

# Evaluation

Process  
INDEPENDENT EVALUATION  
Assumptions  
Operations  
Organizational  
Policy  
Constructability  
Corporate  
Findings  
Data  
Program  
Corporate  
Dependent Variable  
Effect  
Formative  
Evaluand  
Analysis  
Baseline  
Indicator  
Evaluability  
Impact  
IEvD Knowledge  
Strategy  
Timing  
Focus  
Effectiveness  
Cost Benefit Analysis  
Assessment  
Counterfactual

## EVALUATION TYPOLOGY AND NOMENCLATURE

Independent Evaluation Department, IsDB  
Jeddah, Saudi Arabia  
2024



## Acknowledgments

This Note on the Typology of Evaluation is prepared by a team composed of Zaher Rebai, Dr. Intizar Hussain, and Ehtisham Ul Hassan, in consultation with Oguz Ceylan, from the Independent Evaluation Department. The team would like to express sincere appreciation to all the staff members of IEvD who have contributed to the development of this Typology of Evaluation.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	1
2. Definition of Evaluation.....	1
2a. Evaluation Typology .....	1
2b. Evaluation Dimensions and Typology Framework.....	3
2c. Definition of Dimensions of Evaluation.....	5
3. Definition of Types of Evaluation.....	6
4. Difference Between Evaluation, Assessment and Review .....	8
5. Definitions of IEvD Knowledge Products.....	8
Annex-1: Glossary of Relevant Terms .....	10
Annex-2: Sample of Evaluation Types Produced by IEvD .....	17

## 1. Introduction

The aim of this compilation of the Typology of Evaluation is to differentiate and categorize the evaluation types and products and to create a shared understanding of the types of evaluation and their ensuing knowledge products. A common understanding across the team will promote harmonized interpretation and use of evaluation terms. This note will serve as an information resource for IsDB's Independent Evaluation Department (IEvD) Staff and the evaluation community at large. This compilation exercise aimed at achieving the following specific objectives:

1. Defining the different types of evaluations and classifying the dimensions that identify and describe these evaluation types.
2. Distinguishing between different terms frequently used, including evaluation, assessment, review, performance audit, diagnostic, investigation, etc.
3. Taking stock of the IEvD knowledge products and discerning their objectives and uses.

## 2. Definition of Evaluation

Evaluation is a systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, program or policy, its design, implementation, and results<sup>1</sup>. Different types of evaluations are designed to determine the relevance, coherence, fulfillment of project or program objectives or expected results, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.

### 2a. Evaluation Typology

Ten different types of evaluations were purposely selected to build a common understanding of Evaluation types across the IEvD team and to use the correct classification of the type of evaluation on the LEARN (Learning for Engagement, Action, Results, and Networking) and STEER (Systematic Tracking of Execution of Evaluation Recommendations) platforms.

IEvD broadly classifies evaluations into two categories, based on their scope and purpose: Corporate or Operations.

- **Corporate evaluation** is related to the evaluation of organizations' function, corporate affairs, or both. Corporate-level evaluations are often conducted to assess the achievement of results of IsDB organization-wide corporate policies, strategies, business processes, and organizational aspects. "Corporate" refers to the overall structures of the Bank that serve to carry out the organizational functions. These evaluations are designed to gather evidence to inform the review or formulation of organizational-level policies and strategies.
- **Operations evaluation** is related to the implementation or processing functions of the Bank.

---

<sup>1</sup> Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) – Glossary of evaluation and results-based management terms and concepts (2002)

Table 1: Classification of evaluations as Corporate vs. Operations

Sr.	Evaluation Types	Corporate	Operations
1.	Organizational evaluation	☒	
2.	Strategy evaluation	☒	☒
3.	Policy evaluation	☒	☒
4.	Process evaluation	☒	
5.	Sector evaluation		☒
6.	Thematic evaluation		☒
7.	Country works evaluation		☒
8.	Program		☒
8a	Cluster evaluation		☒
9.	Project / operation evaluation		☒
10.	TA evaluation		☒

Evaluation types are defined based on six different dimensions; 1) Evaluand, 2) Scope, 3) Timing, 4) Evaluator, 5) Aggregation/data analysis level and 6) Purpose/objective (Corporate/Operational).



## 2b. Evaluation Dimensions and Typology Framework

The following table presents the features of each type of evaluation in relation to the dimensions of evaluation. (MTE is Mid-term Evaluation)

Sr.	Type of Evaluation	Six Dimensions of Evaluation					
		Evaluated (Subject of an evaluation, typically a program or system rather than a person)	Scope (Coverage, period, boundary related level)	Timing	Evaluator (Self, independent, participatory, Joint)	Aggregation Level (Meta Evaluation <sup>2</sup> / Synthesis)	Classification Corporate / Operational
1.	Organizational Evaluation	Institutional, Corporate, Organizational,	Operational, Institutional, Geographic	Ex-post, MTE, Real time	Self, Joint, Independent	Synthesis of learning from hub and HQ	Corporate
2.	Strategy Evaluation	Determining the effectiveness of a given strategy in achieving the organizational objectives /Results Framework.	Operational, Institutional	Ex-post, MTE, Summative	Self, Independent	Not applicable	Corporate & Operational
3.	Policy Evaluation	Institutional/corporate Sector, or Thematic policies	Institutional	Ex-post, MTE, Format, Real time	Self, Independent, Joint	Synthesis	Corporate & Operational
4.	Process Evaluation	Process design (Project, Program, Organization Business Process) implementation, Policy Instruments, Service Delivery	Operational	Ex-ante, Ex-post, MTE, Format, Summative, Real time	Independent, or Self	Project/Program Level	Operational
5.	Sector Evaluation	IsDB's sector and operations to inform future engagement of IsDB with the sector.	Operational, Geographical	Ex-ante, Ex-post, MTE, Format, Real time	Self, Independent, Joint	Meta Evaluation	Operational
6.	Thematic Evaluation	Theme (Islamic Finance, Climate Change, Gender)	Operational, Geographical, Institutional	Ex-ante, Ex-post, MTE, Format, Real time.	Self, Independent, Joint	Across Subtheme and theme	Operational
7.	Country Works Evaluation	Member Country National Strategy Results, Portfolio, or Policy Progress on Member Country Partnership Strategy (MCPS)	Operational, Institutional,	Ex-ante, Ex-post, MTE, Formative, Real time	Independent or joint	Country	Operational
8.	Program Evaluation	Program	Operational, Institutional, Geographic	Ex-ante, Ex-post, MTE, Formative, Summative, Real time.	Independent	Program	Operational
8a.	Cluster Evaluation	Cluster of projects, results or interventions	Operational	Ex-ante, Ex-post, MTE, Formative, Summative, Real time	Independent or Self	Across a Common Theme	Operational

<sup>2</sup> Note: A meta-evaluation is an instrument used to aggregate findings from series of evaluation.

Sr.	Type of Evaluation	Six Dimensions of Evaluation					
		<u>Evaluand</u> (Subject of an evaluation, typically a program or system rather than a person)	<u>Scope</u> (Coverage, period, boundary related level)	<u>Timing</u>	<u>Evaluator</u> (Self, independent, participatory, Joint)	<u>Aggregation Level</u> (Meta Evaluation <sup>2</sup> / Synthesis)	<u>Classification</u> Corporate / Operational
9.	Project Evaluation	Project	Operational	Ex-ante, Ex-post, MTE, Formative, Summative, Real time	Independent	Program	Operational
10.	TA Evaluation	Evaluating the Extent of TAs Outcomes quality, suitability, and long-term impact achieved	Operational, Institutional	Ex-ante, Ex-post, MTE, Formative, Summative, Real time	Independent, or Self	Region, Country, or Sector operations	Operational



## 2c. Definition of Dimensions of Evaluation

1. **Evaluand:** Refers to the institution, intervention, program, strategy, policy process or product that is being evaluated or part thereof (e.g., the specific topic to be analyzed, the time interval to be considered); the subject of an evaluation, typically a program or system. This is particularly important for strategic evaluations and country-level evaluations, where, for example, the evaluators will need to determine the number of projects to be reviewed and the timeframe. It will be useful to define the scope and coverage for project-level evaluations where the analysis may need to focus on certain project results, components, or specific topic.

2. **Scope:** Refers to the topics and the coverage in terms of timeframes, funds, geographical area, target group(s), organizational structure, implementation arrangements and institutional context, as well as other dimensions covered by the evaluation. It is critical to determine the scope of evaluation by establishing the key themes, questions, and chronological coverage. The scope of the evaluation includes the specific topics to be analyzed and the time interval to be considered.

The scope of the evaluation should be delineated along at least three levels:

- Operational (all or part of the areas of intervention within the project or program theory of change, one or more related policies or interventions);
- Institutional (all or part of the authorities to achieve expected results of project or program); and
- Temporal (period considered), and Geographic (one or more territories or parts of territories, a specific, region, city, place, etc.).

3. **Timing:** Timing is a particular point in time or period when something happens.

- **Ex-ante:** An evaluation that is performed before implementation of a development intervention, for instance baseline studies.
- **Ex-Post Evaluation:** Evaluation of a development intervention after it has been completed. It may be undertaken directly after or long after completion. The intention is to identify the factors of success or failure, to assess the sustainability of results and impacts, and to draw conclusions that may inform other interventions.
- **Mid-Term Evaluation:** Evaluation performed towards the middle of the implementation of the intervention. This type of evaluation presents the key findings based on the comparison of project or program theory of change and expected results between progress and the baseline studies.
- **Formative Evaluation:** Evaluation intended to improve performance, most often conducted during or before the implementation phase of projects or programs. Formative evaluations may also be conducted for other reasons such as compliance, legal requirements, or as part of a systematic approach of a larger evaluation initiative
- **Summative Evaluation:** A study conducted at the end of an intervention (or a phase of that intervention) to determine the extent to which anticipated outcomes were produced. Summative evaluation is intended to provide evidence of the achievements of the theory of change of the program. Summative Evaluation is also called terminal evaluation.



- **Real-time Evaluation:** A real-time evaluation provides evaluative evidence and insights to support decision making and implementation while the intervention is underway (at the same time). Real-time evaluations are often planned to provide evidence, and in a participatory way, in real time (e.g., during the evaluation fieldwork) to those executing and managing the implementation of interventions. It is usually conducted during critical times or an emergency response. Real-time evaluation assesses ongoing operations, processes, and procedures to provide early feedback on emerging issues. It is undertaken on a selective basis.

### 3. Definition of Types of Evaluation

1. **Organizational Evaluation:** An Organizational Evaluation is a systematic assessment of the performance of an organization's structure or its units and/or functions as well as factors that affect the performance. It is an encompassing assessment that extends beyond a specific work program to include strategies, policies, governance and institutional arrangements, leadership, culture, systems procedures, and other organizational aspects such as staffing, financial and physical resource base. An Organizational evaluation can also be a corporate level evaluation, which evaluates a policy, modality, or a process relevant to IsDB's operations. The topics for these evaluations are determined following consultation with the senior management and operations departments.

Example: Performance Assessment of ICBA, 40-year assessment of the IsDB Group.

2. **Strategy Evaluation:** Strategy Evaluation is the process of assessing how well a chosen strategy has been implemented. Strategy evaluation entails reviewing and appraising the strategy implementation process and measuring organizational performance. Evaluating the strategy helps distinguish between what works and what does not and contributes to the ongoing development and adaptation of the strategy to the changing conditions and complexities related to Development Effectiveness.
3. **Policy Evaluation:** Policy Evaluation applies evaluation principles and methods to examine the content, implementation, or impact of a policy. Policy Evaluation is the activity through which we develop an understanding of the merit, worth, and utility of a policy objectives. Policy evaluation uses a range of research methods to systematically investigate the effectiveness of policy interventions, implementation, and processes, and to determine their merit, worth, or value in terms of improving the social and economic conditions of different stakeholders.
4. **Process Evaluation:** An assessment conducted during the implementation of a program to determine if the program is likely to reach its objectives by assessing whether it is reaching its intended beneficiaries (coverage) and providing the intended services using appropriate means (processes). An evaluation of the internal dynamics of implementing IsDB projects, policy instruments, service delivery mechanisms through Member Country Partnership Strategy (MCPS), management practices, and the linkages among these. As such, process evaluation determines whether program activities have been implemented as intended and resulted in certain outputs.
5. **Sector Evaluation:** Sector Evaluations of a cluster of development interventions within one country or region (across countries), all of which contributing to the achievement of results, objectives or development goals in a specific sector (i.e., Education, Health, Energy, Transportation, Water and Sanitation, Agriculture and Rural Development).

6. **Thematic Evaluation:** Thematic Evaluations focus on one theme, such as gender or environment. They typically cover several projects, programs, countries or the whole organization.

Thematic Evaluation includes identifying the theme as an important aspect of the intervention (e.g. capacity strengthening within nutrition, school feeding etc.) and the flexibility of either evaluating these as part of a thematic evaluation by considering the wider country portfolio of other interventions related to the theme. For thematic evaluations, the questions will usually focus on the extent to which the theme has been mainstreamed across or integrated into the interventions, and the effects of the integration.

7. **Country Assistance Evaluation:** Evaluation of the Bank's portfolio of development interventions and the underpinning strategy that sets the partnership framework with a particular member country. This type of evaluation provides systematic evidence and insights about the extent of achievement of the country level national strategy results.

8. **Program Evaluation:** Evaluation of a set of interventions, marshalled to attain specific global, regional, country, or sector development objectives.

**8a. Cluster Evaluation:** Evaluation of a set of related activities, projects or programs linked due to a common theme, sector, or research question. Cluster Evaluations are often combined into a single evaluation based on the results, strategic or thematic focus, or scope. Apart from the relevant common thematic area(s), the geographic location of projects may be considered for a cluster evaluation to be feasible.

9. **Project Evaluation:** Project evaluation is a systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project. Project evaluation assesses the economic, social, environmental, and financial performance of a project and combines these elements to provide an overall assessment of the performance of the project. The aim is to determine the relevance and level of achievement of project objectives, development effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact.

10. **Technical Assistance (TA) Evaluation:** Technical Assistance Evaluation is undertaken to assess the design, implementation, and performance of TA activities according to an agreed set of criteria including relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability.



## 4. Difference Between Evaluation, Assessment, and Review

The following section presents the differences across three terms: Review, Assessment and Evaluation.

**Review (Level-1):** An analysis of the performance of an intervention, periodically or on an ad-hoc basis. Information from monitoring may also prompt a review of a small area of your work, but a substantial review can only take place once a proper evaluation of your effectiveness has taken place. A review may take place annually or at the end of a longer-term project. Reviews are mostly broader top-level analysis of the performance on expected results.

A review is a structured opportunity for reflection to identify key issues and concerns and make informed decisions for effective project or program implementation. While monitoring is ongoing, reviews are less frequent and not as involved as evaluations. Also, reviews are typically used as an internal exercise, based on monitoring data and reports. They are useful to share information and collectively involve stakeholders in decision-making. They may be conducted at different levels within the project or program structure (e.g., at the community level and at headquarters) and at different times and frequencies. Reviews can also be conducted across projects or sectors. It is best to plan and structure regular reviews throughout the project or program implementation.

**Assessment (Level-2):** Assessment is a more detailed and in-depth process of gathering information, analyzing it, then making a judgement based on the information as compared to review. It may or may not be systematic, depending on the specific assessment being conducted.

**Evaluation (Level-3):** The systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, program or policy, its design, implementation, and results. Evaluation studies are designed to gather evidence on (OECD-DAC criteria) relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide credible and useful information, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors.

## 5. Definitions of IEvD Knowledge Products

- **Annual Evaluation Report (AER):** Annual Evaluation Report is the flagship report of the year, which presents the main evaluation, enabling, learning and outreach activities conducted by the department in the previous year.
- **Back-to-Office Report (BTOR):** Back-to-Office Report provides a summary of an evaluation mission, including a brief project or program description, objectives at project design stage, initial findings on results and achievements (with photo/video evidence), a summary of what went well and what could have been done better, lessons learned, issues for the management and follow-up actions.
- **Evaluation Reports:** Evaluation Reports stem from actual evaluations of projects, programs, and other forms of IsDB interventions. Evaluation reports are of two types: project evaluation reports and macro evaluation reports. Project evaluation reports are reports from evaluations of IsDB projects, which are called Project Performance Evaluation Reports (PPER). All forms of evaluations other than project evaluations are macro evaluations.
- **Knowledge Series (K-Series):** is an evaluation knowledge product designed to disseminate the findings of a project evaluation. It summarizes the main takeaways of the evaluation report

describing the challenge the project aimed at addressing, the proposed actions, main findings of the evaluation, and key lessons.

- **Executive Dissemination Notes (EDN):** An Executive Dissemination Note is a summary of the background, main findings, lessons and recommendations of macro evaluation reports. The concept is the same as the K-Series. However, it is more detailed (typically four pages).
- **E-Newsletter** is designed to share updates on the activities of IEvD. The e-Newsletter presents a summary of the events held, IEvD publications including any evaluation report, IEvD videos, flyers, K-series and recommended readings, besides featuring some regular sections. IEvD publishes an e-Newsletter every quarter.
- **Guidelines** are the documents that explain and guide how each section of an evaluation document should be written. Examples of some of the guidelines that are in use at IEvD are IsDB Public Sector Project Evaluation Guidelines, IsDB Guidance Note on PCR Validation Note, Guidance Note on Evaluation Lessons, Recommendations and Follow up Actions, etc.
- **Insight Papers** are four-to-five-page documents designed to present the summary of learnings focused on a specific theme. Insight Papers are not necessarily linked to any specific evaluation.
- **Project Completion Report Validation Notes (PCR-VN):** PCR-VNs are evaluation notes prepared by an independent evaluator to validate the assessments of Project Completion Report scores.
- **Short Videos:** Videos explaining an IsDB intervention based on a completed evaluation. These videos are typically shorter than 5 minutes.
- **Synthesis Notes:** These are reports summarizing several existing evaluations in a particular sector or theme.
- **Templates:** Templates contain all the components of a document, which can be easily filled with updated information to complete the document. Templates are typically used to write evaluation reports and evaluation knowledge products such as Approach Paper, PPER, CAEs, K-Series, etc.



## Annex-1: Glossary of Relevant Terms

- **Analysis:** The process of breaking a complex topic or substance into smaller parts to examine how it is constructed, works, or interacts to help determine the reason for the results observed.
- **Anecdotal Evidence:** Non-systematic qualitative information based on stories about real events.
- **Appraisal:** An overall assessment of the relevance, feasibility and potential sustainability of an intervention or an activity prior to a decision of funding.
- **Assumptions:** A proposition that is taken for granted, as if it were true. For project management, assumptions are hypotheses about causal linkages or factors that could affect the progress or success of an intervention.
- **Attribution:** Ascribing a causal link between observed changes and a specific intervention(s) or program, considering the effects of other interventions and possible confounding factors.
- **Audit:** The systematic examination of records and the investigation of other evidence to determine the propriety, compliance, and adequacy of programs, systems, and operations.
- **Baseline:** Information collected before or at the start of a project or program that provides a basis for planning and/or assessing subsequent progress and impact.
- **Benchmark:** A standard against which results are measured.
- **Beneficiaries:** The individuals, groups, or organizations that benefit from an intervention, project, or program.
- **Bias:** The extent to which a measurement, sampling, or analytic method systematically underestimates or overestimates the true value of a variable or attribute.
- **Causality:** The relationship between one event (the cause) and another event (the effect) which is the direct consequence (result) of the first.
- **Cluster sampling:** A sampling method conducted in two or more stages in which each unit is selected as part of some natural group rather than individually (such as all persons living in a state, city block, or a family).
- **Confounding variable (also confounding factor or confounder):** An extraneous variable in a statistical model that correlates (positively or negatively) with both the dependent and independent variable and can therefore lead to faulty conclusions.
- **Construct Validity:** The degree of agreement between a theoretical concept (e.g., peace and security, economic development) and the specific measures (e.g., number of wars, GDP) used as indicators of the phenomenon; that is the extent to which some measures (e.g., number of wars, GDP) adequately reflects the theoretical construct (e.g., peace and security, economic development) to which it is tied.
- **Content Validity:** The degree to which a measure or set of measures adequately represents all facets of the phenomena it is meant to describe.

- **Control Group:** A randomly selected group that does not receive the services, products or activities of the program being evaluated.
- **Comparison Group:** A non-randomly selected group that does not receive the services, products or activities of the program being evaluated.
- **Counterfactual:** A hypothetical statement of what would have happened (or not) had the program not been implemented.
- **Cost Benefit Analysis:** An evaluation of the relationship between program costs and outcomes. Can be used to compare different interventions with the same outcomes to determine efficiency.
- **Cluster Evaluation:** An evaluation of a set of related activities, projects and/or programs.
- **Corporate Evaluation:** An evaluation that determines whether IsDB strategic partnerships, policies, strategies, etc. have been implemented as intended.
- **Data:** Information collected by a researcher. Data gathered during an evaluation are manipulated and analyzed to yield findings that serve as the basis for conclusions and recommendations.
- **Data Collection Methods:** Techniques used to identify information sources, collect information, and minimize bias during an evaluation.
- **Dependent Variable:** Dependent (output, outcome, response) variables are so called because they are "dependent" on the independent variable; the outcome presumably depends on how these input variables are managed or manipulated.
- **Diagnostic:** This term is used for discovering the characteristics or cause of a problem in a system or machine.
- **Effect:** Intended or unintended change due directly or indirectly to an intervention. Related terms: results, outcome.
- **Effectiveness:** The extent to which an intervention has attained its major relevant objectives. Related term: efficacy.
- **Efficiency:** A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time etc.) are used to achieve results.
- **Evaluability:** Extent to which an intervention or project can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion.
- **Evaluability Assessment:** A study conducted to determine a) whether the program is at a stage where progress towards objectives is likely to be observable; b) whether and how an evaluation would be useful to program managers and/or policy makers; and c) the feasibility of conducting an evaluation.
- **Evaluation:** A systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, program, or policy. Evaluations are undertaken to (a) improve the performance of existing interventions or policies, (b) assess their effects and impacts, and (c) inform decisions about future programming. Evaluations are formal analytical endeavors involving systematic collection and analysis of qualitative and quantitative information.

- **Evaluation Design:** The methodology selected for collecting and analyzing data to reach defensible conclusions about program or project efficiency and effectiveness.
- **Experimental Design:** A methodology in which research subjects are randomly assigned to either a treatment or control group, data is collected both before and after the intervention, and results for the treatment group are benchmarked against a counterfactual established by results from the control group.
- **External Evaluation:** The evaluation of an intervention or program conducted by entities and/or individuals which is not directly related to the implementing organization.
- **External Validity:** The degree to which findings, conclusions, and recommendations produced by an evaluation are applicable to other settings and contexts.
- **Ex-Ante Evaluation:** An evaluation that is performed before implementation of a development intervention.
- **Ex-Post Evaluation:** An evaluation that is performed sometime after completion of a development intervention.
- **Formative Evaluation:** Evaluation intended to improve performance, most often conducted during the implementation phase of projects or programs
- **Findings:** Factual statements about a project or program which are based on empirical evidence. Findings include statements and visual representations of the data, but not interpretations, judgments, or conclusions about what the findings mean or imply.
- **Focus Group:** A group of people convened for the purpose of obtaining perceptions or opinions, suggesting ideas, or recommending actions. A focus group is a method of collecting information for the evaluation process that relies on the particular dynamic of group settings.
- **Formative Evaluation:** An evaluation conducted during the project implementation phase with the aim of improving performance during that phase. Related term: process evaluation.
- **Impact:** A result or effect that is caused by or attributable to a project or program. Impact is often used to refer to higher level effects of a program that occur in the medium or long term and can be intended or unintended and positive or negative.
- **Impact Evaluation:** A systematic study of the change that can be attributed to a particular intervention, such as a project, program or policy. Impact evaluations typically involve the collection of baseline data for both an intervention group and a comparison or control group, as well as a second round of data collection after the intervention, sometimes even years later.
- **Independent Evaluation:** An evaluation of a development intervention conducted by entities and/or individuals who are not involved in the design and delivery of a development intervention. It is characterized by full access to information and by full autonomy in carrying out investigations and reporting findings.
- **Indicator:** Quantitative or qualitative variable that provides reliable means to measure a particular phenomenon or attribute.

- **Internal Evaluation:** Evaluation conducted by those who are implementing and/or managing the intervention or program. Related term: self-evaluation.
- **Internal Validity:** The degree to which conclusions about causal linkages are appropriately supported by the evidence collected.
- **Intervening Variable:** A variable that occurs in a causal pathway from an independent to a dependent variable. It causes variation in the dependent variable, and is itself caused to vary by the independent variable.
- **Intervention:** An action or entity that is introduced into a system to achieve some result. In the program evaluation context, an intervention refers to an activity, project or program that is introduced or changed (amended, expanded, etc.).
- **Investigation:** Investigation entails a comprehensive enquiry into the possible misuse of an organization's funds, resources, or facilities, or any other illegal or improper conduct involving organization's staff, implementing partners or contractors. The outcome is either referral for disciplinary action or closure of the inquiry.
- **Joint Evaluation:** An evaluation in which more than one agency or partner participates. There can be varying levels of collaboration ranging from developing an agreed design and conducting fieldwork independently to pooling resources and undertaking joint research and reporting.
- **Lessons learned:** Generalizations based on evaluation findings that abstract from specific circumstances to broader situations. Frequently, lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome, and impact.
- **Level of Significance:** The probability that observed differences did not occur by chance.
- **Logic Model:** A logic model, often a visual representation, provides a road map showing the sequence of related events connecting the need for a planned program with the programs' desired outcomes and results.
- **Logical Framework (Logframe):** A management tool used to improve the design and evaluation of interventions that is widely used by development agencies. It is a type of logic model that identifies strategic project elements (inputs, outputs, outcomes, impact) and their causal relationships, indicators, and the assumptions or risks that may influence success and failure. Related term: Results Framework.
- **Measurement:** A procedure for assigning a number to an observed object or event.
- **Meta Evaluation:** It is an evaluation of evaluations designed to aggregate findings from a series of evaluations, or to judge their quality and/or assess the performance of the evaluators.
- **Mid-term Evaluation:** Evaluation performed towards the midpoint of program or project implementation.
- **Mixed Methods:** Use of both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection in an evaluation.
- **Monitoring:** The performance and analysis of routine measurements to detect changes in status. Monitoring is used to inform managers about the progress of an ongoing



intervention or program, and to detect problems that may be addressed through corrective actions.

- **Operations Research:** A process to identify and solve problems in program implementation and service delivery. It involves identifying a problem and testing a strategy to address the problem. The goal is to increase the efficiency, effectiveness, and quality of services delivered by providers, and the availability, accessibility, and acceptability of services desired by users.
- **Outcome:** A result or effect that is caused by or attributable to the project, program, or policy. Outcome is often used to refer to more immediate and intended effects. Related terms: result, effect.
- **Outcome Evaluation:** This form of evaluation assesses the extent to which a program achieves its outcome-oriented objectives. It focuses on outputs and outcomes (including unintended effects) to judge program effectiveness but may also assess program processes to understand how outcomes are produced.
- **Outputs:** The products, goods, and services which result from an intervention.
- **Organizational Evaluation:** An evaluation of effectiveness of an organization in terms of its functioning, problems and achievements of its objectives and includes assessment of organizational values and behavior
- **Performance audits:** typically test if a government is making good use of resources to effectively deliver its policy goals and achieve its intended impact. Such audits often intend to examine the implementation of a policy or policies. Performance audits typically test if a government is making good use of resources to effectively deliver its policy goals and achieve its intended impact.
- **Participatory Evaluation:** An evaluation in which managers, implementing staff and beneficiaries work together to choose a research design, collect data, and report findings.
- **Performance Indicator:** A particular characteristic or dimension used to measure intended changes. Performance indicators are used to observe progress and to measure actual results compared to expected results.
- **Performance Management:** Systematic process of collecting and analyzing performance data to track progress towards planned results to improve resource allocation, implementation, and results.
- **Performance Measurement:** Ways to objectively measure the degree of success that a program has had in achieving its stated objectives, goals, and planned program activities.
- **Primary Data:** Information collected directly by the researcher (or assistants), rather than gathered from secondary sources (data collected by others). In program evaluation, it refers to the information gathered directly by an evaluator to inform an evaluation.
- **Process Evaluation:** An assessment conducted during the implementation of a program to determine if the program is likely to reach its objectives by assessing

whether it is reaching its intended beneficiaries (coverage) and providing the intended services using appropriate means (processes).

- **Program Evaluation:** Evaluation of a set of interventions designed to attain specific global, regional, country, or sector development objectives. A program is a time-bound intervention involving multiple activities that may cut across sectors, themes and/or geographic areas.
- **Project Level Evaluation:** An evaluation of an individual development intervention designed to achieve specific objectives within specified resources and implementation schedules, often within the framework of a broader program.
- **Project Appraisal:** A comprehensive and systematic review of all aspects of the project – technical, financial, economic, social, institutional, environmental – to determine whether an investment should be made.
- **Project Evaluation:** An evaluation of a discrete activity designed to achieve specific objectives within specified resources and implementation schedules, often within the framework of a broader program.
- **Qualitative Data:** Observations or information expressed using categories (dichotomous, nominal, ordinal) rather than numerical terms. Examples include sex, survival, or death, and first.
- **Quantitative Data:** Information that can be expressed in numerical terms, counted, or compared on a scale.
- **Quasi-experimental Design:** A methodology in which research subjects are assigned to treatment and comparison groups typically through a matching strategy that attempts to minimize the differences between the two groups in order to approximate random assignment.
- **Quality Assurance:** Quality assurance encompasses any activity that is concerned with assessing and improving the merit of a development intervention or its compliance with given standards.
- **Random Assignment:** The process of assigning research subjects in such a way that each individual is assigned to either the treatment group or the control group entirely by chance. Thus, each research subject has a fair and equal chance of receiving either the intervention being studied (by being placed in the treatment group), or not (by being placed in the control group). Related term: randomization.
- **Randomized Controlled Trials (RCT):** Research studies that use an experimental design. Related terms: experimental design.
- **Rapid Appraisal Methods:** Data collection methods that fall within the continuum of formal and informal data collection methods. They can be used to provide decision-related information in development settings relatively quickly. Examples of rapid appraisal methods include key informant interviews, focusgroup discussions, group interviews, structured observation, and informal surveys.
- **Real-Time Evaluation (RTE):** An evaluation designed to provide immediate (real time) feedback to those planning or implementing a project or program, in order to make adjustments and improvements. Its broad objective is to gauge the effectiveness and

impact of a given response, and to ensure that its findings are used as an immediate catalyst for organizational and operational change.

- **Recommendations:** Proposals based on findings and conclusions that are aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of an intervention.
- **Reliability:** Consistency or dependability of data with reference to the quality of the instruments, procedures, and use. Data are reliable when the repeated use of the same instrument generates the same results.
- **Sector Evaluation:** An evaluation of a cluster of interventions in a sector within one country or across countries, all of which contribute to the achievement of a specific goal.
- **Self-Evaluation:** An evaluation by those who are entrusted with the design and delivery of a development intervention (i.e., independent unit).
- **Special Evaluation:** An evaluation of ongoing or problematic projects upon Management request.
- **Summative Evaluation:** Evaluation of an intervention or program in its later stages or after it has been completed to (a) assess its impact (b) identify the factors that affected its performance, (c) assess the sustainability of its results, and (d) draw lessons that may inform other interventions.
- **Survey:** Systematic collection of information from a defined population through interviews or questionnaires.
- **Sustainability:** The degree to which services or processes continue once inputs (funding, materials, training, etc.) provided by the original source(s) decrease or discontinue.
- **Summative Evaluation:** A study conducted at the end of an intervention (or a phase of that intervention) to determine the extent to which anticipated outcomes were produced. Summative evaluation is intended to provide information about the worth of the program.
- **Terminal/Final Evaluation:** An evaluation that is performed at the completion of a development intervention, to evaluate how the intervention has achieved its development objective(s).
- **Target Group:** The specific individuals, groups, or organizations for whose benefit the intervention is undertaken.
- **Treatment:** A project, program, or policy that is the subject of an evaluation.
- **Thematic Evaluation:** Evaluation of a selection of development interventions, all of which address a specific development priority that cuts across countries, regions, and sectors.
- **Validity:** The extent to which data measures what it purports to measure and the degree to which that data provides sufficient evidence to support the conclusions made by an evaluation.

## Annex-2: Sample of Evaluation Types Produced by IEvD

Sl. No	Types of Evaluation	Examples from IsDB
1.	Organizational Evaluation	<p><b>Evaluation Title:</b> Corporate Evaluation of IsDB Group Synergy</p> <p><b>Evaluation Scope:</b> The objective of this evaluation was to take stock of synergy practices, and to identify ways and means to enhance both external and internal synergy.</p> <p>The evaluation answers the following overarching evaluation questions through multiple lines of evidence: a) To what extent and how have implementation of the business synergy and processes been relevant, effective and efficient in Group harmonization/ coordination and partnerships? b) What are the enabling/hindering factors linked to Group business synergy and processes that have affected/impacted the IsDB Group institutional and organizational effectiveness? c) What is the financial value (benefits and/or cost savings) of IsDB Group synergy and how can it be maximized? d) What are the main lessons learned and recommendations to enhance Group synergy?</p> <p>Report <a href="#">Link</a></p>
2.	Strategy Evaluation	<p><b>Evaluation Title:</b> Final MCPS Implementation Review, Turkey</p> <p><b>Evaluation Scope:</b> This evaluation was planned to systematically assess the MCPS implementation and achievement of development results and IDB Group's performance at the country level from an independent perspective. This systematic assessment will also draw lessons from experience and formulate recommendations to improve future IsDB group performance.</p> <p>Report <a href="#">Link</a></p>
3.	Policy Evaluation	Not any available yet
4.	Process Evaluation	<p><b>Evaluation Title:</b> IRTI Training Process Evaluation Report</p> <p><b>Evaluation Scope:</b> The objective of this evaluation is to assess the entire IRTI Training and Learning Process, from developing a training strategy to delivering and evaluating the training programs and courses. It aims to provide insights to IsDB and IRTI management regarding the issues that arise across the training process value chain; from start to end, as well as identifying the process strengths and weaknesses. Specifically, the evaluation assesses the implementation of the</p>

Sl. No	Types of Evaluation	Examples from IsDB
		<p>training process by examining the procedures and tasks involved with a view of understanding “what is going on” as the training activity is implemented.</p> <p>It aims to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide information to IRTI’s management to enable them to update and improve their current training process to better serve member countries’ needs;</li> <li>• Facilitate a “behind the scenes look” of IRTI training process implementation and benchmark it with good practice standards (GPS).</li> </ul> <p>Report <a href="#">Link</a></p>
	Operations Evaluation	<p><b>Evaluation Title:</b> Report on Evaluation of Fael Khair Ebola Project in Africa,</p> <p><b>Evaluation Scope:</b> This evaluation was planned to address the following questions: (i) To what extent has the Program been relevant to each of the countries involved? (ii) To what extent has implementation of the Program been efficient in each of the countries involved? (iii) What are the outputs and outcomes (i.e., the intermediate and ultimate results) achieved so far by the Program in each of the countries involved?</p> <p>Report <a href="#">Link</a></p>
5.	Sector Evaluation	<p><b>Evaluation Title:</b> Evaluation of the IsDB Operations in The Health Sector of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.</p> <p><b>Evaluation Scope:</b> This evaluation was planned to gather evidence on the IsDB’s health sector assistance in Jordan to examine the status of the Jordanian health sector with regards to its basic functions of service provision, resource generation, financing, and stewardship, to assess the health sector assistance of the Bank focusing on their relevance, efficiency, development impacts and sustainability; and to draw lessons and recommendations for future interventions of the Bank in the health sector.</p> <p>Report <a href="#">Link</a></p>
6.	Thematic Evaluation	<p><b>Evaluation Title:</b> Thematic Evaluation of the Islamic Development Bank Public-Private Partnership Projects.</p> <p><b>Evaluation Scope:</b> This evaluation was planned to answer the following key evaluation questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How consistent were the objectives of IsDB’s PPP financing with (a) the country’s development needs and challenges, and (b) the beneficiaries’ priorities?</li> <li>• Whether the proposed outputs were achieved at a reasonable cost (value for money) and within a reasonable timeframe?</li> </ul>

Sl. No	Types of Evaluation	Examples from IsDB
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether PPP financing of IsDB's stated objectives were achieved: - whether the physical outputs targeted by the project were met?</li> <li>• Whether long-run goals of PPP financing in terms of access to health and social services, economic growth were met? Whether Sustainability refers to the likelihood that achieved (and anticipated) results will be resilient to risks in the long run?</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Report Link</a></p>
7.	Country Works Evaluation	<p><b>Evaluation Title:</b> MALI Country Assistance Evaluation (CAE)</p> <p><b>Evaluation Scope:</b> The CAE aims at assessing: (i) the relevance of IsDBG interventions in terms of their alignment with its Vision and strategic thrusts, and their consistency with the priorities of the Government of Mali (GOM); (ii) their effectiveness/efficacy in achieving the stated objectives; (iii) the efficiency in their implementation; (iv) their outcome and impact; and (v) the sustainability of their development results. The CAE assessment focuses on the sectors where IsDB has been active in terms of project financing namely: Agriculture and Rural Development, Transport, Energy, Social Services (Education and Health), Trade Operations, and Technical Assistance (TA).</p> <p><a href="#">Report Link</a></p>
8.	Program Evaluation	<p><b>Evaluation Title:</b> Evaluation of IsDB Science and Technology Program</p> <p><b>Evaluation Scope:</b> This Evaluation was planned to gather evidence on the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact of the S&amp;T Program. The evaluation scope is limited to three of the six modalities characterizing the S&amp;T program. In particular, the focus is limited to the grant-financed activities and outputs within the framework of the S&amp;T Program, which took place during the period 2002-2014 (1424H-1436H). More specifically, the evaluation covers the following program components (i) S&amp;T events co-financing, (ii) Cooperation among Centers of Excellence, and (iii) Science, Technology, and Innovation (STI) policy training.</p> <p><a href="#">Report Link</a></p>
8a.	Cluster Evaluation	<p><b>Evaluation Title:</b> Final Post Evaluation Report on a Cluster of Special Assistance Operations in Tanzania.</p> <p><b>Evaluation Scope:</b> This Project Performance Evaluation Report (PPER) assesses the performance of the Special Assistance Operations which were approved by IsDB between January 2002 and September 2007 in favor of Tanzania Muslim Associations, Institutions, and Organizations. The projects aimed at improving access to education, enhancing teaching</p>

Sl. No	Types of Evaluation	Examples from IsDB
		<p>and learning environment through the provision of infrastructure and equipment to the beneficiary schools. The project is evaluated based on the IsDB Group's Guidelines for Preparing Project Performance Evaluation Reports for Public Sector Operations, according to four core evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability) and two additional criteria including Bank's performance and performance of the beneficiary of IsDB financing.</p> <p>Report <a href="#">Link</a></p>
9.	Project Evaluation	<p><b>Title:</b> Malaria Prevention and Control: Seasonal Malaria Chemoprophylaxis Intervention-Project</p> <p><b>Evaluation Scope:</b> This Project Performance Evaluation Report (PPER) has been prepared in the light of the Evaluation Coordination Group (ECG) ninth Good Practice Standards (GPS 9) and the OECD-DAC evaluation standards. It assesses the performance of the project based on the IsDB Group's Guidelines for Preparing Project Performance Evaluation Reports for Public Sector Operations, according to four core evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability) and two additional criteria (Bank's performance and performance of the beneficiary of IsDB financing). The PPER identifies lessons and presents follow-up actions and recommendations that need to be taken by the executing agency, Government, and/or IsDB.</p> <p>Report <a href="#">Link</a></p>
10.	TA Evaluation	<p><b>Title:</b> Technical Assistance of Post Evaluation on ODB Completed Cluster of 11 TA Operations in Benin.</p> <p><b>Evaluation Scope:</b> Review of the Performance of the TA Operations: Overview of TA Operations; TAs implementation Performance (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact); Institutional Performance; and Operational Performance. Drawing Lessons and Recommendations for both IsDB and the Government of Benin.</p> <p>Report <a href="#">Link</a></p>