USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

CONSTRUCTING AN EVALUATION REPORT

April 14, 2006

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Richard Blue and Molly Hageboeck, Management Systems International.

CONSTRUCTING AN EVALUATION REPORT

Management Systems International
Corporate Offices
600 Water Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024

Contracted under USAID Contract No. AEP-I-00-00-00024-00

Constructing an Evaluation Report

CONTENTS

GUIDELINES FOR CONSTRUCTING AN EVALUATION REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this TIPS is to provide the user with a general guide to the preparation of an evaluation report. For evaluators, the guide sets out an annotated outline of a generic report, identifying the order of presentation and the types of information most USAID readers expect to find in each section. For general USAID readers, the guide will be helpful in developing a scope of work to conduct evaluations. As with any guide, there are circumstances that require a different approach, in whole or in part.

One of the central challenges in preparing a report is deciding what material to use and in what order, so that the reader is able to follow the logical thread of the report. The following annotated outline is designed to assist in this process. Experienced writers will recognize that constructing a narrative thread is a matter of judgment and skill. Still, like playing a composition by Mozart or Beethoven, one can interpret but should not change the basic musical structure of the work.

Evaluations are about making judgments on the effectiveness of human efforts to intervene in a situation to "make it better" in some way. Evaluators ask, or are asked by their clients: "What was the problem? What did people try to do to address the problem? What were the results, both intended and unintended? And **why** did those results occur?" Often they ask: "Are the results desirable, affordable, replicable, and sustainable?"

Evaluation reports are a combination of accurate description, a blend of existing and new information (evidence), analysis and interpretation of facts, and general conclusions about whether and why the intended results were achieved.

In most evaluations, a judgment is made about the merit or **value** of the intervention. In making such judgments, evaluators should compare results to some standard: the organization's original plan; a widely accepted norm; the expectations of a program's beneficiaries; changes in a situation compared to the baseline, and/or to a group that did not participate in the project. To make evaluations useful, evaluators are usually charged with the task of making recommendations, and, sometimes, stepping back to suggest general lessons one could learn from this experience.

A NOTE ON STYLE AND FORMAT

Good evaluation reports strike a balance between depth and length. As a general rule, reports should be kept to less than 40 pages, with additional materials provided in annexes. Another tradeoff is between the use of sophisticated 'scientific' language and a graphic narrative that captures and holds the interest of the reader. Combine different ways to convey information, such as good quotes, small case studies set in text boxes, and key data displays using clearly labeled data tables and charts. Evaluation reports must be credible and convincing to the immediate stakeholders and client. The evaluation report is also the primary instrument by which an audience beyond the client may be reached. Thus, it is essential that the report be clear, concise, powerful, and persuasive to the general professional reader.

In this guide, the word "project" is used to describe whatever is being evaluated, including activities, projects, programs, strategies, or other definable courses of action of interest to the client. USAID use of the terms may differ for different levels of interventions.

Evaluation reports do have a basic structure. Use Roman Numerals to designate each topic, most of which are common to all reports. The general order of presentation and the specific topics identified below should be followed in preparing USAID evaluation reports. However, the specific organization of the substantive sub-sections of the report (after the Executive Summary) is a matter of some discretion.

COMPONENTS OF AN EVALUATION REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF FIGURES AND/OR TABLES

PREFACE OR FORWARD

Prepare this if the report is part of a series or needs special explanation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is where you thank all the people who provided support during the evaluation.

PROJECT SUMMARY

This summary gives key information on the project including the following:

- Project name and Strategic Objectives (SO);
- Project Number;
- Life of the project (LOP);
- Implementing Partners and contract numbers; and
- Project Funding.

GLOSSARY

The glossary is especially useful if the report uses technical or project specific terminology that would be unfamiliar to the otherwise generally informed reader.

ACRONYMS

Write out the proper names for all the acronyms used in the report. Remember also to do the same in the report on first use.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Executive Summary is an abbreviated version of the most important parts of the report. The busy reader should come away with an understanding of what the project was about, the main evaluation questions, key findings, and major conclusions and recommendations. Everything in the Executive Summary should be based directly on what is in the report. No new information should be presented in the Executive Summary. The balance of successes and problems documented in the full report should be evident to someone who only reads the Executive Summary.

Generally, an Executive Summary should be between three and five pages.

All of the introductory sections above are paginated using lower case Roman Numerals, and do not count against the general limitation of 30 pages.

I. INTRODUCTION

The introduction should inform the reader about the **context** in which the intervention took place. This would include a summary of the relevant history, demography, socio-economic status, and basic political arrangements of the community, country, or region. If the evaluated activities take place in sub-areas of the host country, or if there are other contextual spatial aspects that would help the reader to visualize the task environment, include a map of the target area here or in the next section of the evaluation report.

II. THE DEVELOPMENT PROBLEM AND USAID'S RESPONSE

Every evaluation needs to place the project it examines in context by describing the development problem that prompted USAID to intervene, and the nature of that intervention. This is particularly true for evaluations that focus on the results of an activity or programs and make judgments about the worth of those results. A discussion of the development problem and USAID's intervention may be combined with the context section discussed previously. It does need to be set off as a distinct subject, however.

Despite its importance, many evaluation reports give only cursory attention to the development problem that motivated the USAID project in the first place. At a minimum, an evaluation should characterize the

development problem as it was understood and documented by the activity or program design team. If no description of the problem was provided in the program design documents an evaluation team examined, that fact should be stated. In some evaluations, a team may also be asked to ascertain whether the development problem was stated correctly and whether USAID's response, or intervention, was an appropriate response to the problem.

When an evaluation either presents or reconstructs the development problem a USAID activity or program addressed, it is useful to state the problem as simply as possible, i.e., what was the USAID program trying to fix, improve, remove, or otherwise change for the better. It represents the "gap" between the reality at the start of the intervention and a more desirable condition the intervention attempted to create. When the problem is not well defined or is wrongly stated, the ensuing intervention may be well done (efficiency), but will have little impact (effectiveness).

The Problem Statement should be derived from the documents that led to the intervention, i.e. USAID's activity design documents, its solicitation, and the contractor or grantees' proposal.

Describe in as much detail as possible the nature, scope, and history of the problem that the intervention has tried to address. If this is weak or non-existent, then the evaluation team should try to reconstruct the baseline problem as best they can from available data. Every effort should be made to document the pre-intervention baseline situation (construct a pre-intervention data base that describes the situation when the project began). For example, if the problem is poverty, a credible quantitative baseline should give the reader a fairly precise statement of how many people live below the poverty level (as defined in that particular context) and whether poverty is concentrated among certain groups or in certain physical locations.

A. THE PROBLEM STATEMENT

A **Problem Statement** should explain what it was that an activity or program set out to fix or change. It should also describe any theories that were set forth in design documents, or emerged from other literature the evaluation team reviewed, that attempt to explain why the development problem exists. For example, poverty may have been described as being a function of land and weather conditions or it may have been linked in the minds of the designers of USAID's program to government policies. It is important, from an evaluation perspective, to know which, from a range of theories about the problem, the design team relied upon in crafting the intervention USAID funded. In its description of the problem, the evaluation team should indicate whether design documents offered a clear theory of the problem or not. Unfortunately, many design documents list a number of factors such as unemployment, low literacy, other social factors, without being very precise about which factors are most important or how they contribute to the 'problem.'

When baseline information is available, it can be helpful to include charts and tables with the quantitative data describing the baseline conditions at the beginning of the project. Here it is helpful to insert another map of the problem area. Sometimes photographs can be used to illustrate a problem, such as illegal logging in watersheds, especially if you have "before" and "after" photos. Plan to introduce the "after" photos as evidence in the Findings section of the evaluation report.

B. THE THEORY OF THE INTERVENTION

The reader now knows all that is necessary about the context, the problem, and the various explanations of what is causing or contributing to the problem. Now the reader wants to know what the activity was about. What did USAID try to do about the problem – what was the nature of the intervention it supported? Even if you have not been asked to evaluate design, management or implementation issues,

laying out the project's design and implementation structure helps the reader to understand your evaluation findings and conclusions.

What was the activity or program about? In this section the evaluator must provide the reader a concise picture of:

a. What the project was going to do;

b. What the objectives were;

c. How it was to be done;

d. Where it was to be done;

e. Who was going to do it; and

f. At what cost?

Use this section to explain USAID's objectives and the intended results of the intervention. Did USAID intend to eliminate or simply reduce the level of the problem it saw? Did it intend to change the status of the problem nationally or only in a limited geographic area, or for a specific subset of the population? It is appropriate to use the exact wording of USAID's objectives in this section. Here too, a map is often useful, especially if you can show whether the concentration of the activities was consistent with the spatial distribution of the development problem.

The Design of the Project

Every intervention is based on the expectation that "if" a set of activities is undertaken, "then" some set of changes or improvements in the situation or problem those activities address will occur. USAID uses the term "development hypothesis" to describe these cause and effect propositions. Most USAID programs rely on more than one "development hypothesis," i.e., they rely on a chain of "if-then" propositions to link specific activities to intermediate results, which in turn are expected to have an impact on the problem the program addresses. Many USAID programs express these "development hypotheses" in graphic form through a Results Framework (*Building A Results Framework.* Performance and Monitoring TIPS Series, Number 15. PPC/CDIE. 2000. http://pdf.dec.org/pdf_docs).

In an evaluation, it is important to recreate the logic of USAID's intervention for the reader by explaining the underlying hypothesis and causal logic used by the activity designers to formulate the intervention. In this section, describe, using a chart or graphic representation, the "if –then" propositions that explain why the design team thought the activity or program would cause or contribute to the desired result? What was the "if-then" logic underlying the actions to be carried out in USAID's program or activity? If the theory on which USAID relied is well grounded in scientific or development research, and the evaluation team either knows that research or finds it in the activity documents, cite the research in this section.

The Program Implementation

This part of the report gives the reader a clear picture of what the designers of the intervention wanted to accomplish and how they were going to go about doing it.

The section should describe the contractor and/or grantees who were involved. It should also describe any direct support USAID provided to a host government entity or a private, non-governmental organization. In this section, provide information on USAID's level of investment/budget for this program/activity. Finally, describe any significant changes in the budget for the program/activity, the

Results Framework, indicators and targets, and/or the implementing partner arrangements since implementation began.

III. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

This section sets out the purpose of the evaluation and describes the intended uses of the evaluation. Stating the purpose of the evaluation helps the reader to understand the management or program decision that led to the evaluation, and to frame their own critical reading of the report from that perspective.

Generally speaking, USAID's statement of the evaluation purpose is found in the evaluation SOW. The team can summarize that statement in this section and refer readers to the evaluation SOW, normally one of the first annexes to any evaluation report. Any additional information on USAID's rationale for undertaking an evaluation that may come from discussions the evaluation team has with USAID should be included in this section.

Some USAID evaluations are mandatory. Still, it is useful to go beyond, "We have do it," as an answer to the question of "why" the evaluation is being done.

This section also should include the questions that the evaluation will attempt to answer as derived from the evaluation SOW. If only the main evaluation questions in the SOW are presented here, that should be made clear and a reference to the full set of questions should be provided.

In this section, state the order in which the team will answer the questions.

IV. RESEARCH DESIGN AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The credibility of an evaluation's conclusions rests on the quality of the evidence that supports them. This, in turn depends on the appropriateness of the research design and methodology for data collection and analysis used by the evaluation team.[1] As USAID-commissioned evaluation reports are public documents and increasingly being used by professional evaluators and social science researchers, it is important to explain clearly the methods used to collect the data in an evaluation.

In this section the evaluation design (quasi-experimental, mixed methods, longitudinal data, time-series comparisons, randomized trials, etc.) and the methods used to collect data should be presented in summary form. The description should include the unit of analysis, selection of samples, data collection instruments, types of data collected, analytic techniques used, who did it, and when it was done. This can become a rather lengthy description. If so, summarize it and place supplementary information on these points in an annex. Include questionnaires, observation checklists, descriptions of sampling procedures, data analysis procedures, and other supporting materials in the Annex.

Here, if space permits, a very useful summary chart can be displayed which aligns the SOW questions with the data type and source used to answer each question.

[1] Standards for the quality of evidence presented in evaluations are provided in USAID data quality guidance ADS Chapters 578 and 203. The need for high standards of evidence in evaluations, particularly evidence of program impact, was also stressed in guidance issued by the Office on Management and Budget (OMB) (http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part/2004_program_eval.pdf)

For example:

Evaluation Question	Data Type	Data Source
1. Change in Legislative Framework for SME sector, 2001-2005	1. Questionnaire 2. ABA/CEELI ratings 3. Legislative record	Structured Key Informant Interviews. ABA/CEELI Rule of Law Assessment and Ministry of Justice Reports
2. Judges' knowledge of key elements of recent commercial code amendments	1. Questionnaire	Survey questionnaire administered to random sample of appellate court judges

Pay attention in this section to describing the data sources used when making comparisons between the baseline (status of a problem or situation at the time a USAID intervention began) and the time when the evaluation was conducted. The reader should know from reading this section whether findings about activity results are based solely on a "before" and "after" comparison for the target area or population, or based on evidence that also examines the extent of change in a comparable situation or population that did not benefit from USAID's intervention (control group).

Provide your readers with enough information on the analyses the evaluation team carried out so that they feel confident that the procedures used were adequate and appropriate. Inadequate analysis of data gathered during an evaluation results in a weak evaluation report that is less useful to USAID than was intended. Describe the analysis procedure in the methods annex where you have provided information on data collection methods, particularly complex procedures with which readers may not be well acquainted.

Most evaluations are constrained by limited time and resources. These influence the overall research design and data collection methodology; these constraints also have an impact on the validity of the findings and conclusions. Other factors such as timing of the evaluation, data base limitations, the values of the evaluators and others may also affect the quality of the evidence an evaluation team gathers and the validity of the conclusions they reach.

It is important to identify in summary form any data limitations of which the evaluation team is aware, including data limitations that affect the evaluation team's ability to attribute results it observed to USAID's program rather than to some other plausible cause or explanation of those changes. If appropriate, confidence levels can be included for each data type that was collected using probability sampling methods.

This section is also a good place to briefly describe the members of the evaluation team, stressing their relevant qualifications. Evaluation is the act of making informed judgments about the "value" of something. Most readers want to know whether the evaluators are qualified to do so.

V. FINDINGS

This section must, at a minimum, address the questions posed in the evaluation SOW. If the SOW has multiple questions related to a single macro question, the answers should be bundled in a manner that contributes to answering the macro-question.

The substance of the Findings section depends very much on the questions that have to be answered. In general, these findings can be presented in two parts:

A. PROCESS FINDINGS ABOUT THE MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

In many projects, how the project is implemented may be as important a finding in an evaluation as whether the objectives were achieved. The questions generally answered in a process evaluation are:

- Were the right people in place?
- Were the inputs well organized and timely?
- Were reports and evaluations done and were they used?
- Did the implementation process interfere with or advance the achievement of stated objectives?

The extent to which the evaluation pays detailed attention to management issues is usually a function of the Scope of Work and whether the evaluation is a mid-term or final (end of funding period) evaluation, or is motivated by suspected implementation management issues. Process questions are also a principal focus of scale-up projects where the intervention is already known to produce certain results (polio vaccine, oral rehydration therapy). In these cases, the key evaluation questions examine the degree to which the proper processes are being followed.

B. OUTCOME AND RESULTS FINDINGS ABOUT THE PROJECT'S ACHIEVEMENTS AND CONSEQUENCES

Results are usually an important evaluation focus. The level of results on which an evaluation reports will be a function of whether the evaluation was carried out at the activity, Intermediate Results (IR), or Strategic Objective (SO) level. Some evaluations examine results achieved part-way through the implementation of an activity or program. Others look at results at the end of period of time during which USAID funding was provided. Still other evaluations, including most evaluations carried out by PPC/CDIE on behalf of the Agency as a whole, examine longer-term impact, including the extent to which results were sustained after USAID funding terminated.

C. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

While most evaluation reports include separate sections on findings, conclusions, and recommendations, it is also possible to prepare a report using an alternative structure, e.g. addressing one question at a time and providing findings, conclusions and recommendations on each question without reference to the evaluation's responses to other questions posed in the evaluation SOW. This alternative structure works best in situations where the evaluation questions are very different from each other.

D. FINDINGS ARE EVIDENCE

Regardless of the report structure an evaluation team uses, it is important to remember that **findings are facts**. They emerge from document reviews, observations, interviews and other data collection activities in which the evaluation team engages. In evaluations that compare the status of a situation to norms or targets, the absence of progress toward those norms is as much a fact as is evidence that progress occurred. Some findings are derived from only one data point, e.g., government records on the number of

bills passed by parliament. Other findings emerge only after survey or structured observation data have been analyzed, e.g., the percentage of the population that knows how HIV/AIDS is transmitted.

Empirical findings in which USAID can place a high degree of confidence are what distinguish a high quality evaluation from a casual trip report. Evaluation findings serve as the foundation upon from which conclusions and recommendations are derived. Findings should not be confused with conclusions.

E. DATA ANALYSIS

Analysis is an integral step in the process by which an evaluation team arrives at its findings. Often there are several steps in an analysis process, e.g.:

- Tabulation of raw data and calculation of frequencies and percentages for a survey, set of structured observations, or physical measures.

- Comparison of data for a target area or group to non-target areas or groups, comparisons to international norms or standards, and/or comparison to expectations, e.g., targets USAID established. (For example, compare the percentage of people who adopted a new agricultural practice by the end of USAID's activity with the percentage who used the practice at the beginning of the project and with people who were not included in USAID's program).

- Examination of various explanations as to WHY a result or impact has occurred. This is a critical part of the evaluation team's responsibility to explain, rather than just observe. For every finding, the team needs to discuss as many alternative explanations as possible. This means using various available forms of correlation tests, including cross-tabulations, regression analysis, factor analysis and qualitative analysis, as appropriate, for every finding. These tools help the team test out as many plausible alternative explanations as possible before reaching closure on a particular finding.

When evaluations cannot make such statements based on clear "before and after" data or "with the program and without the program" comparisons, consider other approaches. For example, one method of obtaining information about other plausible explanations of a set of results, is to simply ask the beneficiaries why those results or changes occurred. As long as the questions are asked in a neutral manner and asked of people who do not have a stake in whether the answer is "USAID's program" (i.e., program providers, USAID staff, etc.), the answers to questions of this sort will often reveal not only whether people think a USAID activity or program is responsible for results, but also what other policies, programs, or activities these observers noticed and considered to be part of the reason or even the main explanation of why results or changes occurred.

When examining causality, it often helps to look back at the original activity problem statement and the design document to isolate the causal theory and logic underlying the original design. Sometimes very well executed interventions don't achieve intended results because of a faulty understanding of what was causing the problem, or an inappropriate activity design. This is why evaluation teams often need to revisit the program theory with the data gathered during the evaluation process and answer the question: "To what extent did the project achieve the results hypothesized in the program design?" This analysis may need to be done regardless of whether that question was asked in the Scope of Work provided by the client.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions involve judgments. They emerge when evaluative reasoning is used to interpret evaluation findings, e.g., to determine the importance or worth of an activity/program given the set of empirical findings about its context, the problem it tried to address, its management and its performance the evaluation team has presented.

It is in this section that an evaluation team most often sets forth its deductions about why a project succeeded or failed to achieve its intended results. Inferences an evaluation team draws about the sustainability of an activity/program based on facts about a local organization's management capacity or cost-recovery procedures are also conclusions. Evaluation findings, in this sense, are similar to a set of medical symptoms, while conclusions are like the diagnosis. Conclusions interpret what findings mean.

This section is often where the evaluator's use of judgment is most apparent. Conclusions should be the capstone of the evaluation report's narrative thread. They tie together the team's findings and analyses presented in previous sections as well as establish the case for the recommendations in the final section.

Conclusions answer the "big" questions posed in the Scope of Work. Usually these involve whether the benefits of the intervention were sufficient to warrant the effort, and whether those benefits will be temporary or lasting (sustainability). The conclusions can include an analysis of **unintended consequences,** stating, for example, that while the project did not achieve its objectives, it did produce other valuable, though unintended, results, or conversely that while the project did achieve its objectives, it also contributed to some unintended negative effects. These distinctions can be important, especially when the findings are ambiguous about the project's achievements. It may be that the objectives were only partially met because the objectives were set too high, yet the project still accomplished much of value. Or the evaluation might conclude that the original problem analysis was flawed, or the initial project theory was incorrect, leading to substantial expenditure of effort with very little impact.

Evaluation teams sometimes find conclusions to be the most difficult part of an evaluation report to write. Experienced evaluation teams learn to develop iterative processes for discussing potential conclusions among themselves during the data analysis phases, making sure that proposed conclusions are supported by the team's findings and analyses. The credibility of a set of conclusions is a function of the evidence and expertise an evaluation team draws upon in reaching them.

At the same time, it is unrealistic to expect that your findings and analysis are so air tight that no other interpretation is possible. Keep in mind that you had limited time and resources to reach this point. Sometimes it is necessary to present a 'based on the evidence available' type conclusion even though you recognize that the data is not as strong as you would like. This is where your team's professional judgment and experience come into play. The evaluation conclusions sum up the balance between the project's strengths and weaknesses, especially when results are attributed to the USAID project rather than some other cause such as a regime change.

How a team presents it conclusions is also important, particularly conclusions that readers will perceive as being critical or "negative." Some reports intentionally include sections that present "positive" conclusions and "negative" conclusions, often presenting the former before the latter. How you present negative conclusions can increase or hinder the likelihood that your conclusions and recommendations will be accepted.

You often must give the client bad news that must be heard. Some reports set out "Positive" and "Negative" conclusions. Most projects accomplish something, but there are almost always weaknesses and failures. Both need to be stated in the conclusions.

The evaluation conclusions sum up the balance between the project's strengths and weaknesses, especially when results are attributed to the USAID project rather than to some other cause.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

This section focuses on the future. It is where you get a chance to say what changes need to be made.

Almost every evaluation SOW asks for recommendations, which, in the judgment of the evaluators, may range from minor 'tweaking' of a project design or implementation plan, to major restructuring, or ending the entire project. If the project was a complete success, a team may want to recommend continuation, "scaling up" the intervention to serve more people or a larger area, or an analysis of its replication potential in other regions with similar problems.

Prior to preparing a set of recommendations, an evaluation team is encouraged to review the purpose and uses USAID envisioned when it commissioned the evaluation. These purposes should be taken into account when preparing the recommendations section. In some instances, evaluation results will also indicate the need for recommendations that were not anticipated in the evaluation SOW.

Other keys to good recommendations are that they:

a. Follow directly from the evaluation's findings and the conclusions;

b. Are supported by thorough and sound analysis and evaluative reasoning;

c. Are "actionable," meaning the changes are feasible and can be made by USAID and its implementing partners; and

d. Identify who needs to take the recommended actions, whether USAID, the implementing partner, the private sector or some element of the host government organization.

Most recommendation should be within the management authority of the key evaluation stakeholders. There are times when an evaluation team may feel that their findings and conclusions suggest the need for policy changes that can only be made by high-level stakeholders within the host government or the U.S. government.

At a time when USAID programs are becoming more closely integrated with the long-term foreign policy interests of the United States, evaluators may want to address policy recommendations to higher level authorities. Such recommendations should be clearly addressed to the party responsible for their execution.

VIII. LESSONS LEARNED

Efforts to derive 'Lessons Learned' are not always appropriate, nor are all clients interested in this. Usually, end of project or ex-post impact studies present an opportunity to derive lessons learned, as the project experience is longer and more mature than would be found in a mid-term evaluation.

IX. THE ANNEX

This is a useful place to put important material that doesn't go into the main body of the report, but can be helpful to the reader who wants to know more.

The material may distracts from the flow of the narrative or may not fit, because more space is needed than is allowed in the body of the report. Annexes should be written as stand alone pieces, since readers often turn to them selectively.

What usually goes into the annex?

- The Evaluation Scope of Work (SOW);
- A more complete description of the methods used, copies of the data collection instruments, and a description of the sampling and/or analysis procedures that were used.
- A list of persons interviewed may also be an element of the methods annex, though not every evaluation team provides the names of specific individuals it interviewed;
- In-depth analyses of specific issues in the report, including technical issues or additional information on the project context or design such as maps and additional evidentiary documents of interest;
- If necessary, dissenting views **by a team member** who does not agree with team's findings, conclusions, or recommendations;
- If necessary, **dissenting client views,** especially about conclusions and recommendations; and
- Bibliography of documents reviewed.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER EXPLORATION OF HOW TO PREPARE EVALUATION REPORTS

A reasonably thorough web search using key words "report writing" or "evaluation reports" will give the reader access to how different organizations approach the subject. Some of the web sites are listed below:

- www.canberra.edu.au/study skills/writing/reports.html
- http://ccpp.accc.ca/ftp/cccp/EvalGuide/Rev-Guide4.pdf
- http://www.tbs-set.gc.ca/eval/dev/career/workshops-ateliers/aawer-amrre01_e.asp#s25

  This site is produced by the Treasury Board of Canada. It is a 'self study' approach to developing skills in "The Art and Architecture of Writing Evaluation Reports."

- http://www.brunerfoundation.org/ei/funders/Data%20R.reporting.pdf

Listed as the Bruner Foundation Guidebook, 2004, this website contains many useful tips on how to prepare a persuasive report. The Bruner Foundation was an early advocate of participatory evaluation for the not-for-profit world.

- www.ausaid.gov.au/ausguide/ausguidelines/14-1-4.cfm

  The Australian Government's guide to preparing evaluation reports on development projects.

- http://www.europa.eu.int/comm./budget/evaluation/guide/guide05_en

  The European Union's rather lengthy guide to the preparation of evaluation reports doesn't place any page limits.