CBM Evaluation Policy

Rationale

Showing the impact of CBM's and its partners' work and its contribution to the CRPD and SDGs through evaluations is a crucial component of accountability, transparency, and success. It supports our vision of an inclusive World in which persons with disabilities enjoy their human rights and achieve their full potential.

Purpose of Policy

This policy outlines the framework for CBM's evaluation actions in line with international standards in development and humanitarian aid and CBM's Programme Quality Framework. The Policy is aimed at fostering an evaluative culture in which the organisation deliberately seeks out information on results to learn how to better manage and deliver programs and services[1].

Scope of Policy

This policy is applicable to all evaluations that assess outcome and impact of CBM supported programme work including development, transitional development assistance and humanitarian aid. Each respective CBM organisational unit will decide on how to implement this policy jointly with partner organisations in view of context and donor requirements.

Definition of Evaluation

CBM applies the OECD DAC[2] definition: An evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation, and results. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors.[3]

Purpose of Evaluations

- Accountability – providing evidence of whether we are doing the right things with the given funds; how well expected results are achieved and what is changing;
- Communication – being transparent about and promoting our work and its achievements internally and externally;
- Improvement – creating knowledge about what works why; sharing lessons and promising practices; using results to adapt and improve ongoing and future action.

---

[1] https://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/ILAC_Brief20_Evaluative_Culture.pdf
[2] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee
[3] PRINCIPLES FOR EVALUATION OF DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE (oecd.org)

Evaluation Frame: Standards, Criteria and Guiding Questions

Evaluation standards specify key aspects of 'good' evaluation[4]. The **OECD DAC criteria**[5] provide direction for the overall design of an evaluation and structuring the evaluation questions. **Guiding questions** below each evaluation criterion allow for a more specific perspective related to a given criterion.

Standards for Evaluation

Evaluations conducted on behalf of CBM shall apply the following standards based on the OECD[6] and DEVAL[7] quality standards:

- **Usefulness** for defined audience and provision of recommendations that can be used for improvement;
- **Evaluability**: evaluations are feasible (results have been adequately designed and data is available) and realistically planned, incl. with cost-consciousness;
- **Fairness, independence, and integrity**: external evaluators are independent from the development intervention, including its policy, operations and management functions, as well as intended beneficiaries. They work transparently, and according to ethical principles.
- **Ethical principles:** Evaluation abides by relevant professional and ethical guidelines and codes of conduct for individual evaluators;
- **Accuracy, scientific rigour, and comprehensibility:** Evaluations follow the principles of good scientific practice. They use appropriate design and scientific methods for data collection and analysis;
- **Comparability:** Evaluations apply uniform criteria and evaluation standards so that different evaluations of one evaluated object can be compared and that overall quality of evaluative work can be assessed, e.g. in a meta-evaluation;
- **Participation and Inclusion:** Active engagement of all key stakeholders, including persons with and without disabilities and other vulnerable populations throughout the entire evaluation process.

Evaluation Criteria

Evaluations shall assess projects/programmes according to the OECD DAC criteria and add inclusion and safeguarding as further CBM specific criteria. Their application depends on the evaluation purpose and criteria shall be prioritised in a well-founded and transparent manner. Basis for any assessment is the availability of related data.

- **Relevance/Appropriateness**: Is the intervention/has it been doing the right thing? / How has the action been tailored to local needs?
- **Coherence**: How well does/did the intervention fit?
- **Coverage**: How have population groups, incl. the most marginalised been reached?

---

[4] [Quality Standards for Development Evaluation | READ online (oecd-ilibrary.org)](#)
[5] [Evaluation Criteria - OECD](#) and [Applying Evaluation Criteria Thoughtfully | OECD iLibrary (oecd-ilibrary.org)](#)
[6] [Quality Standards for Development Evaluation | READ online (oecd-ilibrary.org)](#)
[7] German Institute for Development Evaluation, https://www.deval.org/en/methods-and-standards/our-evaluation-standards

- **Efficiency**: How well are resources used/have been used?
- **Effectiveness**: Is the intervention achieving/likely to achieve the expected outcomes?
- **Impact**: To what extent did the intervention contribute to generating significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, high-level changes, often in a longer-term?
- **Sustainability/Connectedness**: Will the benefits last? How likely is it that the benefits will last? / How is the short-term emergency support related to longer-term results?
- **Disability Inclusion**: How far have persons with disabilities and their representative organisations, persons of different age groups and genders, and other vulnerable groups been effectively included in the entire project cycle?
- **Safeguarding**: How have partners and stakeholders embedded and implemented safeguarding of children and persons at risks into their programme work?

Evaluation Questions

Project/programme specific evaluation questions depend on the evaluated object (evaluand) and the specific situation. They shall be developed in accordance with the interests of the stakeholders and using an inclusion lens.

Evaluation Scheduling

Evaluations take place before (ex-ante), during (mid-term/real-time), towards the end (final) of implementation or after the completion (ex-post) of a project/programme, strategy, or (initiative) plan. They are scheduled early enough to ensure their usefulness for adjustment, further action, and follow-up planning.

Standards of Management for Evaluations

Decision on evaluations shall be guided by the principle of efficient use of resources and workload for those involved. Fewer, but methodological sound and participatory evaluations allow for more useful results and higher uptake of recommendations by stakeholders.

Planned project/programme evaluations must be included in respective budgets and reflected as a milestone in the CBM system. The CBM 3-way-working methodology applies to the entire process.

Legally Contracted Designated Funding (LCDF) projects are contracted and managed by CBM. Any other **partner project/programme evaluations** shall be contracted and managed by the partner organisation with decisive involvement of CBM (e.g., selection of consultants).

As a minimum, all projects with a total budget above 1 million Euro shall undergo a mid-term and a final evaluation; projects from 500,000 to 1 million Euro shall undergo one evaluation.

It is at the discretion of the CBM stakeholders to decide on the need for an evaluation e.g., in case of infrastructure/construction projects, innovative and pilot projects.

Thematic and strategic evaluations assess performance and achievements of CBM's Initiatives, partnerships, programmatic approaches, cooperation modalities, or innovative approaches and are managed by the related CBM entities.

Learning and Communication

- Evaluations shall reveal feasible recommendations and outline positive and negative lessons learnt to allow for adjustment and improvement of future action.
- Actions are to be agreed in a mandatory Management Response and shall be followed up and monitored by the related entities.
- Results shall be made available to relevant departments via CBM communication channels, learning fora and reflection workshops.
- Evaluation reports shall be shared with donors and selected summaries shall be published on the [official CBM website](#).

Quality Assurance

The Evaluation process follows the Quick Process Reference Guide (QPRG) for Evaluation and Learning. Adherence to the QPRG, incl. 3-way-working methodology shall be assessed regularly to recommend improvements in the process.

Risks and Remote Evaluations

CBM's work can take place in fragile situations or locations with high levels of security risks. Unforeseen disasters and hazards can occur before or during an evaluation. Mechanisms for personal safety of evaluators and for data security shall be put in place by the contracting unit.

Based on the situation, contractors of evaluations shall allow for remote or semi-remote conduct of the evaluation and encourage consultants to use related technologies while observing highest possible data security. Remote evaluations have the potential to reduce negative environmental impact and enhance use of resources.