is used as a strategy for managing dysfunctions that occur within an organization in the midst of change.

9.7 Evaluation Paradigms

When considering evaluation, most of the experts think about a particular approach/model depending upon their past experiences and their beliefs about evaluation. Guba and Lincoln (1989) have reported four paradigms of evaluation considering its historical perspective which are as under:

1. Measurement—Evaluator as technitcian
2. Description—Evaluation as describer
3. Judgement—Evaluator as judge
4. Responsiveness—Evaluator as collaborator and negotiator

A brief description of these four paradigms is presented below:

9.7.1 Measurement - Evaluator as Technician

In the measurement paradigm, the evaluator is essentially a technician. Measurement, evaluation and assessment are terms that have been used interchangeably and still are in some contexts. The assumption underlying the 'measurement' paradigm is that if farmer do not perform well, it is due to some lackness on their part. Most experts are now well aware of the limitations of this view. and know there are many factors, human and non-human, which can affect farmer/ learners performance.

9.7.2 Description - Evaluator as Describer

As reported by Guba and Lincoln (1989, p 28) this "approach was characterised by description of patterns of strengths and weaknesses with respect to certain

stated objectives". Here the evaluator is describer. However, because this approach merely described events after they had occurred.

9.7.3 Judgement - Evaluator as Judge

During the 1960's, evaluation processes began to adopt not only a measuring and describing role, but also a judgemental role with the evaluator as judge. Evaluators were required to evaluate programme objectives and to exercise judgement against the particular standards they had developed. Hence evaluation was based on the values of the evaluator, rather than on the multiple values of stakeholders.

9.7.4 Responsive - Evaluator as Collaborator and Negotiator

Here the key point to note with each the approaches briefly described above is that evaluation is carried out by an outside evaluator rather than by practitioners themselves. While each approach has contributed to the development and improvement of evaluation as a process, Guba and Lincoln argue that there are flaws with each of them; a reliance on the scientific approach, management of evaluation by 'outsiders' and a tendency to disregard multiple values and viewpoints. Therefore, they argue for the need to move towards a more encompassing approach, a fourth paradigm of evaluation which they refer to as responsive evaluation. Now a days, it is named as participatory evaluation. Guba and Lincoln(1989, p 253-256) outline seven characteristics of responsive evaluation. To them it is:

- a sociopolitical process,
- a collaborative process
- a teaching/learning process
- a continuous, recursive and highly divergent process
- an emergent process
- a process with unpredictable outcomes
- a process that creates reality.

Participatory evaluation -- what is it

Participatory evaluation is not just a matter of using participatory techniques within a conventional evaluation paradigm. It is about radically rethinking who initiates and undertakes the process, and who learns or benefits from the findings. It ensures the concious involvement of all the stakeholders.. Participatory evaluation is based on following four broad principles:

- 'Participation' - which means opening up the design of the process to include those most directly affected, and agreeing to analyse data together;
- The inclusiveness of PM&E requires 'negotiation' to reach agreement about what will be monitored or evaluated, how and when data will be collected and analysed, what the data actually means, and how findings will be shared, and action taken;
- This leads to 'learning' which becomes the basis for subsequent improvement and corrective action;
- Since the number, role, and skills of stakeholders, the external environment, and other factors change over time, 'flexibility' is essential.

Difference between Conventional and Participatory Evaluation

Indicator	Conventional Evaluation	Participatory valuation
Planning process:	Senior managers, or staff, outside experts	Local people, project staff managers, and other stakeholders, often helped by a facilitator.
Primary stakeholders (the intended beneficiaries):	Provide information only	Design and adapt the methodology, collect and analyse data, share findings and link them to action
How success is measured:	Externally-defined, mainly quantitative indicators	Internally-defined indicators, including more qualitative judgements
Approach:	Predetermined	Adaptive

9.8 Participatory Techniques

A wide range of methods and tools have been developed to carry out participatory evaluation. They all seek to compare the situation before and after a particular project, considering a set of events. Some the methods commonly used for participatory evaluation include:

Method	Description
Maps:	to show the location and types of changes in the area being monitored
Venn diagrams:	to show changes in relationships between groups, institutions, and individuals
Flow diagrams:	to show direct and indirect impacts of changes, and relates them to causes
Diaries:	to describe changes in the lives of individuals or groups
Photographs:	to depict changes through a sequence of images
Matrix scoring:	to compare people's preferences for a set of options or outcomes
Network diagrams:	to show changes in the type and degree of contact between people and services

9.9 Steps in Evaluating Extension Programmes

Following are the steps to be followed while evaluating an extension programmes.

9.9.1 Object Description

An object description is used to better understand the thing that is to be evaluated. It helps in planning the evaluation and is the part of the final evaluation report generally covered under the titles: "Introduction". Elements of effective object descriptions include the following:

Rational/Philosophy?

What is the logic for the programme's existence?

- **Objectives**

  What are the programme's specific intended outcomes.

- **Setting**

  Describe the physical and/or the socio-psychological environment in which the programme takes place.

- **Staff**

  Who are the people responsible for the programme's operations? What are the characteristics and qualifications of their positions?

- **Organization**

  What is the structure of the programme? Are there any specific arrangements that are important for the object's success?

- **Activities**

  Describe in detail what actions, techniques or procedures are used to accomplish programme objectives.

- **Participants**

  Who are the participants and what are their characteristics and /or selection criteria?

- **Budget**

  Itemize the intended or actual costs of implementing this programme.

The object description helps the evaluator as well as the readers (audience) clarify just what it is that will be/has been evaluated. The description is generally based on interviews with the key project personnel, document review, direct observations of the project in action, and conversations with participants. The best object descriptions are those which avoid judgmental language on the part of the evaluator.

9.9.2 Planning Evaluation

- **Clarify the Evaluation Request**

Interview the client-----the specific agency or individual who requests the evaluation and the sponsor ----the agency or individual who authorizes the evaluation and provides necessary financial resources for its conduct and to clarify the reasons for wanting to evaluate the object.

- **Identify the Intended Audiences and Their Concerns**

Audiences include individuals, groups, and agencies who have an interest in the evaluation and receive its results. Sponsors and clients are usually the primary

audiences and may occasionally be the only audiences. Generally an evaluation's audiences will also include all participants and stake holders -----those who may be directly affected by evaluation results. Audience concerns/views may be identified through face to face interviews, telephone interviews or by mail.

- **Identify and Select the Evaluation Questions**

  Based upon the interviews conducted and information received from the client, sponsor, stakeholders, and the audience, identify the evaluation questions and decide upon the questions to be addressed in the evaluation. Involve all concerned taking such decisions. Decide what evidence is needed to determine that the extension programme is reaching its goals in terms of **(a) number of accomplishments, or (b) changed behaviour of the people.** Which are the most important indicators of changed behaviour? A hierarchy of the levels of evidence is presented in Table. 1. Suppose an organization runs a project of five years duration to educate farmers of Faisalabad District regarding farm forestry. The examples of the types of evidence needed for evaluation at various levels are given in Table. 1.

Table 1. Hierarchy of evidence for programme evaluation

Level of Evidence		Examples
7. End results	-	Changes in the quality of life and standards of living of farmers.
6. Practice change	-	Adoption of innovations in Farm Forestry by farmers on their farms.
5. KASA change	-	Changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills and aspirations of farmers regarding farm forestry.
4. Reactions	-	Opinions and reactions of farmers regarding extension programme and activities. Interested or not, like or dislike, useful or not useful.

3. People involvement-		Percentage of farmers attending extension meetings. Frequency and intensity of their involvement type and quality.
2. Activities	-	No. type and quality of extension meetings conducted.
	-	No. of demonstrations conducted.
	-	Subject matter taught
	-	No. of trees planted on farm lands.
1. Inputs	-	Time invested
	-	Money invested
	-	Resources used such as plants distributed among farmers.

9.9.3 Preparing the Evaluation Design.

The evaluation design includes: the evaluation questions, information needed to answer these questions, sources of this information, sample, recommended strategies/methods for gathering the information and analyzing data.

- *Statement of Evaluation Questions*

  Evaluation is possible only if there are clear statements of the evaluation questions.

- *Information Needed*

  Identify clearly the information needed to answer evaluation questions.

- **Source of Evidence**

  Identify the source(s) from which the needed information can be achieved.

- **Sample**

  Sometime to becomes very difficult to study all those, people/things, which are considered as source of evidence of the needed information. In such cases a sample may be studied.

  A carefully drawn but representative sample (where each has equal chance of being drawn---such as "every tenth name") can provide essentially the

same evidence as the total group. A purposeful sample may be drawn for in-depth understanding of the context in which the evaluation object exists. A brief description of various types of samples is given below:

	Sample	Description
A	Random Probability sampling	Representativeness: Sample size a function of Population size and desired confidence level.
A.1	Simple random sample	Permits generalization from sample to the population it represents.
A.2	Stratified random and cluster samples	Increases confidence in making generalizations to particular subgroups of areas.
B.	Purposeful sampling	Selects information-rich cases for in-depth study-Size and specific cases depend on study purpose.
B.1	Extreme or deviant case sampling	Learning from highly unusual manifestations of the phenomenon of interest, such as outstanding successes/ notable failures, top of the class/ dropouts, exotic events, crises.
B.2	Intensity sampling	Information-rich cases that manifest the phenomenon intensely, but not extremely, such as good students/poor students, above average/below average.
B.3	Maximum variation sampling-	Documents unique or diverse variations that have (Purposefully picking a wide range emerged in adapting to different conditions. Of variation on dimensions of interest)Identifies important common patterns that cut across variations.
B.4	Homogeneous sampling	Focuses, reduces variation, simplifies analysis, facilitates group interviewing.
B.5	Typical case sampling	Illustrates or highlights what is typical, normal,average.

B.6 Stratified purposeful	Illustrates characteristics of particular sampling subgroups of interest; facilitates comparisons.
B.7 Critical case sampling	Permits *logical* generalization and maximum application of information to other cases because if it's true of this one case it's likely to be true of all other cases.
B.8 Snowball or chain sampling	Identifies case of interest from people who know what cases are information rich, that is,good examples for study, good interview subjects.
B.9 Criterion sampling	Picking all cases that meet some criterion, Such as all children abused in a treatment facility.
B.10 Theory-based or operational	Finding manifestations of a theoretical Construct, construct sampling of interest so as to elaborate and examine the construct.
B.11 Confirming and disconfirming cases	Elaborating and deepening initial analysis, seeking exceptions, testing variation.
B.12 Opportunistic sampling	Following new leads during fieldwork, taking advantage of the unexpected, flexibility.
B.13 Random purposeful	Adds credibility to sample when potential sampling purposeful (still small sample size) sample is larger than one can handle. Reduces judgment within a purposeful category.
B. 14 Sampling politically	Attracts attention to the study (or avoids important cases attracting undesired attention by purposeful eliminating from the sample politically sensitive cases).
B. 15 Convenience sampling	Saves time, money, and effort. Poorest rationale; lowest credibility. Yields information-poor cases.

B.16 Combination or mixed	Triangulation, flexibility, meets purposeful multiple interests

9.9.4 Data Collection

The methods of obtaining evidence must be appropriate to the kinds of information being collected. Questions must be worded carefully to obtain reliable unbiased data. A pre-test of questionnaire is most desirable. Some important methods of data collection are discussed here.

a) Mail Questionnaire

The evaluator develops a questionnaire. It is then field tested for its validity and reliability. Then it is mailed to the members of the selected sample along with a self addressed stamped envelop. It has the advantage of being a reasonably responsive method of data collection. However, it has the disadvantage that questions may not be understood as there is no opportunity to explain theme, returns are fewer, and follow-up is necessary. It is impracticable in situations where people are illiterate or where mail service is unreliable.

b) Face to Face Individual Interviews

The evaluator develops an interview scheduled. It is then field tested for its validity and reliability. Interviews are conducted in individual settings. This method allows the evaluator/interviewer to explain the questions and to keep the interest of the respondents for a considerable period of time. Reasons for resistance may be discovered and overcome. The personal contact offers the interviewer opportunities to establish friendly relations, observe personal reactions, and to secure fairly complete answers. However it has the disadvantage that it is relatively expensive, and the interviewer's bias may become a part of collected information.

c) Telephone Interviews

In this method the evaluator/interviewer interviews respondents through telephone. In advanced countries the use of telephone in interview studies has greatly increased in recent years. It has many advantages. Subjects from a much broad population can be selected. It is relatively less expensive method. However, it has many disadvantages such as many people do not have telephone facilities. Limited information may be found through telephones.

d) Focus Group Interviews

A focus group interview is an interview with a small group of people on specific topic. The participants are generally a homogeneous group of 6-8 people who are asked to reflect the questions asked by the interviewer. They hear each other's responses and make additional comments. The focus in this interview is getting high-quality data in a social context when people can consider their own views in the content of the views of others. Focus group interviews is considered very efficient qualitative data collection technique.

e) Key-Informant Interview

This is a kind of ethnographic data collection technique. The key informants are people having special knowledge or perceptions that are not otherwise available to the evaluator. They have generally more knowledge, better communication skills, or perspectives which different from other people.

f) Observation

The method requires keenly observing and describing the evaluation object. The purpose of observational data is to describe the setting that was observed, the activities that took place in that setting, the people who participated in those activities, and the meanings of what was observed from the perspective

of those observed. It has the advantage that the first hand information may be obtained through this methods. The disadvantage is that it requires sufficient amount of time and money to train observers.

g) Delphi Technique

In this method a panel of selected experts responds independently to a set of questions. A follow-up report to the panel summarizes responses using the mean, median, and range as descriptive statistics for the responses to each original question. Each member of the panel receives a reminder of how he responded to the original questions. He is asked to compare his first response to the panel summary and revise any response if he desires. If his second response is outside the inter quartile range, he is asked to justify his deviation from the panels majority judgement. After three or four rounds the panel members are asked to revise their responds, on last time, given the results and agreements yielded by the previous rounds. This method is generally used to find out the group consensus.

h) Checklists

Checklists are often used in order to enable people to make one or more choices from a list of statements regarding a problem or an idea. Usually a statement of the problem is made followed by a list of several possible answers from which a choice may be made.

i) Rating scales

In rating scales the members of the sample choose, among various degrees of opinion, a feeling or interest about a problem or idea. Descriptive words such as "good", "average", "poor" and numerical ratings should be defined in terms of characteristics to be measured. Following is an example of a rating scale. In a doctoral research study extension workers

were asked to assess their competencies according to the following scale Level of competency possessed. Level of Importance of competency

Very Low	Low	Avg	High	Very High	Very Low	Low	Avg	High	Very High
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

j) Case studies

There are studies of a limited number of problems or situations which are valuable for providing concrete information on problems or solutions, and on sequences of events leading to problem solution. They are useful in testing approaches to a specific type of problem. However, they do not provide information for general conclusions and require a great deal of time for observing, requiring facts and preparing reports. Relatively few cases can be observed and reported.

k) Q-Sort

The Q-sort technique requires following steps.

- Place unambiguous statements of needs or objectives on cards, one to a card. Theoretically, at least 75 but no more than 140 items should be sorted.
- Shuffle or randomly order the cards and give them to someone to sort. The same random order should be given to each person.
- Sort the cards into some predetermined distribution. Usually 7 to 13 piles of cards are used, but this can be modified, depending on the needs of the investigator. For example, if 80 items were to be sorted into a somewhat normal distribution, the instruction might be to sort the cards into 9 piles, with the left-most pile representing

most valuable needs or objectives and the right-most pile representing least valuable needs or objectives, and the number in each pile set as follows:

4 6 10 12 16 12 10 6 4

- Collect the cards as sorted by the person and assign ranks to the cards in each pile (for example, a value of "1" to cards in the left-most pile and "10" to cards in the right-most pile).
- Calculate desired statistics on resultant data.

8.9.5 Data Analysis

Evaluation data may be analyzed manually using tally sheet method or through computer software such as SPSS, Marital, Ethnography etc.

9.10 Evaluation reporting

After conducting an evaluation, it is often desirable to document it in the form of a report. An evaluation report needs to be concise, non-technical, easy to read and understand. It is always good to prepare an outline of the report to work with. It does not mean to chalk out a detailed outline and may not necessarily be in written form. But to have a sketch in mind is always useful and helpful to work in order and avoid repetition and guard against omissions. An evaluation written report be organized as followed:

9.10.1 Title

All evaluation reports bear a title. Normally, a separate title page is set-up followed by the report. The name of author or the agency conducting evaluation is also mentioned on the title page.

9.10.2 Table of contents

It can be omitted if the report is short. Lengthy reports need a table of contents. It helps to locate the chapters or sections in which the reader may be more interested.

9.10.3 Executive summary

It is becoming a popular practice to provide an executive summary of the evaluation report before or after the table of contents. But it must precede with the body of the report. It provides a quick overview of the report and helps the reader to decide whether to read the entire report or not.

9.10.4 Justification of conducting evaluation

This section highlights the significance of the evaluation and provides the sound justification by explaining the reasons for conducting the evaluation.

9.10.5 Objectives of Evaluation

An evaluation report must state clearly and explicitly the specific objectives and purposes of conducting the evaluation. Sometimes the objectives are stated in the introductory section of the report. And an independent section can contain objectives as well.

9.10.6 Procedure of Evaluation

This section includes a complete discussion of methodology being followed in the evaluation. It elaborates the population, sample, sampling procedure, its size, method(s) of data collection, statistical procedures and techniques used for data analysis and its interpretation.

9.10.7 Main Findings

His section reports the evaluation results or findings in terms of objectives and provides empirical evidence in support or against the hypothesis. If the results are not conclusive , then try to present some type of explanation to this end. Findings are often presented in visual forms such as graphs, etc.

9.10.8 Implications

In the section of the evaluation report, author makes some comments as to what the findings mean.

9.11 Activities

1. Select an evaluation object and describe it according to the following sub-headings:

- **Rationale**

  .....
  .....
  .....

- **Objectives**

  .....
  .....
  .....

2. Prepare an evaluation design for the object selected for activity No. 1.

- **Evaluation questions**

  .....
  .....
  .....

- **Information needed**

  .....
  .....
  .....

- **Source of evidence**

  .....
  .....
  .....

- **Sample**

  i)Type

  .....
  .....
  .....
  .....
  .....
  .....

  ii)Size

  .....
  .....
  .....
  .....
  .....
  .....

9.12 Self-assessment Exercises

1. Define and discuss various types of evaluation.

2. Enlist different steps involved in conducting evaluation of an extension programme

3. What do you understand by the term evaluation design? Discuss in detail.

Reference

Guba, E.G & Lincoln, Y.S. (1989). Fourth Generation Evaluation. Sage Publications, California.

Bibliography

Bembridge, TJ. 1991 *Practical Guidelines for Agricultural Extension Workers: A Field Manual*, Development Bank of Southern Africa.

Bembridge, TJ. 1993 *The Practice of Agricultural Extension: A Training Manual*, Development Bank of Southern Africa.

Blackburn, D. J.(ed.) 1994 *Extension Handbook: Processes and Practices*, Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc., Ontario, Canada.

Campbell, D. A. & Barker, St. C. 1997, 'Selecting appropriate content and methods in programme delivery', in *Improving Agricultural Extension: A Reference Manual*, eds. B. E. Swanson, R. P. Bentz and A. J. Sofranko, Food and Agricultural Organization, Rome, Italy.

Compton, J. L.1984, 'Extension programme development' in *Agricultural Extension: A Reference Manual*, 2nd. edition, ed. B. E. Swanson, Rome, Italy.

Food and Agricultural Organization 1994 *The Group promotor's Resource Book: A practical Guide to Building Rural Self-help Groups*, Rome, Italy.

Gerster, R. 2000 *Alternative Approaches to Poverty Reduction Strategies*, Swiss Agency for Development and Corporation, Switzerland.

Gajanayake, S. and Gajanayake, J. 1993 *Community Empowerment*, PACT Publications, New York.

Guba, E.G &Lincoln, Y.S. (1989). Fourth Generation Evaluation. Sage Publications, California.

Lindley, W.I. (ed.) 1999 *Communication in Extension: A Teaching Learning Guide*, Food and Agricultural Organisation, Rome, Italy.

Maunder, A. H. (ed.) 1972, *Agricultural Extension: A Reference Manual*, Food and Agricultural Organisation, Rome, Italy.

Mayeske, G. W. 2002 *How to Design Better Programmes: A Staff Centered Stakeholder Approach to Programme Logic Modeling*, The Programme Design Institute Maryland, USA.

Robinson, R. D. 1989 *An Introduction to Helping Adults Learn and Change,* Omni Book Co, USA.

Supe, S. V. 1998 *An Introduction to Extension Education,* 2nd Edition, Oxford and IBH Publishing Co., New Delhi, India.

Swanson, B. E. (Ed.) 1984 *Agricultural Extension: A Reference Manual,* Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome, Italy.

Guba, E.G & Lincoln, Y.S. (1989). Fourth Generation Evaluation. Sage Publications, California.

Swanson, B. E.; Bentz, R. P.& Sofranko, A. J. (eds) 1997, *Improving agricultural Extension: A Reference Manual,* Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome, Italy.

Van Den Ban, A. W. and H.S. Hawkins 1996 *Agricultural Extension,* 2nd Edition, Blackwell Science, Berlin, Germany.