

Learning From Experience: World Vision Australia Annual Evaluation Review 2015



Summary

Understanding the quality of our evidence base allows us to be more confident in our communications and decision making. A consistent approach to assessing the strengths and weaknesses of evidence assists with making more effective programming decisions.

Each year World Vision Australia reviews the evaluation reports from projects it funded which were completed and evaluated in the previous financial year. The Annual Evaluation Review examines the outcomes of the evaluated projects and the quality of those evaluations, providing an overview of the impact of our work and the reliability of the assessment of that impact.

In the 2014 financial year, 111 projects were eligible for evaluation and 94 reports were available to be reviewed.

In 27 (29 percent) of the evaluated projects, the highest level of changes were observed in social, economic, environmental and physical conditions in the target communities, which mirrors the achievement in recent years.

Forty-one (44 percent) evaluations reported on one or more of the World Vision "standard" or "highly recommended" indicators of Child Well-being Outcomes, which is considerably higher than the previous year (31 percent).

This year, the indicators of quality were expanded to provide more insight into the nature of our evaluations. In 2014, 68 (72 percent) evaluations used both qualitative and quantitative methods, which is the same as 2013. Significantly, 59 evaluations (63 percent) incorporated comparison to baseline data, a sustained improvement from 38 percent when the review was first undertaken in 2009. Evaluations were also benchmarked against the Bond Evidence Principles which are an industry standard to assess evidence quality.

This year we also considered the cross-cutting themes of gender and disability in order to get a snapshot of how well these are being addressed.

Six years since the first Annual Evaluation Review (2009), we are now beginning to see the impact of a World Vision Australia-wide focus on the importance of evaluations and their quality. The proportion of projects evaluated is higher, and some indicators of quality are rising. However, there is a need to consistently improve evaluation quality across all projects.

Sustained effort and resourcing in this regard is essential to deliver the solid foundation underpinning our ability to communicate credibly about the impact of the work we are doing.



Introduction

The Annual Evaluation Review is a review of the evaluation reports from projects funded by World Vision Australia which were completed and evaluated in the previous financial year.

The Annual Evaluation Review aims to investigate the results of the evaluated projects and the quality of those evaluations, and to explore learning from the evaluations worth sharing across World Vision Australia and beyond.

Evaluations of World Vision projects require substantial time, skill and resources. They can result in valuable information which, if used, can play an important part in improving our programs and also ensuring we can engage credibly and compellingly with our supporters.

This review covers a number of key elements – project eligibility, outcomes for communities, child well-being outcomes, indicators of evaluation quality, performance against evidence quality benchmarks, gender and disability reporting, key lessons from evaluation reports, and case studies. Finally, we identify opportunities to improve our capacity for quality project evaluations and make some recommendations.

What we found in FYI4

Project eligibility

In the 2014 financial year, 111 projects were eligible for evaluation and 94 had evaluation reports available to be reviewed and were included (see Figure 1). This is a lower number of projects eligible for evaluation and a much higher proportion of reports available than in previous years.

These differences reflect the more intensive process taken to identify evaluation reports this year, which also provided much more information on projects that were ineligible for review (eg, short-term humanitarian aid projects, etc). Twenty-six of the included reports (28 percent) were of Area Development Programs (ADPs) and 28 were funded by the Australian Government through the Australian NGO Cooperative Program (ANCP).

Figure 1: Number of projects included the Annual Evaluation Review

Financial year	Projects eligible for evaluation	Evaluation reports available to be reviewed	
	N	Ν	%
2014	111	94	85
2013	133	78	59
2012	215	74	34
2011	300	95	32
2010	211	58	27
2009	222	46	21

The proportion of evaluation reports available to be reviewed is a substantial increase over previous years, which reflects the cumulative efforts of World Vision Australia and our World Vision National Office partners to ensure that end of project evaluations occur and the reports are shared, and this should be acknowledged. However the process required to identify these reports is still time-consuming and onerous, which highlights the need for improved information systems and project tracking. Ready access to information about our projects will support us to more effectively assess our programming and report to our supporters.

Outcomes for communities

In 27 (29 percent) of the evaluated projects, changes were observed in social, economic, environmental and/or physical conditions in the target communities.

This level of systemic change requires substantial investment of time, effort and skill. It is only possible in the presence of changes in practice and behaviour (56 projects, 60 percent); which are in turn dependent on improved capacity (85 projects, 91 percent); and increased awareness (93 projects, 100 percent).¹

The proportion of projects contributing to this highest level of change is the same as for projects ending in 2013 (29 percent), yet not as high as previous years. However, we consistently achieve increased community capacity in our projects, which demonstrates our role in community building. See Figure 2.



These figures should be seen as indicative only, as they do not measure the quantity or quality of change, rather only that some changes at the specified level have taken place. Therefore they should not be seen as stand-alone indicators on the impact on child well-being or on the efficiency of our programming.

However, there were projects that achieved meaningful impact within target communities. Whilst further investigation is required to assess the long-term sustainability of such changes, there were many examples of success. Examples include increases in food security, increases in children's educational attainment, improved access to water and decreases in malnutrition.

Child Well-being Outcomes

Forty-one (44 percent) of the evaluations we reviewed reported on one or more of the World Vision "standard" or "highly recommended" indicators of Child Well-being Outcomes. These were more likely to be reported by Area Development Program projects (73 percent) than Other Community Projects (36 percent) or Australian Government funded projects (32 percent).

The Child Well-being Outcomes assess World Vision's contributions to the well-being of children in the communities where we work. The Compendium of Indicators for Child Well-being, developed by World Vision International in 2012, provides a common set of indicators for measuring each of the Child Well-being Outcomes. It is expected that all National Offices report annually on progress towards agreed child well-being targets, so it is critical that evaluation reports include measurement of these indicators.

The most commonly used standard indicators in this review were:

- proportion of children who are functionally literate (22 projects);
- prevalence of stunting in children under five years of age (12 projects);
- proportion of children under five with diarrhoea who received correct management of diarrhoea (12 projects);
- prevalence of wasting in children under five years of age (11 projects); and
- coverage of essential vaccines among children (11 projects).

This is the third year that we have examined this data, and it shows an increase on last year's result of 31 percent of evaluations reviewed reporting on indicators of Child Well-being Outcomes.

Indicators of evaluation quality

Assessing the evaluation reports against agreed quality standards allows us to draw conclusions and track change. A twostep review process was implemented – firstly a general assessment of all reports using "indicators of quality", and secondly, shortlisted reports were rated against the Bond Evidence Principles.²

This year, the indicators of quality were expanded to provide more insight into the nature of our evaluations (Figure 3). The indicators included the use of quantitative and qualitative methods, a clear description of the methods of analysis, comparison to baseline data, acknowledgment of limitations and potential biases, and use of participatory approaches to include beneficiary perspectives.

In 2014, 68 (72 percent) evaluations used both qualitative and quantitative methods, which was the same as 2013. Significantly, 59 evaluations (63 percent) incorporated comparison to baseline data, a sustained improvement from 38 percent when the review was first undertaken in 2009. Refer to Figure 4.

Figure 3: Indicators of evaluation quality

	Number of projects	Percent of projects
Clear description of the methods of analysis	50	53
Comparison to baseline data or other appropriate data source	59	63
Participatory approach/perspectives of beneficiaries included	57	61
Qualitative methods used to collect and analyse data	75	80
Quantitative methods used to collect and analyse data	75	80
Section on limitations and potential biases	62	66





Projects either funded directly by World Vision (Area Development Programs and Other Community Projects) or the Australian Government were analysed further to assess if there were differences in guality. Projects funded by the Australian Government were marginally more likely to have included the indicators of quality, when compared to Area Development Program evaluations, which reflects the increased reporting demands from such funding.

Figure 5: Number of "quality indicators" achieved, by project funding source



Evaluation reports that were undertaken with a reasonable degree of rigour³ were subjected to an in-depth review using the Bond Evidence Principles Tool which is becoming the industry standard for assessment of evaluation quality. This tool has also been adopted by World Vision International in the 2014 Child Well-being Report.

This tool assesses five domains:

- Voice and Inclusion: the perspectives of people living in poverty, including the most marginalised, are included in the evidence, and a clear picture is provided of who is affected and how.
- Appropriateness: the evidence is generated through methods that are justifiable given the nature of the purpose of the assessment.
- Triangulation: the evidence has been generated using a mix of methods, data sources and perspectives.
- Contribution: the evidence explores how change happens and the contribution of the intervention and factors outside the intervention in explaining change.
- Transparency: the evidence discloses the details of the data sources and methods used, the results achieved, and any limitations in the data or conclusions.

Fifty-two of the 94 evaluations (55 percent) met the criteria to be considered for assessment against the Bond Evidence Principles. Paralleling last year's findings, these more rigorous evaluation reports usually addressed the Appropriateness, Triangulation and Transparency domains to a "minimum" or "good" quality standard; and Contribution was often addressed to a "minimum" or "good" standard, whilst the Voice and Inclusion domain was the most poorly addressed (Figure 6). Thirty-five (67 percent) of the 52 evaluation reports met at least three domains of evidence at a "minimum" or higher standard, with 13 (25 percent) addressing all five domains. Four projects (eight percent) failed to achieve minimum standard in any domain.

Comparable results were found in the Child Well-being Report, indicating that there is significant opportunity for improvement across the World Vision Partnership.

In this past year the Bond Evidence Principles were shared with National Offices for the first time as the benchmark for quality evidence, and so we hope to see an improvement in forthcoming annual evaluation reviews.

Figure 6: Proportion of shortlisted reports meeting each domain of Bond Evidence Principles (n=52)



There are a number of specific areas that we can improve:

- Involving the beneficiaries in the evaluation beyond participation, for example, in the evaluation design or analysis of findings.
- Clearly presenting the perspectives of the most excluded and marginalised in the community.
- Improving the use and analysis of collected data. Where data has been disaggregated, it is often minimal, and not used in a way to explore the project's impact on different sectors of the community.
- Improving the validation of results and recommendations. Validation is often quite weak. If results are shared with the community and stakeholders, they are usually not validated.
- Being explicit in sharing the perspectives of different stakeholders, and presenting conflicting or divergent findings.
- Exploring alternative factors such as the contribution of others to the observed project outcomes.
- Grounding conclusions and recommendations in the analysis of data.







▲ World Vision staff organise the distribution of relief items to flood victims in Honiara, the capital of the Solomon Islands. Photo: Rachel Skeates/World Vision.

▲ World Vision's Kon Dimo (left) and local farmers discuss the progress of a large community cassava farm in South Sudan. Photo: Jon Warren/World Vision.

Case studies

The use of appropriate data collection methods and strong evaluation reporting increases our confidence in the outcomes of a project, and allows us to demonstrate its impact. Here we share two case studies of projects which have made a significant impact within their respective communities.

Malaita Community Resilience and Livelihoods Project, Solomon Islands

This project partnered with 15 rural communities in southern Malaita Province of the Solomon Islands who wanted to be better prepared to mitigate the risks of climate change and natural disasters that threatened them, thereby increasing their resilience and improving their livelihoods. The project was supported by the Australian Government, in partnership with World Vision Australia.

The project evaluation sought to assess the influence of the project on communities' resilience to climatic and natural hazards and to gather lessons learned and recommendations to inform the development of a Solomon Islands Climate Change Adaptation (CCA)/community resilience project model.

In just four years, this project achieved a significant change in the level of awareness and confidence felt by men, women and youth in their communities' ability to mitigate the impact of natural disasters and minimise the loss of life. Through participatory disaster risk assessment activities, communities identified the risks and vulnerabilities they face, conducted their own risk planning and identified available resources needed in case of natural disaster occurring.

- 61 percent of community members rated their knowledge of natural disasters as "high" (up from one percent).
- 70 percent of community members expressed "full confidence" in their community's ability to manage risks related to disasters (up from three percent).

- 95 percent of community members surveyed knew that the community had a person or a committee responsible for disaster planning.
- 94 percent knew of the community disaster preparedness plan (up from eight percent).
- More than 70 percent of community members reported having a disaster supply kit, which included a range of items to be kept aside, such as torches, spare clothing and food (up from five percent).
- 96 percent of community members were aware of their community's early warning system (up from seven percent).

This project clearly demonstrated improved household financial management in target communities. More than 56 percent of community members participated in financial training, and evaluation data revealed a growing demand for Savings Groups.

- 70 percent of the community members surveyed now use a Savings Group, improving the resilience of households affected by natural disasters.
- More than 20 percent reported saving more than 50 percent of their income, compared to only six percent at baseline.

Prior to this project, events such as sea-level rise, king tides and tsunamis were perceived as natural events whose occurrence and impacts are unavoidable. Through this project, communities learnt that they could plan for these natural disasters and thereby mitigate the effect of the events on their lives and livelihoods. Without having recent experience of natural disasters and the impacts of climate change, these communities may have been less likely to attend the disaster preparedness workshops and implement the disaster risk preparedness initiatives that they learnt about.

Integrating the project with an existing World Vision Community Economic Development project strengthened the communities' contextual understanding of the role of financial planning in disaster mitigation and broadened the impact of both projects' interventions.



Tanna Helti Komuniti Project, Vanuatu

The Tanna Helti Komuniti Project aimed to improve the health status of children (0-5 years) and women who were pregnant or breastfeeding, in order to address the intergenerational cycle of malnutrition. It was undertaken with 79 villages in South West Tanna Island, in Vanuatu's south, during 2011-2014, and was supported by the Australian Government, in partnership with World Vision Australia.

This project was strikingly successful, with the end of project evaluation demonstrating substantial improvements in childhood nutrition, important changes in hygiene behaviours and significant reductions in diarrhoea prevalence. For example:

- The proportion of mothers who reported increasing their food intake while pregnant rose from 28 percent to 62 percent.
- Breastfeeding within the first hour after birth increased from 60 percent to 71 percent.
- Colostrum feeding increased from 86 percent to 98 percent.
- Exclusive breastfeeding practice increased from 52 percent to 90 percent.
- Mothers offering Vitamin A tablets to children increased from five percent to 65 percent.
- Stunting in children reduced by 10 percent in three years, from 47 percent to 37 percent.
- Incidence of diarrhoea decreased from 39 percent to 22 percent.
- Proportion of children with full immunisation coverage increased from 39 percent to 73 percent.
- Mothers attending a single antenatal care visit increased from 76 percent to 96 percent.
- Mothers attending four or more antenatal care visits increased from 39 percent to 65 percent.

The project evaluation highlighted several key factors that contributed to the improvements seen. These include the extent to which the project was community-owned, sensitivity to gender issues and integration with water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) activities.

The clear, thoughtful communication of baseline findings, which raised awareness of the importance of good nutrition and hygiene, helped to facilitate early, strong engagement of the community and galvanised the community to take action.

Effective community ownership of the Community Malnutrition Elimination Officers (CMEOs) activity was also vital. The name and role of CMEOs was developed and owned by the community, and CMEOs were selected and supported by the community. Establishing this level of ownership, and the relationships required to underpin it, was time-consuming and complex but ultimately foundational for the project's success.

Developing a community cookbook was also a key activity for building ownership across the entire community. Popular local recipes were recreated in collaboration with CMEOs and staff to ensure each meal was nutritionally balanced and communities clearly enjoyed and actively engaged with the activity. As an unintended benefit, it was observed that after participating in the cookbook development, more women began sharing their ideas in workshops and communicating more openly during forums.

Working effectively with both men and women in the community was crucial to the project's success. Initially it was vital to efficiently communicate the results of the baseline study in order to build community engagement; later to discuss nutrition and understand the multiple factors that affected nutritional decisions; and by the final year, project staff, volunteers and community members were able to discuss taboo topics like family planning and contraception.

Further benefits arose from aligning the project with existing World Vision Vanuatu Water and Sanitation Hygiene programming in the region, providing opportunities for valuable cross learning between staff and communities.

Key lessons from evaluation reports

In previous years we have fully documented the factors associated with positive and negative project outcomes.⁴ This year's Annual Evaluation Review affirms those learnings and some common themes have emerged.

Positive project outcomes were more likely when:

- was relevant to the beneficiaries' needs;
- there was a strong partnership with key stakeholders, including government, from design to project completion. Shared goals and alignment with government policy was especially important;
- capacity building occurred for women and men, community members, local professionals, faith leaders and project staff;
- change were well articulated and understood by project participants; and
- project activities were appropriate and well implemented, and at times innovative and creative.

Figure 7: Most common words associated with factors related to positive project outcomes



Projects failed to fulfil their potential when:

- the design was weak, and theory of change poorly considered;
- there was poor coordination with other agencies or partners;
- there was insufficient human capacity, in terms of technical or management skills, or resourcing sufficient to implement all of the project's activities, and project capacity building was inadequate for staff and the community;
- there was limited community engagement, due to lack of interest or project relevance;
- project management issues such as delayed project implementation and project staff turnover resulted in loss of momentum and reduced achievements; and

Outcomes for gender equality and women's empowerment

The global development community is increasingly focused on the influence of traditional gender roles on individuals' health and well-being and the implications for program design and effectiveness. To understand how well this is addressed within World

· meaningful community engagement occurred throughout the project, involving women, men, girls and boys, and the project

• the design was strong and well contextualised, meeting the needs of the community. The strategy and project's theory of

community capacity building activities were too ambitious, and didn't allow for ongoing support and reinforcement of key messages.

Vision Australia projects, more detailed data was collected this year regarding the assessment of projects' impact on women, men, girls and boys. Sixty-three (67 percent) of the evaluation reports included sex disaggregated data. However, this is often at a simplistic level, for example, recording the proportion of women and men who participated in a household survey. As the requirement for analysis increased, the proportion of evaluations providing this level of assessment decreased (Figure 8).

Figure 8: Level of gender assessment in evaluation reports



In 19 of the evaluated projects (20 percent), the programming effect on girls and boys, women and men has been explicitly included, to varying extents, in evaluation reporting. Programming contributing to gender equality or the empowerment of women and girls was found to be both gender-specific programming and sectoral programming or Area Development Programs which mainstreamed considerations of gender.

Area Development Programs in Uganda, for example, included community gender equality training which was found to contribute to the almost unanimous importance placed on equal education opportunities for both boys and girls.⁵ Health programs in Vanuatu reported learning regarding the importance of targeting chiefs and community leaders as change agents for topics such as nutrition, hygiene and, of critical importance for women, family planning – promoting increased communication and decision making between women and men.⁶ The impact of economic development programming on women was also captured in evaluation reports. For example, the appropriateness of beekeeping as an enterprise for women was reported in Ethiopia,⁷ and improved access to credit for income generation led to an improvement in women's "income and economic power" in Senegal:

Programming which effectively targeted women has been shown to have "significantly impacted on improving the welfare of children as in Senegalese society, child survival through the support of their health problems and protection is delegated to women."⁸

Examples of gender-specific activities included working with faith-based institutions and biblical messaging in the Southern Africa Regional Office⁹ and Solomon Islands¹⁰ to challenge harmful social norms and beliefs regarding the value and role of women and men, and gender-specific activities in water management programming in Swaziland.¹¹

6 The evaluation reported that "Chiefs have since also directly encouraged couples to make decisions together about family planning, birth spacing and the use of contraception. This demonstrated that involving chiefs in sensitive issues has been vital in gaining community support." Tanna Maternal, Newborn and Child Health, Helti Komuniti Project (Vanuatu). 7 Increase Household Income by Creating Market Linkage to Honey Production project (Ethiopia).

8 Business Development Facilitators project (Senegal).

Outcomes for people with disabilities

Increasingly, donors such as the Australian Government are seeking evidence that we are working with the most vulnerable, and progress in this area is also addressed by the Sustainable Development Goals. This year we chose to apply a "disability" lens when reviewing reports, in order to provide insight into how well this is addressed by project evaluations.

Overall, evaluations have provided little in the way of clarity on the quality, nature or existence of work on disability inclusiveness.

The core elements of World Vision's guidance on disability inclusiveness focus on ensuring children with disability are able to engage and participate in order to benefit from the work being undertaken in the field. Some projects engaged people with disabilities in the design of appropriate sanitation solutions and took additional needs of people with disabilities into account when improving healthcare services and school access, or developing community disaster risk management plans. For example, a project in Vanuatu undertook a vulnerability mapping process to locate where people with a disability were living in the community and the special considerations required to ensure that they were safe in the event of a disaster.¹²

But only 10 percent of evaluation reports contained any reflection on the participation of people with a disability in project activities, and even fewer identified challenges and successes in engaging people with a disability.

Only a small number of projects explicitly documented their engagement with disabled people's organisations, one of the key aspects of improving disability inclusiveness. When that did take place, such work has helped to raise awareness of staff and community members, and in one example helped provide a stronger focus on strengthening the capacity of adults with disabilities to improve their livelihood skills and options.

Only 13 percent of the evaluations provided disability disaggregated data and most of those were focusing on the prevalence of people and children defined as having a disability in households surveyed. This data is useful for our projects and programs as it provides a mechanism to ensure that households with children with disabilities and/or parents with disabilities are prioritised in terms of benefits from our projects. There is very little or no analysis and reflection on working with children and people with disabilities for better understanding how to improve the inclusive nature of our programming.

Figure 9: Level of assessment of people with disability in evaluation reports



^{5 98} percent of caretaker respondents agreed with education equality, and 79 percent reported that the gender training they received has been helpful to them. Quantitative data was confirmed via key informant interviews regarding sensitisation and outreach to reduce discrimination against girl children. Kitgum Area Development Program (Uganda).

⁹ Church Partnerships on Gender and Development (Southern Africa Regional Office).

¹⁰ Royal Solomon Islands Police Force Channels of Hope for Gender Project (Solomon Islands).

II Gender mainstreaming in water management (Swaziland).

¹² Community-Based Disaster Risk Management Program (Vanuatu).

Improving our capacity for quality project evaluations

It is six years since World Vision Australia first began to systematically assess the quality of project evaluations. Whilst the end goal has been the same, during this time the focus on the assessment process has sharpened, with the introduction of more indicators of quality and using the Bond Evidence Principles.

Initiatives in the past year have included:

- clear messaging about the vital need for reliable evidence of program impact;
- a call for a benchmark minimum spend of three percent of project/program budget on evaluation;
- development of tools and resources to support the evaluation process, including checklists for reviewing Terms of Reference, and detailed guidelines for the evaluation of Australian Government funded projects;
- capacity building events for World Vision Australia staff who are providing support to National Offices to ensure evaluations meet minimum standards of quality;
- selection of approximately seven significant projects which are either high profile, meet donor priorities or provide insight into our program models to receive additional support from Field Partnership staff to help ensure quality evaluations; and
- support to the World Vision Partnership process for developing project model indicators to increase consistency in evidence collection across our programming.

There is a lead time to seeing a commensurate improvement in overall evaluation quality. There is also variation in National Office capacity and between programs, which can impact on results from year to year depending on the programming cycle. Therefore, it is important to focus on data trends over time rather than absolute numbers. Opportunities to partner with other World Vision Support Offices in consistent messaging and use of evaluation tools and indicators of quality will assist in achieving change.

Implications for our evaluation process

This year's review highlighted that progress is being made, but there is still further opportunity to increase the quality and usefulness of our evaluations across the board, to ensure improved programming and provide a solid foundation for communicating with our supporters.

We make the following recommendations:

- Allow adequate time and resources during the evaluation process for data analysis and reporting. Our data collection processes are usually suitable, but the final report fails to provide in-depth analysis and development of insights and conclusions.
- Consider consultant competency as well as cost. Selection of consultants to undertake evaluations should be led by experienced design, monitoring and evaluation staff, and based on the competency and prior experience of the consultant, not price alone.
- Improve to how gender is addressed. Data for key interventions should be disaggregated and the implications for women and men, girls and boys (where appropriate) considered.
- Better inclusion of people with disabilities. This applies to both the evaluation data collection process, and understanding the impact of change for people with disabilities.
- A management response to recommendations. World Vision Australia should develop and implement a process to consider evaluation recommendations, ensuring that insights for programming and key lessons are captured.
- Continued resourcing to further develop our evidence base. This will allow us to communicate credibly about high quality and high impact programming with our supporters.

Conclusion

Considerable gains have been made in the past six years in increasing the proportion of projects which are evaluated, rising from 21 percent in 2009 to 85 percent this year. There is also evidence of some small improvements in evaluation quality, such as the use of baseline data to demonstrate project impact.

Improving evaluation quality is an ongoing task, requiring sustained resourcing and effort. Being explicit with our National Office partners regarding the tools that we are using to assess evaluation quality and providing guidance will assist. Specifically, both gender and disability, as cross-cutting themes, require more focus in both data collection and analysis. Approaches that engage the most vulnerable are also important.

A partnership-wide Evaluation Policy would assist to ensure that the goal of quality evaluation is shared and acknowledged.



Appendix I – What we did

Methods for this Annual Evaluation Review were similar to those employed in previous years.

Process in brief

- A list of projects funded by World Vision Australia ending in the 2014 financial year was sourced from our project management database; and a report from our document storage system was used to identify projects for which evaluation reports had been added during or since the 2014 financial year.
- Evaluation reports for these projects were sought from our information systems and from Field Partnerships staff.
- A team comprising staff from Technical Business Partners, Field Relations and the Australia Program reviewed evaluation reports according to 21 standard questions and entered data into a Microsoft Access database. Specifically we sought to identify:
- How many projects ended, were evaluated and had reports available to be reviewed?
- How many projects:
- created awareness of an issue?
- built community capacity?
- achieved practice and behavioural change?
- resulted in changes in social, economic, environmental and physical conditions?
- How many projects undertook evaluations which included:
- qualitative methods?
- quantitative methods?
- comparison of baseline or other appropriate data?
- participatory approaches/perspectives of beneficiaries?
- a section on limitations/potential biases?
- clear description of the methods of analysis?
- one or more child well-being indicators?
- How many evaluations met Bond Evidence Principles minimum standards?
- How many projects collected gender related data?
- How many projects collected disability related data?
- Key factors that influence positive outcomes
- Key factors that led to poor outcomes or impeded progress
- Outstanding examples of rigorous evaluations
- Highlighted messages that would be useful to share more widely
- A smaller team comprising staff from Technical Business Partners and a World Vision volunteer further reviewed evaluation reports identified as being rigorous using the Bond Evidence Principles assessment tool.
- Analysis of results was undertaken using Excel for quantitative data whilst qualitative data was coded for themes using NVivo. The report was drafted and revised in light of feedback from the Technical Business Partners team.

Team

Project Technical Leads: Anne Crawford and Tari Turner

Project Team: Amy Cracknell, Christine Fellner, Corinne Goh, Cynthia Mulenga, Daniela Rojas Chaves, Diarmuid Kelly, Emma Pritchard, Grace Asten, Gus Ridder, Julie Wiltshire, Kate Clark, Katrina Barnes, Louise Currie, Louise Kilgour, Margy Dowling, Marianne Khalil, Melissa Sprake, Natasha Tamplin, Nukunu Nanedo, Paul Crossley, Priya Stephen, San Tea, Shelby Stapleton, Sumera Jabeen, Tracy Mcdiarmid

Project Sponsor: Peter Baynard-Smith

Appendix 2 – Evaluation reports reviewed

Country/Region	Project number	Project name	Project type
Afghanistan	IAFG027	Support for Street Children (SFISC) in Herat	Project
	IAFG028	Establishing Early Childhood Care and Development Spaces in Badghis	Project
	IAFG029	Herat WASH Promotion Project	Project
	IAFG031	STI & HIV/AIDS Prevention Education III (SHAPE III)	Project
Armenia	IARM003	MEERO Cross-border cooperation for HIV prevention in Southern Caucasus – Armenia	Project
	IARM004	Keeping Children Safe Online (ARM)	Project
Bangladesh	IBGD043	Sherpur Child Rescue Project	Project
	IBGD046	Assistance for Juvenile Delinquents Project	Project
Bolivia	IBOL032	Right to protection and a life free of violence in children and adolescents in Bolivia	Project
Brazil	02399	Estrala da Manha	ADP
	00760	Ponto	ADP
Burundi	IBDI014	Youth Empowerment Project – Burundi	Project
Cambodia	ICAM094	Food, Nutrition and Livelihoods for PLHIV and OVC- 2	Project
	ICAM096	Sustainable Water and Sanitation Management Project	Project
	ICAM097	Initiative for Integration of Child Survival in ADPs	Project
	ICAMI06	HIV & AIDS Prevention and Care for Mothers and Infants (HAPCAMI)	Project
	ICAMI08	Agriculture Cooperatives for Sustainable Community Economic Development (ACSCED)	Project
	ICAMI09	Building Community Resilience to Disaster and Climate Change	Project
Colombia	01563	El Dorado	ADP
	01727	Camino Hacia La Esperanza	ADP

Country/Region	Project number	Project name	Project type
Colombia	ICOL015	ECOPAD [Community Team for Disasters Prevention and Response]	Project
East Timor	ITMP056	Bobonaro Food Security and Nutrition Project	Project
	ITMP059	Hare Hau (See Me) project	Project
	ITMP067	Baucau IPM Pilot Project	Project
	ITMP071	Good Nutrition, Healthy Children (Nutrisaun Diak Labarik Saudavel)	Project
Ecuador	00816	Esmeraldas Vuelta Larga	ADP
Ethiopia	00287	Homosha-Assosa	ADP
	00410	Ma'okomo-Bambasi	ADP
	00573	Saesie Tseada Emba	ADP
	00694	Wukro	ADP
	03409	Medebay Zana	ADP
	03551	Bedelle	ADP
	IETH039	Kochore coffee revitalisation	Project
	IETHI04	Tigray Acacia Project	Project
	IETHI25	Increase Household Income by Creating Market Linkage to Honey Production	Project
	IETHI37	WIN (Women, Infant and Neonatal) Health Project – Tigray	Project
	IETHI46	REEEP: Renewable energy and energy efficient technologies in Ethiopia	Project
	IETHI47	Wukro 40HR Famine Food Security Project	Project
Georgia	IGEO005	Keeping Children Safe Online (GEO)	Project
Guatemala	02275	San Rafael Petzal	ADP
India	IIND061	Avsar Kanpur Project	Project
	IIND080	Kopila Siliguri Project	Project
Indonesia	IIDN066	Empowering Karubaga's youth in Papua through gender-sensitive and technical education	Project
	IIDNI07	Boven Digul Capacity Building Project	Project
	IIDNI08	SOLVE: Strengthening Livelihoods and Reducing Local Vulnerabilities	Project

Country/Region	Project number	Project name	Project type
Kenya	03319	Golbo	ADP
	IKEN147	Mtito Andei Food Security Project	Project
	IKEN150	Ndabibi Anti-FGM Project	Project
Laos	01763	Xonnabouly	ADP
	03289	Mahaxay (MAA)	ADP
	ILAO04I	Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction Project (CBDRR)	Project
	ILAO042	Integrated UXO Project (LANGOCA)	Project
Lebanon	02624	Ain El Remmaneh	ADP
Lesotho	ILSO056	Makhunoane Community Health and Nutrition Project	Project
Malawi	02875	Chitundu	ADP
MEERO	IMEE020	Systems Reform Project: MEERO Advocacy	Project
Mongolia	IMOG059	Improve Herder's Resilience to Natural Disasters	Project
Mozambique	02779	Mucotho	ADP
Myanmar	00142	Dawei	ADP
	03939	Thayet Chaung	ADP
	IMYA112	Strengthening Community and Health Systems to Achieve 4th, 5th & 6th Millennium Dev Goals	Project
Nepal	INPL029	Building climate change assessment and response capability in Jumla ADP	Project
Nicaragua	INIC011	Integrated Farm Management Stressing on Agrosilvopastoril Systems	Project
	INIC019	Promoting Sexual Health, with an emphasis on HIV/ AIDS	Project
	INIC050	Access to safe water and sanitation in rural communities accompanied by ADPs Wabule and Terrabuena	Project
Pakistan	IPAK064	Promoting Communities' Practices to Reduce, Reuse and Recycle – Mera Mahool Meri Dunya [3R]	Project

Country/Region	Project number	Project name	Project type
Peru	IPER056	K'ana Permacultura Area 2	Project
	IPER064	Marketing of Guinea Pigs	Project
SARO	IAFS010	Church Partnerships on Gender and Development	Project
Senegal	ISEN059	Business Development Facilitators	Project
Solomon Islands	ISOL046	Honiara Youth Development Employment & Small Enterprise Project	Project
	ISOL047	Malaita Community Resilience and Livelihoods Project	Project
	ISOL050	Temotu Early Childhood Care Development	Project
	ISOL058	Community Vision For Change	Project
	ISOL071	Royal Solomon Islands Police Force Community Channels of Hope Project	Project
Somalia	ISOM061	Somalia Vocational & Entrepreneur Livelihood Support	Project
South Sudan	ISDN060	Education Project – Rajaf Payam	Project
	ISDN063	Access to strengthened services for early recovery in Tambura (Assert)	Project
Sri Lanka	00409	Mannar	ADP
	00509	Paddipalai	ADP
Swaziland	01225	Nkalashane	ADP
	ISWZ055	Gender mainstreaming in water management	Project
Tanzania	02944	Dar Urban	ADP
	ITZA099	Nakombo Food Security Project	Project
	ITZAII3	Mukulat FGM eradication and gender project	Project
	ITZAII5	Expanding Market-Led Agriculture Production (EMLAP)	Project
Thailand	ITHA052	Hope Project (Hope for Children in Crisis, Phuket)	Project
Uganda	01502	Nkozi	ADP
	01533	Kitgum	ADP

Country/Region	Project number	Project name	Project type
Vanuatu	IVAN027	Vanuatu Education and Community-Based Organisation Empowerment Project	Project
	IVAN031	Vanuatu Community-Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) Program	Project
	IVAN035	Tanna MNCH Helti Komuniti Project	Project
Vietnam	IVNMI03	Economic Development for Poor Families in Lac Son and Tua Chua ADPs	Project
	IVNMI06	Grassroots Capacity Development in Phu Cu district	Project



CONTACT DETAILS

World Vision Australia National Office

I Vision Drive Burwood East VIC 3151 Telephone: 13 32 40 Fax: (03) 9287 2424 Email: service@worldvision.com.au Internet: worldvision.com.au

New South Wales Office

Level 3, 134 William Street Potts Point NSW 2011 Telephone: (02) 9806 6300

Queensland Office

96 Ernest Street South Brisbane QLD 4101 Telephone: (07) 3387 2700

South Australia Office

26 Flinders Street Adelaide SA 5000 Telephone: (08) 8238 4600

Western Australia Office

Level 12, Septimus Roe Square 256 Adelaide Terrace Perth WA 6000 Telephone: (08) 6454 7800

Government Relations Office

Suite 11 Baileys Corner 145 London Circuit Civic ACT 2600 Telephone: (02) 6102 5502



The Campaign for Australian Aid is a joint initiative of the Make Poverty History and Micah Challenge coalitions, for all Australians who believe we can and should do more as a nation to end extreme poverty around the world.