

GUIDELINES ON REVIEW AND EVALUATION

Preface

Evaluation is used to improve the grant making process and strategy, and to hold grant recipients accountable for the projects / programs funded.

Evaluations require dedicated staff or volunteer time to review the information collected and put it into use. Complex projects may require an expert to be hired for the evaluation, and grant-makers may build in a percentage of the grant awarded for this purpose.

EVALUATING PROJECTS / PROGRAMS

Grantee self evaluations

The organization would be required to measure and report the planned outcomes as approved in the application. The grantee may choose the format, or the foundation may choose to develop standardized questions or self-assessment tools. Discussing the value of the evaluative information at the time the grant is awarded, and using a non-punitive approach with the grantee, helps to get more accurate results. Project / program milestones and reporting procedures can be built in to the Memorandum of Agreement.

The most common evaluative approach is to ask recipients to report on their outcomes against the objectives they set using the indicators submitted with their application. In addition to service statistics and a financial report, other information such as media coverage, research findings, and published materials would be requested.

Visit / audit of the Foundation

1. The Foundation may consider to conduct an independent evaluation of the outcomes by means of questionnaire surveys, meeting / interviews with beneficiaries, or other evaluation tools.
2. When reviewing the grant application, the staff or delegates of the Foundation may consider paying visits to the site / client

group concerned, in order to understand the justifications of the needs in question, or to gather background information for future monitoring of the program/project. The applying organization is required to arrange such visit(s) when necessary.

3. During the stage of program / project implementation, depending on the nature and duration of the program/project, visit(s) by the Executive Director or Trustees may also be paid to the organization receiving support, to meet with the beneficiaries and /or staff concerned in order to understand its progress.
4. The Foundation would conduct an audit of the program/project records and financial statements upon completion of the program/project; and may also consider doing so during the stage of implementation, particularly when the program/project lasts for a longer period.

Committee / board member / staff site visits

An interview with the grantees might suffice in some cases. In this scenario, a list of prepared questions, and an on-site report of findings, is recommended. Visits to projects / program sites are usually part of the on-site visit.

Peer review

In some cases, notably scientific research and complex projects / programs aimed at social, health, and environmental change, may be more appropriate for peer review.

Hiring an evaluator

Using an independent researcher to conduct a formal evaluation of implementation strategies and outcomes / impact is warranted in some cases. Universities have a list of staff and students that may be hired for such purposes.

GETTING INPUT FROM EXPERTS AND STAKEHOLDERS FOR FUTURE DIRECTION

Best practice grant makers make a point of sharing the outcomes and impacts reported from their funded projects. They also seek out advice on a course of future action based on their own past results, new and/or

emerging needs, research, and the input of opinion leaders or service recipients. Surveys, telephone conversations, and/or roundtable meetings are widely used.