Danish MFA's evaluations of development assistance:

Evaluations
- use, user relevance
and communication

Analysis of the use of evaluations, July 2014

Aim and purpose

The Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)'s Evaluation Department (EVAL) wanted to conduct an analysis on how their evaluations are used. The purpose was to achieve an independent view on how main users

− Use and find the different kinds of documents used for the evaluation; evaluation report, executive summary, management response, website and short Danish summaries
− Perceive communication and availability of the evaluations
− Perceive the relevance and use of the evaluations in their work
− Asses how the evaluations could become more relevant or easier to use in their work

The analysis was conducted by the companies Publikum Kommunikation and inVirke during February-May 2014 and the report was concluded in July 2014.

Method

The analysis was conducted as a combination of a quantitative survey and a qualitative survey of the users' views.
1. Two quantitative surveys with questionnaires were conducted as a web survey and its data treated by the analysis company YouGov. Both surveys were anonymous.
    a. One survey was sent out to staff at The Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It was sent out by e-mail to all employees at the bilateral representations in countries receiving development assistance, and to staff involved with development policy and assistance at the multilateral representations and at MFA Copenhagen. The report is based on questionnaire responses from 124 employees.
    b. The other survey was sent out to about 125 external users of Danida evaluations and the report is based on questionnaire responses from 56 of them. The respondents come from consultancy companies, civil society organizations and research organizations/ universities.
2. A qualitative analysis based on two focus groups with staff from MFA Copenhagen. The companies, Publikum and inVirke, served as moderators.
    a. Staff from different departments at MFA Copenhagen who are potential users of the evaluations and who work with communication, strategy, programme design and policy were in one focus group.
    b. Six "expert users", who work with programme design and technical advice on a specialist level, were in the other focus group.

Copenhagen, 10. July 2014
Anette Petersen, inVirke
Christian Vaabensted, Publikum Kommunikation

Main findings

Danida evaluations are important and useful

Danida evaluations are recognised among the users as important and trustworthy. More than 2/3s of internal and external users find that the evaluations provide useful evidence for what works and what does not work in development assistance, and that the evaluations are valuable learning tools.

The focus groups stressed that evaluations are relevant for programme design, policy and strategy development as well as inputs to reviews and appraisals. In addition, they serve as an important source of information and a help when answering questions from the Parliament and the press, and serve as background information when visiting cooperation countries. These points of view balance well with the quantitative surveys of the user pattern.

The participants in the focus groups and the respondents also stated that they would like to use the evaluations and their insights even more in their daily work as a source of knowledge and a tool for learning, and provided suggestions for increasing the useability of the evaluations, including better timing and targeting of evaluations, better communication of the results, stronger demand for evidence in the preparation phase, and more independence of the evaluations. To enhance the quality of evaluations it was suggested to assess the evaluability of the programmes as part of programme preparation.

The surveys revealed that format is not the main issue. Users will use reports, summaries and management responses if they are relevant to their work. However, members of focus groups expressed a clear preference for shorter and more user-friendly evaluation reports and summaries. Staff close to the political process prefers the management response and the short, Danish summaries. On the whole, more needs to be done to communicate the results and lessons learned in an easy-to-read way and to enhance peoples' knowledge about the availability of the evaluations. Some members of the focus groups also highlighted that the structure of the reports, based on the DAC evaluation criteria, could be a barrier to use – as the reports seldom answered straight forward questions. Other said that they mainly used the reports as reference guides on specific issues.

The evaluations are found to be highly relevant and of professional value

In both the external and the internal quantitative surveys the evaluations are very positively assessed for their relevance and professional value. 61-69 % of the users agree/strongly agree with the statement that the evaluations are relevant for decision making, as a learning tool and as evidence for what works and doesn't work in development assistance. Similar assessments were made by the focus groups.

When comparing evaluations with others sources for acquiring knowledge about development assistance, evaluation comes out quite strongly together with meetings and informal conversations with colleagues, and participation in donor groups. Only participation in field visits and reviews are rated higher. External users pointed to evaluation reports and studies conducted by others as the place where they most often seek information on development.

Demand for stronger evidence in development cooperation at MFA

One aspect that came out very strongly in the focus group discussions was that a greater demand from MFA management in the preparatory phase for evidence on what works and what does not work in development assistance would enhance the use of evaluations and evaluation results. It was felt that too many decisions where based on politics and hunches rather than an understanding of development. This was to some extent backed by the quantitative survey where 50 % of the

internal users and 45 % of the external users said that they would use the evidence and recommendations of the evaluations more if it were in greater demand by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Enhancing the quality of evaluations

Focus group discussions and surveys were centred on issues related to enhancing the quality and usability of evaluations, and a number of suggestions were put forward:

- Relevant topics: Evaluations are useful when they provide evidence and insights on relevant topics that staff is engaged in – so they can serve directly as a tool in programme improvement, programme design, development of strategies, communication etc. That would often imply that targeted evaluations would be of more interest than broad evaluations providing general insights. In this context, the usefulness of joint evaluations was questioned as they often led to general conclusions.
- Timing: Usability is greatly enhanced when evaluations can provide input into programming processes and provide evidence that can be used for policy and strategy formulation.
- Accountability vs. learning: Staff recognises that the evaluations serve a dual-purpose; accountability and learning. However, it was strongly felt that the main focus of the evaluations should be on learning which could lead to improved decision making and increase the efficiency and effectiveness of development assistance.
- Evaluability and monitoring**:** To ensure high quality evaluations that actually produce results and insights, it was suggested that evaluability issues should be addressed as part of programme design. This would entail use of theories of change, stronger baselines, relevant indicators, and adequate monitoring.
- Communication of results: Staff has a need for clear and well-documented results which illustrates what difference development cooperation makes and which can be used in the communication with politicians and with the general public. It is stated that the evaluations are often too reluctant to point towards or take credit for positive results. It is also found difficult to use and communicate results of evaluations that are organised and structured in accordance with OECD criteria. Rather, evaluations should have a greater focus on main results and impacts and/or answer a few really pertinent and "burning" questions which can then be communicated.
- Independence: 30 % of the external respondents, primarily from civil society, felt that the quality of evaluations could be enhanced if evaluations became more independent. Questions around independence relates not only to Danida but also the consultants who are tasked to carry out evaluations.

User-friendly reports and communication will increase their use

The third aspect greatly in demand for improving the evaluations is their format and the way findings and conclusions are communicated.

The actual evaluation format
According to the survey, respondents are not concerned about the format when they decide to use an evaluation. The frequency of using reports is similar to the frequency of using summaries. But 58 % of the internal users and 55 % of the external users state that they would use the evaluations more if the overview was better. In the focus group, the predominant view was that they would use the evaluation reports more frequently if it was easier to get a quick overview of relevant topics and main findings, in particular when staff is in a hurry to produce answers to the Minister or the Parliament, and when they need results and insights for external communication.

Summaries are very important
Well-written summaries are the main single tool to ensure that findings, conclusions and results from the evaluations are used internally and communicated. There is great potential for improving use and communication through improvement of summaries.

For most staff members the very short, Danish summaries, "Evaluerings Resumé" serve as their main tool and for some as their only tool. Even the expert users use these occasionally when writing speeches, answering questions and developing strategies and policies. For external communication – both towards politicians, press and the general public – they serve as the main source.

It is stressed that the format of the summaries could be improved. They should be short, simple and easy to consult while at the same time provide a number of useful facts and an overview of the programme and its main results, as well as essential complexities and difficulties.

Some internal users suggest that the evaluation results are communicated as a package – customised messages for different target groups and purposes, e.g. Parliament, twitter and facebook.

<u>Overview and web search must be improved – a hard copy of the main report is not essential</u>
The large majority of users use the PDF of the main evaluation report and other documents such as the executive summary and management response. This is fine by most users and only very few wish to have access to a hard copy. It is worth noticing, however, that it is mainly internal users who find the hard copy important.

On the other hand there is widespread criticism that the evaluations are too difficult to find online. Even MFA staff would like to search only once to get an overview. Furthermore, it is pointed out that it is too difficult to quickly glance through an evaluation to see if there is something of relevance. The focus groups express their need to gain easier access to thematic content, i.e. country, sector, and modality and on important issues such as human rights, growth or women.

Main recommendations

- The Evaluation Department as well as MFA Copenhagen should work to strengthen evaluability already in the design phase in order to be able to evaluate, document results and provide learning.

- Efforts should be made to strengthen the readability and editing of the content in the actual evaluation reports with a view to communicating the results of the development efforts. This must be done without compromising the depth or the professional standard and with a view of the main users' daily need. Relevant topics, results and findings should be easier to find.

- Improving the format of the short Danish summaries has great potential with regard to editing and clarity. It may, for instance, be considered to extend the Danish summaries to eight pages but to make them clear and useful with the aim of having a quicker overview on more aspects. Hard copies of a certain number of these short summaries should be considered.

- Strengthening communication of the evaluations to core user groups may be improved. Few and simple measurements will be efficient. A lot of people do not get or do not read the newsletter, Danida Evaluation News, for instance, or automatically receive summaries or reports.

- It is important to increase the online overview and to improve online search criteria for the different kinds of evaluation documents. On the other hand, it may be considered to cut down on preparing hard copies so that these are only offered to key users, perhaps only for internal use at MFA. For frequent users it may be advantageous to have a physical copy at hand for faster use in order to consult themselves with the content and for making notes.

External Survey of Danida Evaluations 2014

Introduction

This report conveys the main results of an external survey of the use of Danida evaluations conducted for the Evaluation Department (EVAL).

The survey was conducted via the internet by the YouGov analysis institute in the period of March 26. – April 10, 2014. The report is based on questionnaire responses from 56 external users of Danida evaluations.

The questionnaire and table report are attached as appendix.

Characteristic of respondents

- 50% of the respondents work for Consultancy companies
- 21% work for 'Civil society organisations/Interest organisations'
- 21% answer that they work for a 'University, research organisation, think tank etc.'
- 2% work for an 'International organisation'
- 5% answer 'other'.

All figures have been tested in order to reveal possible significant differences of the answers between these characteristic groups, but due to the very small base of respondents, the results doesn't show reliable, significant variations.

Frequency of the use of evaluations

The respondents were asked how frequently they use the different kinds of evaluation documents. In general, they know and use different evaluation documents from Danida, but most respondents use them only a few times a year.

The documents that are used least frequently by most respondents are 'Management response/follow-up note on Danida's evaluation reports' whereas 'Evaluation reports and studies conducted by others' are used most frequently. For all Danida documents applies that less than 10 % of the respondents use them more often than once a month.

Q2. How often do you use the following kinds of evaluation documents?	Once a month or more often	Several times a year (6-11 times)	A few times a year (1-5 times)	Less than once a year	Never
Evaluation reports from Danida	7%	16%	52%	18%	7%
Evaluation studies from Danida	6%	14%	45%	27%	9%
Danish summaries of evaluation reports from Danida ("EvalueringResumé")	9%	14%	43%	18%	13%
Management response/follow-up note on Danida's evaluation reports	9%	4%	23%	30%	21%
Evaluation reports and studies conducted by others	22%	29%	38%	9%	4%

Communication channels for Danida evaluations

Most respondents learn about the evaluations from Danida by finding them on Danida's websites and use them as PDF. Only 7 % answer that they generally don't learn about new Danida evaluations.

The communication channels disperse themselves as follows:
- 68 % answer that they learn about the evaluations from Danida by finding them on Danida's websites and use them as PDF.
- 41% answer that they learn about them from colleagues.
- 36 % answer that they find them on danida-publikationer.dk and use them as pdf or html.
- 20 % answer that they read about them in the e-mail newsletter "Danida Evaluation News".
- 13 % answer that they find them on danida-publikationer.dk and order them in hardcopy.
- 7 % answer that they subscribe to the "Evaluering Resumé".

Relevance of Danida evaluations

The respondents are predominantly positive towards the relevance of the Danida evaluations. 64% *agree* or *strongly agree* that 'the evaluations provide useful evidence for what works and doesn't work in development assistance' and 61% *agree* or *strongly agree* that 'the evaluations are a valuable leaning tool' - while very few (5-7 %) *disagree* or *strongly disagree.*

More than half (55 %) of the respondents also *agree* or *strongly agree* that 'the evaluations present findings and conclusions in a clear, easy-to-find and understandable manner' while 18 % *disagree* or *strongly disagree.*

The figures show that there is not much consensus about whether or not 'the evaluations provide independent views on Danish Development cooperation'. 36 % *agree* or *strongly agree* to that – but 29 % *disagree* or *strongly disagree.*

Q4. How would you assess the relevance of the Danida evaluations in general?	Strongly agree or agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree or strongly disagree
The evaluations are timely	39%	41%	5%
The evaluations provide useful evidence for what works and doesn't work in development assistance	64%	21%	5%
The evaluations are a useful tool in decision making	45%	29%	11%
The evaluations are a valuable learning tool	61%	27%	7%
The evaluations present findings and conclusions in a clear, easy-to-find and understandable manner	55%	21%	18%
They provide independent views on Danish Development cooperation	36%	30%	29%

Encouraging factors for the use of Danida evaluations

The respondents were presented with a number of factors and asked to what extent these factors would encourage them to make greater use of the evaluations. In general, the respondents' rankings according to the extent of encouragement are very widespread.

The factors that most respondents *to a large* or *very large extend* would be encouraged by are 'Better overview on Danida's website of content and learning in the different evaluations' (48 %), 'Easier to get a quick overview of the most important content in the evaluation reports/studies' (39 %) and 'That the Ministry of Foreign Affairs demands that evidence and recommendations from relevant evaluations are included in their work' (36 %).

For some of the factors more respondents indicated that they were in fact not encouraging. The factors which more than half of the respondents would *not at all* or *only to a limited extent* be encouraged by are 'That they can continue to get the evaluation report as a booklet (printed hardcopy) and not only as pdf or in html format' (57 %) and 'Short Danish summaries ("Evaluering Resumé") with a clearer presentation than today' (54 %).

The figures show that there is not much consensus on how encouraging the respondents find the factors to be. For instance, almost equally many respondents stated 'Easier to subscribe to receiving all Danish summaries ("Evaluering Resumé") or all evaluation reports/studies/EvalNews' and 'More readable and understandable evaluation reports/studies' as an encouraging factor as those who did not find it encouraging.

Q5. To what extent would the following factors encourage you to make greater use of Danida's evaluations?	To a large or very large extent	To some extent	To a limited extent or not at all
Higher quality of content	34%	39%	16%
More readable and understandable evaluation reports/studies	21%	39%	29%
Easier to get a quick overview of the most important content in the evaluation reports/studies	39%	32%	20%
Better overview on Danida's website of content and learnings in the different evaluations	48%	27%	14%
Easier to subscribe to receiving all Danish summaries ("Evaluering Resumé") or all evaluation reports/studies/EvalNews	30%	23%	36%
Short Danish summaries ("Evaluering Resumé") with a clearer presentation than today	25%	14%	54%
That I can continue to get the evaluation report as a booklet (printed hardcopy) and not only as pdf or in html format	11%	23%	57%
That the Ministry of Foreign Affairs demands that I include evidence and recommendations from relevant evaluations in my work	36%	9%	27%

In the cases where the respondents indicated higher quality of content as an encouraging factor they were asked to specify what could improve the quality of the evaluations. Many of these respondents have constructive suggestions for improvements:

− *"I specifically look to descriptions of methodology and they are often vague".*

− *"More focus on communication and presentation skills would improve the quality of the reporting".*

− *"More thorough studies with a more solid academic foundation. Though some resources are spent on the evaluations, further resources are needed in order to ensure the above mentioned."*

− *"Evaluations used the evaluation criteria and questions too squarely, and have not taken innovative approaches and interesting ground breaking approaches into the reports."*

− *"Use of theories of change assumed in the given context - and used for identifying and assessing crucial assumptions".*

− *"Stronger baselines would generally improve quality in terms of measurable change on indicators."*

− *"More focus on country context. More focus and analysis of the role of various players, for example policy makers/political agenda versus government officials/technical issues in both donor and partner countries."*

− *"The design/planning of the TOR for the evaluations."*

− *"(1) It's important that evaluation results are usable. This can be achieved through focus on what works and why in a given set of conditions. (2) Executive summaries should generally be short and focus on key messages/findings. (3) We should be clear that in many cases it is not*

possible to determine impact unless arrangements for this are built into programme design (relevant baselines) and sufficient resources allocated to the evaluation team to measure results (also amongst control groups)."

– *"Quality is often equal with relevance. So when the topic is relevant for me it has to do with the themes and topics of the evaluation. One specific example would be use of a Right Based approach in the evaluations"*

– *"One thing that I miss is to have the response comments and follow-up results from those that have been evaluated."*

However, many of the comments on how to improve the quality leads back to a wish for more objectivity of the evaluations:

– *"More independent evaluations with higher integrity by e.g. having the evaluation office further removed from day to day operations of MFA. Less focus/weight to financial consideration in procuring evaluations".*

– *"Sometimes I have the feeling that the evaluations state what is already obvious or very context specific and therefore of little general relevance for information on development matters. I might turn to more independent sources".*

– *"More room for independent view of consultants and less political management of evaluations needed".*

– *"I have experienced that "homemade" expressed political agendas by the Danish Ambassador in the country have had priority to the "professional" deliverables i.e. as outlined in DANIDA Terms of Reference. This "disturbs" the fulfilment of the targets/objectives – and thus the quality of the work carried out by the Consultant & his/her team."*

– *"This relates to the 'independence'. One sometimes has a feeling that the evaluation reports are sanitized to give a more positive view. It is not clear if this is due to Danida or due to those who did the evaluation".*

Internal Survey of Danida Evaluations 2014

Introduction
This report conveys the main results of an internal survey of the use of Danida evaluations conducted for the Evaluation Department (EVAL). The survey was conducted via the internet by the YouGov analysis institute in the period of March 26. – April 9, 2014. It was sent out by email to all employees at the Bilateral representations, the Multilateral representations and MFA Copenhagen. The report is based on questionnaire responses from 124 employees. The questionnaire and table report are attached as appendix.

Characteristics of respondents
The 124 respondents are characterised by the entity within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs they work for, their level of management responsibilities/positions and whether they have taken part in a Danida evaluation process on development assistance earlier.

59 % of the respondents work at the Bilateral representations, 37% work at MFA Copenhagen and 4% work at the Multilateral representations.

- 48 % of the respondents have positions such as 'Senior Advisor, Programme officer or head of section'
- 21 % of the respondents are administrative staff
- 19% have mid-level management positions such as 'Team Leader, Programme Manager and Chief Advisors'
- 12 % have management positions such as 'Head of Department, Ambassador and deputies'.

More than half of the respondents (55 %) have never taken part in a Danida evaluation process on development assistance. 27 % have taken part in a Danida evaluation process within the last 3 years whereas the last 18 % participated in a Danida evaluation process more than 3 years ago.

All figures have been tested for significance regarding these characteristics, but due to the relative small base of respondents, the results show only very few significant variations.

Sources of knowledge
The respondents were asked to rank different sources for acquiring knowledge about what works and doesn't work in development assistance according to how important they find the sources. The two sources that more than half of the respondents state as either *very important* or of *crucial importance* are 'Participating in field visits, exchanges with partners, reviews, etc.' (59 %) and 'Meetings and informal conversations with colleagues' (54 %).

Almost half of the respondents (48 %) also rank 'Evaluation reports and studies conducted by Danida' and 'Participating in donor/sector group discussions, conferences and seminars' as either *very important* or *of crucial importance*.

The sources that most respondents ranked as *less important* or *not important at all* are 'Conferences, seminars or meetings where evaluations are presented' (25 %), 'Evaluation reports and studies conducted by others' (21 %) and 'Articles, research briefs/reports and literature other than evaluation reports/studies' (19 %).

Significantly fewer from the group of respondents working as 'senior advisors, programme officers, head of sections' (10%) find that 'Evaluation reports and studies conducted by others' are *less important* or *not important at all*.

Q4. In your job, how important are the following sources for acquiring knowledge about what works and doesn't work in development assistance?	Of crucial importance or very important	Important	Less important or not important at all
Evaluation reports and studies conducted by Danida	48%	29%	15%
Evaluation reports and studies conducted by others	37%	34%	21%
Conferences, seminars or meetings where evaluations are presented	32%	35%	25%
Articles, research briefs/reports and literature other than evaluation reports/studies	31%	43%	19%
Meetings and informal conversations with colleagues	54%	29%	12%
Participating in donor/sector group discussions, conferences and seminars	48%	30%	15%
Participating in field visits, exchanges with partners, reviews, etc.	59%	23%	10%

Very few respondents answer that they use other sources than the ones listed in the questionnaire and indicate the following as additional sources for acquiring knowledge about developing assistance:

– *Continuous context analysis*
– *Findings published in the organisations' websites*
– *Access to evidence through DIIS library*
– *The conducting of small action research on own initiative in order to create evidence*
– *Dialog (Policy dialogues with Government, NGOs and Development partners)*

Frequency of the use of evaluations

The respondents were asked how frequently they use the different kinds of evaluation documents. In general, none of the documents are used very frequently, a few times a year being the most common frequency. For all documents applies that less than 10 % of the respondents use them *more often than once a month* and that one third of the respondents indicate that they use them *less than once a year or never.*

The figures show that the documents used with the highest frequency are 'Danish summaries of evaluation reports from Danida ("Evaluering Resumé")', 'Evaluation reports from Danida' and 'Evaluation reports and studies conducted by others'.

Significantly fewer respondents that haven't taken part in a Danida evaluation process on development assistance use 'Management response/follow-up note on Danida's evaluation reports' a few times a year (22%).

Q5. How often do you use the following kinds of evaluation documents?	Once a month or more often	Several times a year (6-11 times)	A few times a year (1-5 times)	Less than once a year	Never
Evaluation reports from Danida	6%	24%	33%	17%	13%
Evaluation studies from Danida	6%	20%	27%	25%	15%
Danish summaries of evaluation reports from Danida ("Evaluering Resumé")	9%	21%	31%	14%	15%
Management response/follow-up note on Danida's evaluation reports	5%	15%	35%	19%	18%
Evaluation reports and studies conducted by others	10%	21%	32%	19%	11%

Communication channels for Danida evaluations

More than half of the respondents indicate that they learn about the evaluations from Danida from colleagues and almost half state that they learn about them on the intranet. 14 % of the respondents indicate that they generally don't learn about new Danida evaluations.

The communication channels disperse as follows:
- 58 % state that they learn about the evaluations from Danida from colleagues.
- 48 % state that they learn about them on the intranet.
- 30 % state that they learn about them from being consulted in connection with evaluations.
- 30 % state that they find them themselves on Danida's websites and use them as pdf.
- 14 % state that they receive the "Evaluering Resumé" from their unit.
- 14 % state that they read about them in the e-mail newsletter "Danida Evaluation News".
- 8 % state that they find them themselves on danida-publikationer.dk and use them as pdf or html (6 %) or order them in hard copy (2 %).
- Only 1 % subscribe on the "Evaluering Resumé".

Relevance of Danida evaluations

In general, the respondents are predominantly positive towards the relevance of the Danida evaluations. More than two thirds of the respondents *agree or strongly agree* that 'the evaluations provide useful evidence for what works and doesn't work in development assistance' (69 %), that 'the evaluations are a valuable learning tool' (69 %) and that 'evaluations of development assistance are interesting' (68%) – while very few (2-3 %) *disagree or strongly disagree.* 61 % either *agree or strongly agree* that the evaluations are a useful tool in decision making while 4 % *disagree or strongly disagree.*

When asked if 'The evaluations are mainly done for others and not for Danida themselves as a tool for learning' 40 % *disagree or strongly disagree* while 25 % *agree or strongly agree* that it is mainly done for others to report on work done and ensure accountability.

Less than half of the respondents *agree or strongly agree* that 'the evaluations present findings and conclusions in a clear, easy-to-find and understandable manner' (45 %) and that 'the evaluations are timely' (36 %).

Q8. How would you assess the relevance of the Danida evaluations in general?	Strongly agree or agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree or strongly disagree
The evaluations are timely	36%	32%	9%
The evaluations provide useful evidence for what works and doesn't work in development assistance	69%	15%	2%
The evaluations are a useful tool in decision making	61%	20%	4%
The evaluations are a valuable learning tool	69%	15%	2%
The evaluations present findings and conclusions in a clear, easy-to-find and understandable manner	45%	32%	4%
I personally find evaluations of development assistance interesting	68%	16%	3%
The evaluations are mainly done for others (to report on work done and ensure accountability) and not for ourselves (as a tool for learning in our on-going work with programs and efforts)	25%	21%	40%

Reasons for the use of evaluations

The respondents were asked about their own reasons to make use of the evaluations and the extent to which they do it. Almost half of the respondents answered that they *to a large extent* or *very large extent* make use of the evaluations 'To acquire broader learning' (45 %) or 'To strengthen evidence-based thinking in development assistance' (41 %). And about one third

indicate that they *to a large or very large extent* make use of the evaluations 'To influence a new programme design' (37 %) and 'To improve an existing programme' (35 %).

But significantly fewer respondents that haven't taken part in a Danida evaluation process on development assistance state that they *to a very large extent* make use of evaluations 'To acquire broader learning'.

Common for the reasons for using the evaluations is that they are ranked to be used *to some extend* rather evenly on all purposes (25-31 %). Worth noting is also the very evenly dispersed use of the evaluations when it comes to the purpose of informing others about Danida activities.

Q9. To what extent do you make use of evaluations to do any of the following?	To a large or very large extent	To some extent	To a limited extent or not at all
To influence a new programme design	37%	25%	17%
To improve an existing programme	35%	26%	20%
To strengthen evidence-based thinking in development assistance	41%	26%	18%
To acquire broader learning	45%	27%	15%
To inform others about Danida activities	27%	31%	27%

Encouraging factors for the use of Danida evaluations

The respondents were asked what factors that would encourage them to make greater use of Danida's evaluations.

The two factors that more than half of the respondents would be encouraged by *to a large* or *very large extent* are 'Evaluation reports/studies with greater relevance to my work' (63 %) and 'Easier to get a quick overview of the most important content in the evaluation reports/studies' (58 %).

Other factors that would encourage many *to a large* or *very large extent* are 'More readable and understandable reports/studies' (41%), 'That they are more often reminded about evaluations as a source of information' (37 %) and 'Better overview on Danida's website of content and learnings in the different evaluations' (35 %).

The factors, which most respondents would *not at all* or only *to a limited extent* be encouraged by are 'That they can continue to get the evaluation report as a booklet (printed hardcopy) and not only as pdf or in html format' (46 %) and 'Personal incentives (that the use of evaluations can give for instance recognition, better career opportunities or reward)' (45%).

Common for the listed factors for encouragement to use the evaluations is that they are ranked to be encouraging *to some extend* rather evenly.

Q10. To what extent would the following factors encourage you to make greater use of Danida's evaluation?	To a large or very large extent	To some extent	To a limited extent or not at all
That I am more often reminded about evaluations as a source of information	37%	27%	23%
That I am informed about the evaluation during the evaluation process	31%	31%	27%
Evaluation reports/studies with greater relevance to my work	63%	17%	6%
More readable and understandable reports/studies	41%	29%	15%
Easier to get a quick overview of the most important content in the evaluation reports/studies	58%	23%	6%
Short Danish summaries ("Evaluering Resumé") with a clearer presentation than today	31%	21%	19%
Better overview on Danida's website of content and learnings in the different evaluations	35%	32%	17%
Easier to subscribe to receiving all Danish summaries ("Evaluering Resumé") or all evaluation reports/studies/EvalNews	23%	23%	27%
That I can continue to get the evaluation report as a booklet (printed hardcopy) and not only as pdf or in html format	16%	20%	46%
Personal incentives (that my use of evaluations can give me for instance recognition, better career opportunities or reward)	17%	20%	45%
That management more clearly prioritizes that I include evidence and recommendations from relevant evaluations in my work	32%	27%	23%

The figures show that there is most consensus on making the evaluations more relevant for the work as well as making it easier to get a quick overview of important and relevant content. The respondents were also given the option to specify other critical factors which supports the figures:

− *"A more timely and targeted evaluation report would encourage me a great deal to make use of it".*

− *"Most evaluations look back over a long time and takes months if not years to be ready. The timing of an evaluation report is never 'right' in relation to preparing a specific programme".*

− *"During day to day need of working in relevant areas and programme management cycles".*

− *"Be aware of information overload. More is not necessarily better".*

− *"I find that the blockage in our system for using evidence in implementation is that evidence is not sufficiently recognised in our political system, or that the evaluation that is done does not sufficiently cover the 'political economy' of our own system. Our own Ministry should be part of the whole evaluation process as our system also contributes to outcome and impact".*