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This study attempts to answer the question, do formalized evaluation procedures contribute to increased project effectiveness? Project effectiveness is defined as the successful attainment of project goals and objectives. According to the literature, evaluations have the potential to improve a project's success by raising awareness of problem areas and offering ways suggestions for improvement. To test this theory, the evaluation systems of seven international development organizations that are currently implementing projects in Bolivia are examined: Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE), Peace Corps, Project Concern International (PCI), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Water for People, and World Vision.

The evaluation systems of each organization are analyzed within the context of four important components that should ideally characterize all development projects: effective information management, participant incorporation into the evaluation process, flexibility, and coordination between various actors. While some organizations show near textbook performance on carrying out parts of these components, on other factors, especially participant involvement, some organizations seem to struggle. In none of the organizations are evaluations found to be a detriment to project success, but rather, the effect that the monitoring and evaluation procedures have on the current implementation and future design of the projects appears to be minimal. The limited impact of evaluations on project effectiveness is due to the evaluation methods of the organizations, the characteristics of the project itself, as well as external factors, including the societal conditions in which the project takes place.
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INTRODUCTION

With the majority of the population living below the poverty line, widespread recognition as the poorest country in South America and the second poorest country in the entire Western hemisphere, and a dismal record for democracy, Bolivia is certainly in need of ways in which to raise the standard of living of its population. National development policies, international aid, and locally and internationally initiated development projects focus their efforts on trying to combat the pervasive poverty and improve the lives of Bolivians little by little. This paper will focus specifically on the benefits of evaluations in the efforts of projects led by international development organizations. The aims of these organizations range from as narrow as providing potable water to a few households in a rural village to as broad as increasing the national literacy rate; they attend to the various necessities of Bolivians through projects that seek to improve their health, education, basic sanitation, agriculture, economic endeavors, and environment. Although diverse in their objectives, seen as a whole, these actions strive to make improvements in the overall lives of the affected individuals. These initiatives are taken seriously, as private and public donors spend millions of dollars each year on such projects, both in Bolivia and in other impoverished countries throughout the world. But do those projects really make a difference? What are in fact the impacts of those projects? While it is not within the scope of this investigation to answer these specific questions, this paper strives to provide an analysis of the necessary monitoring and evaluation tools for how to arrive at these answers.

The importance of evaluations within the development process cannot be understated; the pivotal role that they play is two-fold. Evaluations can provide answers
about the effects and impacts of a project. Furthermore, aside from this informative role of evaluations, evaluations can also play a critical role in improving current and future projects. In light of evaluative information, actors are able to alter, remove, and add components of a project, depending upon the successes, failures, and effects of each component. It is with this reasoning that it is postulated that development projects that lack a formal monitoring and evaluation process are less effective than those projects with formal monitoring and evaluation procedures. More specifically, it was initially hypothesized that the Peace Corps lacks a formal monitoring and evaluation process, which makes its projects less effective than the projects of organizations with formal monitoring and evaluation procedures. “Effective” is here defined as a project’s ability to meet the needs and desires of the affected population without compromising the needs of future generations.

The second, more specific, hypothesis concerning the Peace Corps was established through conducting several informal interviews with former Peace Corps Volunteers (PCVs) regarding the monitoring policies of the Peace Corps. All interviewees stated that they did not have to comply with monitoring and evaluation procedures, claiming that any monitoring to which they were subject was strictly informal.¹ However, one week prior to field research, it was discovered through a conversation with Maryann Minutillo, the former Country Director for Peace Corps Bolivia and current Peace Corps Director for the Inter-America and Pacific Region, that the Peace Corps does in fact have a monitoring process. Nonetheless, there is still little

evidence to support that the organization has any formalized final evaluation procedures.² Although the Peace Corps does have a monitoring system, the fact that no former Peace Corps Volunteers knew of a monitoring system is in and of itself quite significant and will be discussed in detail in the chapter on Coordination of Actors.

At the genesis of this investigation, the effectiveness of Peace Corps projects was to be compared against the effectiveness of projects implemented by six other international development organizations that are known to have formal monitoring and evaluation systems: the Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE), Project Concern International (PCI), United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Water for People, and World Vision. Table 1, located in the appendix, gives an overview of each of these organizations. However, by the time it was established that the Peace Corps does in fact have a monitoring system, it was too late into the research to find another international development organization that does not formally monitor and evaluate its projects against which to compare the aforementioned organizations. Consequently, due to the initial lack of complete information on the Peace Corps, there are no organizations included in this study that do not have a monitoring and evaluation system, and thus comparison between organizations that do and do not monitor or conduct evaluations of their projects is not possible. Comparison between the monitoring and evaluation methods of each organization, however, is still quite relevant; the differing structures of the evaluation systems of each organization can have a profound effect on the overall impact of an evaluation on project effectiveness.

The evaluation systems of the seven aforementioned organizations will be compared with each other and with important criteria that have been drawn from evaluation literature. Specifically, the evaluation systems will be looked at in light of four important qualitative components that should be present for an evaluation system to be truly successful: information management, coordination of development actors, participant involvement in the evaluation process, and flexibility. It will be found that both the literature and the organizations have limitations in trying to explain and carry out ideal evaluation systems, and most importantly, it will become apparent that while evaluations sometimes do provide valuable information about the status of the organization's projects, in none of the organizations do evaluations lead to particularly more effective projects.

Structure of the Thesis

Chapter one presents the context in which the research for this paper was conducted, including an overview of the political, social, and economic situation of Bolivia, which was the site of the field research. The chapter also gives a full description of the methodological methods that were used to gather information for the investigation.

Chapter two is a synopsis of the evaluation literature. Pulling from various sources, this chapter outlines the critical components of effective monitoring and evaluation procedures, as suggested by evaluation experts.

Chapters three through six are a discussion of the four most important qualitative components of an evaluation system: information management, participant involvement, flexibility, and coordination of actors. The length of these chapters vary drastically, from
the detailed explanations in chapter three on information management to the shorter chapters dealing with participant involvement and flexibility. While all components are arguably of equal importance, the amount of attention that development actors pay to each component differs greatly. Consequently, the lengths of the chapters are a reflection of the information available from the field research.

Chapter seven pulls together the various lessons that have been learned through the examination of the evaluation methods of each organization in comparison with evaluation literature. The chapter discusses the limitations that evaluations have in improving project effectiveness and the shortcomings of evaluation literature in providing a complete framework for all necessary evaluation components. Chapter eight turns to the policy recommendations that arise out of the lessons learned. It also offers a list of suggestions for future students, for ideas on how this current study could be enhanced. The paper concludes that not enough information and time were available to adequately prove or refute the initial hypothesis. Evaluations do appear to be a very important factor in the development process, but it remains unclear the extent to which they can affect a project's effectiveness.
CHAPTER ONE: METHODOLOGY

The process used to gather the necessary information for this investigation was two-fold; both literature and field research were used over the 2003-2004 academic year. During the fall of 2003 a review of evaluation and development literature was conducted. The literature described how evaluations should ideally be performed, what components of a project must be examined, and what role evaluations play in the effectiveness and sustainability of a project. January 2004 was an opportunity to apply this theory to reality, through conducting field research in Cochabamba and La Paz, Bolivia. The following section gives an overview of the context in which the research was conducted and the specifics of the field research, including the organizations studied, the actors interviewed and the sites visited.

The Bolivian Context

The majority of the eight million people that populate Bolivia is both poor and indigenous. Bolivia is often regarded as the poorest and most underdeveloped nation in South America, with many of the quality of life indicators comparable to those of the nations of sub-Saharan Africa. While approximately sixty percent of the population lives in urban sectors, rural Bolivia remains the most impoverished area of the country. There, eighty percent of the population, which is predominantly indigenous, lives below the poverty line. The GDP per capita in 2002 was $883; at least seventy-five percent of Bolivians work within the informal sector of the economy, where they receive neither benefits nor an assured wage. Literacy and infant mortality rates are dismal, as there is

---

limited access to education and health care, especially for women. Bolivia's grim social situation, coupled with democracy's poor performance throughout the country's history, have caused the country to be the focus of much development attention. Bolivia has long had agencies, both national and international, working within its borders to improve the quality of life of the Bolivians, but since the early 1990s, this number of organizations has increased exponentially. Before 1980, there were approximately one hundred non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Bolivia, and by 1992, five-hundred thirty NGOs were established in the country. NGOs have been a particularly popular medium for channeling foreign aid, because the local government has historically been viewed as disconnected from and disinterested in the reality of its population.

Although poverty exists throughout all of Bolivia, and therefore there are development agencies that have projects countrywide, the research for this study focuses on organizations that are based or execute in La Paz and Cochabamba, Bolivia. Cochabamba was a necessary location for part of the research because the main office for Peace Corps, the driving force behind this investigation, is located there. Furthermore, because of Cochabamba's size and importance in the country's economy, many organizations house branches of their offices in and around the city. However, most other organizations' central offices, and consequently the actors who are most familiar with the overall practices and polices of the organization, are located in the capital city of La Paz, making research there also a necessity.

5 "Country Profile" 13.
7 Arellano-López and Petras 562.
8 Arellano-López and Petras 558, 561.
Cochabamba, Bolivia, nicknamed “the city of eternal spring,” is situated in a valley at the comfortable altitude of seven thousand feet above sea level. It lies eight hours by bus to the southeast of La Paz. Cochabamba is the third largest city in Bolivia, with a population of approximately 500,000 residents. The region surrounding Cochabamba is the center of agricultural production for Bolivia. For most of the year little rain falls in the region, making small farmers especially susceptible to drought. Nonetheless, for four months out of the year (December through March) it rains heavily, destroying bridges and roads, and making transportation to the surrounding rural areas very difficult. Such was the situation during the time of this study’s research, impeding visits to some rural areas where development projects are being implemented.

The majority of the population in the department of Cochabamba is of Quechua descent. The indigenous heritage of these people is evident throughout the city, from the traditional dress of the women, to the colorful blankets in which babies are carried and the Quechua language that is widely heard. While most people within the city of Cochabamba who speak Quechua also speak Spanish fluently, the principal language is Quechua just a few hours outside of the city. After Spanish, Quechua is the most widely spoken language in Bolivia. Aymara is the second most spoken indigenous language, and is heard principally by peoples from the department of La Paz.

A couple of hours from the city of Cochabamba is the largest coca-producing region in the country, the Chapare. Many people from rural villages around Cochabamba migrate temporarily to the Chapare to work for the illicit cocaine production and trade, because such jobs are much more lucrative than the other economic option of rural Bolivia: subsistence agriculture. In an attempt to stop coca growing, many alternative
development projects, funded primarily by international donors, have sprung up in the region of the Chapare. However, the United State’s policy of the “war against drugs,” where the US actively pursues the eradication of the coca crop in regions such as the Chapare, has received much criticism and backlash, making the region unsafe to US travelers. Thus it was not possible to investigate the alternative agricultural development projects of the Chapare.

Aside from regional migration to the Chapare, urban migration has exploded over the past decade throughout the country. The average annual migration rate from rural to urban areas hovers around five percent.9 Some of this migration is seasonal, but much now appears to be permanent, adding strains to preexisting urban problems. Namely, crime rates are on the rise, particularly in Cochabamba, which is now considered to be the most dangerous city in Bolivia and has a crime rate comparable to many of the crime-ridden cities throughout South America.10 The migration has also led to the rapid growth of El Alto, a city perched one thousand feet directly above La Paz on the altiplano. El Alto is credited as the city with the highest growth rate in South America.11 The population of El Alto is almost completely indigenous, as the residents have moved there from the surrounding impoverished rural areas, in search of a better life, only to find high rates of unemployment and limited economic opportunities. This recent migrational phenomenon has had a profound effect on the demographics, economic situation, and developmental processes of rural communities throughout Bolivia.

---

La Paz, Bolivia's administrative capital (the constitutional capital is Sucre), has a population of approximately one million inhabitants, of which the majority is Aymara. The city is located in a steep valley, nestled between the Andes and the altiplano, at 12,000 feet above sea level, making it the highest capital in the world. The parliament and all governmental institutions of Bolivia reside in La Paz. La Paz is often a hotbed for protests, susceptible to roadblocks and strikes, as people from around the country come to the capital to claim justice, demanding such things as rights to land, government assistance for poverty eradication, lower gas prices, better mining conditions, and improved unionization. The city has been the site of many attempted coups, including most recently, in October 2003, the forced resignation of President Sanchez de Lozada.

As a result of being the home of the government and many other organizations and corporations, La Paz is very unstable, and consequently, little in the way of community development projects actually occur within close proximity to the city. For instance, following the attempted coup of this past fall, Peace Corps will no longer assign any volunteers to this region. Access to volunteers and projects is too often prohibited by the recurring blockades. There are, however, several organizations that are dedicated primarily to the urban problems of La Paz and El Alto. Nonetheless, the focus of this study is centered on small-scale community-based development projects, which necessarily implies projects that are executed in a more rural setting. Consequently, the main purpose of the La Paz-based research was not to visit and observe active development projects, but rather to gain information regarding project success and evaluation procedures from individuals at each organizations' headquarters.
Research Procedures

It is within this social, political, and economic context that the investigation was performed. Upon arrival to Bolivia, on the fourth of January, the majority of the offices in La Paz remained closed for the following week for summer vacation and New Year's celebration. However, because the Peace Corps is a United States governmental organization, it follows the US work calendar and holiday schedule and was thus open and accessible. The research consequently began in Cochabamba, where there were previously established contacts with various Peace Corps actors.

Interviews were conducted with Associate Peace Corps Directors (APCDs), of whom there are five in Bolivia and who are in charge of the different project sectors: Natural Resources, Basic Sanitation, Integrated Education (IE), Microenterprise Development (MED), and Agriculture. Except for the APCD of Basic Sanitation, who is American, the APCDs are Bolivian; all are men. In talking with these directors, questions were asked to determine the current methods of evaluation and monitoring that Peace Corps Bolivia utilizes, the results of the evaluations, challenges for development, and prospective success and sustainability of Peace Corps projects (for a complete list of all interview questions, please see Appendix A). An interview was also conducted with the Program and Training Officer (PTO) for Peace Corps Bolivia, Charna Lefton. Lefton, an American, is second only to the Country Director in terms of her power and responsibilities within Peace Corps Bolivia.

Several (eight) Peace Corps Volunteers (PCVs), including third-year volunteers who act as technical specialists for particular project sectors, were interviewed primarily about their individual project experiences, their successes and challenges in
implementing a project, and their knowledge and experience with the Peace Corps evaluation and monitoring procedures. Three site visits were made to the villages to which the PCVs were assigned to complete their specific projects. During these visits informal conversation, directed interviews, and observation were used to gather information on Peace Corps procedures. Observations were conducted on the work of the volunteers, their interactions and discussions with their fellow community members, and the status of their projects.

During the field research, especially in the Cochabamba area, it was hoped to speak with community members that have been involved in or affected by development projects, but with one exception, this was not possible. The lack of community members interviewed is due in part to the location where these individuals live; many PCVs travel outside of their base communities to work with more rural residents, and other development organizations work in remote communities, all of which are difficult to access without private transportation. The field research was conducted during the rainy season, which further impeded the accessibility of many rural areas. Due to liability reasons, Peace Corps workers and members of other organizations would not provide transportation to access the project sites. Furthermore, because of the limited time allotted for the field research, each site visit could not last more than a day, which is insufficient time to establish contacts and the trust with community members that is necessary to comfortably perform a formal interview. Despite these challenges, one informal conversation was conducted with a community member who was a beneficiary of a PCV’s work and the work of a British non-governmental organization (NGO), PLAN.
International. Topics ranging from the beneficiary’s opinion of PLAN and Peace Corps and the impact that the projects have had on her and her family’s life were discussed.

Through interviews with various Peace Corps workers, contacts with other development organizations were established. (Initial contacts had been established with some organizations in the United States prior to arrival in Bolivia, but the US offices were only able to provide phone numbers and addresses of the Bolivian offices, and not names of individuals that should be contacted.) Because the majority of the offices and authorities on the subject of evaluation are situated in La Paz, most interviews with non-Peace Corps workers were conducted during the last week and a half of January in La Paz in the central offices of each of the organizations.

The interviews with actors from the other organizations were conducted with personnel in positions of authority, including program directors and officials. Only one interview with one individual per organization was possible, due to time constraints. Consequently, while the research regarding the Peace Corps is relatively complete, in that it includes information from individuals from many different levels of the bureaucracy that tends to characterize international organizations, the information gathered on the other organizations is lacking. This inequality of information is due to the lack of time for the investigation, the holiday schedule of the organizations, the initial lack of specific contacts, and the easy accessibility of the Peace Corps workers, in part a result of the similar culture (American) and language (English) that the majority of them shared with the researcher.

In total, twenty-one interviews were conducted during the month of January 2004. These interviews included Peace Corps workers and members from the following
international organizations: Water for People, Project Concern International (PCI),
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), World Vision, United States Agency for
International Development (USAID), and CARE (for further information on each of these
organizations, please see Table 1 in the appendix). Certainly this investigation is not
exhaustive; more time, interviews, and observations would be extremely useful.
Nonetheless, utilizing related literature and its application to the case studies, important
conclusions can be drawn regarding the evaluation and monitoring procedures of
international development organizations and the status of small-scale development work
within Bolivia.
CHAPTER TWO: EVALUATION THEORY AND SUGGESTED PRACTICES

Evaluation and monitoring processes play a critical role in the effectiveness of development projects, including literacy, education, nutrition, family planning, and women empowerment projects. The term "effectiveness" is certainly highly conducive to a wide array of interpretations, and depending on the type of project, is measured in various ways. Project "effectiveness," in general, is taken to mean the successful achievement of a project's goals, which in turn should be meeting the needs and demands of the affected population. While an evaluation itself cannot make a failing project improve, it is able to identify a project's deficiencies, outcomes, and successes. It is then dependent on the project actors to effect change in the project design and implementation that reflects the findings of the evaluation. Such changes can reduce undesirable outcomes and problems, thus heightening the project's success, and, consequently, effectiveness.

Howard Freeman, Peter Rossi, and Sonia Wright, in a text on evaluating social programs, explain that evaluations are extremely important, in that their information aids in rational decision making by policy makers, especially concerning issues of technical planning and management of a project. Evaluations are also valued because they can establish merit for a project and can raise the consciousness of participants, community members, and policy makers about its status and existence. The mere presence of an evaluation will certainly not make a project more effective; in fact, the evaluation itself must be effective in order to convey significant and useful information regarding a

project. Furthermore, an evaluation cannot simply be something that is undergone at the completion of a project, but should rather be, as Vinayagum Chinapah and Gary Miron note, "regarded as a continuous and permanent field of information processing [that is] built into the life-cycle of a project."\(^{14}\) The ensuing chapter seeks to define the important aspects for a constructive evaluation, both in general and in terms of specific types of projects, which, when utilized appropriately, can assist in the ever increasing effectiveness of a project.

To make substantial conclusions in a final evaluation, a project must be monitored throughout its design and implementation. An evaluation that occurs only at the completion of a project will have no basis for comparison against which to measure the project's progress. Furthermore, to gain a greater appreciation for the long-term effects and impact of a project, it is desirable to perform a follow-up evaluation a few years after the completion of a project, or at least to conduct follow-up monitoring, where past project beneficiaries are interviewed. While follow-up evaluations cannot affect the concluded project, it could have implications for the design of future projects.

Much of the introductory evaluation literature emphasizes the importance of comparative studies in order to truly discern the effects of a particular project.\(^{15}\) Because development projects are labor intensive and are usually specially designed for the needs and demands of a particular community or group of people, a comparative study between a control group and an experimental group is unlikely. One could approximate such a

---


comparison by looking at the differences between two similar communities/groups, one that is participating in a project and one that is not. However, especially in the case of examining two communities, there are too many uncontrollable factors that can account for variations, so that the best method of comparison is assessing the changes that occur within one particular community or group over time. Consequently, much evaluative work must be done before a project even begins. Prior to project initiation, extensive research should be done regarding other similar projects, so as to be aware of and prepare for the potential outcomes.\(^\text{16}\) This is an important step because invariably, projects produce unintended results; through learning from other similar projects, the current project may be able to avoid potentially undesirable results, while at the same time fostering an environment for as many positive results as possible.

Other necessary pre-project preparation includes in-depth discussions with project members, participants, and community members regarding their desired changes, needs and possible concerns.\(^\text{17}\) Such discussion not only promotes community involvement from the start of the project, which is an essential element for all effective projects, but will also help ensure that the project is best shaped to fit the needs of all of those involved and that the initial attitudes and opinions of community members are heard. Observation of the changes in attitude and knowledge is a key method for determining the effectiveness of a project, and thus gathering pre-project opinions will assist both in the project’s design and in the measurement of the project’s results. Not only is it important to measure changes in the project beneficiaries, but also changes in the status of the affected community must be accounted for. Accordingly, prior to a project’s initiation a

\(^{16}\) Samuel P. Hayes Jr., *Evaluating Development Projects*, (Belgium: UNESCO, 1959) 68.
\(^{17}\) Hayes 68.
general observation of the current infrastructure, demographics, resources, and other conditions should be done.\textsuperscript{18} This overview will form an important basis against which the project's progress will be compared.

Aside from the data that should be gathered prior to the actual initiation of the project, ongoing monitoring is necessary to measure the project's progress, and to identify any negative effects or problems that are occurring. If only an end of project evaluation were conducted, instead of a constant monitoring process, there would not be any time to make adjustments and improve the project's performance and effectiveness. Many project elements must be examined during the monitoring phase. In his text regarding the evaluation of development projects, Samuel Hayes Jr. suggests that attention must be paid to the project objectives; physical conditions of work; project personnel, including how their numbers and attitudes have changed; public information that is disseminated about the project; and the projected work plans for the next monitoring period.\textsuperscript{19} Most importantly in these observations is how each element changes from one monitoring period to the next. The evaluators must also provide a description of the actual activities that are occurring.\textsuperscript{20}

Although observation has been mentioned as one way in which to gather data during the monitoring process, there are many other procedures that might be more effective, depending upon the project element that is being studied. For instance, in measuring changes in attitudes and behavior, personal in-depth interviews might be most useful. However, Hayes asserts that it is best if the interviews consist of clear, closed questions. Not only are the responses to closed questions more comparable, especially
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18} Hayes 68.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Hayes 68.
\item \textsuperscript{20} Hayes 74.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
when an evaluator attempts to draw generalizations from a large population, but also, long and open ended questions can increase the respondent’s irritability and fatigue, which in turn decreases her willingness to participate in the project and/or the evaluation process. Other methods for collecting information during the monitoring and evaluation processes include questionnaires; review of institutional records, which is especially useful in gathering pre-project data on the situation of the community; tests that apply the skills and knowledge that is being taught or encouraged by the project; and participant observation. Regardless of the methods used or the questions asked, they should remain consistent throughout the monitoring and evaluation stages because of the need for accuracy in detecting changes. Consistency allows for the creation of a complete body of knowledge on a particular subject, permitting evaluators to make well-informed conclusions.

Another important element to consider for a productive evaluation is the role and priorities of the evaluator. While the evaluator must be well informed about the project, because she must clearly understand how the project functions and what its goals are, the evaluator should not be an actual project actor. Being such a member is likely to introduce bias into the evaluation and threaten its external validity; non-members are apt to be skeptical of the results of an evaluation that is published by the people most closely associated with the project. Nonetheless, project actors are deemed acceptable for performing the routine monitoring that occurs throughout the life of the project.

---

21 Casley and Lury 90.
23 Weiss, Evaluation Research 34.
24 Chinapah and Miron 28.
25 Chinapah and Miron 28.
26 Casley and Lury 11.
Many times projects have for objectives very long-term, broad goals, such as the eradication of poverty or the empowerment of women. Such goals are extremely difficult to measure, both in terms of time allotment (i.e. how long after the completion of the project is it necessary to wait for the full effects to be felt?) and in terms of how they should be quantified (i.e. what is meant by the empowerment of women and how can it be measured?). Responding to the question of time, Rossi, Freeman, and Lipsey argue that a final evaluation should be conducted only once the project is “sufficiently well implemented that there is no question that its critical elements have been delivered to appropriate targets.” In Carol Weiss’ text, she asserts that a final evaluation can occur when a project is operating as planned and is in a relatively stable state; that is, when most of the inefficiencies have been removed. For a frame of reference, in the case of family planning projects, the time estimate for its results to be felt is two years.

Having described the stages of the monitoring and evaluation process and the way in which evaluative information should be collected, we now turn to the question of how to quantify project objectives. For an objective to be quantifiable, it must have various indicators that break down these all-encompassing wholes into more manageable parts. These indicators, Weiss states, should follow certain criteria in order to truly measure the effectiveness of a project: they must be valid, in that they accurately capture the concept of interest; they must be reliable, so that they can be used repeatedly; they must be able to show a trend, i.e. the evaluator should be expecting a specific pattern in the indicator results that would demonstrate positive or negative outcomes; there must be a clear

---

27 Rossi, Freeman, and Lipsey 28.
relationship between the indicators and the project; the indicators should be related to current events or issues, especially if they are being measured in an interview, as people tend to forget or misperceive occurrences of the (distant) past.\textsuperscript{30} Robert Fitzpatrick\'s perspective, in an essay on evaluation measures, reiterates many of Weiss\' key points: "in selecting measures for evaluating effectiveness, measures should be relevant, comprehensive, reliable, and feasible."\textsuperscript{31} Despite an indicator\'s attempt to measure the results of a project, it is important to note that the found outcomes may not necessarily be consequences of the project, but instead may merely be demonstrating a spurious correlation. A spurious correlation occurs when the indicators show marked change with the progression of a project, but the change is not actually the result of anything having to do with the particular project. In many instances, the existence of a spurious correlation cannot be ruled out, but through marking a progression of changes throughout the course of the project, the likelihood of such falsely drawn conclusions becomes minimal. With these criteria and cautions in mind, one can now look to several indicators, many of which actually serve for various types of projects.

Participant characteristics are important to review no matter the project. While a project may be very focused on a certain type of participant, such as women or children, an examination of the exact characteristics can be important in demonstrating who the project is targeting (either intentionally or inadvertently), to whom the project appeals, and to whom the project is accessible. Such characteristics include the participants\' sex, age, socioeconomic status, education, and racial/ethnic background.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{30} Weiss, \textit{Evaluation Methods} 144.  
\textsuperscript{32} Weiss, \textit{Evaluation Methods} 134.
the characteristics of the participants is the need to examine the accessibility of the project and how that may change over time. A critical question is thus, are those for whom the project is intended able to participate, and why or why not?

If a project is truly effective, it will most likely have incorporated the expected participants at all stages in the project’s development. However, it is vital to determine throughout the monitoring process to what extent the needs and expectations of the participants are being met. Close attention to the opinions of the participants also highlights the effectiveness of a project. An evaluator must examine the participants’ attitudes, behaviors, skills, and knowledge and how these four factors change over the course of the project. Surely there are different attitudes and skills that an evaluator will be looking for depending on the type of project, but nonetheless, these are factors that must be considered for all social projects.

Because not all development projects can be evaluated in the same way, despite similarities on certain indicators, it is necessary to give an overview of specific projects types and their indicators, which should be measured in addition to the more general aforementioned indicators. Many development projects focus specifically on education, literacy, and family planning. Many of these projects, notwithstanding their initial project focus, seek to, in the long run, improve the quality of life and reduce the poverty of the participants. Certainly such goals are too general to measure, but there are many indicators that serve as approximations. Casley and Lury provide several such “proxy” measures for determining a person’s or community’s quality of life: food consumption, which is determined by domestic food production and food purchases; child nutritional status, calculated as weight for height, weight for age, or height for age; school

\[33\] Rossi, Freeman, and Lipsey 84.
enrollment by age; living conditions, consisting of the number of people per room, the
type of construction, and the expenditures on shelter and its improvements and contents;
distance or time to potable water; and the frequency of use of a clinic, as well as the
distance or time to that clinic.34

Determining poverty would at first seem a better defined procedure, in that one
can measure a person's or family's income level. However, income is often a sensitive
topic, and many individuals do not have an income per se, but rather they survive through
subsistence agriculture.35 Instead, one must look at an individual's expenditures
(although this too is not always accurate, as people often exaggerate their expenditures in
an effort to impress) and at food production that is self-consumed and that which is
sold.36

Education projects are perhaps the most common type of development project
because of the implications that education has on the future of individuals, communities,
and countries. Education projects often promise a high return on investment.37 Women's
education, in particular, is "strongly associated with increased economic productivity,
smaller family size, improved health and nutritional status, and education of the next
generation of children," states a USAID report.38 Such lofty achievements are difficult to
measure, but because these correlations are highly believed, what is more important is
determining the immediate effects of the projects. If the short-term results prove to be

34 Casley and Lury 45.
35 Casley and Lury 42.
36 Casley and Lury 42.
37 Patrice Franko, The Puzzle of Latin American Economic Development, (New York: Rowman and
38 Chloe O'Gara et al, "More, But Not Yet Better: An Evaluation of USAID's Programs and Policies to
Improve Girls' Education," USAID Program and Operations Assessment Report No. 25, (Washington:
USAID, June 1999) xiii.
positive, there is consequently the hope and expectation that the future will bring greater prosperity than solely an improved ability to read, write, and do arithmetic.

To measure the more immediate effectiveness of a literacy project, for example, one must look at the participants’ literacy skills and the functionality of those skills, as well as at the quality and content of teaching materials and classes. If one wishes to measure more intermediate results of a literacy project, one should look at how politically aware are participants and former participants, how they utilize their knowledge of literacy outside of the classroom (especially in how that relates to their transactions in the economic, social and political spheres), and what the school enrollment rates are for the participants’ children. In addition, linkages between literacy projects and the community or other organizations can affect a project’s results, and should thus be noted. Answering all of these questions seems a formidable task, and rightly so, but it is possible. For instance, an evaluation of an Ethiopian literacy campaign utilized basic questionnaires, interviews, observation, and cognitive tests to measure such indicators.

For education improvement projects, in general (including vocational education), evaluations should be done both on the achievements of the students, and on the teachers’ performances, which includes their qualifications and previous teaching experience, methods and content of teaching, and their teaching attitudes and expectations. In measuring the effectiveness of the education that the students are receiving, several factors must be considered: repetition, drop out, retention, and graduation rates; class size; hours per class; pupils per teacher ratio; teacher’s average teaching load; procedure
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of promotion for teachers; teachers' salaries; and teacher turnover rates. Each indicator will not be applicable or necessary for determining the effectiveness of every education project, but each factor should be recognized as having the potential to impact the outcomes of a student's education.

Family planning projects also prove important in development strategies. Projects that concern family planning often utilize classes, posters, and reunions to disseminate knowledge about birth control. Such methods hope to foster a decrease in fertility, but because, as previously mentioned, it can take at least two years for noted changes in fertility rates to occur, other more short-term measures are used to indicate the success or failure of a family planning project. An evaluator should obtain information on the pre-project fertility rates and monitor how these change throughout the course of the project. Evaluators can also look at the knowledge and attitudes participants have gained and at the rate at which participants are utilizing family planning methods (often termed the acceptance or adoption rate). Participants' attitudes can be discerned through open-ended questionnaires or pointed questions asking, for example, about the number of children they desire to have, the average number of children that were actually born into that household, and their opinions regarding large families. The responses to these questions, especially if they are asked both at the onset and completion of the project, are indicative of experienced changes in attitudes and behavior.

For all of the beneficial aspects of evaluations and their potential to improve a project's effectiveness, there are, of course, drawbacks and limitations to their power. The aforesaid indicators by no means comprise a comprehensive list of factors that must
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be measured in order to determine whether or not a specific project is effective. Most every development project is custom developed or altered to best fit the needs and situation of the participants, which while certainly valuable for these beneficiaries, makes generalizations regarding project outcomes and information sharing between projects difficult.\textsuperscript{47} Especially in cases where the applicability of the evaluation is called into question, evaluations are criticized as being time and cost intensive. However, Chinapah and Miron attack this argument, pointing out that the cost of an evaluation is usually justifiable, because through improving the planning and implementation of projects, there can be better utilization of available resources, thus decreasing the overall costs of the project.\textsuperscript{48}

The central purpose of an evaluation is to identify the various aspects (both positive and negative) of a project in the hopes that policy makers will effect future change that ideally will improve the success of a project. However, because professional evaluators and individuals who are not directly involved in the project design or implementation normally (or should) conduct the evaluations, the evaluations are often written using technical terms that program sponsors find difficult to interpret and apply.\textsuperscript{49} Especially concerning educational projects, developing countries tend to have limited evaluation capacities, causing them to rely on foreign expertise, funds, and consequently, the evaluation and education theories of the more developed countries, which are not necessarily applicable or appropriate to less developed nations.\textsuperscript{50} The evaluators, because of their outside role, do not have much invested in the project and thus do not promote

\textsuperscript{48} Chinapah and Miron 25.
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changes; rather, evaluators view evaluations from an academic standpoint, not seeing it within their obligations or interest to recommend policy change. 51

Neither do policymakers themselves regularly advocate for change; with low budgets and limited personnel, which is the case for most small-scale development projects, in particular, change simply is not feasible. 52 Institutional change requires more management, perhaps new training, and a change in accustomed practices, which can lead to instability. 53 Furthermore, many evaluations are conducted only because such action is required for future funding from donor organizations. Donor agencies initially give funds to a project that has specified goals, practices, and ideologies; suggested changes may break with these initial claims, which could threaten the relationship with the donor agency. 54 Most often, the organizations that receive funds from donor agencies are not held highly accountable for achieving all of their objectives, such that there is little incentive for completed evaluations to be utilized. Nonetheless, as previously stated, there are those individuals and organizations that clearly recognize the important role that evaluations play in the development process.

Evaluations not only highlight a project’s triumphs and failures, but also offer reasons for such outcomes and with that, the potential for change to occur. Effective evaluations should be fully integrated into the entire project process, through monitoring systems that begin even before a project’s inception, allowing for comparisons and accurate conclusions to be drawn. Because projects are individually tailored to the participants, there is no one set of indicators that can be used across all projects. Some
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measures, however, such as participant characteristics, and changes in knowledge, skills, attitude, and behavior are essential to all evaluations. Lack of funding, resources, and time, in conjunction with donor-development project relationships currently frustrate evaluation efforts, but through addressing these criticisms and institutional obstacles, evaluations have the potential to greatly improve the success and effectiveness of development projects.

**Evaluation Literature as Applied to the Field Research in Bolivia**

Most development analysts, as evidenced throughout this chapter, suggest that the evaluation and monitoring process is a strictly linear process. To complete an evaluation, they argue, certain evaluative tasks must be done in a particular order. Prior to the implementation of a project, one must collect data regarding the pre-project status of the community and the individuals that are to be affected by the project. Certain indicators are consequently established, and throughout the project process, these indicators are measured in an attempt to determine the effect or impact that the project has. At the end of the project it is best to conduct a final evaluation that looks for the overall outcomes of the project. Finally, ideally, organizations should conduct follow-up evaluations to measure the long-term impact and sustainability of a project.

This simple outline does not suggest that evaluations are easy, for certainly each step requires much time, energy, and money. However, this standard way of describing evaluations, as if one must check off items on a "to do" list to accomplish a successful evaluation implies that each stage of an evaluation is discreet and separate, when in fact, many overarching themes can be recognized. Instead of describing evaluations in the
traditional step-wise manner, as the evaluation literature does, this thesis takes a new look
at monitoring and evaluation systems, by cutting across the linear processes and pulling
out characteristics that are important at every level of the evaluation process. It is an
attempt to classify the various steps of an evaluation into overarching qualitative
components. After analyzing the literature review here, which is drawn from a cross
examination of seminal evaluative works by Carol Weiss, Samuel Hayes, Peter Rossi,
and Howard Freeman, it is possible to identify four important qualitative factors that
should characterize evaluations: information management, participant involvement,
flexibility, and coordination of actors. These four categories are critical for creating the
most accurate and useful evaluations and are thus the subject of the following four
chapters. Quality evaluations are necessary to provide accurate data regarding the actual
progress, effect, and impact of a project. Such accuracy is important because it is from
evaluations that policy changes and project designs arise. We now turn to an
examination of the way in which seven international development organizations that
work in Bolivia incorporate these key themes.
Information management is arguably the component that receives the most attention from evaluation specialists. Such a focus on the process of information management is likely the reason that evaluations are viewed in a strictly linear fashion. It is important to keep in mind, however, that information management is but one component of a successful evaluation. Evaluations, it is argued, are composed of pieces of information, or indicators, that must be gathered and monitored throughout the lifetime of a project. What type of information must be gathered is as important as how the information is managed and utilized.

The following section analyzes the ways in which development organizations in Bolivia choose, monitor, and evaluate project indicators in comparison with the more general evaluation theories. Table 3 gives a full description of the indicators that each organization uses for its different types of projects. It will become apparent through this section that evaluation theory can never be perfectly carried out, due to restrictions of time, money, and the nature of particular projects. Organizations with larger scale projects tend to carry out what evaluation theory recommends, but even these organizations fail in certain evaluation processes, especially in the follow up procedures.

The Content of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

Indicators form the backbone of evaluation systems, as they are the tools that are used to compile the information that will ultimately become the main content of any monitoring report or evaluation. Nevertheless, indicators are also extremely challenging to develop and manage. Evaluation specialists, such as Carol Weiss, Peter Rossi, and
### Table 3. Indicators by Project Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Basic Sanitation</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Site visits: look for members of household to be practicing basic hygiene (using latrine, washing hands), number of water systems in a community, number of families with latrines</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Site visits: Incidence of diarrhea, number of pregnant women</td>
<td>For all projects - site visits: use KAP - look for changes in knowledge, aptitude, and practices of beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Corps</td>
<td>QPRs: no. of individuals trained on the topics of each objective, no. of organizations strengthened, no. of communities assisted</td>
<td>QPRs: no. of beneficiaries with access to clean water after the construction of a water system, no. of improved water systems, no. of people trained how to make potable water, no. of people that use a potable water method four months after training, no. of people trained on the importance of using latrines, no. of people trained how to recycle plastic, no. of people that participate in plastic recycling activities</td>
<td>QPRs: no. of individuals trained on the topics of each objective, no. of organizations strengthened, no. of communities assisted</td>
<td>QPRs: no. of individuals trained on the topics of each objective, no. of organizations strengthened, no. of communities assisted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Microenterprise development - QPRs: no. of business owners implementing new practices, no. of artisans reporting higher level of family income, percentage of increase in family income, no. of artisan associations implementing improved systems/practices, no. of sustainable markets developed per association, no. of microenterprises that develop/improve tourism-related attractions or services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 Continued. Indicators by Project Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Basic Sanitation</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Concern International (PCI)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>National statistics: dropout rate, percent of students that pass a grade, repetition rate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Infrastructure- site visits: progress of construction compared to set timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nation's Children's Fund (UNICEF)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>National Statistics (unspecified)</td>
<td>National Statistics: literacy rate, national education coverage, dropout rate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>National statistics: infant mortality rate, percentage of population with access to health care, percentage of children 0-5 years with diarrhea, percent of population with access to running water, prevalence of malnutrition in children under 5</td>
<td>All projects, where necessary- site visits: changes in knowledge and attitudes of beneficiaries Defense of childhood-national statistics: intrafamily violence, incidence of child abuse, percent of children 0-14 years whose birth is unregistered, percent of children 7-18 that work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Basic Sanitation</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water for People</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Site visits: cleanliness and utilization of latrines, no. of children that changed customs of water use</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Site visits/ reports by local health post; weight and height of children 0-5 years, no. of cases of acute respiratory infections and acute diarrheas in children 0-5 years</td>
<td>Water systems- site visits/records book; no. of people paying water tariffs, no. of cleanings of water tank per year, no. of pipes exposed to sun, percentage of taps dripping, no. of inspections to drinking water system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>National statistics: drop out rate, accessibility of education</td>
<td>National guidelines: make sure projects are ecologically friendly</td>
<td>National statistics- access and availability of universal mother-infant insurance, number of children under 5 that seek/need medical attention</td>
<td>For spiritual development- observation/interviews: intrafamily violence, change in conduct-where individuals treat their children, spouse, and neighbors with respect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Howard Freeman, stress the importance of creating indicators that can accurately represent the progress of a project’s objectives. They go on to outline the various types of indicators that can be used, depending on whether one desires to assess the quality, content, effect, or impact of a project. However, these theorists are unable to suggest specific indicators that all development projects must use, as indicators must almost always be project-specific. Evaluation literature that is more focused on a particular type of development project, such as Freeman, Rossi, and Wright’s work on social projects in developing countries, H.S. Bhola’s text on literacy projects and campaigns, and Vinayagum and Miron’s book on educational programs and projects, do offer some suggestions for indicators (as outlined in detail in chapter one), but even these indicators must be shaped to each particular project to best reflect the specific nature, scope, and goals of the project.

The principal way in which monitoring occurs is through regular measurement of project indicators. Indicators can be qualitative or quantitative, measuring such things as changes in attitude or changes in the literacy rate. They attempt to break down project goals and objectives into measurable components. There are a variety of different underlying types of indicators, depending upon when in the project implementation process the monitoring or evaluating is taking place. Process indicators are the most immediate indicators, as they reflect the actions that are being completed during the project process to attain the end goals. Used particularly in infrastructure projects, where an evaluator is interested in determining how much of a building, water system, or latrine has been constructed, what components are missing, and how on schedule the construction process is, process indicators can also be used effectively to monitor training.

projects, to assess how many people are attending training sessions and what information is being disseminated at these sessions. Impact indicators are usually only used following the completion of a project, as they determine the final impact that a project has had, which is often not visible until some time after the end of the project. The third kind of indicator that is commonly used is a proxy indicator, which is an indicator that reflects the more immediate results of long-term goals. As Carol Weiss asserts, long-term goals of projects can take years to witness, but proxy indicators can give an approximation as to what the long-term results will be.\textsuperscript{56} There is little evidence of the use of proxy indicators among the organizations included in this study, except when there is a focus on the changes in attitudes and knowledge of project beneficiaries. Instead, the majority of the organizations tend to favor impact indicators, which, as will be demonstrated, can be problematic when used as a regular monitoring tool.

As mentioned, some of the project sector-specific literature suggests indicators that can be utilized for particular types of projects. For instance, H.S. Bhola states that life expectancy, infant mortality rate, and percent of population with access to safe water are good measures to use when evaluating health projects.\textsuperscript{57} Bhola's indicators are representative of impact indicators because they reflect long-term goals of increasing life expectancy and increasing access to potable water. Most literature tends to follow Bhola's approach by supplying evaluators with quantitative macro indicators: Casley and Lury propose that evaluators use the literacy rate and student drop out rate to evaluate educational projects, and Cuca and Pierce suggest measuring fertility rates for family
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planning projects. In practice, such information does not accurately represent the progress or impact of a project, as these measures are usually only available on a national level, from national statistics. Many other factors apart from the actual project, not least the economic and political situation of the country, contribute to the status of these macro indicators. Moreover, statistics are not always current, as they are usually derived from national censuses or polls, which do not occur on a monthly, or even annual basis. Although these indicators may be telling of the overall educational or health level of a country, development projects do not affect the entire population, and these indicators are slow to reflect the changes that are occurring.

Despite the several drawbacks associated with quantitative macro indicators, many organizations that have expansive projects utilize these indicators as their principal monitoring and evaluation tools. CARE, Project Concern International, World Vision, UNICEF, and USAID all use national statistics, of which the majority are impact indicators, for at least a portion of their indicators. Such macro indicators are particularly used for monitoring the progress of health and education related projects. Carlos Gutierrez, the Monitoring and Evaluation Official for UNICEF-Bolivia, laments the fact that UNICEF relies so heavily on quantitative macro indicators and hopes to develop more qualitative indicators in the near future. He acknowledges that quantitative data are often unable to reflect accurately the effect of certain UNICEF projects, especially projects that deal with the protection of childhood, a central goal of many UNICEF projects, for which there is no good quantitative indicator. Moreover, Gutierrez recognizes that UNICEF projects, while affecting thousands of Bolivians throughout the country, do not affect everyone, nor every community, and consequently national
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statistics include too much of the general population to be accurate. Occasionally, however, the Bolivian government breaks down national statistics by region, and in some instances, by community. UNICEF utilizes these more specific, local values whenever possible.

Sergio Navajas of USAID also realizes the problems associated with using national statistics as project indicators, noting that there is constantly a "problem of attribution," where any changes in the national statistics may not be a result of USAID projects, but rather the result of a complex set of factors, such as government policies, the economy, and the current social situation. Only rarely are evaluators able to determine what changes in the macro indicators can be attributed to USAID's projects, by looking at expenditures of particular project sectors. For example, USAID's environmental projects often focus on national parks in Bolivia; if the status of a national park that receives funding from various institutions is compared to that of a national park that is funded solely by USAID, and there is a significant difference between the statuses of these two parks, that difference may be attributed to USAID. Some sectors, such as education, receive support from several institutions and are too large that it is simply too complex to break down assistance by expenditures.

Limitations with indicators, which include instances where local data are unavailable, where changes in indicators cannot be attributed to a particular project, and where good indicators simply do not exist for a particular project objective can often only be overcome, if at all, by external evaluators. Members of the implementing organization are too busy designing, implementing, and monitoring the quantitative aspects of their

projects that they do not have the time or the financial resources to gather the more qualitative, detailed information that is actually most representative of the progress and impact of a project. Navajas admits this fact, stating that USAID's external evaluations are much more qualitative than quantitative, as the external evaluators have both the time and the resources to conduct in-depth interviews with Bolivians who are experts on the particular project sectors.61 These interviews are conducted in an effort to determine the local experts' opinions on the value and impact of the project. Despite this qualitative information, which plays a central role in the external evaluations, there is no attempt by the evaluators to contact project beneficiaries, at least in the case of USAID. USAID's projects affect far too many individuals countrywide and cover such a variety of sectors, that even external evaluators are unable to reach that level of detail for the majority of the projects, Navajas claims.62 Nonetheless, in some instances, more detail is necessary, especially when an objective is not easily quantifiable, as in the case for USAID democracy promotion projects. National statistics usually do not offer information regarding how democratic its society is or how confident its citizens are in the democratic system. Because USAID is particularly concerned with these issues, it employs external monitors (discussed in more detail in the following chapter) to conduct interviews with Bolivians, where the interviewers ask Bolivians about the level of trust that they have in democracy, in general, and in the Bolivian democracy, in particular.

Organizations other than USAID also rely almost solely on qualitative indicators when quantitative indicators are unable to measure adequately the objectives and goals that they are attempting to achieve. While Project Concern International finds national

statistics, such as the drop out rate and the percent of students that pass each particular grade, acceptable to measure the progress of its education projects, projects that are infrastructure-based, including the construction of water systems, have no nationally established indicators. Consequently, PCI evaluators make site visits to the locations of infrastructure projects to determine the progress of the construction compared with the projected timeline for when specific components should be completed. This procedure of utilizing process indicators to monitor infrastructure projects directly coincides with the evaluation suggestions of Casley and Lury in their text on evaluation and monitoring methods of development projects.63

World Vision likewise utilizes national statistics as project indicators except in instances where these indicators fail to describe the desired information, as is the case for World Vision's goal of spiritual development. As Raul Baltazar, the Coordinator for Monitoring for World Vision, explains, finding any indicator to assess the progress of spiritual development in project beneficiaries is extremely difficult.64 Consequently, World Vision evaluators primarily use observation and interviews with project beneficiaries to determine spiritual development, by looking for changes in conduct of community leaders and heads of households, and an improvement in the way in which individuals treat their children, their spouse, and their neighbors. These indicators of personal change are reflective of proxy indicators, in that they look at the current changes that are occurring as an indication of how well the community is progressing towards a more socially just community that upholds the notion of solidarity, a very long term goal that cannot be detected within the scope of the project. The hope is that project
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beneficiaries will not only learn the important concepts, such as solidarity, through World Vision projects, but that they will also understand these concepts, utilize them in their daily life, and teach them to other individuals that may not be directly involved in World Vision projects.

The majority of UNICEF’s monitoring system is also based on national indicators, even for such a complex issue as measuring defense of childhood. Certainly no one indicator accurately portrays defense of childhood. However, UNICEF evaluators have established the national indicators of the incidence of family violence, incidence of child abuse, percent of children zero to seventeen years old whose birth is unregistered, and the percent of children aged seven to eighteen that work as approximations for measuring how well defense of childhood is being accomplished. Despite these approximations, Gutierrez admits that these indicators are not ideal. In attempt not to rely exclusively on national statistics, UNICEF evaluators also occasionally look for changes in the knowledge and attitudes of project beneficiaries.

CARE does not rely as heavily on macro indicators as the aforementioned organizations, but it, too, utilizes the national statistic of infant mortality rate as a key indicator for determining the progress of its health programs. More so even than UNICEF, however, CARE actors are also very interested to see changes in the knowledge, aptitude, and practices of project beneficiaries. The determination of these three criteria is commonly known among individuals in the development field as the KAP method. The majority of CARE’s evaluative information for basic sanitation and health projects is derived from site visits, where quantitative information is gathered through
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observation and interviews. Although the information collected remains quantitative, its focus is much more specific and is community, rather than nationally, based. Basic sanitation indicators for CARE include the number of members per household that appear to be practicing basic hygiene, such as appropriately using the latrine and washing hands, and the number of families with latrines in a particular community.

The following two development organizations, Peace Corps and Water for People, unlike the abovementioned organizations, do not use macro indicators for any of their projects. The stark differences between the content of the evaluations of these two organizations and the other organizations (CARE, Project Concern International, World Vision, UNICEF, and USAID) may be the result of the scale of each organization’s projects. Peace Corps and Water for People tend to have relatively small-scale, community based development projects. Although many of the project ideas of the other organizations originate at the community level and the projects are designed to fit the specific conditions and needs of the communities in which they are implemented, the projects encompass thousands of people throughout all of Bolivia. Maintaining regular monitoring of projects of this large scale is very difficult without the use of macro indicators. Because of the smaller size of the Peace Corps and Water for People projects, actors of these two organizations are able to gather more specified information and utilize relatively micro indicators.

The monitoring process for the majority of the Peace Corps project sectors strikingly differs from that of the previously mentioned organizations. All of the indicators for Peace Corps projects are quantitative and are gathered through observation; most of the indicators are process indicators. Until January 2004, the indicators were the
same for all project sectors and required PCVs to record on a trimonthly basis how many individuals they had trained, how many organizations had been strengthened, and how many communities had been assisted. The PCVs also had to note to which project objective their actions corresponded. All of these indicators are process indicators, asking nothing about the effects or potential impact that this training will have on the project beneficiaries.

There are a few reasons that Peace Corps indicators tend to focus on the process, rather than on the output, of a project. Peace Corps projects are relatively specific, in that they attempt to address only a few objectives under each sector's goals, and the projects are normally executed by only one individual. The small nature and specificity of each Peace Corps project, which is often designed by the PCV herself, makes holding all volunteers in one sector accountable to a set of specific indicators unrealistic. It is not possible for one PCV, in only two years of service, to work towards the achievement of all objectives in one project sector. Additionally, in the case of rural volunteers, there is usually only one PCV per community. It would be too large a task for the PCV to ask project beneficiaries about their attitudes, opinions, practices, and knowledge on a regular and formal basis. Process indicators, on the other hand, are part of a manageable task for PCVs, as they must only speak of their own actions and simply count the number of individuals with which they work.

Although the process indicators appear to be appropriate for the scale and nature of Peace Corps projects, the existing indicators are very basic and do not at all demonstrate the potential effects that the projects could have in the future. In attempt to remedy these weaknesses, the APCDs of the basic sanitation and microenterprise
development project sectors have established new indicators for their projects that are much more objective-specific. These new indicators were very hard to establish; the small-scale nature of Peace Corps projects prohibits APCDs from borrowing indicator ideas from some of the larger development organizations also operating in Bolivia, as they heavily rely on national statistics. Tim McFarren, the APCD for basic sanitation, describes the process of revamping the monitoring and indicator system as one where he was constantly “banging [his] head against the wall.” However, it appears as though this long process may pay off, in that the newly developed indicators are much more descriptive and try to incorporate not only the project processes, but also the results. Instead of asking PCVs how many people they have trained and requiring that they record the objective that they were trying to accomplish through their training, the new basic sanitation indicators now ask PCVs to list the number of people that they have trained on methods of water purification, the number of people trained on the importance of using latrines, and the number of people that demonstrate that they are utilizing their newly acquired knowledge, and indicator system that integrates proxy and process indicators. These new indicator systems break down each objective into quantifiable components, making the collected information more accurately reflect the work of each volunteer and the potential impact that the volunteer’s actions can have. Additionally, the more specified indicators are able to reduce the incidence of double counting; previously, the number of individuals affected by Peace Corps projects was consistently overestimated.

In the more formalized monitoring reports that reach Peace Corps Headquarters, there is an attempt to include more qualitative information, by listing noted changes in the attitudes and knowledge of project beneficiaries. These criteria, however, are not indicators, per se, in that they are not used throughout the monitoring and evaluation process to determine the progress or impact of a project. In fact, at no point are PCVs asked to record such changes. As the Peace Corps monitoring system is reworked even more, perhaps these qualitative components will become more integral to the entire monitoring process.

Water for People, like Peace Corps, relies on much more locally gathered data to form the basis of its monitoring and evaluation system. Although some of the health indicators are quite similar to the macro indicators that organizations such as UNICEF utilize, including the number of cases of acute respiratory infections and acute diarrheas in children aged zero to five, Water for People’s indicators are based on reports that are produced in the local health clinics. Water for People’s health indicators can thus more accurately reflect the health situation of the community in which a project is being implemented. The health indicators are impact indicators and contrast significantly with the basic sanitation and water system indicators, which are generally process and proxy indicators. Determining the cleanliness and utilization of latrines, as basic sanitation proxy indicators, can approximate how incidences of illnesses related to contaminated water will be affected. Logically, if people use latrines appropriately, rather than depositing human waste near water sources, water borne diseases will likely decrease in the future. Indicators that measure the effectiveness of water systems tend towards process indicators, where the construction and maintenance of the systems are monitored.
The organizations included in this study utilize at least one of the three principal indicators (process, proxy, and impact), to some extent. However, the main focus of the monitoring and evaluation information systems is on the project output, where the concentration is on what has resulted from the project, whether it be a change in the literacy rate, the knowledge and attitudes of a beneficiary, or the correct construction of a water system. Only the Peace Corps (although only as of very recently) combines both input and output indicators, looking at both the information that is taught to the project beneficiaries and, in the revised evaluation systems, how that taught information is utilized by the beneficiaries.

Despite the apparent consistency of evaluation methods with evaluation theory until this point, interestingly, none of the organizations' evaluators accounts for variables that might alter the outcomes of its projects, as Carol Weiss suggests they should. According to Weiss, evaluators should determine variables that exist among the project beneficiaries, looking at, among other criteria, the age, sex, and socioeconomic status, of the project participants.69 There is also no accounting for the quality of the information that is taught. Aside from these missing components, the principal use of quantitative macro indicators for most of the organizations is not ideal. The drawbacks to such large-scale indicators have already been mentioned and include, most importantly, the inability of the indicators to demonstrate the true results of a project. A review of how and when these indicators are utilized, compared with how they should ideally be utilized, also highlights limitations in the evaluation processes of development organizations in Bolivia.

69 Weiss, Evaluation Research 47.
Monitoring and Evaluation Processes

For effective information management, not only are high quality and accurate indicators important, but also a well-organized and detailed process is critical. The way in which the information is collected can have a significant impact on the utility of monitoring reports and final evaluations. A successful monitoring and evaluation system must have an ongoing monitoring process that begins before a project is even implemented, so that over the course of the project a “body of knowledge,” to use Carol Weiss’ terminology, can be created.70 Before project implementation, a baseline, which is comprised of the initial values of all of the indicators, should be established; all future indicator values will be measured against these baseline values. Indicators must be monitored on a regular basis, because as Casley and Lury point out, “monitoring is an integral part of day to day management.”71 Samuel Hayes, another evaluation specialist, also strongly emphasizes the importance of regular and consistent monitoring.72 A project-end evaluation by itself will do nothing to indicate how the situation has changed as a result of the project, especially because there is nothing against which to compare any changes. As Normal Gold states, “an evaluation cannot be relevant if it is to occur autonomously.”73 However, neither will constant monitoring, which is essential for determining the progress of a project during its implementation phase, illustrate the bigger picture of the impacts and effects of a project. Consequently, both regular monitoring, before, during and after a project, and a comprehensive final evaluation are needed to truly represent the full results that a project has effected on its beneficiaries.

70 Weiss, Evaluation Research 34.
71 Casley and Lury 4.
72 Hayes 68.
73 Gold 147.
Monitoring

All organizations demonstrate constant monitoring throughout the implementation of their projects, but not every organization has an established baseline nor conducts follow up. Furthermore, the ways in which the organizations conduct their actual monitoring vary. The Peace Corps is an example of an organization that does not utilize a baseline. At the beginning of a PCV’s experience, each PCV is encouraged to conduct a community needs assessment, which attempts to determine the community’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges. This assessment, while not a formal evaluation, has the potential to aid current and future PCVs design their projects. Although the information gathered in this assessment is not directly related to the monitoring indicators that PCVs use later on, it could serve as a basis of knowledge about the initial challenges and condition of the community, prior to project implementation. However, this information is not written down, and consequently no Peace Corps actors are able to refer back to the assessment to discern the ways in which the community changed over the course of the PCV’s project. The fact that Peace Corps does not create a baseline of information is directly related to the nature of the majority of Peace Corps’ indicators, which are predominantly process-oriented. Process indicators, including the number of people trained about the proper use of latrines, does not require baseline information, as prior to the project’s implementation, hypothetically, no individuals have been trained. One way to create a baseline would be to do an assessment of the number of individuals in the community that have prior knowledge of the topics that the PCV intends to cover. The growth of that knowledge could be

recorded to demonstrate the progress that the PCV has on her particular project.

However, such a process will likely not be received well by the project participants, as an assessment of knowledge portrays the image that the PCV knows better than the locals. Project implementers and evaluators always tread this very fine line, where they hope to improve the living condition of impoverished peoples, but in doing so often come across as superior in knowledge and skill, causing a rift between development actors and project participants and threatening the pride of the locals, which is one of the few items that they can hold onto in difficult times.

The organizations that use macro indicators to monitor their projects are able to establish a baseline of information that illustrates the conditions prior to project intervention. Throughout the project process these indicators are regularly monitored and are compared against the baseline to determine the progress that the projects are making. UNICEF evaluators utilize their established baseline to form expectations for what the values of the indicators should be after a certain amount of time. CARE workers use their baseline as the first entry in a comprehensive database that records the monthly progress of each of its projects. The information systems that CARE maintains on the progress of all of its projects serve as both a useful short-term monitoring tool for CARE personnel and as an evaluation database that suggests the overall success or failure of the projects, which will later be utilized by external experts. UNICEF does not monitor its indicators as regularly as CARE, doing so only once a year, rather than monthly. CARE’s qualitative indicators, which take a considerable amount of time to measure, are monitored even less regularly, every two to three years.
Despite the fact that Peace Corps does not have a baseline of indicator information, constant monitoring during the lifetime of a project does occur. PCVs provide their APCDs with monitoring reports on a trimonthly basis, called Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs). Failure to turn in the QPR results in the suspension of the PCV's vacation time. The QPRs are a two-sided form that, until recent revisions, were the same for all PCVs, regardless of their project type: the front side (required) is divided into a qualitative and quantitative section. In the qualitative section, the PCV is to describe her activities in relation to the project's objectives. The quantitative section asks the PCV to list the number of people, organizations, and communities with which she worked on each particular activity. The back side of the form (optional) asks ways in which the volunteer can monitor the success of her project and asks for the strengths and weaknesses of the project, lessons learned, plans for the next quarter, and what assistance the PCV requires. QPRs receive a large amount of criticism from APCDs and PCVs alike; one third year PCV referred to the QPRs as "absolutely worthless." These forms, though, are currently under revision. Until this past year, the forms were completed in English, but beginning in January 2004, the forms must be completed in Spanish by the PCV in conjunction with her counterpart agency. The content, however, of the QPRs has remained the same for all project sectors except basic sanitation and microenterprise development. The QPRs for these two sectors now ask for information specifically related to each sector's objectives.

This new method hopes to better the relationship between the PCVs and their counterparts, thus assuring that both actors are in accordance with the PCV's activities,
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objectives, and accomplishments. Coordination between these two actors is important, because many times PCVs have been criticized for implementing projects that are ill-suited for the needs and realities of the community members among which the PCVs live.76 Conversation with actors in the counterpart agencies, who are most likely individuals who are much more familiar with the economic, social, and political situation, promises that a project will be in better accordance with both the desires of the implementer (the PCV) and the other project participants (the community members).

Another method of monitoring that Peace Corps utilizes is site visits reports, which are written by APCDs following visits to the PCVs in the communities in which they work and live. APCDs must visit their PCVs at least once during the first three months of the PCV’s service, once more during the first year, and at least once during the second year. The site visits provide an opportunity for the APCDs to monitor the PCV’s interactions with community members, the status of the project, and the living situation of the PCV. The visit is also an occasion for the PCV to receive feedback about her project and to receive any technical assistance. Following the visit, the APCD must write a brief report, which will be communicated to the PCV and the technical specialists, commenting on the project and situation of the volunteer, and offering any suggestions for improvement. Technical specialists, who are third year volunteers, and the Peace Corps Volunteer Coordinator (PCVC) also visit the volunteers sporadically throughout their service. They, too, must write up a site visit report, so as to keep the communication and the knowledge open between all actors in the Peace Corps project process.77

Most organizations view final evaluations as the end of the monitoring and evaluation system, but follow up, a form of post-project monitoring, of completed projects is also an integral, but often ignored, aspect of the evaluation process. Gold explains that it is only during follow-up that the true long-term impacts of a project can be assessed. Despite the recognition by evaluation specialists such as Gold of the importance of follow up, in practice, follow-up occurs only very irregularly and informally and usually only in response to negative feedback from former project beneficiaries. Most actors of development organizations cite follow-up as too costly and time-consuming to conduct on a regular basis. They instead rely on local actors, whether it be local NGOs or community leaders, to approach the implementing organization if a project has long-term negative effects that require attention. In some organizations, such as Water for People, this method, while not ideal, does function. However, in general, project follow-up appears to be the weakest component of evaluation methods of development organizations in Bolivia.

In the official plans for Water for People projects, Water for People agrees to do two follow-up visits a year to the receiving communities for three years following the completion of a project. In reality, however, Water for People is only able to do one follow-up visit a year, due to time constraints and the rural location of the majority of the recipient communities. Despite the lack of frequent follow up with the communities, Water for People is able to maintain an informal monitoring system through contact with local NGOs. The local NGOs, even if they are not working specifically on a Water for People project, are normally working on other development projects in the same area and thus maintain contact with the community members. Community members tend to
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contact the NGO personnel if something regarding the project is not working. Another way that Water for People is able to maintain contact with the recipient communities is through serving as a counterpart agency for PCVs. PCVs connected with Water for People work in communities where Water for People is implementing or has implemented a project. PCVs, simply through living in the community on a day-to-day basis, will hear about the successes and failures of projects and will report such things back to Water for People. Through using outside workers, Water for People has access to and communication with receiving communities and is able to implement an informal monitoring system in this manner.

Although PCI recognizes the importance of following up on completed projects, as with all organizations, it faces time and financial constraints, so that its method of follow-up is relatively informal. PCI implements projects continuously in certain regions. When PCI has completed one project, workers from the organization remain in constant contact with the community or its surrounding areas for several years, as they implement other projects. These workers will thus hear if a completed PCI project is failing to bring about the desired changes. Such feedback will result in further assistance from PCI to work to correct problems that the beneficiaries are experiencing. The follow up practices of World Vision are very similar: World Vision normally has several projects occurring simultaneously within a development project area, so that although it may not be working on a project within a particular community, there are constantly workers in the area who will hear of any problems.

Although organizations vary in the ways and regularity in which they perform their monitoring, it is clear that monitoring is an important process to all of the
organizations, for it is the process through which that body of knowledge, to which Weiss referred, is formed. Monitoring provides a general idea of the progress of a particular project, but only in rare instances does it provide qualitative information. Evaluations are a much more detailed process in the information management system, where not only are national statistics recorded, but the personal effects that a project has had on its beneficiaries are examined.

**Evaluation: Midterm and Final**

Evaluations are usually thought of as coming after the completion of a project, and are usually stressed as such in the literature, but they can occur at any time during the project implementation process. In fact, many actors from the organizations in this study expressed a strong desire for midterm evaluations, in addition to final evaluations, because midterm evaluations allow for problems, which macro indicators are often unable to detect, to be identified and rectified. Final evaluations, while illuminating many important aspects of a project, are by their very nature unable to elicit change on the present project; they can only provide lessons for future projects.

Water for People is one such organization that utilizes midterm evaluations. Midterm evaluations serve as tools to determine whether the project should be expanded; normally Water for People projects start off very locally, as they are only initiated at the request of a particular municipality. If the midterm evaluations demonstrate that the project is being implemented successfully, the project will expand to nearby communities in incremental phases (such as twenty water pumps will be constructed at a time). Certainly it cannot be determined in the short-term how beneficial a project is, but these
initial evaluations look to see if the construction of items (such as water pumps) is going according to schedule, if the materials are readily available and appropriate for the type of climate and geography, if the community members are actively participating in the project implementation, and if the items that have been constructed (say, water pumps) are being maintained and are functioning. When the majority of the aspects of the project appear to be operating appropriately, a project is deemed to have positive results, and thus the project will grow to affect other interested communities. Early evaluations are also particularly useful in noting how well the funding is being spent. Because funding is often an issue for infrastructure type projects, such as those of Water for People, they cannot allow for money to be ill spent.

The midterm evaluations that PCI conducts are relatively similar to the early evaluations of Water for People, both in their timing within the project process and in their purpose. A more thorough examination of the initial results and impacts of a project before it has been completed, rather than merely monitoring the numerical indicators, allows problems to be corrected and improvements to be made, helping the project to accomplish its goals and meet the needs of the beneficiaries to the best of its ability. An end-of-project evaluation does not permit for such changes to be made. PCI performs midterm evaluations on social and infrastructure projects. In the case of infrastructure projects, the midterm evaluation seeks to determine the progress of the construction, particularly to ensure that the progress is on schedule and that the allocated funds are being used appropriately.

The importance of midterm evaluations cannot be understated, but according to evaluation specialists and development actors, including Fidel Alvarez the Regional
Director for PCI, final evaluations are certainly the most important component of the entire monitoring and evaluation process. Their importance can be determined simply by the amount of attention they receive in the evaluation literature. Due to the comprehensive nature of final evaluations, external evaluators, that is, individuals from other development organizations, often conduct them. Because of the importance that final evaluations are accredited, there are also relatively strong suggestions on when they should be conducted. There appears to be general consensus between Weiss, Rossi, Freeman, Lipsey and Wright that final evaluations should be conducted several years after the project has been implemented, because a final evaluation attempts to identify the effects and impacts of a project, which can take several years to become visible. Weiss gives some specific criteria to assist evaluators in determining whether or not a project is ready to be evaluated: the project should be operating as intended, the project should be relatively stable, and the project should appear to be achieving positive results. Rossi, Freeman and Lipsey add that the amount of time necessary for these items to occur is roughly four to eight years. Despite the strong emphasis on the timing of final evaluations, none of the actors interviewed expressed much concern for the schedule of final evaluations, but rather asserted that the final evaluation should take place whenever a project is completed, which can range anywhere from three to eight years after it has been implemented.

Final evaluations, because of their comprehensive nature are often referred to as integrative evaluations. Integrative evaluations are quite costly and require a large investment of time, as they evaluate all aspects of a particular project, including its

79 See for example Hayes, Freeman, Weiss, and Rossi.
80 Weiss, Evaluation Methods 73.
81 Rossi, Freeman and Lipsey 408.
financial, cultural, and social impacts on the beneficiaries and their communities. Many different actors have performed evaluations of PCI projects, including most recently, a six-month long evaluation conducted by members of USAID. This evaluation was funded by international donations. In the past, certain ministries from the government of Bolivia (such as the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education) have visited PCI project sites and conducted evaluations. The government of Bolivia has a strong interest in the projects of PCI because although the projects are implemented on a small scale, they are helping to improve the education and health systems, in particular, which the government of Bolivia cannot do alone, due to its limited resources.

UNICEF has various levels of evaluations, ranging from small-scale internal evaluations to government-run evaluations. The Vice Ministry of Public Spending for Bolivia performs evaluations on the financial aspects of UNICEF’s projects to assure that UNICEF reaches, but does not exceed, its projected amount of spending. UNICEF relies on external evaluators, who come from either the Bolivian government or from other development agencies, to determine the effects and impact of a project. These external evaluators are also responsible for establishing baseline information on qualitative indicators and on monitoring these indicators throughout the life of the project. Impact evaluations generally occur four to six years after the implementation of a project. UNICEF does also perform its own (internal) evaluations, which mainly focus on the project outputs and the structural and technical challenges that UNICEF faces in achieving its objectives. The internal evaluations, consequently, are especially important for revealing ways in which the projects can be improved. Furthermore, while most of UNICEF’s projects begin at the local level, the Bolivian government later assumes many
of these projects, later incorporating them into their own plans for national development. Internal evaluations often offer suggestions for how the government can adopt UNICEF’s projects and effectively expand them to the national level.

Despite the many levels of evaluations at UNICEF, there is no evaluation that examines the financial sustainability of the projects. Project financing, while under the direction of UNICEF, is relatively secure, provided that the project is roughly meeting the target values of its indicators and objectives. However, if the Bolivian government assumes the responsibility of executing UNICEF projects, it also assumes the associated costs, which can be very high. Even if the government does not take on a UNICEF project, it ultimately assumes the running costs of all projects, such as the salaries of the nurses, doctors, and teachers of these newly UNICEF trained professionals and the maintenance costs of UNICEF built hospitals, clinics, and schools. Maintaining these new costs can be difficult for the weak economy of Bolivia, and thus an evaluation of the financial sustainability of UNICEF projects is necessary to offer suggestions on ways to take precautions and act in a manner that will prove to be most sustainable. As of now, UNICEF is not strongly considering these future challenges.

Evaluation teams, composed of two or three people, usually spend two months in Bolivia performing final evaluations of USAID projects. Qualitative components are the focus of external evaluations, particularly in light of the problems associated with using national statistics during the monitoring process, as they often do little to demonstrate the projects’ effects. External evaluations are by no means inexpensive, costing USAID approximately two thousand dollars per evaluator each day.82 Despite the associated
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costs with external evaluations, Sergio Navajas, the Senior Economics Official for USAID Bolivia, believes that they are necessary.

Final evaluations of CARE's projects rely, in part, on the information databases that have been compiled throughout the entire project implementation process. The evaluations begin with a review of the original project proposal to determine how well the data that have been collected regularly over the life of the project correspond with the initial project goals and objectives. The evaluators also interview CARE workers, who have been directly involved with the specific projects, regarding their knowledge and perceptions of the project. These responses are then compared with the results of site visits and interviews with the project's beneficiaries. This process is highly useful for CARE workers, in that not only do they gain a comprehensive report, but they are also better able to understand how well their actions and perceptions correspond with the actual results of the project. The final evaluations are also imperative for the development of future CARE projects, as they include conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned. Victor Rico, the Chief of Infrastructure for CARE Bolivia, relies heavily on the recommendations included in the final evaluations when he designs any new projects.

The final evaluations of World Vision's projects are strikingly different from those of the other development organizations in Bolivia. While World Vision does have external final evaluations that are conducted by external evaluators every two to three years, the main focus of World Vision's evaluative procedures is on self-evaluations. For the traditional final evaluations, international commissions look particularly at the effects that the project has had on its beneficiaries and the receiving communities. Several of the
Bolivian ministries, such as the ministry of education, the ministry of health, and the ministry of agriculture, also conduct final evaluations of World Vision projects. Bolivian ministries are interested in World Vision projects, because many directly and indirectly support their own objectives.

Self-evaluations are the central focus of World Vision's evaluation efforts. The self-evaluations are just that; they give the opportunity for those people who have been most involved and affected by the project to evaluate the project's progress, successes and failures. This form of evaluation is relatively new to World Vision and is a complete novelty to many of the communities involved. Self-evaluations are to occur every three years, as every three years World Vision revises its project plans. Members of World Vision facilitate community meetings and discussion sessions to initiate the evaluation process in communities that have not had prior experience with evaluations or that are not particularly well organized. Communities that have been working with World Vision for longer periods of time and that have established community leaders conduct their own evaluations through their community assemblies. This complete autonomy in the evaluation process has so far been successful in two out of the seven development project areas (proyecto desarrollo de area, or PDAs). Development project areas (Proyecto Desarrollo de Area) are regions that contain about twenty rural communities each.

At the completion of the self-evaluations, the community leaders hand in a summary of their comments and suggestions to World Vision. World Vision relies primarily on this input to revise all of their project plans. From the information that the evaluations provide, World Vision will often alter its strategy of project implementation,
or if the collected data are not demonstrating what World Vision hoped to know, it will modify and change its indicators to better determine the desired information.

As World Vision’s Monitoring Coordinator, Raul Baltazar, admits, there are certainly risks involved in having the communities essentially direct their own development process through the self-evaluations. The two largest risks, in Baltazar’s opinion, are that the development process can become politicized and characterized by immediatism. Self-evaluations require that there be a leader to direct the discussions; often, those that assume this position work for the local municipality. Most (if not all) levels of the government in Bolivia, however, are associated with favoritism and corruption. The inclusion of local leaders as key facilitators of development projects poses the threat that the projects will assist only those associated with the local government. Second, because the condition of living is often so dire in rural Bolivia, where rural residents are most concerned about acquiring food or drinking water or their crops, there is little focus on the future. This short-term outlook can produce economically and ecologically unsustainable practices. Freeman, Rossi, and Wright would also likely find fault with this method of self-evaluation, as they believe that participant ratings should be regarded as weak approach to assessment, unless the project’s goal is to change the attitudes of participants. The participatory nature of World Vision projects suggests that one of the goals is indeed to change the attitudes of the participants, in which case, self-evaluations may be a very appropriate method of evaluation.
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The Peace Corps is the only organization in this study that demonstrates no evidence that it conducts final evaluations. Peace Corps projects are normally designed on a six-year cycle, where three generations of volunteers will work on the same project. Most people in development work agree that projects of less than six years are highly unsustainable. Despite the good intentions of Peace Corps to make their projects sustainable and long-lasting, there does not exist a continuous method of monitoring and evaluation, whereby Peace Corps can measure the progress of a project over its six-year lifetime. The closest that the Peace Corps comes to a final evaluation is in the Progress Status Reports (PSRs), which are annual reports from each project sector that are sent to Peace Corps Headquarters in Washington D.C. Essentially, the PSRs are a summary of the numbers and comments that have been compiled from all of the QPRs and site visit reports that have been handed in over the previous year. The PSRs include lists of the various specific activities that PCVs have performed in order to achieve the project’s objectives, including vignettes that give further detail on exemplar work of two to three volunteers. The final section of the PSRs asks for successes and challenges in achieving the overall goals of each project sector, the impact that external funding has on the projects, lessons learned, and outcomes related to each objective, including changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills, or behaviors as a result of the activities. These specific qualitative questions do not seem to receive much attention, as APCDs do not tend to speak with community members about the effect the project has had on their lives; instead, the APCDs rely on information gathered through informal conversations with
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PCVs and through guesswork to complete these components. The short-term nature of Peace Corps projects, the uniqueness of each project, and the fact that there is only one person responsible for the project all are contributing elements to the fact that the Peace Corps has no final evaluation of its projects.

Although the Peace Corps does have a monitoring process, all individuals interviewed in this study strongly believe that the procedures need to be revised and improved. However, they also feel that due to the nature of the Peace Corps, no evaluation will ever be able to measure all of the effects of Peace Corps workers. The revised QPRs are a step in the right direction, but many results of Peace Corps projects are intangible and thus highly difficult to quantify with indicators. The Peace Corps experience, they argue, is more than simply an individual offering technical assistance to those in need. It is about cultural exchange, awareness, and creating solid relationships between community members and the volunteers. PCVs often have a large impact on the lives of the people with whom they have worked and lived for two years, but such impact may not be in the form of access to potable water or increased sanitation, but may have more to do with improving women’s and children’s self-esteem and cultural understanding. Self-esteem and intercultural sharing, while important, are not directly related to the objectives of any one project, and thus are not measured. Furthermore, in their spare time, many PCVs do other activities, such as organizing women’s soccer teams, teaching English, and conducting cooking classes. Again, these activities are not listed under their main project’s objectives, and consequently the QPRs and PSRs, as
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they currently stand, do not provide a place for PCVs and APCDs to recognize such accomplishments.
Participation is widely accepted as a key ingredient for a successful development project, because participation leads to ownership, which is critical for continuity. However, less recognized is that participation is also necessary throughout the evaluation and monitoring process. Participant involvement can occur in a variety of ways, but most importantly, participant involvement signifies the incorporation of project beneficiaries into the evaluation process. Such a practice might seem self-evident; clearly the project beneficiaries best know how a project has affected their lives, the lives of others, and their community. Nonetheless, not every organization does involve its participants in the evaluation process. Table 4 summarizes the different ways in which each organization incorporates project participants into the monitoring and evaluation procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Participant Involvement in Evaluation System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE)</td>
<td>Interviews with participants on how the project has affected their lives. Participants monitor effects of project after project completion and contact organization regarding any difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Corps</td>
<td>No formal participant involvement, but PCVs always in contact with participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Concern International (PCI)</td>
<td>Participants monitor effects of project after project completion and contact organization regarding any difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)</td>
<td>Interviews, about changes in knowledge and behavior, with participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Agency for International Development (USAID)</td>
<td>No participant involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water for People</td>
<td>Participants monitor effects of project after project completion and contact organization regarding any difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>Self-evaluations by participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Incorporation in Evaluation Data

The monitoring process typically begins before a project has even been officially implemented, and thus, so too should the involvement of the participants begin then. Samuel Hayes offers an extensive list of monitoring tasks that must actually be accomplished prior to the initiation of a project, including observation, surveys, interviews, and informal conversations with community members. These tasks help to establish a foundation of knowledge about the situation of the community, including the initial attitudes and behaviors of the beneficiaries, all of which will serve as a base against which to measure all changes that occur during (and often after) a project. Of the organizations interviewed for this study, there is no evidence regarding the extent to which they actually encourage participation in the early stages of monitoring, seeming to demonstrate that pre-project participation occurs only rarely.

After an initial baseline of indicators has been set, monitoring occurs to measure the progress of the indicators. Many times evaluators utilize statistics and quantitative indicators to measure project success, which does not require much participation, except when the participants are asked to fill out surveys or questionnaires. More important, perhaps, than quantitative data is qualitative information, which can offer better insight as to the complete effect of a project. Carol Weiss’ comprehensive evaluation methods text suggests that changes in attitude, values, and behavior of the participants and people closely associated with the participants (family, friends, neighbors) can serve as excellent qualitative measures. Howard E. Freeman, Peter H. Rossi, and Sonia R. Wright add to Weiss’ list that changes of and fulfillment of participants’ expectations are also necessary.
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criteria to gather. While some of this information can be collected through observation, many times specific questionnaires or interviews are necessary. Interviews, in particular, actively engage the participants, so that not only are their voices are heard, but they also feel included and important within the project process. As an example of this practice, CARE workers periodically visit the communities in which they have projects to ask the beneficiaries about what effects the projects have had on their lives. External evaluators for UNICEF projects are also interested in gathering information from participants, particularly regarding changes in their knowledge and behavior over the course of the project. However, it appears as though this practice is more the exception than the rule; most often external evaluators do not reach the local level during the evaluation process. Development projects are scattered throughout all of Bolivia, making them hard to reach. Furthermore, projects, especially of large development agencies, can affect thousands of people, so that even taking a representative sample of some of the participants can be very time consuming. Due to the limited time that external evaluators have to complete their large task (normally one to two months), they usually limit themselves to gathering information from national data sources or from local experts on the particular subject that they are evaluating (e.g. basic sanitation, health, education, agricultural extension, etc.). Such is the practice of most evaluations conducted of USAID sponsored projects. Representatives from Project Concern International (PCI) gave no indication regarding how project participants are involved in the evaluation process. It may thus be assumed that PCI, like USAID, does not include participants. Active participant involvement appears to be relatively uncommon, especially among large development agencies.
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Even in the case of the Peace Corps, which has as a significant strength constant interaction between the project implementer and project beneficiaries, does not overtly include the beneficiaries in the evaluation process. In fact, there is no place on the quarterly progress reports (QPRs) for the volunteers to include data on the attitudes and opinions of the project beneficiaries. The QPRs, instead, focus mainly on the number of people that have been affected by the project that the volunteer is implementing. The format of the QPRs is currently under revision (discussed in more detail in the flexibility section), but the focus of the change is on improving the accuracy of the reported numbers, rather than on improving the beneficiary's involvement in the process.

As mentioned, beneficiaries of Peace Corps projects are excluded from the formal monitoring and evaluation process, but this does not account for the fact that PCVs are in constant contact with their project beneficiaries. Through living in the same community with the beneficiaries on a day to day basis, informal monitoring is constantly occurring via casual conversations and observation. Nonetheless, in none of the formal Peace Corps evaluation procedures is this casual monitoring well recognized. APCDs do submit annual reports, called Progress Status Reports (PSRs) to the Peace Corps Headquarters in Washington, DC, which attempt to incorporate the opinions of the beneficiaries. However, because this information has not been gathered at any other point during the monitoring process, much of what is stated in these PSRs is mere conjecture; Peace Corps does not have a formal method to collect such data.\(^2\)

Participant Incorporation in Evaluation Process

Most evaluators are beginning to realize the importance of including the views of the participants (and not just statistics) in their evaluations, but the majority still fails to acknowledge the critical role that project beneficiaries can potentially play in the actual construction of an evaluation or monitoring report. In fact, most authorities on evaluation, including most notably, Vinayagum Chinapah and Gary Miron, recommend that specialists from outside of the particular implementing organization conduct the evaluations, with the assumption that external evaluators will provide the most objective evaluations. World Vision, however, is one significant example of an organization that actively involves its participants throughout every stage of an evaluation. While World Vision does occasionally have external evaluations conducted of its projects, the central focus of World Vision's evaluation methodology is on self-evaluations, which are fully explained in the chapter on information management.

Similar to the self-evaluations of World Vision are the informal follow up processes of many organizations, including Water for People, PCI, CARE, all of which rely on local non-governmental organizations (NGO) or community members to self-identify any challenges that arise following the completion of a project. These individuals are encouraged to bring these issues to the attention of the organization. All of these organizations recognize that this is not a formal way to do follow-up, but formal follow-up can be quite costly and time consuming. However, they also believe that this method is relatively successful in monitoring the progress and impact of completed projects. The organizations place faith on this system particularly because once they
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finish one project, they often continue with a similar project in a nearby community, or on a different project within the same community. By maintaining contact between the agency and the community, however informal it may be, there is the expectation that past project participants will request future assistance as necessary. This informal system, which places complete control of the future results of the project on the community members, and thus requires the complete participation of past participants, may not encourage as much participation as it seems at first glance. For this follow-up system to have beneficial results, the organizations assume that community members are accustomed to participating and actively seeking assistance, and that they know how and when to do so. However, as previously noted, many of the organizations that have this form of follow-up, minimally engage their participants during the earlier stages of the monitoring and evaluation process, suggesting that many of the participants may not actually have much experience in participating, or at least not participating in an evaluative process.

Clearly, the involvement of project beneficiaries and former beneficiaries is still lacking in the majority of Bolivia’s development organizations. Although there is a plethora of information regarding the importance of local participation during the project process, there is little literature on how individuals can participate in the evaluation process. Recent changes in evaluation methods, including the incorporation of participants’ knowledge, attitudes and behaviors and the self-evaluation method of World Vision suggest that participation is a new topic in the development world that with time will encompass all aspects of the development process. Only time will tell.
CHAPTER FIVE: FLEXIBILITY AS AN ENHANCER OF PROJECT SUCCESS

The data from monitoring reports and evaluations demonstrate the progress, successes, and challenges of a project in achieving its objectives. While this information is important in and of itself, the true benefit of an evaluation lies in its ability to identify aspects of a project that require improvement. For this feedback to be constructive, project implementers must be flexible. Reports and evaluations can make bold suggestions, but ultimately, it is the project designers and implementers who must decide what role the feedback will play. Weiss notes that the segregation between the evaluators and the policy implementers can severely hinder the effectuation of evaluation results. The most successful projects, defining success as the achievement of project objectives, utilize information provided by the evaluations to redirect project focus and restructure project initiatives. In this manner, projects react and adapt to the current conditions, allowing the projects to continuously improve their outcomes. In some of the organizations studied in this investigation, evaluations are highly valued and strongly influence the design and expectations of the projects, whereas in other cases, evaluations have little impact upon current projects, but do, in some instances, assist in future project planning. Table 5 summarizes these varying degrees of flexibility of each organization.

The evaluation system must be an ongoing process throughout the entire project implementation process for there to be substantial flexibility, as Norman Gold emphasizes in his essay of how to evaluate social programs. Although one evaluation at the completion of a project can offer interesting information on the achievements of
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that particular project, it is too late for the project to be modified. When feedback is provided earlier in the project’s lifetime, changes can be made, which can substantially improve the final outcome of the project. Nonetheless, continual monitoring does not guarantee that improvements will be made.

**Table 5. Degree of Flexibility of Each Organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE)</td>
<td>Evaluations are used to design future projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Corps</td>
<td>Monitoring does not lead to change of project design, but does lead to change in project objectives and evaluation procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Concern International (PCI)</td>
<td>Midterm evaluations allow problems to be corrected part way through the implementation of a project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)</td>
<td>Evaluations are used to design future projects and offer suggestions to the Bolivian government for ways to expand the projects to a national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Agency for International Development (USAID)</td>
<td>Project objectives are removed if very unsuccessful, objectives that are moderately successful are given more attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water for People</td>
<td>Results of evaluations determine if projects will be expanded to other communities. Training sessions are provided when an evaluation reveals difficulties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>Evaluations do not change current projects, but are used to design future projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monitoring and Evaluation without Change- Peace Corps as a Special Case**

The Peace Corps is an example of an organization that does little to change its projects as a result of information gathered from the monitoring and evaluation processes. The lack of project flexibility in the Peace Corps may be a special case and is thus given individual attention here. Although the organization has a formal monitoring process, little is done to adjust the project design, even when a PCV appears to have little success.
in achieving her goals. PCVs must submit monitoring reports, QPRs, on a trimonthly basis and are subject to informal monitoring by way of intermittent site visits by their Associate Peace Corps Directors (APCDs) and Peace Corps Technical Specialists. Through these various forms of monitoring, much information is gathered on the progress of each project, but never are any formal changes made to the current projects as a result of this evaluative information. In part this lack of flexibility is due to the nature of Peace Corps projects, which normally are individually designed by each PCV and which do not have a formal design or objectives (at the level of the volunteer). While no project adaptations are made in response to the evaluation systems of Peace Corps, PCVs attest to constantly modifying their project plans in response to the attitudes and actions of community members. A former PCV, who served in Guatemala from 1994 to 1997 states, “don’t forget, in Peace Corps you are living the project, so it wasn’t really necessary to refer to a form to know what was working and what wasn’t.”

Another PCV gave an example of this situation: when a PCV plans an informational community meeting on facile ways in which to improve one’s basic sanitation and very few individuals show up, it is immediately apparent that the PCV must alter her strategy for disseminating information to the community.

Higher up in the Peace Corps administration, changes do occur in response to QPR data; however, such changes are rare and deal with altering project sector objectives and the evaluation system itself, rather than with adjusting the design of individual projects. When the APCDs compile all of the data from the QPRs to create the PSRs, they are interested in seeing the general trends of the number of people affected by Peace
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Corps projects, both over the previous months and over the previous years. As noted in the chapter on information management, there has been much controversy over the accuracy of the numbers reported by the PCVs. There is a high percentage of double counting and pure guesswork to arrive at the reported numbers. Because of the relative inaccuracy of these numbers and the various other factors that can affect the PCVs' efforts (and consequently their numbers) in the short term (i.e. natural disasters, political unrest, or an unusually poor economy), the data are not given high importance on a month to month basis. Nevertheless, when year to year data appear to be consistently higher or lower than that which was predicted, project objectives are reexamined. For example, one current objective for the basic sanitation projects states that by December 2006, PCVs and their counterparts will have worked with 1500 families to construct 100 new water systems, so that 1300 beneficiaries will have improved access to clean water.98 If the QPRs that the Basic Sanitation Volunteers turn in demonstrate that they are consistently affecting very few people, or constructing very few water systems, the target numbers will most likely be lowered. Although the Peace Corps must submit PSRs to the Peace Corps Headquarters in the United States to demonstrate that volunteers are, in fact, being productive, there is neither an incentive to reach the targets, nor is there any penalty if the objectives are not fully met. Each country office must simply demonstrate to the Peace Corps Headquarters, that Peace Corps is having some impact in the areas in which it is working.99
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In addition to altering target numbers as a result of thorough examinations of the work of the PCVs, two project objectives in the Basic Sanitation sector have been altered in content. In the past, Peace Corps worked on Chagas prevention in Bolivia. Chagas is a potentially life-threatening disease that affects the human heart and that is transmitted through a particular insect, the binchuca. It has been determined, however, that Chagas prevention is a long term process, which makes it difficult for PCVs, who only perform two years of service, to execute such a project. Measuring the success of a Chagas prevention project is also very difficult given the PCV’s background, training, and monetary constraints; measurement requires blood tests and follow up with participating families a long while after the completion of the project. Consequently, the basic sanitation APCD decided to remove Chagas prevention from the objectives of basic sanitation projects. Furthermore, while not specifically a part of the project descriptions, many PCVs have, on their own, decided to concentrate much of their efforts on improving the self-esteem of community members. Due to the widespread popularity of self-esteem as a project component among both PCVs and their beneficiaries, self-esteem has been incorporated into the existing project objectives. Rather than the design of a project changing to realize better project objectives, in the case of the Peace Corps, the objectives are modified to represent the actuality of the project design and results.

Monitoring procedures have also been altered in response to feedback from various Peace Corps actors. Due to input from the Peace Corps Headquarters and the current Project Training Officer in Bolivia, some of the APCDs of Peace Corps Bolivia have been working to revamp the QPR process. While there is no pressure to attain target numbers, Peace Corps Bolivia believes it to be in its best interest to collect the
most accurate information possible.\textsuperscript{100} Accuracy of data will have no other purpose than to inform all parties involved in the Peace Corps project process of the true work that is being performed by the PCVs, which in and of itself is seen as a valuable reason to change the monitoring process. In the words of Mark Dolan, the APCD for Microenterprise Development projects, “because there is no pressure to have ‘good’ numbers, or reach some target goal, it is best to at least have accuracy of results.”

Previously, the QPRs were to be completed in English by the PCV, but the APCDs learned from these reports that there was very little coordination between PCV and the counterpart agency.\textsuperscript{101} Peace Corps did not formally require that the two parties work together, but rather established this relationship with the hope that both sides would collaborate as necessary. Such a weak relationship did not prove to be beneficial for either side involved. Therefore, during the evaluation restructuring process that the Peace Corps is currently undergoing, the APCDs have decided to require that the QPRs be filled out in Spanish (rather than English) by both the PCV and her counterpart. This change should improve the coordination between the PCV and the counterparts and will keep all parties aware of everyone’s tasks and the progress of the entire project. However, this task may be overwhelming for new PCVs who are often not fluent, or even very familiar with Spanish. This challenge may in fact lead to further inaccuracy of the reported information as a result of misunderstanding or a lack of comprehension by the PCV of what information she should be reporting.

The previous examples of the Peace Corps’ responses to evaluation and monitoring certainly demonstrate that there is feedback flexibility within the
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organization. Nonetheless, this flexibility does not extend down to the level of the project design of each volunteer. One rationalization for this lack of project flexibility is that development, termed "technical assistance" by the Peace Corps, is only one of three goals of the Peace Corps. PCVs are not only aiming to improve the social situation of the community in which they work and live, but they are also actively learning about the culture of their host community/country and are teaching others about their own culture and what it means to be American and live in the United States. Furthermore, each PCV, while following the basic guidelines of her assignment and project sector (i.e. working on education if assigned to the Integrated Education project sector), also has considerable leeway as to how to design and implement her project. No two projects are exactly the same. Because the project ideas come from the PCV herself, the APCDs have little control over how the project is carried out; they can only make sure that the PCVs are, in fact, implementing some project. Thus, the APCDs can only achieve flexibility in the items that they do have control over, such as the overall project sector goals and objectives and the reporting and monitoring requirements.

**Monitoring and Evaluation with Change**

Peace Corps is unique in that its monitoring and evaluation results do not lead to any changes in project design or project sector revisions. For many organizations, evaluations can play a critical role in deciding the future of a particular project. Namely, evaluations determine the future funding that projects will receive. However, because PCVs generally spend very little, if any money, on the implementation of their projects, 
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they need not worry about qualifying for future financial assistance, as most other development organizations must. PCVs can indeed receive small grants from the Peace Corps or charity organizations in the United States, but these grants are usually a one lump sum, due to the limited time of the PCV's service, so that PCVs are not concerned with proving effective use of funds in hopes of gaining future funds. For the projects of these other organizations that are indeed dependent on financing, negative feedback from an evaluation can lead to the termination of project, as is the case for USAID, or to substantial changes that hope to improve the project's outcome.

USDAID projects are a prime example of the influence that evaluations and monitoring can play on access to funding. USAID is a large organization that funds various projects in several countries worldwide, but it clearly has a limited budget. The different country offices and project sectors within each country are constantly vying for the limited amount of funding that is available. Therefore, if an evaluation of a particular project demonstrates that the project is having little success in accomplishing its goals, funding will be partially or completely removed, depending upon the project's prospects for future improvement. Some USAID evaluations reveal that a project, while not a complete disappointment, is only able to accomplish certain aspects of its goals. Such a project will most likely be redesigned, rather than be terminated all together. There are a few options that project designers have when faced with this situation; the weaker aspects of the project can be strengthened and given more emphasis, or, as was the case with Chagas prevention by the Peace Corps, these weak aspects may be eliminated completely from the project.
Certainly there is little incentive to proceed with aspects of a project that have not proven to be successful, especially in situations where money can be better spent on another project component that promises to be more effective in achieving its goals. However, completely eliminating a project component because it is unable to achieve its goals as quickly or effectively as another component, or as another project entirely, does not recognize the potential that the component or project may have in the more distant future, if given more time or if readjusted. For example, if Chagas prevention programs were eliminated from the agenda of several development agencies because of the extensive time that monitoring and evaluation entail and the long time required before results can be seen, then little would be done at all in the country to prevent Chagas, a deadly, but easily preventable disease. This is clearly an extreme example, but it demonstrates the power that external funding and the desire for immediate results can have on which projects are actually carried out.

From the obtained information, there is no evidence that the other organizations included in this study do eliminate projects part way through as a result of negative feedback, as USAID does. However, because of the limited budgets for all development projects, such a practice does not seem unlikely; projects that seem most promising will most likely receive the bulk of the funding and implementation effort. Most other organizations do, nonetheless, demonstrate that negative feedback on evaluations can lead to significant changes in the focus of a project.

Carlos Gutierrez, the Monitoring and Evaluation Official for UNICEF-Bolivia, recognizes that clearly no project will perfectly achieve all that it sets out to do on the first attempt. Evaluations, he believes, are useful tools that are part of the learning
process and that help to identify aspects of a project that need improvement. Depending upon the conclusions of the evaluations, changes will be made accordingly in future projects. For instance, if a certain method is found not to be very effective, it may be redefined in all similar future projects. In the case of UNICEF, evaluations not only help improve the success of future UNICEF projects, but also assist in the national development plans of the Bolivian government. Many projects that UNICEF conducts on a local level are adopted by the Bolivian government and are consequently applied on a national level. Evaluations of UNICEF projects often offer suggestions for how relatively local and small-scale projects can be enlarged effectively to affect people throughout the country.

World Vision’s approach of utilizing evaluations in the planning of future projects is very similar to that of UNICEF. The project planning process of World Vision is on a three year cycle, at the end of which time evaluations are reviewed. Past evaluations serve as the basis for revising existing project plans and for creating new project ideas. Evaluations for CARE projects are also a fundamental aspect in the design of future projects. When Victor Rico, the Chief of Infrastructure for CARE, was asked if he actively utilized past evaluations, he acted slightly insulted at the basic nature of this question, replying, “of course I do, this is what evaluations are for. If I want to create a new project what I do is read the ‘conclusions,’ ‘recommendations,’ ‘lessons learned,’ and ‘future strategies’ [all of which are components of every CARE evaluation]. I just read these, and with this information I can prepare a new project.” The recommendations prove especially useful for determining why a certain project was

ineffective and what essential components will aid the project avoid such troubles. Even in the case of very successful projects, evaluators always find ways in which a project can be further improved.\textsuperscript{105}

Despite the similarities in the ways in which evaluations are utilized by World Vision and CARE, World Vision's response to evaluations extends beyond project planning. The results of World Vision's evaluations also serve, as in the case of the Peace Corps, to modify the actual evaluation process. Indicators are the component of the evaluation process that is most likely to be altered, because proxy indicators are never a perfect representation of the desired information. The purpose of an evaluation is to accurately represent the effects and impact that a particular project is having on its beneficiaries, but if evaluations repeatedly do not show these aspects well, it may not be due to a problem in the project, but rather due to poorly chosen indicators. Evaluators might thus decide to adjust a few indicators to determine if different indicators can offer more accurate information. (Indicators and the problems associated with indicators are discussed in detail in the chapter entitled Information Management.)

Final evaluations, as shown, do little to affect the project being evaluated; instead, they serve predominantly to design future projects and to provide input for future funding. However, Water for People serves as a notable exception. Beginning in 2004, Water for People's headquarters in Denver has allocated two thousand dollars specifically to Bolivia's branch to conduct evaluations, which should significantly increase the number of evaluations that Water for People Bolivia is able to do. Water for People has only conducted three final project evaluations, in part a result of the previous lack of funding available for this purpose. Nonetheless, the evaluations that have been

completed have led to significant changes and improvements of the evaluated projects. An evaluation of the way in which a Water for People-initiated water system was constructed and maintained revealed that many of the hand pumps that are used to supply water to individual homes were broken. Local NGOs, with which Water for People had collaborated, requested additional funding to repair the pumps, but the evaluation noted that the problem was not simply a lack of money to repair broken items, but rather that the individuals who utilized the pumps did not know how to maintain or repair their pumps. Thus, Water for People not only donated money, but also provided training courses to community members on how to do maintenance work on the water system. In the coming months, Water for People plans to conduct a follow up to assure that these post-project repairs and training sessions are increasing the usefulness of the water system.  

Another Water for People project-end evaluation observed that water from systems built in a cluster of rural communities in the department of Oruro, Bolivia contained a high salt content. This low quality water was an unforeseen consequence that is due to the geography of the land. While salt in the water in the Oruro area was determined to be unavoidable regardless of the design or location of a water system, Water for People offered local workshops on household methods for reducing the salt content of water. Once again, follow-up will be conducted to assure that these sessions have been useful in improving the quality of the water.

The majority of Water for People evaluations do not in fact occur at the conclusion of a project, but rather during the intermediary stages of a project. These
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evaluations, which are very similar to the midterm evaluations of PCI, are conducted before the projects have been finished, so that there is time to make improvements on aspects of the projects that are not functioning as well. PCI conducts midterm evaluations specifically so that problems can be caught and corrected before they become irreversible or too large that much effort would be needed to improve the project. As seen, though, in the case of Water for People’s grander final evaluations, even after the completion of a project, further actions can be supplemented to increase the effectiveness of a project, but this does require much more time, money, and energy.

The organizations in this study demonstrate an array of ways in which feedback from monitoring reports and evaluations is used. All of the organizations prove to have varying degrees of flexibility. Interestingly, only two of the organizations are able to alter their current projects in response to the information gathered in the evaluations (PCI and Water for People). The remaining organizations (excluding the Peace Corps) use the evaluations solely for designing future projects. The Peace Corps is the only organization where the evaluations do not directly play any role in the design of current or future projects. In this situation, the evaluations have only been used to revise the evaluation system itself. While many factors influence the flexibility of each organization, it has been shown that the timing of the evaluation within a project’s lifetime, external funding, and the size of the project all contribute to the role that evaluation feedback plays in the development project process.
CHAPTER SIX: COORDINATION OF ACTORS

The development process is neither short nor simple; projects usually take years to complete and involve many different actors. These actors range in levels of authority and involvement with the actual project implementation, but they are all imperative in contributing to the successful completion of project objectives. The individuals include top-level administrators, members of financing institutions, project sector experts (normally these are the individuals that design a project's objectives), government ministers, external evaluators, local NGO workers, members of local municipalities, project implementers, and project beneficiaries. Coordination between these various actors is essential for assuring that they all have accurate information of the project goals, objectives, proceedings, and evaluations. Coordination must exist between all levels and during all stages of the project, from the project planning stages through project completion, final evaluations, and follow-up. The focus of this section is on the coordination that occurs throughout the evaluation and monitoring process of each organization. Because of the multiple levels involved in the development process, there will first be a description of some of the ways in which these levels interact to form the particular evaluation systems. This overview will be followed by a more thorough discussion of the coordination that occurs during the actual monitoring and evaluation. This coordination is expressed in a variety of ways, ranging from inter-organization workshops and meetings to external evaluations, and is given different emphasis depending upon the organization, as summarized in Table 6.
Table 6. Coordination of Actors by Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Coordination of Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE)</td>
<td>Headquarters use local evaluations to create regional reports. External evaluations for all completed projects. Communicates with other organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Corps</td>
<td>QPRs from PCVs to regional offices, QPRs condensed into PSRs for national headquarters, PSRs condensed for Congress. Meetings and workshops for PCVs, APCDs, and counterpart agencies in conjunction with other organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Concern International (PCI)</td>
<td>External evaluations for all completed projects. Communicates with other organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Agency for International Development (USAID)</td>
<td>Headquarters require that certain indicators be monitored and require a certain evaluation format. External evaluations for all completed projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water for People</td>
<td>Asks local NGOs to do most of the monitoring. External evaluations on some completed projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>External evaluations for all completed projects. Belongs to a network of NGOs in Bolivia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hierarchy of Development

The majority of the information that is presented in this study has been gathered from individuals working for the Bolivian branches of international organizations. While many of these individuals are themselves Bolivian, and the projects that they implement have been created in response to the particular social, economic, and geopolitical conditions of Bolivia, they are still responsible to the regulations and requirements of the organization’s headquarters. Moreover, oftentimes these Bolivian branches employ members of local non-governmental organizations to carry out the greater part of the project, that is, to do the “on the ground” development work. As the Bolivian branches are under the authority of their headquarters, the local NGOs are also subject to certain
rules of the Bolivian branches. This hierarchy exists at all stages of the development process, but will here be examined at the evaluation and monitoring level. In some instances there is little coordination between these three levels, where each level acts relatively autonomously on its own system of evaluation and monitoring. In other cases, much of the evaluation system is coordinated between at least two of the levels. The degree of coordination and amount of autonomy between and among the levels appears to be, in part, dependent upon the organization's relationship to the government (US government or otherwise).

External financing plays a large role in determining the coordination that occurs between the Bolivian branch and the organization’s headquarters. Although the headquarters itself may not provide the funding, it is often directly responsible for assuring the donating agencies that the funds are being well spent. When this is the case, the national branches, i.e. the Bolivian branches, are often required to submit some form of an evaluation to its headquarters. Such is the policy for the Peace Corps, which is a United States government organization. US Congress ultimately decides what Peace Corps' budget will be in each country.  

To provide accurate information to Congress, Peace Corps headquarters needs uniform information from all of its branches from which it can compile comprehensive reports for Congress. Consequently, the local branches of Peace Corps must submit Progress Status Reports (PSRs) to the Peace Corps Headquarters in Washington D.C. Individuals at the headquarters compile this information on a regional basis, placing all information from Latin American countries in one document, for example, which will then be submitted to Congress for review. Because the information in the PSRs draws directly from input from the PCVs, the

Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs) are likewise a requirement. While the format of the PSRs remains the same for all project sectors throughout the world (since it contains the information necessary to report to Congress) the QPRs are at the discretion of each APCD, provided they are able to gather satisfactory information to complete the PSRs. The information that is submitted to Peace Corps Headquarters is not simply used to report to Congress; individuals working at the headquarters comment upon the information and provide feedback to the APCDs of each project sector. Most recently this feedback has been in the form of constructive criticism as to how to improve the accuracy and quality of indicators.\(^\text{108}\) There is therefore communication flowing in both directions between the Bolivian branch and headquarters of Peace Corps.

USAID is similarly a US government organization, but in this instance, the Bolivian branch appears to have less flexibility in creating its own evaluation system. USAID headquarters outlines ninety percent of the essential components and design that all project evaluations should have.\(^\text{109}\) Headquarters also requests that each branch report on specific indicators, including each branch’s ability to spend its allotted funding. The remaining ten percent of the evaluation is open to the discretion of the USAID workers at the national branches and allows for these individuals to adapt the evaluations to the local circumstances. All USAID evaluations are ultimately submitted to the headquarters, but there is little evidence that the headquarters provides the Bolivian branch with feedback following the submission of the evaluations.

While USAID and Peace Corps start to show a trend of strong coordination between national branches and the organization’s headquarters in instances where the

organization is closely associated with the government, UNICEF does not appear to uphold this hypothesis. Although UNICEF has strong ties to governments (though not specifically only to the US government), evaluation coordination between the headquarters and the national branches is surprisingly limited. However, the lack of witnessed coordination may be the result of incomplete research, rather than a true portrayal of UNICEF’s actual practices.

For the organizations of this study that are strictly non-governmental, the coordination appears to be more flexible, where the national branches are able to retain a strong sense of autonomy over their monitoring and evaluation methods. Communication does nonetheless exist between the top two levels. CARE headquarters, for example, utilizes evaluations that have been carried out by individuals at CARE-Bolivia, to create comprehensive reports of the progress of CARE projects in particular regions of the world. Workers at CARE headquarters desire access to the evaluative information of each of its branches, but they have relatively little say over the content or structure of each evaluation.

Although surely evaluative coordination exists between the national branches and the international headquarters for the other organizations included in this study, there is no evidence that this coordination occurs on a regular basis or that it is fundamental to their evaluation processes. In these cases, where top-level coordination is limited, the focus of inter-level coordination occurs instead primarily between the bottom two levels, that is, between the national branches and local NGOs. This is especially true for Water for People, which utilizes local (i.e. Bolivian) NGOs to do the majority of the project implementation. These local NGOs are then responsible for evaluating their own work;

however, most Bolivians do not have much experience with formal evaluations and are unfamiliar with how to create accurate indicators. Consequently, Water for People-Bolivia employees work closely with the local NGOs to assist in the creation of indicators and to provide guidance in conducting the actual evaluations. This amount of coordination is likely to decrease as the local NGOs become more comfortable with Water for People's evaluation system.

The Peace Corps case is unique, in that rather than having only three basic levels of authority (the international headquarters, the national branch, and the local NGOs), the Peace Corps adds a level between the national branch and the local NGOs: the volunteer. In many instances, the PCV acts as a local NGO, in that she alone is responsible for executing the project, but technically, each PCV is assigned to a counterpart agency, which is a local institution. The counterpart agencies can be anything from a local municipality to a school, or an NGO. The counterpart agencies normally have similar goals and objectives to that of the PCV, but the agencies themselves may not actually be involved in the implementation of the PCV's project. Rather, the counterpart agencies serve as a local contact and support system for the PCV throughout her service. Although the counterpart agency may not be actively involved in implementing a project along side the PCV, it is expected that there is regular communication between the two actors. Until recently, communication has been very limited, where many PCVs do not even know who exactly is their counterpart. The APCDs are working to remedy this lack of coordination, specifically by now requiring that PCVs complete their QPRs in

---

111 Water for People does also recognize the importance of external evaluations; as of January 2004, Water for People headquarters has allocated funds specifically for external evaluations of projects in Bolivia.
collaboration with their counterparts. Despite the currently weak coordination between the PCVs and their counterpart, there tends to be high levels of communication between the PCVs and the regional offices, specifically with the APCDs.

The lack of coordination present between Peace Corps actors has profound consequences. Admittedly, there is a significant amount of coordination between the PCVs and their APCDs, which occurs through site visits and regular telephone and email conversations.114 However, there appears to be very little coordination of evaluative knowledge passed between these two actors. APCDs in each national branch have specific project sector goals from which the project ideas of each PCV arise. For example, the basic sanitation sector has as its primary objectives to improve specific communities’ access to potable water systems, to provide access to latrines and bathrooms to Bolivian families and to assure that the families utilize these services appropriately, to assure that Bolivian families know proper methods for trash disposal, and to provide technical assistance for plastic recycling.115 Clearly, one volunteer cannot work to achieve these four objectives in her two years of service; instead, a volunteer is assigned a particular task, such as constructing latrines or providing meetings to community members on proper ways to use and maintain a latrine, which will contribute to the attainment of one objective.

Because each volunteer’s task, or project, is relatively limited in scope, and because volunteers are largely unaware of the overarching objectives, many volunteers fail to recognize their projects as part of a larger, countrywide development plan. This causes many volunteers to take the success of their projects and the monitoring

information that they are required to submit to their APCDs (the QPRs) less seriously. It is mainly only the volunteers who decide to perform an additional year of service, and who often are given more responsibility at the regional offices, that realize the importance of their projects and the significant role that QPRs can potentially play in demonstrating the progress of certain objectives. As a result, most PCVs do not take the QPRs at all seriously, but rather view them as an obligation they must complete in order to receive vacation time, as PCVs are not allowed vacation time without the regular submission of QPRs. Thus, while there is evidence of coordination between the various actors in Peace Corps, there is insufficient coordination of knowledge and ideas, leading to a loss in accuracy and quality of reported information.

This description of the hierarchy that exists in the various development agencies in this study shows three clear levels of actors: international headquarters, national branches, and local NGOs (or in the case of the Peace Corps, the volunteers themselves). The levels of each organization have varying degrees of autonomy in developing and carrying out monitoring and evaluation procedures. It appears as though organizations that are more closely associated with the US government have stricter reporting requirements, whereas NGOs are more free to develop their own evaluation methods in response to the project design and societal conditions in which the project is being implemented. In the case of the Peace Corps, despite the specific evaluation requirements to which the national branches of Peace Corps are subject, equal understanding of the evaluation methods and project objectives does not exist at the different levels. With an understanding of the different levels involved, one must now

turn to how levels in the hierarchy interact in the actual evaluation practices of each organization.

**External Evaluations**

The most common instance, and most advocated level, of coordination between the many actors is between those working directly on the project design and implementation and external evaluators. Nearly all literature, including the text by Dennis J. Casley and Denis A. Lury that outlines the essential components of development project evaluations, points to the necessity for organizations to conduct external evaluations; that is, to require that some evaluations be carried out by individuals who are not members of the implementing organization.\(^{118}\) However, Casley and Lury go on to say that external evaluators are only necessary to conduct a comprehensive study of the effects and impact of a project in a final evaluation; individuals of the implementing organization can usually adequately conduct the routine monitoring that must occur during the course of the project implementation.\(^{119}\) The individuals that carry out the external evaluations are usually experts on the particular field of the project, whether it be on basic sanitation, health, education, or natural resources, for example, but they may not have much knowledge of the particular country or culture where the project is being implemented, as they usually hail from the world headquarters of the external organization.\(^{120}\) Vinayagum Chinapah and Gary Miron, in their overview of critical components of evaluations, emphasize that external evaluations are extremely important because of their objectiveness, an objectiveness that cannot be achieved through internal
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\(^{118}\) Casely and Lury I I.

\(^{119}\) Casely and Lury I I.

\(^{120}\) Navajas, personal interview, 30 Jan. 2004.
evaluations. Furthermore, Sergio Navajas, the Senior Economics Official for USAID-Bolivia, believes that external evaluations are often the most extensive and integrative form of evaluation that can be conducted on a particular project, because external evaluators have both the time and resources to examine various project components in depth. Of all organizations included in this study, the Peace Corps is the only one that does not carry out external evaluations. For the other organizations, external evaluations are in addition to, and not a replacement of, the internal evaluation and monitoring system. Although all other organizations do have external evaluations, they are conducted for various reasons and they are not given equal importance in each organization.

UNICEF utilizes external evaluations primarily in instances where the information needed to compile an evaluation is difficult to obtain, which occurs most frequently when the indicators are qualitative. To determine the progress of some components of UNICEF and USAID projects, macro indicators, such as life expectancy and infant mortality, can be used, but in other instances, quantitative indicators do not successfully measure project objectives. For instance, UNICEF desires to find what changes in project beneficiaries' knowledge and attitudes occur over the implementation of a project. Likewise, several USAID projects are concerned with improving the democratic nature of Bolivian society, an objective for which there are no readily available indicators. Acquiring such information requires timely in-depth interviews, which neither UNICEF nor USAID have the time to conduct. Consequently, external evaluators are paid to gather this information and to conduct final evaluations. The

121 Chinapah and Miron 28.
involvement of external evaluators over the entirety of a project, rather than only at the project’s end, is unique to these two organizations and may be a result of the large size and complexity of these organizations and their projects. The individuals who perform the monitoring tasks for USAID tend to hail from Pittsburgh University and Ohio State University. At the same time that USAID employs external evaluations for its projects, many USAID officials conduct external evaluations for other projects of outside organizations operating in Bolivia. Recently, USAID officials performed a six-month-long evaluation on a PCI project.123

Apart from the external monitoring that occurs for some USAID projects, there is an additional well-developed system for external evaluations at the completion of all USAID projects. USAID workers believe external evaluations to be of a higher quality than internal evaluations because external evaluators have the time and resources to conduct a very complete study of the full impact of a project.124 Thus, external evaluations are given high importance. USAID has contracts with many external evaluators from several development agencies that are based in the US. These individuals are not experts on evaluation, but do have international work experience and presumably a working knowledge of Bolivia. Near the completion of a project, USAID makes a request to the several contracted evaluators; each evaluator must submit a proposal as to how she will evaluate the project. Once an evaluator is chosen, USAID provides the individual with copious amounts of information on the project: how it was designed and implemented, where it was implemented, who are the beneficiaries, what

are the project goals and objectives, and if necessary, background information on the local community and culture.\textsuperscript{125}

For some organizations, external evaluations are not orchestrated by the implementing organization, but rather by the local government. While an organization’s development projects are localized, located only in certain regions and communities throughout the country, they can play a significant role on the development and quality of life in those areas, such that the Bolivian government is interested to find what the results are. Members of unspecified state institutions make relatively regular visits to PCI project sites as a way of conducting informal monitoring; more formal evaluations are also occasional conducted by the Bolivian government on PCI projects.\textsuperscript{126}

In some instances development projects are done in collaboration with certain government ministries, meaning that the government clearly has a vested interest in the progress of those particular projects, which is particularly the case for UNICEF projects. The Bolivian government is involved in the progress of all UNICEF projects from their inception; the government collaborates with UNICEF and other financing organizations, such as World Bank, to do a diagnostic analysis of the country’s situation to establish what projects are needed. UNICEF creates a project plan of action for each year, which must be signed by the Bolivian government. This plan of action serves as a backbone for the evaluations that the Vice Ministry of Public Spending conducts on UNICEF projects. These ministerial evaluations concentrate primarily on UNICEF’s actual project spending in relation to the proposed spending plan, rather than on the impacts of the particular projects. The Monitoring and Evaluation Official for UNICEF, Carlos Gutierrez,

\textsuperscript{125}Navajas, personal interview, 30 Jan. 2004.
believes that the other viceministries of the Bolivian government should also be invested in the evaluation process, in that they should concern themselves more with the progress and impact of UNICEF projects by doing follow-up evaluations on completed UNICEF projects.  

**Workshops and Meetings**

Aside from external evaluations, workshops and meetings provide another way in which different development actors can communicate. Such open forums allow for constructive discussions to occur between members of the same organization or between members of different organizations. Although workshops and meetings may not initially appear to be components of the evaluation process, they offer an opportunity for self-reflection and constructive criticism, which are essential for illuminating trouble spots in certain projects and proposing potential ideas for improvement.

While Peace Corps proves to be the exception in not having external evaluations, this is one organization (of several) that utilizes workshops and meetings as a way to generate coordination between the various actors involved in the development process. For example, USAID and Peace Corps project beneficiaries provide funding for project design workshops, which are compulsory for both the PCVs and members of their counterpart agencies. The workshops offer a chance for both actors to discuss capacity building, budgeting, monitoring, and prospects for project sustainability after the PCV completes her two years of service. Another Peace Corps meeting process is the Project Advisory Committee (PAC). Unlike the project design workshops, PACs do not

---

include PCVs, and they meet less frequently, only every other year. There is a PAC for each project sector. These committees are composed of the APCD, members from various other international development agencies (namely USAID), and representatives from the various counterpart agencies with which the PCVs work, including members of local municipalities and government ministries. The PAC meetings enable individuals who are deeply invested in the development process to gather and share best practices and suggestions of ways in which to improve each other’s projects. For example, over the past few years, the APCD of basic sanitation projects requested assistance for how to improve his sector’s indicators from his PAC. APCDs have had difficulty in coordinating with some of the larger international development agencies, especially over issues of information management, as the larger organizations, such as USAID, have much larger, more widespread projects, and can consequently use macro and impact indicators. Peace Corps projects, on the other hand, are so small-scale and short-termed that they require much more specified indicators that measure the immediate results of a project. Nonetheless, general feedback from individuals who are also concerned with improving development projects is always appreciated.

Similar to the PAC meetings are biannual workshops for PCVs and APCDs. In these workshops, all members discuss aspects of the projects that are working and not working. Both these workshops and PAC meetings are an opportunity for self-reflection, self-evaluation in comparison to the practices of other organizations or volunteers, and evaluation of the practices of the other organizations or volunteers.

Further coordination of Peace Corps actors occurs on a regional level. APCDs from the same project sectors and different countries sporadically convene for regional conferences. Coordination between actors of the same organization but that work in different countries (such as APCDs from all over Latin America) is considered more difficult than coordination between actors from different organizations but of the same country (such as the PACs within Bolivia), as many cultural differences can render best practices from one country’s projects inappropriate for another country. Nonetheless, the APCD of Microenterprise Development, Marko Dolan, would like to see more regional coordination between Peace Corps actors.¹³¹

Peace Corps is not unique to this method of coordination between various project actors; many organizations communicate between themselves to share project ideas and practices. World Vision’s branch in Cochabamba, for instance, belongs to the association of NGOs of Cochabamba, and the entire Bolivian branch belongs to a network of local NGOs that work on the specific project sectors with which World Vision is concerned, such as health. Members of World Vision, PCI, and CARE claim that their organizations are always in touch with other development organizations in Bolivia as a way to compare project practices, progress, and results.¹³²

As noted, multiple actors, with varying levels of authority and autonomy, are invested in seeing that development projects are fruitful. Regardless of the way in which these actors within organizations and between organizations choose to coordinate, whether it is through external evaluations or workshops and meetings, coordination is imperative. Although many different actors strive to achieve their own goals and

objectives, development is ultimately a public good, and provision of a public good is
greatly enhanced through cooperation at all levels of the development process. Much can
be learned from communication regarding each others' accomplishments and challenges.
As Fidel Alvarez of PCI perceptively states, "at this level of development, sharing
information is vitally important."\textsuperscript{133}

With an understanding of the four qualitative components of the evaluation
process, which includes this last section dealing with coordination of actors, it is
important now to synthesize the most important lessons gained from the study.

One cannot underestimate the importance that an evaluation system plays in the development process, as can be determined by the simple fact that it was not possible to find an organization that did not have an evaluation system to include in this study. Although all of the organizations included in this study do in fact have some form of an evaluation system, the methods of each organization are slightly different and the role that the evaluation system plays within the entire project process also differs. With an understanding of the evaluation procedures of each organization, in comparison with the methods that are suggested in evaluation literature, certain lessons can now be drawn, from which policy recommendations can be made.

**Constraints and Limitations of Evaluations**

At the genesis of this investigation, it was thought that a formalized evaluation system played a large role in the effectiveness of a project. Much literature certainly points to the validity of this hypothesis; Samuel Hayes, for example, states that monitoring reports and evaluations can lead to changes in project design and implementation, thus creating ever-improving projects.\(^{134}\) All of the development actors interviewed for the study did not deny the importance of evaluations, but they tended to view evaluations as a useful tool that informed them of the status of projects, rather than as a tool that could effect positive change in current and future projects. Only in Water for People did evaluations appear to contribute to more effective projects. In the other organizations, excluding the Peace Corps, evaluations are sometimes used for the design of future projects, but in general, evaluations did not tend to weigh heavily in the success

\[^{134}\text{Hayes 75.}\]
or failure of development projects. The evaluations only seemed to create more informed development workers. Clearly, evaluations alone cannot make an otherwise ineffective project successful; many other factors affect how well a project is able to achieve its goals. The following section highlights a few of the most important reasons why evaluations are not always able to lead to effective projects. The nature of the development projects and organizations, the evaluation procedures, and the context within which the projects are carried out all contribute to the minimal impact that evaluations appear to have on evaluation effectiveness in development projects within Bolivia.

When comparing the evaluation strategies of each of the development organizations with the suggested practices as outlined in evaluation-specific literature, some of the organizations appear to fall short of doing all that is recommended for a successful evaluation. Flexibility, as discussed in chapter five, is a key component to the role that evaluations can play on increasing a project’s effectiveness. It appears extremely difficult for organizations, such as USAID and UNICEF, that have relatively large-scale projects to be very flexible. For reasons discussed in the chapter on information management, including the sheer size of the projects, large-scale projects tend to have quantitative macro indicators. While these indicators are easy to measure, they are not often reflective of the effects and impacts of a project. It is only through external evaluations that the actors in these organizations are informed of the true consequences that the projects are having, because external evaluations are usually quantitative and they examine the projects from a more micro level than do the aggregate indicators. Except in the case of Project Concern International and Water for People,
which have comprehensive midterm evaluations, these comprehensive evaluations only occur at the completion of a project. Policy makers are consequently only able to utilize the completed evaluations to design future projects; it is too late for any changes to be effected on the project that was evaluated.

The flexibility of development organizations with large-scale projects is further hindered by heavy reliance on external funding. The national branches of international development organizations are constantly vying for an adequate portion of the available funding. To be eligible for substantial funding, these national branches must prove that they are successfully meeting their objectives, as failed or failing projects are often eliminated or de-emphasized. If a project is having difficulty in attaining its objectives, rather than change the nature of the project and further risk not achieving its targets, the objectives themselves are changed to better reflect the reality of the project. While on paper such a project would appear to be very effective, the project’s success, in relation to its original objectives, is consequently quite minimal.

The small-scale nature of Peace Corps projects and a lack of commitments to financing institutions might suggest that the organization should be more flexible. However, the nature of the evaluation system does not, for the most part, encourage flexibility. Volunteers are provided with project objectives, which include the number of people that Peace Corps hopes to train within a certain timeframe, but these numbers are meant to encompass the efforts of hundreds of volunteers over several years. Accordingly, PCVs have little idea of how successful their projects are within the larger picture, providing little incentive or information for them to try to improve the success of their projects.
Unlike the other organizations included in this study, the Peace Corps hopes to affect both the project implementers and the project participants. According to the three overarching goals of the Peace Corps, the changes in knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs that PCVs experience over their two years of service are no less significant than the changes that are hoped to occur among project participants. Furthermore, the changes in the PCVs are likely to affect the way in which the project is implemented. Nevertheless, Peace Corps' monitoring methods only look for changes in the participants. Neglecting to account for the ways in which the project implementers (the PCVs) change, ignores a fundamental component of the project process.

Although other development organizations do not attempt to affect their own project implementers, it is likely that the implementers will also change over the course of a project. At the very least, the attitudes, knowledge, and socioeconomic situation of the project implementers, even if unchanged throughout the project process, will undoubtedly have an effect on the design, implementation, and outcome of a project. Evaluation specialists, including Carol Weiss, recognize the importance of project inputs, such as implementers, and thus recommend that these factors be accounted for in the monitoring and evaluation procedures.\footnote{Weiss, \textit{Evaluation Research} 45.} However, all of the information gathered from the development agencies suggests that inputs are never identified in the evaluations. While gathering more complete information on the project implementers during the monitoring and evaluation procedures will not improve the effectiveness of a project, it can improve the understanding of the effects of a project and the several factors that contributed to the particular outcome. Incorporating human characteristics into the evaluation criteria is also important, in that it acknowledges the human side of
development, which, although often overlooked throughout this investigation, is critical to recognize. Throughout this study, the focus has been on the technical components of development. It has in essence broken down development, and evaluations, in particular, into the nuts and bolts of the processes, but it must be understood that these procedures can profoundly impact people’s lives, including both project participants and implementers.

Follow up of a project is also considered a critical aspect of the evaluation procedures, yet the only follow-up that appears to occur within the various organizations is very informal. While follow-up need not occur on a regular basis, pathways for continuous communication between past project participants and the implementing organization is encouraged, so that any undesirable future effects can be dealt with in a timely manner. In part, follow-up is hindered by time and financial constraints, which are not easily overcome. Water for People, however, through its close relationship with local NGOs and individuals, including PCVs, living in the vicinity of past project participants, has been able to improve the success of its projects following project completion, and should thus be regarded as a best practice.

Elements that are not directly related to the evaluation process must additionally be in place to create an effective project. Most important among these criteria is participation. As Monica Ramos, a current PCV, put it succinctly, “if a project is not community driven, it’s going to fail, that’s the bottom line.” Active participation is imperative for creating a sense of ownership of the project, which is necessary for the benefits of the project to continue even after its completion. Organization efficiency and transparency may also be viewed as critical components for successful development.

Factors outside of the control of the development agencies also contribute to a project's level of success. The political, economic, social, and geographical situations of Bolivia all hinder a project's success. Bolivia is a country that is often plagued with political and social unrest in part as a result of corruption, a dismal economic situation, and institutionalized discrimination against indigenous peoples. This discontent often takes the form of protests and blockades, which can make travel by project implementers and evaluators to the communities unsafe or even impossible. The geography of the country, with its desert landscape to the Southwest and the Andes mountains running through the western and central regions, coupled with poor or nonexistent roads, further impedes transport to rural communities, where the majority of the projects are carried out. Ideally, monitoring should occur on a regular basis, but without the ability to travel easily to particular areas, especially during the rainy season, constant monitoring can be a challenging and unrealistic task, which may be one further reason that many organizations choose to monitor macro indicators, which are readily available from outside sources.

The cultural values of many Bolivians, especially those from rural areas, encumber the efforts of development projects. Historically, the majority of development projects in Bolivia that were executed by international organizations had a tendency simply to provide material goods to Bolivians. Development workers would build a hospital, a school, a park, a water system, or latrines within a community and upon completion of the construction, leave the community and continue to another area. This system, where the locals were not at all given an opportunity to be involved in the
project, created a "give me" attitude among Bolivians.\textsuperscript{137} Bolivians still now expect workers of international development organizations to provide them with material goods, assuming that they need not do anything to gain such goods. Such an attitude is especially problematic for PCVs, whose main purpose is to teach, not to give, and which thus requires the active involvement of all project participants.\textsuperscript{138} Reversing this ingrained notion that project beneficiaries need not be engaged in the project process is a formidable task, but is important for fostering participation.

**Shortcomings of Evaluation Literature**

From the previous discussion, it is clear that evaluations have many shortcomings in their abilities to contribute to project effectiveness. Although some of these shortcomings are beyond the control of the organizations, other weaknesses are caused by the organization's failure to do all that evaluation theory suggests. Evaluation theory certainly offers a range of evaluation methods and best practices, but it too, has its limitations.

Despite the central focus of evaluation literature on the importance of information management, few suggestions for how to develop indicators are presented, especially for small-scale projects. Evaluation specialists tend to stress the importance of macro indicators, but as has been seen, there are many drawbacks to using this type of indicator. Namely, macro indicators are unable to reflect the true effects of a project. Many of the actors who were interviewed expressed discontent with the indicators that they had chosen to monitor the progress and effects of their projects, but they found few

\textsuperscript{137} Ramos, personal interview, 12 Jan. 2004.
economical and timely alternatives. For years, development actors such as Tim McFarren of the Peace Corps have struggled to develop new indicators that more adequately describe the objectives that they hope to achieve. McFarren and others hoped that collaboration with other development actors would foster creative ideas for new types of indicators, but such action was relatively unsuccessful. Undeniably, creating accurate indicators is a difficult process, but evaluation theorists must pay more attention to this topic, for only when actors gain accurate information regarding the true status of their projects, can positive policy changes occur.

One form of evaluation that is not readily expressed in the evaluation literature, but that is seen by development actors in Bolivia to be of utmost importance, is an evaluation method that assesses a project's potential for sustainability; that is, the potential for a project's benefits to continue once development workers leave the community. Sergio Navajas of USAID believes that sustainability and exit strategies should be given heightened importance in evaluations. Exit strategies encompass suggestions for how a project can be completed, or at least how development workers can leave a community, without causing an end to the project effects or creating negative effects. PCVs also expressed great interest in establishing a way to determine the sustainability of their projects. Many volunteers speculate that once they finish their service, their project, along with all of its benefits, will also come to an end.\textsuperscript{139} An evaluation or informal indicator system will not alone be able to improve the sustainability of the project, but at the very least it will offer the prospects of the future of the project and may reveal ways in which to increase the project's sustainability.

\textsuperscript{139} Yaddick, personal interview, 13 Jan. 2004.
As noted in the chapter on participant involvement, development specialists all view participation as an important component of the development process. Without participant ownership, projects will not endure. There is little, however, in the way of evaluation literature on how to incorporate participants into the process, or even if such involvement is appropriate at this level of the project. World Vision offers an interesting example that evaluation specialists may want to consider as an effective way to bring participation into the evaluation process. In addition to the more traditional external evaluations, World Vision encourages self-evaluation by all project participants. While there are certainly difficulties with this, as with any, evaluation procedure, it ably integrates participation and evaluation.

**Reflections on the Peace Corps**

Much distinguishes the Peace Corps from the other development organizations included in this study and raises the question of whether or not it is appropriate to compare the organization with organizations whose central purpose is decidedly development. The nature of Peace Corps as a development agency is widely debated. Even Charna Lefton, the Project and Training Officer for Peace Corps Bolivia, is unsure whether Peace Corps should be considered primarily a development agency or a cultural exchange agency, as Peace Corps’ three goals speak to both of these aspects.\(^{140}\) The first goal of the Peace Corps is to provide technical assistance to communities and peoples in need, in an aim to foster local development, but the following two goals are focused exclusively on improving intercultural understanding. Regardless of the true nature of the organization, the fact remains that volunteers and APCDs alike appeared very

unconcerned with the success of the projects, in terms of executing a project that fostered local and sustainable development. Luis Skandar, the Integrated Education APCD expressed this view in saying that he cares little if volunteers reach the target numbers or objectives; he simply hopes that the volunteers are engaged in intellectually and cultural stimulating activities during their service.\textsuperscript{141}

Even if the Peace Corps can be considered a development agency, it is undeniable that the project implementers of Peace Corps vary greatly from the project implementers of the other organizations. First and foremost, PCVs are not locals, but rather are American. Most often, PCVs do not share the same culture, customs, or even language as the project participants. Nevertheless, all PCVs and APCDs that were interviewed do not find these differences to be unique to Peace Corps projects. The nationality of the PCVs does create certain expectations among project participants, as Bolivians are accustomed to “hand-outs,” either in the form of money or goods. PCVs, because they have no set funds, can be an initial disappointment to the community members. However, PCVs do not strongly believe that these differences make Peace Corps projects any less effective than other development organizations, noting that although the project implementers of the other organizations are usually Bolivian, they tend to come from a higher socioeconomic class and be more educated than the project participants.\textsuperscript{142}

Therefore, even Bolivian project implementers are seen as outsiders to the project participants. PCVs, unlike most other project implementers, are usually young (between twenty-two and thirty years old) and are relatively untrained, as they often serve right out of college.

\textsuperscript{141} Skandar, personal interview, 13 Jan. 2004.
\textsuperscript{142} Ramos, personal interview, 12 Jan. 2004.
The small-scale nature and limited funding of Peace Corps projects make Peace Corps projects resemble more closely projects of local NGOs than the projects of large international development agencies. However, like the large international agencies, Peace Corps is very bureaucratic, with many different levels of authority. Comparison between the Peace Corps and local NGOs would still very interesting and may be more appropriate, but would ignore the important international component of the Peace Corps.

Despite the limited time available to conduct field research of the evaluation procedures of seven international development organizations working in Bolivia, many lessons can be drawn, particularly about Peace Corps’ role in development, and the limitations that both the organizations and the evaluation literature have. These lessons bring to the fore policy recommendations, and ideas for further study, as certainly this study has its own limitations. These various recommendations will be the focus of the following chapter, the conclusion.
Chapter Eight: Conclusion

The findings of the preceding analysis suggest that neither evaluation literature nor development organizations can perfectly describe or implement evaluation processes. Through these witnessed limitations, policy recommendations arise. As noted in various instances, follow up is strongly recommended in order to determine the long-term effects and sustainability of a project; however, none of the studied organizations demonstrated a concerted effort to follow up on past project participants. Water for People's reaction to final evaluations, while not truly follow-up, aptly shows the merit of post-project intervention. Through recognizing deficiencies in the evaluated projects, Water for People was able to implement further training sessions. Because the aim of the projects of all of the organizations is to effect long-lasting positive change, it is the responsibility of these organizations to assure that such changes are occurring, which is not often possible within the limited time frame of the projects; therefore more attention to follow-up is highly recommended. Follow-up need not be highly structured, as this can be costly and time-consuming, but instead should consist of continued communication between the implementing organization and past project participants long after the project has been completed.

Several problems with the current indicators were outlined in the chapter on information management. Specifically, the indicators of the majority of the organizations are not well able to reflect the true effects of their projects, and in the case of the Peace Corps, the indicators tend to focus on the project processes rather than on the effects and impacts. Undeniably, the creation of indicators is a difficult process, as can be seen with the complications that various development actors expressed at establishing accurate
indicators. Nevertheless, indicators form the basis of any monitoring report or evaluation. Conclusions about the success or failure of a project are primarily drawn from the change of the indicators over the progress of the project, and thus they should reflect the reality of the project as best as possible. Where possible, organizations should employ individuals to work specifically on the task of developing indicators, and more attention in the entire evaluation field should be paid not simply to the importance of indicators, but also to the ways in which more accurate indicators can be established.

Most all development actors will attest to the importance that participation plays in the success of a development project. It is through participation that ownership of a project is established, and only through participant ownership will the benefits of a project continue past project completion. Participation is important at all stages of the development process, including during the monitoring and evaluation processes. Certainly it is the project participants that know best the successes and challenges of a project, and the ways in which a project could be improved; however, they are given a very limited voice in most evaluation systems. Active involvement of project participants, such as what World Vision encourages through its self-evaluations, is important for creating evaluations that truly reflect the outcomes of a project.

The above recommendations are reflective of the analysis and lessons of this investigation, but they do come out of a relatively limited amount of field and literature research. Certainly this study cannot encompass all aspects of evaluation systems of development projects in Bolivia, but because of the important implications that evaluations can have on project effectiveness, further research is merited on a variety of topics. It is of interest to compare and contrast the evaluation practices from a wider
sample of organizations that includes, in particular, local NGOs in comparison with the Peace Corps. Because of the bureaucracy and international scope of the Peace Corps, it is some ways similar to international development organizations, but the small-scale nature of Peace Corps projects causes the organization to also resemble local NGOs, such that comparison with these organizations may lead to important findings. Furthermore, due to the limited time for field research, the present study only includes interviews from one actor from six of the organizations (this excludes the Peace Corps). These actors tended to be people with authority that were based at the national branches of the organizations. It is thus not known if the opinions and knowledge of these interviewees is reflective of all actors within the organization. Therefore, for a more comprehensive study, one should analyze the different roles and importance that evaluations are assigned at the various levels (international, national, and local) of each organization.

Through these additional studies, further conclusions can be drawn. Drawing our attention back to the current investigation, however, it is important to look at what final conclusions can be made about the status of evaluation processes of international development organizations in Bolivia. Within the scope of this study, it becomes evident that, for a couple of reasons, it is not possible to prove or reject the initial hypothesis that projects of organizations with formal evaluation systems are more effective than projects of organizations without formal evaluation systems. First, with the finding that the Peace Corps does indeed have a formal monitoring process, the investigation no longer contains an organization without a monitoring system, which is needed to serve as a basis of comparison. Second, development organizations execute several projects simultaneously in a wide range of sectors, from health and education to natural resources and agriculture.
Each project, although under the auspices of the same organization, is individually designed and implemented, meaning that each project is very unlikely to have the same level of success. While all of the projects of one organization are subject to the same monitoring and evaluation procedures, external factors, over which the organization often has little control, contribute to the effectiveness of a project.

Although it is not possible to discern whether one organization is overall more effective than another organization, it is possible to determine the role that evaluations play in project effectiveness. Development specialists attest to the importance that evaluations play, and this is further evidenced by the fact that it was not possible to find a single organization without an evaluation system to include in this study. However, in the seven international development organizations that serve as case studies in this investigation, evaluations appear to play a minimal role on project effectiveness. In these organizations, evaluations are important for informing actors about the status or progress of a project, but they do little to transform the project design, especially of current projects, which is necessary for continual improvement of project effectiveness. This is not to say that evaluations cannot lead to project improvement; through acknowledging the limitations of both the development organizations and the evaluation literature, and heeding several policy recommendations, evaluations can hope to realize their potential as a key contributor to enhancing the effectiveness of development projects.
Interview Questions for Peace Corps Volunteers

Please briefly describe the project on which you are working.

Is an evaluation required of your project, or just recommended?

Do you conduct the evaluation of your project, or does someone else evaluate it? If so, who?

What is the format of the evaluation?

What types of questions are asked on the evaluation?

Do you refer to this evaluation to make changes to your project design or implementation?

To whom do you submit this evaluation?

To your knowledge, do future volunteers of the same project refer to past evaluations? Did you?

To your knowledge, are these evaluations published or made public knowledge?

With what frequency do you evaluate your project, and at what points in the project implementation do you conduct the evaluation?

Do you have contact with a Peace Corps supervisor?

If so, with what frequency, and what are the nature of your interactions?

Do you consult with community members about the project design and implementation?

If so, with what frequency do you consult them?

Do they offer you suggestions?

Do you feel your project was effective in meeting its objectives?

Do you feel your project was effective in meeting the needs of community members?

Additional comments/suggestions/helpful contacts:
Interview questions for community members of a town in which there is a small-scale development project (Peace Corps sponsored or otherwise)

What do you perceive to be the purpose of the project?
Do you think what the project hopes to achieve is important?
Do you know how and why the project was started?
What are your expectations of the project?
Do you actively participate in the project?
   If so, how often?
Before the project began were you or other community members consulted?
Do the project implementers ask your opinion about the project?
   If so, do you offer suggestions/ are changes made that reflect the input of community members?
How has the project affected your daily life?
How has the project affected the lives of your family members/ friends?
Do you have much contact with the implementers of the project?
   If so, how much, and what is the nature of your contact (informal conversation, community reunions, etc.)?
Do you feel the project is helping to meet the needs of the community?
How could the project change to better meet your needs and the needs of the community?
Additional comments/suggestions/helpful contacts:
Interview questions for non-Peace Corps project implementers (I am assuming that these projects do in fact have formal evaluations):

Who conducts the evaluation of the project?

What prior knowledge does the evaluator have of the project?

What is the format of the evaluation?

What types of questions are asked on the evaluation?

To whom is the evaluation submitted?

Do the people who receive the evaluation have authority to effect policy change?

Do you or others refer to past evaluations to make changes in the project design and implementation?

Is the evaluation made public knowledge/ is it published?

Did you initially speak with community members to establish what change was sought in the community, or how did the idea for the project arise?

Do you consult with community members about the project design and implementation?

If so, with what frequency do you consult them and what is the nature of this encounter?

Do they offer you suggestions? If so, such as what?

With what frequency is the project evaluated, and at what points in the project implementation is the evaluation conducted?

Do you have an incentive to do an evaluation, is the evaluation required?

Is there (and if so, what is) a determined length for the implementation of the project?

Do you feel that the project has been effective in meeting its objectives and in meeting the needs of the community members?

What do you think could be done to improve the effectiveness of the project?

What challenges have you faced in realizing the objectives of the project?
What do you think is the value of having a formal evaluation built into the project design?

Do you make any comparisons to other similar programs to gauge your success or look for new ideas?

What have been the effects of the project?

Were these effects expected or unexpected?

**Evaluation Specific Questions:**

What do you use as indicators that the project is being implemented effectively?

Were these indicators measured before the project was implemented, so as to determine their progress over the course of the project?

Do you monitor specific aspects of the project throughout its implementation?

If so, which aspects do you measure?

Additional comments/suggestions/helpful contacts:
APPENDIX B: ABBREVIATIONS

APCD- Associate Peace Corps Director
CARE- Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere
NGO- Non-governmental organization
QPR- Quarterly Progress Report
PAC- Project Advisory Committee
PCI- Project Concern International
PCV- Peace Corps Volunteer
PCVC- Peace Corps Volunteer Coordinator
PSR- Progress Status Report
PTO- Project Training Officer
UNICEF- United Nations Children’s Fund
USAID- United States Agency for International Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Mission Statement</th>
<th>Project Sectors in Bolivia</th>
<th>Years in Bolivia</th>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>Relationship with government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE)</td>
<td>“To serve individuals and families in the poorest communities in the world. Drawing strength from our global diversity, resources and experience, we promote innovative solutions and are advocates for global responsibility.”</td>
<td>Rehabilitation, emergency relief, health, environment, water and sanitation, institutional strengthening</td>
<td>1976-present</td>
<td>USAID (among other unspecified institutions), private donors</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Corps</td>
<td>Provide technical assistance, promote better understanding of Americans abroad, promote better understanding of other peoples on part of Americans</td>
<td>Integrated Education, Basic Sanitation, Natural Resources Management, Agricultural Extension, Microenterprise Development</td>
<td>1962-1971, 1990-present</td>
<td>Funding is rare, but Small Project Assistance (SPA) grants from the US government and Partnership grants from US-based NGOs are sometimes available</td>
<td>Under the direction of the US government, often work with local Bolivian municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Concern International (PCI)</td>
<td>“Project Concern mobilizes resources at every level, crossing borders and integrating approaches to save children’s lives and build healthy communities.”</td>
<td>Health, Food Security, Education</td>
<td>1983-present</td>
<td>International and national development organizations, private donors</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nation’s Children’s Fund (UNICEF)</td>
<td>UNICEF is mandated by the United Nations General Assembly to advocate for the protection of children’s rights, to help meet their basic needs and to expand their opportunities to reach their full potential.”</td>
<td>Education, Health, Protection of Childhood and Adolescence, Local Integrated Development</td>
<td>1950s-present</td>
<td>National governments worldwide and local sources, channeled through national UNICEF committees</td>
<td>Project plans must be approved by the Bolivian Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Mission Statement</th>
<th>Project Sectors in Bolivia</th>
<th>Years in Bolivia</th>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>Relationship with government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Agency for International Development (USAID)</td>
<td>Projects support long-term and equitable economic growth and advances U.S. foreign policy objectives by supporting: economic growth, agriculture and trade; global health; and democracy, conflict prevention and humanitarian assistance.</td>
<td>Environment, health, promotion of democracy, economic opportunity, alternative development</td>
<td>1961-present</td>
<td>US government, World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank</td>
<td>US government organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water for People</td>
<td>&quot;International humanitarian organization that deeply values water as an essential social, economic, and environmental good. Water for People uses water as a catalyst for change in communities throughout the world that lack access to drinking water, adequate sanitation, and hygiene education.&quot;</td>
<td>Drinking water systems, latrines, training courses</td>
<td>1992-present</td>
<td>Private donors, including American Water, American WaterWorks Association, US Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>&quot;To follow Jesus Christ, our father and savior, working with the poor and oppressed to promote human transformation, seek justice and testify the good of God.&quot;</td>
<td>Transitional development; prevention, emergency, and rehabilitation projects; promotion of justice; church strengthening; economic development</td>
<td>1981-present</td>
<td>Private donors, international donor organizations</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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