



DIAGNOSTIC ON THE SUPPLY AND DEMAND OF EVALUATORS IN UGANDA

DRAFT REPORT

Dr Aggrey Niringiye

April, 2018

ACRONYMS

AfrEA	African Evaluation Association
AG	Auditor General
APR	Annual Performance Report
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EES	European Evaluation Society
GoU	Government of Uganda (GoU)
IDEAS	International Development Evaluation Association
IOCE	International Organisation for Cooperation in Evaluation
IPDET	International Program for Development Evaluation Training
MDA	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEMS	Monitoring and Evaluation Management Services
MISR	Makarere Institute for Social Research
MSI	Management Systems International-
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NIMES	National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy
NMETWG	National Monitoring and Evaluation Technical Working Group
OAG	Office of the Auditor General
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OPM	Office of the Prime Minister
PAF	Poverty Action Fund
PD	Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness
UEA	Ugandan Evaluation Association
UMI	Uganda Management Institute



TWENDE MBELE

ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNANCE THROUGH COLLABORATION

USAID

United States Agency for International Development

VFM

Value for money

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This diagnostic study aimed at establishing the capacity and supply of evaluators in Uganda and what is required to strengthen this capacity and supply. On the supply side, the study established that there is a substantial potential pool of M&E consultants in Uganda. The study also established that there are a number of universities, training institutions and national, regional and international networks for evaluation capacity building in Uganda. Results from the survey of individual evaluators show that the majority of the evaluators self-taught(50%). It was also established that about half of the donor-led evaluations were conducted by international evaluators only, while approximately the other half was conducted by mixed teams, i.e. international and national evaluators. The pricing of skills varies according to experience, education, or whether one is a local or international consultant. Results from the survey of local individual evaluators show that the average charge-out rate per day was US\$200.

On the demand side, the Government has in place guidelines for the public sector and UEA has developed and approved standard guidelines that stipulate that evaluators and evaluation teams must be independent, trustworthy and transparently selected. The value of the current country demand by government as per the National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation (2013), is approximately 28% of the projects that are valued at over 70 billion shillings. All projects are supposed to allocate a percentage of not more than 4% of their budgets to evaluation, as determined by the Development Committee,. Survey results showed that the average cost of an evaluation in most CSOs is Ug Shs 30 million. The study also established the specific professional skills required of evaluators by both Government and CSOs include minimum academic qualifications, experience, core skills and other qualities or attributes. The only source of information about available evaluators is the Uganda Evaluation Association (UEA) and the USAID funded Uganda Monitoring and Evaluation Management Services (MEMS) project that developed a roster of Ugandan institutions, firms and individual consultants for Monitoring and Evaluation Services. Findings from the survey of clients show that the majority of the commissioners of evaluations (71%) have a database of evaluation providers.

The study also established a number of opportunities for local evaluation capacity building in Uganda and in other communities of practice such as CSOs. The opportunities are in the form of training programs in monitoring and evaluation at the universities, training institutes and professional networks. Survey findings from most clients show that the supply of evaluators is not sufficient to meet the demand. To better match the supply

to demand, it was established that there is need for a deeper analysis of the profession of evaluation in Uganda more especially organizational capacity gaps at MDAs level in Uganda. It was also established that local capacities for conducting high-quality evaluation are quite limited. Results from the survey of individual evaluators show that majority of the evaluators (43%) have experience in carrying out evaluations of between 1 and 3 years. The demand and supply evaluators continue to be driven by development partners with limited country ownership of the processes.

To strengthen the evaluation capacity and supply of evaluators there is need to strengthen the culture of management that understands values and uses evaluative information to achieve results and organizational performance. The NIMES Secretariat and the National Monitoring and Evaluation Technical Working Group (NMETWG) should ensure systematic dissemination of evaluation reports and sharing of good practices. There is need to create a Centre of Excellency in evaluation that would establish an efficient Uganda information systems on evaluation findings and evaluator availability and opportunities. There is also need to identify champions of evaluation to promote evaluations. There is also a need to expand the existing pool of evaluators, and enable emerging evaluators to enter the market with fewer restrictions. Persons engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities should possess core evaluation competencies which should be maintained through a regular programme of continuing professional development. In addition, there is need to develop and maintain ongoing professional development for evaluation by GoU. There is also need for Government to interface with and support the development of professional evaluation associations such as the Ugandan Evaluation Association. There is also need to define very well the key competencies for evaluation that should form part of the functional organization of personnel requirements.



TWENDE MBELE

ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNANCE THROUGH COLLABORATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms	i
Executive Summary	ii
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Purpose of the Study	2
1.3 Research Questions	3
1.4 Methodology	3
1.5 Structure of the Report	4
2 Country Context	4
3. A Root Cause Analysis	7
3.1 Current Approach to Building the Evaluation Market in Uganda	7
3.2 Supply Side Profile	8
3.3 Demand Side Profile	16
3.4 Matching the Supply to Demand	18
3.5 Efficiency of Uganda Information System	19
3.6 Opportunities for Transformation and Uganda Specific Empowerment	20
3.7 Obstacles to Evaluation Market Entry	20
3.8 Citizens Based Monitoring and Empowerment	21
4. Conclusion and Recommendations	22
4.1 Conclusion	22
4.2 Recommendations	24
References	27

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Twende Mbele (TM) is a partnership programme between Benin, Uganda and South Africa, using a Peer-learning approach to build stronger national evaluation systems to improve governance and accountability to citizens. As more and more evaluations are being commissioned and undertaken in a number of African countries, it is clear that the current supply of good evaluators is constrained, with relatively small group of professional suppliers taking up most of the larger evaluation studies. In many instances, evaluations are done by foreign evaluators from the western Countries. As more Governments demand for more evaluative evidence, the number and quality of human resources required to meet this will grow. At the current level of demand, problems with the size of the pool of available evaluators, the quality of their deliverables and their ability to respond to Government terms of reference (ToRs), consolidates an already skewed evaluation market.

There is, therefore, a need to expand in terms of numbers and quality of the existing pool of evaluators, and to ensure that the representivity of evaluators in Uganda approximates that of the local population, as well as enabling emerging evaluators to enter the market with fewer restrictions which includes experience, qualifications, etc. Uganda will benefit from further understanding of the incentives and barriers that foster a more competitive demand and supply in the evaluation market.

Within the framework provided by Twende Mbele, country-specific trends as well as cross-country comparisons are possible, with strong references to African and regional issues also possible. In political-economic terms, besides gender relations that are being foregrounded in DFID criteria, there is a growing recognition of the importance of broader poverty and social inequality as major determinants of current assessments of the economic winners and losers in the global social order. These critical considerations need to be factored into the thematic assessment of evaluator demand and supply, specifically issues of transformation, obstacles to evaluation market entry, and even more challenging, notion empowerment.

A study was done in Uganda in June 2009 by Ian C. Davies and found out that demand for evaluative information in, and of the Government of Uganda, and resulting use, falls broadly into two categories; monitoring information for budget allocation and control purposes and; evaluation information to meet the accountability requirements. A key finding of the study was that there were significant gaps, and variances among MDAs, in organizational capacity for evaluation of GOU.

The general approach considered involved Uganda-specific M&E system as foundation to provide the necessary system and context. System and country context provides the basis for study support and eventual ownership of study output. This study undertakes a diagnostic on the supply and demand of evaluators in Uganda with the aim of providing a Uganda-specific demand-and-supply profile of evaluators.

1.2 Purpose of the Diagnostic Study

The diagnostic of supply and demand of evaluators sought to provide a country-specific demand-and-supply profile of evaluators in each of the three partner countries in the Twende Mbele project: Benin, Uganda and South Africa. The study answered questions around the capacity and supply of evaluators in Uganda, and what is required to strengthen this capacity and supply.

On the supply side, current capacity was identified through: (i) size of current country supply of evaluation consultants (including government, academic, donors, business and civil society), (ii) skill levels, abilities and specializations, (iii) shape of the current pools of skills (age, gender, race and ethnicity, geography, language, organization or individual, etc.), (iv) pricing (relative cost) of skills and value-for-money considerations, (v) access to evaluators (ability and/or reach of national systems to procure required skills), (vi) other capacity considerations.

On the demand side, considerations included (i) national government system requirements for eligibility to provide evaluation services, and other market entry determinants, (ii) value of current country demand (including government, academic, donors, business and civil society), (iii) specific professional skills required from evaluators, (iv) efficiency of country information systems on evaluator availability (supply), and opportunities (demand), (v) opportunities/possibilities for transformation and country-specific empowerment

and, (vi) sustainability of the market.

The outcomes of this diagnostic were used to design activities to improve the supply and quality of evaluations (and evaluators) in Uganda. These activities were designed during the national and regional workshops, and were supported by Uganda governments, UEA, academia and other relevant organizations. The report of this diagnostic is meant to provide the basis for planning specific TM programme interventions and activities, and to inform and enrich other

planned activities.

1.3 Research Questions

The main research question that was answered through this study was: What do we know of the capacity and supply of evaluators on the continent, and what is required to strengthen this capacity and supply?

Additional questions were:

1. What is the size of the evaluation market (demand from donors, government, private sector) in each of three countries - and in response, how big is the supply (pool of skills available)?
2. How do we better match the supply to demand (especially if we are trying to increase , demand)?
3. To what extent has the current approach to building an evaluation market constrained/enabled that market in each country?
4. What are the current patterns of evaluation implementation using external service providers versus the use of officials/public servants in government?

1.4 Methodology

The methodology incorporated an extensive review of documentation relevant to evaluation in Uganda. The collation of and analysis of secondary data covered policy, academic and grey literature relating to the demand and supply side of evaluation. Primary and secondary documentation was considered in order to substantiate the claims of the interviews and to expand the information base.

Often desk study alone leaves many questions unanswered and much of the information obtained not verified. To understand the context and in addition to obtaining primary data from stakeholders, we carried out in—depth interviews with a sample of Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) in the GoU, of Parliamentary officers, committees and elected officials, of training and research institutions, of donors and of civil society organizations (CSOs)(see Annex1).In particular, issues of actual and latent demand and of evaluation capacities were explored through the interview process. Data collection took place in a semi-structured way that allowed people to narrate

their story – with some probing taking place based upon the guiding supply and demand questions. The data from interviews was analyzed qualitatively basing on the emerging relevant themes and sub themes during the fieldwork, with emerging conclusions refined and subjected to validation during the last set of interviews.

1.5 Structure of the Report

Chapter two presents country context. Chapter three presents the root cause analysis and chapter four presents the conclusion and recommendations.

2. Country Context

This section presents an overview of Uganda's planning and budgeting process and how these are linked to monitoring and evaluation framework in the country. In Uganda, over the past two decades, considerable efforts have been made to establish a strong and robust basis for assessing public spending, and its effects on development. In achieving this, Public Sector M&E was considered as a means of Government measuring its development interventions. M&E was therefore enshrined in the National Development Plan and institutionalized in the governance systems and processes (National Development Plan, 2010/11- 2014/15).

The Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) was given the constitutional mandate to oversee reforms and service delivery in all Government Ministries, Departments and Agencies and established an M&E function to support this role (National M&E Policy, 2013). It was set up to design, commission, conduct and disseminate evaluations on public policies and major public investments, as directed by the Uganda government, and to oversee improvements in the quality and utility of evaluations conducted across the government at a decentralised level. OPM works closely with evaluation networks, national and international partners and evaluation expert institutions to promote the use of evidence in policy and programme formulation and in decision-making.

A National Strategy for Monitoring and Evaluation of Government programmes (NIMES) was developed with the aim of enhancing M&E capacity as well as ensuring that sound evidence-based data and information are available to inform decision-making (The Republic of Uganda, National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy, 2006). The National Policy for Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation was developed and approved in 2013 to provide a clear framework for strengthening the coverage, timeliness of assessment of public interventions. The policy was meant to enhance the performance of Public Sector through strengthening coordination and cost-effective production and use of objective information in

the implementation of national interventions. The policy enabled government, civil society organizations, development partners and corporations access credible evidence to inform policy and programmatic decisions, and hold the public sector accountable for its application of resources (National M&E Policy, 2013).

The implementation of the National Policy for Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation saw government introduce a series of reforms to enhance accountability and transparency of the Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) and Local Governments (LGs). Significant effort went into introducing planning, results-based budgets, monitoring systems and developing the institutional capacity to design ministry strategy and plans to implement M&E arrangements to monitor results and provide a basis for performance improvement as provided for in the National Development Plan (Annual Performance Assessment Report, 2013/2014).

In Uganda, the Office of the Prime Minister collates information from other departments and produce bi-annual and annual sector performance reports. There is a system of annual Cabinet retreats to review the performance of the government. The Prime Minister, ministers and top public servants attend the retreat. The retreats review reports and may issue recommendations to inform budgeting processes. In this way, there are mechanisms to institutionalize monitoring to feed into executive decision-making processes. For Parliament, the Office of the Auditor General has an established evaluative practice as it carries value—for-money audits on a regular and systematic basis since 2005. There is an evaluation practice in Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) although the practice appears under-resourced, ad-hoc and driven primarily by donor requirements and support. This shows a high level demand for M&E evidence. However, monitoring dominates the M&E systems in all cases.

In Uganda, there is a two-year rolling evaluation agenda, mainly donor funded and overseen by an M&E technical working group. The Government Evaluation Facility (GEF) is run by a secretariat in the Office of the Prime Minister, which provides technical support for evaluations and the evaluation system. Evaluations are more focused on implementation and impact or summative forms of evaluations. The Department of M&E/UEA in Uganda is endeavoring to set standards across government for evaluation and attempting to invoke demand for evaluation by introducing a range of tools to increase commitment by Cabinet, the Prime Minister and Sector Departments. The specific tools being applied to support this include mechanisms such as Departments

proposing evaluations, development of a national evaluation agenda or plan, and making the reports publicly available.

Demand for evaluative information in, and of, the GoU, and resulting use, falls broadly into two categories: Monitoring information for budget allocation and control purposes and, evaluation information to meet the accountability requirements of donors. A majority of the evaluations are donor initiated, funded, commissioned, managed, conducted and used primarily to meet donor accountability requirements.

In Uganda, the key challenges for implementing evaluation include invoking incentive for use and demand for use from politicians, and developing adapted endogenous system that can draw on in-country quality evaluation capacity. While some limited capacity does exist for evaluation in the various public sector institutions in the country in terms of personnel and systems, the quality of practice is at variance with the standard norms that are agreed upon and used internationally. In addition, demand for evaluation comes primarily from donors who, in most cases, initiate, commission and manage evaluations with variable participation of GoU staff and/or of national evaluators. Although there is a robust supply of evaluations and production of evaluation reports generally in Uganda, one of the constraints for use by the GoU and the public sector in general is the lack of coordination and dissemination by donors of evaluation reports they commission. There is little in the way of organized social accountability mechanisms that could generate demand as well for evaluation. Although there is general demand for accountability information from Parliament and the public in general, with the former, mechanisms for implementing response and scrutiny require strengthening and linking to clear instructions to actors that should respond. With the latter, mechanisms for social accountability are insufficiently developed and organized to exert effective and focused demand for evaluation and accountability information in general. There is however, institutionalized demand for evaluation at the national level as part of the National Development Plan (NDP) processes. As well, there is demand from Parliament, the Public Accounts Committee and the public in general for accountability information on GoU spending. This demand is addressed through the value for money audits of the Office of the Auditor General (OAG). The Office of the Auditor General does respond to the accountability demand of Parliament by conducting value for money audits on a systematic and regular basis.

3. A Root Cause Analysis

3.1 Current Approach to Building the Evaluation Market in Uganda

Monitoring is the dominant part of Uganda Government monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system, indicating that there is weak demand from decision-makers for evidence. In addition, the supply of M&E in Uganda has to a large extent been influenced by donor demands that have stimulated the development of M&E practice, in face of limited the absence of national government demand. Even the available evaluators have been trained in a donor-orientated milieu, due to the strength of demand from donors and the limited government M&E system. The donor-driven orientation of M&E practice has been recognized by the African Evaluation Association (AfrEA, 2007) and within the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (OECD, 2005). In Uganda there are multiple donor reporting systems at project level, and there is need to reduce, harmonize and minimize duplication of monitoring functions.

In Uganda policy relating to the Monitoring and Evaluation is supported by the constitution thus enabling the evaluation market. As a result, the MDAs have the institutional support to develop their organizational capacity for evaluation. International organizations like CLEAR, 3ie and donors (ie, GIZUSAID, World Bank, UNDP, etc) are actively supporting development of MDAs organizational capacity for evaluation. This is expected to reduce donor dominance, both in terms of concepts and instruments, help to reinforce in-country capacity to develop M&E systems, and build local confidence. There is evidence of emerging endogenous demand from Uganda for evidence. This demand is sometimes being filled by Uganda-led monitoring systems, and development of evaluations that supply deeper analysis. The Office of the Prime Minister goes beyond coordination, to information generation through evaluation.

3.2 Uganda Supply Side Profile

3.2.1 Size of the Current Supply of Evaluators

The size of the evaluation market (demand from donors, government, private sector) in Uganda is considerable in terms of number of consultants and companies, for evaluation outside government. There is a substantial pool of M&E consultants in Uganda. The USAID funded Uganda Monitoring and Evaluation Management Services (MEMS) project developed a roster of Ugandan institutions, firms and individual consultants for Monitoring and Evaluation Services, in 2006. The roster identified 18 Ugandan based firms, 11 institutions and 75 individuals

that provide M&E services. These have either served their respective clients satisfactorily on their consultancies or been assessed as having 1) experience, 2) qualifications, and 3) credibility, as in quality of product produced. The roster was updated in 2012 updated, under the management of the new contractor, the Mitchell Group. The updated roster has 158 Ugandan experts in evaluation. The MEMS project also conducted a series of training sessions in performance management to 302 people that have contributed immensely to the capacity of Ugandan evaluation staff to conduct their M&E activities more effectively.

3ie and the Government of Uganda facilitated logistics for the impact evaluation technical training course provided by the Center for Learning and Results (CLEAR) in Uganda in 2013. The course was attended by the staff from various Government agencies as well as policymakers and researchers from other countries in sub-Saharan Africa. 3ie has provided bursaries for OPM representatives to attend several courses and conferences related to impact evaluation and rigorous evidence including for the seventh international AfrEA meeting in 2014 and the Campbell Collaboration Colloquium in 2013. GIZ/GoU provided capacity building for the public sector, civil society, private sector in evaluation contributing to a pool of evaluators in 2012 to 2015.

3.2.2 Evaluation Capacity Building Initiatives

There are a number of opportunities for local evaluation capacity building in Uganda and in other communities of practice such as CSOs in the form of training programs in monitoring and evaluation at the universities and training institutes. Currently, the most well developed (and popular) training courses in M&E are provided by the Uganda Management Institute (UMI), UTAMI and the Makerere Institute of Social Research (MISR), but M&E is in most cases part of Project Planning & Management course curricula at Ugandan universities across the country. As well there exist donor supported training events in Uganda as well as regional and international resources for evaluation.

UMI offers a two-week course and post graduate diploma on project monitoring and evaluation. In developing the curriculum for the postgraduate programme, UMI consulted a few government agencies, donors and CSOs, which emphasized that the course should be relevant to the M&E needs within government, be based on programme theory rather than project thinking, and also address M&E in thematic areas such as humanitarian assistance.

MISR is usually contracted by the OPM to conduct M&E training for members of the National M&E Technical Working Group. The training module is an adaptation of the International Program for Development Evaluation

Training (IPDET) training curriculum. M&E capacity development initiatives that have taken place were not always adequately coordinated (BTC Uganda, 2012), and furthermore were concentrated mainly at central line ministry level, largely foregoing investment in M&E (and more broadly education management) capacity at district level. In fact, district level M&E is often considered to function merely as an outpost for central-level data collection and does not necessarily address local level implementation realities.

As part of the initiative to build local M&E capacity USAID provides financial Support to its local implementing partners (these include local governments) to attend training courses on M&E. The USAID supported the Uganda Monitoring and Evaluation Management Services (MEMS) project, during the management of Management Systems International (MSI), offered training in evaluation to USAID partner organizations (Save the Children, Africare, TASO, AIC, IRC, CRD, and others). In the second phase of MEMS, under the management of the Mitchell Group, USAID requested MEMS to focus on training for improved monitoring and reporting of results. The Ugandan Evaluation Association (UEA) has existed since 2002, has the potential to provide ongoing professional networking and development if provided with support. The association can be a forum where evaluation professionals meet and share information and good practices on evaluation in addition to organizing short courses on topics of interest to its members. Once it is nurtured the UEA has the potential to contribute to professionalizing home grown evaluation capacity.

At the regional level, the African Evaluation Association (AfrEA) is an association of M&E associations and networks in Africa. Their website¹ contains information on both regional and international graduate degrees and diplomas, short courses and workshops on evaluation. AfrEA conferences, usually preceded by professional development workshops, are another forum for capacity building. The conferences are also an opportunity for sharing knowledge and experience on evaluation, from which good practices and lessons can be identified, just as networks can be built. The AfrEA website also contains resource materials on M&E that can be used to professionalize evaluation, i.e. guidelines, standards and methodologies on evaluation, web links to evaluation journals, and links to other useful websites.

At the international level, the IPDET evaluation training programme in Canada targets officers occupying senior and middle level evaluation, audit and management positions in developed and developing economies and who

¹www.afrea.org

work in government, NGOs and the private sector. As number of Ugandan professionals have already benefited from this training program. From 2001-2007 about 25 CSO representatives from Uganda have taken the IPDET² course.

Associations such as the International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE), the European Evaluation Society (EES), and the International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS) also provide opportunities for the strengthening of institutions' and individuals' evaluation capacity, through conferences where the sharing of knowledge on evaluation theory and practices around the world is facilitated. Their websites³ contain extensive electronic resources as well as information on training programs that offer certificate or graduate qualifications in evaluation.

3.2.3 Skill levels, Abilities and Specializations

The general view of persons in GoU, donor representatives as well as people in the consulting environment is that local Ugandan M&E capacity is still generally weak. Regarding capacity for evaluation in the CSOs the study observed that generally M&E staffs in CSOs have only taken a 3-week course in M&E, and local consultants offering evaluation services are not necessarily better trained or more experienced. Results from the survey of individual evaluators show that 50% of the evaluators have not completed any specific courses in M&E (self-taught). Survey results showed that individual evaluators had either completed a short course in evaluation or completed an M&E module as part of a degree. Capacity development in most CSOs is ad hoc. Results from the survey of individual evaluators show that majority of the evaluators (43%) have experience in carrying out evaluations of between 1 and 3 years implying that evaluators in Uganda have limited experience.

In the MDAs there are no examples of written and institutionalized guidelines or standards on how to commission and manage evaluations. Skills, experience and know-how rest mainly with individuals and are not yet systematically institutionalized. There are also no systematic approaches to the building of capacity. Capacity building is rarely budgeted for and therefore ad hoc, based on individual initiatives.

Most of the staff in M&E units of MDAs have no certificate or diploma in M&E (Office of the Prime Minister, 2012) but have gained significant experience and on-the-job-training in M&E, however, they lack analytical capacities

²International Program for Development Evaluation Training – www.ipdet.org

³www.internationalevaluation.com - www.europeanevaluation.org - www.ideas-int.org

which hamper the development of the evaluative component. There is lack of evaluative capacity at decentralized level because of limited investment in M&E capacity development. In fact, district level M&E is often considered to function merely as an outpost for central-level data collection and does not necessarily address local level implementation realities. Districts send quarterly work plans (for approval) and reports to the MDAs, yet hardly receive any feedback with respect to the data that was locally collected and channeled upwards (interviewees). Quality of data is barely controlled and is not analyzed locally for use in local-level decision-making which in itself discourages local level data collection.

There are no systematic approaches to ensuring that there is knowledge specific to evaluation in the various MDAs, including where there is an M&E unit. Findings from survey of individual evaluators showed that 63 % of the evaluators specialize in a specific sector or sectors, for instance, agriculture, health, entrepreneurship, education, financial literacy among other sectors.

The Ministry of Public Service, does not have a detailed job description that specify competencies in evaluation, i.e. knowledge, skills and abilities (KSA) for the positions of Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. The job description for an Assistant Commissioner for Monitoring and Evaluation in a ministry does not contain minimum requirements for level of knowledge, skills and abilities for evaluation. The job description lists key areas of responsibility and outputs but makes no distinction between monitoring and evaluation.

This does not mean that individuals with responsibilities for monitoring and evaluation in MDAs do not have the abilities to carry out their work appropriately. On-the-job learning and training, together with access to documentation and opportunities for professional development outside of government, constitute ways in which evaluation capability is expanded. While institutional capacity for evaluation remains weak however, the risk is that evaluation practice, and its quality, can be affected by staff turnover. A 2009 World Bank document considers Uganda's capacity to monitor education indicators such as enrolment rates, number of teachers, infrastructure and instructional material to be relatively strong (World Bank, 2009).

Policy and Planning units and M&E units across government are generally understaffed and in some cases go for long -periods without staff trained in evaluation or having access to professional development in M&E. There are a few cases in which a unit with M&E responsibilities had no staff with skills and competencies to

commission and manage evaluations. Local supply in many instances is more configured for monitoring of policies, and even more of programmes and projects, for example annual progress reports.

Survey findings showed that most clients had sent, or are planning to send, their staff involved in managing evaluations on training courses. The training courses include: certificate /diploma in Monitoring and Evaluation, project planning and management, basic research skills, research designs frameworks and quality control.

3.2.4 The Shape of the Current Pools of Skills

There is limited information on the shape of the current pool of skills in terms of age , gender, language , organization or individuals. Findings from survey of individual evaluators showed that 67 % of the evaluators were men, implying that evaluations in Uganda are dominated by men. What is also known is that with a few exceptions evaluation teams are led by foreign consultants from the western countries although there is, in most cases, participation and support to varying degrees of national evaluators. The majority of the evaluations identified by the study from 2005 to 2016 have been initiated, commissioned and managed by donors; with USAID accounting for about half of these (the study used web based searches).

About half of the donor-led evaluations were conducted by international evaluators only (companies or individuals), while the other half was conducted by mixed teams, i.e. international and national evaluators. Findings from survey of individual evaluators showed that most evaluators carry out evaluations for clients, as individual suppliers. Of the evaluations commissioned and/or co-managed by GoU, no sector is overly represented and there is a fair balance between teams that are made up either of all international evaluators, all national evaluators and mixed teams. The evaluations in CSOs are most often conducted by external local consultants, except for larger evaluations, which are typically conducted by international consultants. It is also clear that the current supply of good evaluators is constrained, with relatively small group of professional suppliers taking up most of the larger evaluation studies.

3.2.5 Pricing of Skills

The pricing of skills varies according to experience and education. The pricing also depends on whether an evaluator is local or international with the later commanding high pay because of the extra costs such as

accommodation and airfare. Results from the survey of local individual evaluators show that the average charge-out rate per day was US\$200 and ranged from US\$50-US\$300. The low average charge-out rate per day may either be a reflection of limited skills or low remuneration for the evaluation service in Uganda.

3.2.6 Access to Evaluators

In Uganda, there is a disconnect between evaluation supply and demand as there is little evidence of substantive relationships between government and evaluation agents, except in some limited areas. However this challenge is being addressed through Uganda Evaluation Association (UEA), which acts as an interface between supply and demand for evaluations. As a body of various evaluation practitioners, who are convinced of the importance of evaluations, and who have a direct professional interest in evaluations, UEA is able to advocate and draw attention of some organizations on the need to undertake evaluation of their initiatives. In this way, UEA contributes to activating latent demand for evaluations, hosting important events with the purpose of nurturing evaluation demand.

3.2.7 Capacity for Evaluation Uganda

There exists non-state capacity for evaluation in Uganda in civil society organizations, in research and training institutions and with consultants and consulting firms. Such technically good evaluation actors offer entry points to evaluation capacity development efforts. However the development of that capacity is not supported systematically by the State or by donors. The various agents who are related to the supply evaluations may be grouped into four (4) categories: (1) consultants; (2) universities; (3) research institutions and think tanks; and (4) voluntary organizations of professional evaluators (VOPEs).

Consultants: There is a growing number of individual consultants and consultancy organizations that have been undertaking evaluations or related work on projects, programmes and policies. Among the organizations that can be mentioned are the Centre for Democratic Development, Innovation for Poverty Actions (IPA), KPMG, Ernst & Young and GIMPA Consultancy Unit. The financial incentives associated with evaluation are the major driving force for these consultancy organizations to seek opportunities to undertake evaluations or related work.

Universities: Out of over 30 universities in Uganda, Makerere is the only one that made it to the top 50 in Africa in 2017 in research ranking. Gulu University came at 79, MUBS at 122, Mbarara University of Science and Technology came at number 134. Generally, the public universities are more endowed with research capabilities than the private ones. Meanwhile, Mountains of the moon was ranked 173rd, Uganda Christian University came at

179th, Kampala International University was 250th, Kyambogo ranked 330th, Busitema came 357th, Uganda Martyr's 377th and IUIU was in the 378 position. The Universities are endowed with highly qualified teaching and research staff thereby presenting great opportunities to conduct various evaluations. Faculty members undertake research work in the various Schools and Faculties.

All the universities in Uganda have a social science capacity (sociologists, economists, political scientists) which could be mobilized for evaluation work linked to research. Potential exists to build the capacities of these institutions to bridge the evaluation supply-demand gaps. As can be expected an increase in demand for evaluation has the potential for driving supply for evaluation. Some development partners have collaborated with evaluation agents (research institutions and universities) on in-country evaluation capacity development initiatives. A case in point is the partnership between GIZ and UTAMI to start the first ever Master of Arts programme in Evaluation Uganda.

Think Tanks: Economic Policy Research Centre (EPRC) is an economic policy research centre that undertakes policy analysis, evidence-based advocacy and advice to Uganda government to enable her formulate and implement good policies and strengthen public institutions towards accelerated development. The relative strength of EPRC appears to relate to its ability to work legitimately within the political economy and therefore provides an entry point for evaluation capacity development. EPRC is fully funded by the government and therefore has potential for shifting the latent demand to actual demand and developing evaluation capacity.

Organizations and Networks: The Uganda Evaluation Association (UEA) was formed in May 2001 and registered in 2002 as a professional association and national chapter of the African Evaluation Association. The main objective was to create a national network to facilitate sharing of literature methods, procedure and practical evaluation frameworks among evaluators who were operating in isolation, build capacity for evaluation and promote professionalism in evaluation practice. The Association started with a membership of over fifty individuals drawn from monitoring and evaluation units in Government, Parastatals, local and international NGOs, private organizations and members from the public that are engaged in evaluation practice. The UEA is supported by USAID and World Bank.

The UEA developed and endorsed in 2013 for the first time the Uganda Evaluation Standards that provide guidance on how evaluation professionals and users should behave, what concepts and practices evaluators should use, the benchmarks their products should meet, and the outcomes they should achieve. The standards are in conformity with the African Evaluation Association (Afrea) Guidelines and the good practices endorsed by the International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE).

3.2 Uganda Demand Side Profile

3.3.1 National Government System Requirements for Eligibility

The Government has developed guidelines for public sector evaluations and the UEA has developed and approved standard guidelines that stipulate that evaluators and evaluation teams must be independent, trustworthy and transparently selected. They must have appropriate knowledge, skills mix, and proven competencies in evaluation methodology and specialist area(s). The evaluators should have professional work experience relevant to the evaluation. The evaluation team should be gender sensitive, where applicable.⁴ This diagnostic study did not find examples of written guidelines on how to conduct, commission or manage evaluations; rather ToR are developed on a case-by-case basis, in collaboration with the particular donor.

Results from the survey of clients who commission evaluations show that most of the clients contract suppliers using the RFQ approach (57%), while 29 % of the clients use mixed approaches (open tender and RFQ), and the rest use open tender approach. Survey results show that the majority of firms issue RFQ for evaluation separately depending on the timing but also based on donor requests. RFQs are combined for all evaluations at specific intervals in a year. This is based on the Annual M&E Calendar. Survey results show that clients receive on an average range between 3- 10 per RFQ or tender. Findings from the survey also show that in all cases they receive responses from evaluators. Survey results also show that there is difference in responsiveness depending on the type of evaluation varying with the technicality of the projects, level of measurements that may be required, scope and size of the evaluation.

3.3.2 Value, Size and Type of Current Evaluation Demand

According to the National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation (2013), all projects over 70 billion shillings in value are required to conduct rigorous evaluation, including a baseline study to establish initial conditions, a mid-term review and a final evaluation. The value of current country demand by Government as per

⁴<http://ugandaevaluationassociation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/uganda-evaluation-standards.pdf>

the National Policy on Public sector monitoring and evaluation (2013), is approximately 28% of the projects that are valued at over 70 billion shillings. To finance evaluation, all projects are supposed to allocate a percentage of their budgets to evaluation, as determined by the Development Committee, taking into account the budget and scope of the project. This percentage covers the cost of conducting a baseline study during the project preparation, a mid-term review at the half-way stage in the project, and a final evaluation. Based on calculations of the average costs of conducting a rigorous baseline, mid-term review and final evaluation, within the range of 1.5 billion to 2.5 billion shillings are required. This is within 4% of projects budgeting over 70 billion shillings. Public policy and major cross-sectoral evaluations are supposed to be budgeted for under the Office of the Prime Minister Development budget. This requires a minimum of three billion shillings per annum, based on a cost of conducting 3 evaluations per annum at 1 billion shillings each. Survey findings show that the average cost of an evaluation depends on the scope, the coverage among other attendant factors. Survey results showed that the average cost of an evaluation in most CSOs is Ug Shs 30 million.

According to the available evidence, approximately 12% of total evaluations conducted in Uganda have been commissioned and/or co—managed by GoU. The Government Evaluation Facility has commissioned 23 evaluations, these include Evaluation of the Government Response to absenteeism in the public sector, Evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of the PPDA; Study of the Government Employment Strategy; Impact evaluation of the Baraza initiative; Summative evaluation of the Avian and human Influenza Preparedness Project; Comparative study of public service delivery models; Impact/Implementation evaluation of the land policy on illegal land evictions. Looking at the identified evaluations commissioned and/or co—managed by GoU, they are generally consistent with accepted quality standards for evaluation such as OECD DAC evaluation quality standards. They all assess efficiency and effectiveness of programmes, performance against qualitative and quantitative indicators, etc., and they all use a mixed methods approach, i.e. literature review, stakeholder meetings, and field visits.

CSOs overall have a systematic approach to evaluation, e.g. regular programme performance evaluations, mainly based on donor requirements and procedures. As such, the evaluation processes in CSOs are to a large extent driven by donors, with the evaluations being funded by donors and commissioned on the basis of ToR developed in collaboration with donors. Compared to government agencies, CSOs are reportedly better at following up on findings and recommendations from evaluations, due to competition for donor support in the

CSO environment, meaning that there is pressure to demonstrate that they qualify for support. The CSOs' existence depends on their ability to produce results, demonstrate impact, and therefore implement the changes suggested in evaluations.

Results from the survey of clients indicated that the average number of evaluations they had commissioned from suppliers in the last three years (including the current financial year) was six evaluations. Findings from survey of 63 % of the clients who were sure about the number of evaluations indicate that they intend to commission evaluations from suppliers on average of five evaluations in the next three financial years.

Results from the survey of individual evaluators show that the average number of evaluations that they had implemented (or in the process of implementing) over the past 3 years was three. Survey findings showed that most of the evaluations that had been implemented were impact evaluations (55%), followed by implementation evaluation (27%) and economic evaluation (18%). In the survey, no evaluator had carried out diagnostic evaluation and design evaluation implying that either such studies are rarely carried out or there are no skills to undertake such types of evaluations. A breakdown of the past and future evaluations type (diagnostic, design, implementation, impact, economic) by clients who commission evaluations from survey findings showed that the common types of evaluation undertaken are design (baselines), implementation (Mid-term reviews) and impact evaluations.

3.3.3 Specific Professional Skills Required from Evaluators

The specific professional skills required from evaluators by both government and CSOs include a minimum of academic qualifications of a first degree in Statistics, Economics or SWSA and Postgraduate Diploma in Project Planning and Management. The experience required is at least 6 years' experience with M&E, and impact evaluation in working in the specific sector in developing countries. The core skills required usually include computational and analytical skills, business analysis skills, computer skills relevant to data management, database design, statistical analysis skills, training skills, good communication and interpersonal skills, report writing and drafting skills. Other qualities and attributes required include: integrity, empathy, confidentiality and innovativeness.

Results from the survey of clients who commission evaluations show that clients require minimum qualifications or experience levels from evaluation suppliers. Survey results also show that the minimum qualifications or experience vary per evaluation. The minimum qualifications expected from evaluators include among others;

experts at PhD level but also at Masters level with a wealth of experience in research are considered for the lead investigator, extent to which the evaluator has been able to publish their work, relationship with academia, evidence of similar work done before and list of contacts, experience in using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies, participated as the lead in at least three assessments/evaluations, demonstrate deep knowledge of the field to be evaluated, experience in designing and managing evaluations, diversity and complementarity of the team. Survey results also indicated that the majority of evaluators (75%) do not have difficulty in meeting the minimum qualifications or experience levels. This may be attributed to most clients using RFQ approach in contracting evaluators.

3.4 Matching the Supply and Demand of Evaluators

A study done in Uganda in June 2009 by Ian C. Davies and found out that demand for evaluative information in, and of the Government of Uganda, and resulting use, falls broadly into two categories; Monitoring information for budget allocation and control purposes, and Evaluation information to meet the accountability requirements. A key finding of the study was that there were significant supply and demand gaps, and variances among MDAs, in organizational capacity for evaluation of GOU. Survey findings from most clients show that the supply of evaluators is not sufficient to meet the demand. Findings from survey of individual evaluators showed that the majority of the evaluators (71 %) ranked their estimated capacity at 50% more evaluations to undertake more evaluations annually than they were currently undertaking, which may imply that evaluators are not fully occupied with evaluation assignments.

To better match the supply to demand of evaluators, there is need for a deeper analysis of the profession of evaluation in Uganda more especially organizational capacity gaps at MDAs level in Uganda. This would give an indication of the gaps between government demand and the current supply as governments start to regulate the markets they generate as they commission evaluation.

3.5 Efficiency of Information Systems

There is no efficient Government information system on evaluator availability and opportunities. The only source of information about available evaluators is the Uganda Evaluation Association (UEA) and the USAID funded Uganda Monitoring and Evaluation Management Services (MEMS) project that developed a roster of Ugandan institutions, firms and individual consultants for Monitoring and Evaluation Services. However, UEA and MEMS are currently inactive because of limited funding. There is also no proper documentation about evaluators who have recently

conducted evaluations in Uganda. Findings from the survey of clients show that the majority of the evaluators (71%) have a database of evaluation providers.

Most staff involved in M&E at national and local level highlight that systematic feedback loops of M&E outputs to sector and local-level planning and budgeting do not exist. A recent review of some of the MDAs pointed out that they are under the impression that they are obligated to submit copies of studies and reports produced to NIMES, while others are not; however, those MDAs that do submit information to NIMES complain that they do not receive any feedback, i.e. they do not know if or how the information is used, which in turn weakens incentive for making sure reports are forwarded to NIMES. There are therefore no efficient information systems on evaluation findings and evaluator availability and opportunities.

3.6 Opportunities for Transformation and Uganda- specific Empowerment

There are a number of opportunities for local evaluation capacity building in the country and in other communities of practice such as CSOs in the form of training programs in monitoring and evaluation at the universities and training institutes. The Universities are endowed with highly qualified teaching and research staff thereby presenting great opportunities to conduct various evaluations. Think tanks and universities may enhance their capacities to conduct evaluations within research processes, whereas donors can provide opportunities for learning by doing through support within sector-working groups that are country-led. National, regional and international Associations also provide opportunities for the strengthening of institutions' and individuals' evaluation capacity, through conferences where the sharing of knowledge on evaluation theory and practices around the world is facilitated.

There exists opportunities to strengthen technical evaluation demand, with Governments playing a more active role in demanding and managing evaluations. Besides triggering M&E demand, the Office of the Prime Minister invests in the M&E supply side through the set-up of the Evaluation Facility and the proposal to allocate and ring-fence parts of sector budgets to monitoring and (particularly) evaluation is another opportunity to transform evaluation in Uganda.

3.7 Obstacles to Evaluation Market Entry

There is potential rather than actual technical capacity to manage, undertake and demand evaluations. This is a major barrier to a more competitive demand and supply in the evaluation market. Local capacities for conducting high-quality evaluation are quite limited. The demand and supply evaluators continue to be driven by Development Partners with limited country ownership of the processes. High-quality evaluations are more often commissioned and managed by Development Partners than Government, which means that they are less likely to be used in policy.

Another barrier is that impact evaluation of programmes is not designed from the outset (so a counterfactual is a challenge). Consequently, innovative methodologies are needed, the skills for which may be lacking. Development of the quality of the supply of evaluations is important, so that decision-makers are assured of the quality of the product they are receiving. In this way the Government can become more confident that evaluation helps them to understand issues and directs the public service towards results. The broader political and economic environment impact on evaluation systems, for example, where donor funding was withdrawn from the Office of the Prime Minister due to corruption.

Results from the survey of individual evaluators show that majority of the evaluators(88%) face evaluation market entry obstacles(i.e ability to obtain appointments from clients to carry out evaluations).The obstacles include; unfair selection criteria, clients aim at experience which most Ugandans do not possess even when they have the required qualifications, most clients tend to think that fellow Ugandans can't do quality evaluations thus give jobs to foreign evaluators, most clients don't want individual evaluators but prefer consultancy firms which are evaluated on the basis of experience for which foreign firms have an advantage, lack of adequate information linking evaluators to clients, lack of Information on existing opportunities for those who are not connected with government bureaucrats, among others.

Findings from survey of individual evaluators showed that most of the evaluators(63%) have experienced challenges with the way their clients have managed evaluations that they have undertaken (at any stage of the evaluation process including procurement and implementation). The challenges faced by individual evaluators include; reluctance to provide financial data and when they provide it is incomplete or delayed, procurement

delays, poorly designed ToRs that lead to disagreements in the scope of the study results and findings, lack of adequate supervisory capacity, international evaluator bias, among others.

Survey findings also show that clients had in most cases problems with the quality of evaluations done by suppliers. The problems include: unclear results from the project evaluation, long reports, poor documentation of success stories or impact of the project, estimations rather than facts, lack a proper methodology, poor depth of reporting and analysis of data collected, strong in quantitative and weak in qualitative and vice-versa, poor demonstration of impact with limited advanced analysis techniques, turnaround time, limited articulation of issues in line with sustainability and related indicators, weak illustrations of lessons and recommendations for both the project but also for future reference/projects, wrong data collected, unclear documentation of impact, inadequate triangulation of data, absence of standardized evaluation tools and guidelines, n, limited capacity, rigid and inflexible donors, much focus on methodology and limited focus on evaluation purpose among others.

Results from the survey also show that most of the clients experienced problems on particular aspects of evaluations. The aspects of evaluations where clients experienced problems include: generation of gender disaggregated data, statistical analysis, methodology, qualitative analysis and presentation of the report.

In most cases, CSOs do not have a budget for M&E, except what is allocated for M&E from programme and project budgets. Consequently, the NGOs often have weak M&E systems in place. Some CSOs have no M&E function; instead the responsibility to monitor and evaluate activities resides with project officers. Given the financial constraints facing CSOs, training of staff in M&E appears to be rare and occurs on an ad hoc basis.

CSO Field-staff often lack the knowledge and skills to go beyond checking numbers, i.e. to appreciate the analytical dimension of evaluations and consequently what information is needed to answer questions about outcomes, for instance. When a commissioner of evaluation in a CSO has poor knowledge and training in M&E, the person does not know what type of questions to ask, resulting in poor terms of reference. This spills over into poor management of evaluations, and consequently creates a risk of poor evaluations.

3.8 Citizen-based Monitoring and Empowerment



The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development puts citizens at the center of achieving the new development agenda. Aid Data⁵, is testing an innovative work in Uganda a crowd-sourcing technology, which allows community stakeholders to give feedback to development partners about programmes implemented. Through this programme policy makers and donors get beneficiary feedback and are thus able to monitor results.

Uganda Debt Network is also implementing a Community Participation and Empowerment programme. UDN's work with communities is based on the belief that improvements in economic literacy will empower poor people to demand that Government allocate funds to address their needs and concerns. Investment in citizen-led monitoring will ensure that lessons from local contexts influence the planning, design, and implementation of policies. This is because citizens from the local community best understand their context and will therefore bring their understanding in the planning, designing, implementation and monitoring of policies that affect them (Beyond2015 Campaign, 2014).

In Uganda, the Government has used decentralization as a system of improving service delivery and strengthening good governance. To address the deficiencies in public service delivery at local level, the Government has strengthened monitoring of programmes using "monitoring units and inspectorate in central government ministries, public accounts committee of parliament, constitutionalized statutory accountability bodies, local accountability committees, and more recently administrative initiatives such as barazas"(Kyohairwe, 2014).

The Government of Uganda has formalized the use of barazas⁶. The baraza brings together twice a year stakeholders from the central government, service providers or bureaucrats and the public/community, as well as users of the services, and provides them with an opportunity for sharing public information with the local

12 AidData is a research and innovation lab that seeks to improve development outcomes by making development finance data more accessible and actionable. See <http://aiddata.org/listen-to-citizen-voices#> ⁵

⁶Baraza is a Swahili word that means "a public meeting which is used as a platform for creating awareness, responding to issues affecting a given community, sharing vital information, and providing citizens with the opportunity to identify and propose solutions on their concerns" (Kyoheirwe, 2014).

community. It is focused on effective monitoring of public service provision and given an arena for the community to demand accountability from the bureaucrats.

Uganda, community monitoring and evaluation of the delivery of public health has improved the quality of delivery by public hospitals. In some districts, communities and civil society have set up health users' management committees. Where these committees were active, the World Bank reports absenteeism by public servants decreased and the quality of service measured by wait time and quality of care, improved (Bjorkman & Svensson, 2009).

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusion

The study aimed at establishing the capacity and supply of evaluators in Uganda, and what is required to strengthen this capacity and supply. On the supply side, the study established that there is a substantial pool of M&E consultants in Uganda. However there is no national data base for evaluators. The study established that there are a number universities, training institutions and national, regional and international networks for local evaluation capacity building in Uganda. It was also established that about half of the donor-led evaluations were conducted by international evaluators, while balance was conducted by mixed teams, i.e. international and national evaluators. The pricing of skills varies according to experience, education, or whether one is a local or international consultant. Suppliers are not selected on merit, besides they lack information on the evaluation subject. In Uganda, there is a disconnect between evaluation supply and demand as there is little evidence of substantive relationships between government and evaluation agents, except in some limited areas.

On the demand side, it was established that there are no national government system requirements for eligibility to provide evaluation services. However, the UEA has developed and approved standard guidelines that stipulate that evaluators and evaluation teams must be independent, trustworthy and transparently selected. The value of current country demand by government as per the National Policy on Public sector monitoring and evaluation (2013), is approximately 28% of the projects that are valued at over 70 billion shillings. To finance evaluation, all

projects are supposed to allocate a percentage of not more than 4% of their budgets to evaluation, as determined by the Development Committee, taking into account the budget and scope of the project. The study also established the specific professional skills required from evaluators by both government and CSOs including the minimum academic qualifications, experience, core skills and other qualities or attributes. The only source of information about available evaluators is the Uganda Evaluation Association (UEA) and the USAID funded Uganda Monitoring and Evaluation Management Services (MEMS) project that developed a roster of Ugandan institutions, firms and individual consultants for Monitoring and Evaluation Services.

The study also established a number of opportunities for local evaluation capacity building in Uganda and in other communities of practice such as CSOs in the form of training programs in monitoring and evaluation at the universities, training institutes and professional networks. It was also established that as Uganda government continues to demand more evaluative evidence, the number and quality of human resources required to meet this will grow and this will lead to sustainability of the evaluation market. To better match the supply to demand of evaluators, it was established that there is need for a deeper analysis of the profession of evaluation in Uganda more especially organizational capacity gaps at MDAs level in Uganda. It was also established that local capacities for conducting high-quality evaluation are quite limited as well as poor management of evaluation programs. The demand and supply evaluators continue to be driven by development partners with limited country ownership of the processes and there is limited demand for evaluation from the cabinet and parliament.

4.2 Recommendations

To strengthen the evaluation capacity demand and supply of evaluators there is need to strengthen the culture of management that understands values and uses evaluative information to achieve results and organizational performance. Without a culture of management, including policy and accountability, there is little use of, and effective demand for, evaluation. This means that management reforms and improvements are a necessary counterpart to successful development of meaningful evaluative practices.

The NIMES Secretariat and the National Monitoring and Evaluation Technical Working Group (NMETWG) should take the lead in fostering closer collaboration with donors on evaluation and ensuring systematic dissemination of evaluation reports and sharing of good practices. Furthermore, sharing evaluation experiences among

countries can strengthen local and regional evaluation networks, contributing to the development of regional evaluation capacities and to fostering demand for evaluation, making policy makers aware of the knowledge generated by evaluation and the possibilities of using that knowledge to improve policy making.

There is need to create an efficient information systems on evaluation findings and evaluator availability and opportunities by the Office of the Prime Minister(OPM). This will not only match the supply and demand for evaluators but can also create incentive for making sure there is submission of evaluation reports to NIMEs and feedback on the reports. There is need to maintain a database of evaluations and a knowledge resource center for evaluation in Uganda. There is need to create or update the 2012 MEMS database by profiling and categorizing evaluators according to their experience. This data base should be updated regularly. It should be a requirement that foreign consultant is understudied by a local consultant for capacity building and sustainability.OPM should adopt the evaluation standards developed by UEA and make them legal.

Further local capacity should receive preference in commissioning evaluation, rather than relying upon international expertise. In this way, Government can improve the quality of the provision of a public good (evaluation), through developing and regulating the market. In the longer term this can help to enhance local and contextually relevant capacity for both monitoring and evaluation.

In respect of supply, the diagnostic study found that evaluation practice and capacity in the GoU need to be strengthened and expanded. There is a need to expand the existing pool of evaluators, and enable emerging evaluators to enter the market with fewer restrictions. A strategy for developing and strengthening evaluation should address capacity issues such as, institutional supports to evaluation such as guidelines, standards and competency requirements (knowledge, skills and abilities) for evaluation positions in GoU (job descriptions) as well as ongoing professional development. Development of evaluation norms and standards can help government to place demands on the evaluation profession that will raise the overall quality of practice. There is also need to develop procedure templates for evaluation in MDAs. There is also need to support the capacity development of Parliament to demand evaluations as part of their mandate.

Persons engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities should possess core evaluation competencies which should be maintained through a regular programme of continuing professional

development. The professional capacity of evaluators and commissioners of evaluations should be continuously developed through improved knowledge and skills; strengthening evaluation management; stimulating demand for evaluations; and supporting an environment of accountability and learning.

The capacity of UEA should be strengthened. In addition the capacity of commissioners of evaluations should be enhanced following a capacity needs assessment. Dissemination and enforcement of evaluation guidelines should be fast tracked.

There is need to develop and maintain ongoing professional development for evaluation in GoU. There should be an annual programme of professional development for evaluators in MDAs. For example the programme could be made up of annual cross-government core training sessions, for example at introductory⁷ and intermediate⁸ levels and on specialised topics, together with attendance at external training sessions based on professional development needs⁹. Training should provide more than competencies in M&E. Senior officials need to understand the strengths and limitations-the relative cost effectiveness of various types of evaluation tools and techniques. Introductory training can also raise awareness of and demand for M&E information. Training should extend to the use of evaluation findings. They must be able to tell when an evaluation is reliable or when its methodology or findings are questionable. There is also need to provide professional and technical support to evaluation in MDAs by organising, brokering, disseminate professional evaluation training and conferencing activities.

There is also need to make evaluations participatory. Evaluations should be carried by a well-balanced combination of internal and experienced external evaluators to take advantage of the strengths and counter the limitations of each. Participation of the clients staff in evaluation shall encourage ownership of results and capacity building. Experienced evaluators from outside the programme shall provide additional insight, greater technical expertise, and be more objective in formulating recommendations.

⁷For example see: <http://gsociology.icaap.org/methods/>

⁸For example see: <http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/site.cgi>

⁹These should be ascertained during the annual staff performance appraisal.

There is also need interface with and support the development of professional evaluation associations such as the Ugandan Evaluation Association. The association has the potential to provide ongoing professional networking and development if provided with support. The association can be a forum where evaluation professionals meet and share information and good practices on evaluation in addition to organizing short courses on topics of interest to its members. Once it is nurtured the UEA has the potential to contribute to professionalizing home grown evaluation capacity.

There is also need to define very well the key competencies for evaluation that should form part of the functional organization of personnel requirements. For example, evaluations should be carried out or managed by a unit with required personnel competencies in evaluation.

To better match the supply to demand of evaluators, there is need for a deeper analysis of the profession of evaluation in Uganda more especially organizational capacity gaps at MDAs level in Uganda. This would give an indication of the gaps between government demand and the current supply as governments start to regulate the markets they generate as they commission evaluation.

Individual evaluators who were surveyed had views on what should be done to address the challenges with the way in which their clients have managed evaluations that they have undertaken. The views on what should be done to address the challenges include; evaluation work should be regulated to ensure client fulfill the obligation of providing full information, build capacity for commissioning evaluations to help those who demand for evaluation services determine what they want, need for review of procurement processes with a view of reducing turnaround time, enhance local evaluation capacity across board, among others.

Survey findings show that to improve the quality of evaluations done by suppliers, there is need to do the following: the suppliers need to read the ToR/ scope of work and understand them well, commissioners of evaluation should provide detailed TOR or RFQ, development and regular update of the supplier data base, capacity building for suppliers on statistical, qualitative analysis and report presentation of findings that meet the needs of the client or commissioner of the evaluation, improve utilization of evaluation, deliberate effort to ensure all involved in evaluation are all-round grounded in the various skills, improve evaluation design and methodology, encouraging suppliers to have competent team composition, establishing communities of

practices based on the sectors to share and learn, joint partnership with a credible research institutions, among others.

Survey findings from most clients also show that the supply of evaluators is not sufficient to meet the demand. To address quality or competitiveness problems clients proposed the following solutions: training all private and government organisation managers to gain evaluation skills(development of TOR, methodology, etc), promote evaluation, strengthen evaluation standards throughout the entire process by weeding out incompetent evaluators, PPDA needs to reinforce evaluation standards throughout the entire process to remove unskilled evaluators, improve competences in evaluation design, establish a database of evaluators for each sector, continuous professional development, and work through the Uganda Evaluation Association to build capacity of evaluators.

The recommendations that emerged from stakeholders consultative workshop included the need: for evaluators to be accredited; to give UEA legal mandate to regulate evaluators; to develop, adopt and disseminate standards and regulations for evaluations for all sectors; to support the establishment of an evaluation tribunal; to make it a requirement for foreign evaluators to work with local evaluators to encourage transfer of skills; to make it a requirement in any program design to have an evaluation component, to develop a communication strategy to create awareness about the need for evaluation and to publish evaluation reports.

In addition , the stakeholders in the consultative workshop recommended the need : to ;create a Centre of Excellency in evaluation that would establish an efficient Uganda information systems on evaluation findings and evaluator availability and opportunities , and start e-learning courses; to support implementation of the National Monitoring and Evaluation policy; to support both government and CSOs to establish Monitoring and Evaluation units/departments in their organizational structures; to reduce, harmonize and minimize duplication of monitoring functions; to identify champions of evaluation to promote evaluations; and to support training institutions to mainstream monitoring and evaluation in the courses being taught.

References

- Bjorkman, Martina, and Jakob Svensson (2009) Power to the People: Evidence From a Randomized Field Experiment on Community-Based Monitoring in Uganda. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124(2): 735-69.
- BTC Uganda. (2012). Progress Report #2, Education Sector Budget Support (ESBS). Kampala: BTC Uganda.
- Beyond 2015 Campaign. (2014). Citizen-led accountability: recommendations and key research findings for the post-2015 Agenda.
- Davies, I.(2009).Mapping Evaluation Practice , Demand and Related Capacity Study, Office of the Prime Minister, Uganda
- Kyohairwe, S. (2014). Local democracy and public accountability in Uganda: the need for organizational learning. *Commonwealth Journal of local Governance*. June 2014.
- National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation(2013), Office of the Prime Minister, Uganda.
- S.P, (2013) A Growing Demand for Monitoring and Evaluation in Africa. *African Evaluation Journal* 2013;1(1),
- World Bank (2009). Project Appraisal Document for the proposed credit in the amount of SDR 99 Million (US\$ 150 Million Equivalent) to the Republic of Uganda for a Post Primary Education and Training Adaptable Program Lending (apl 1) Project in Support of the First Phase of the Uganda Post Primary Education and Training Program, March 5, 2009. Washington, DC.: World Bank.

Annex I: Action Plan

ACTION PLAN FOR THE SUPPLY AND DEMAND OF EVALUATORS IN UGANDA

TWENDE MBELE

With Approval of :
Office of the Prime Minister

April, 2018

TABLE: ACTION PLAN 2018- 2023

Intervention	Budget(US \$)
<i>Short term(2018-2019)</i>	
1. Support Office of the Prime minister to establish a Centre of Excellency in evaluation that would establish an efficient Uganda information systems on evaluation findings and evaluator availability and opportunities	150,000
2. Support development of guidelines, regulations, standards and competency requirements (knowledge, skills and abilities) for evaluation positions in GoU (job descriptions) as well as ongoing professional development.	80,000
3.Support a study on deeper analysis of the profession of evaluation in Uganda	50,000
4.Support training all private and government organization managers to gain evaluation skills	30,000
5.Identify champions of evaluation to promote evaluation of government and private programs and projects	5,000
<i>Medium term and long term</i>	
1.Support the NIMES Secretariat and the National Monitoring and Evaluation Technical Working Group (NMETWG) ensure systematic dissemination of evaluation reports and sharing of good practices.	30,000
2.Support Ugandan Evaluation Association to establish communities of practices	20,000



TWENDE MBELE

ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNANCE THROUGH COLLABORATION

based on the sectors to share and learn	
3.Support capacity building of evaluators	15,000
4.Support formation of an accreditation system for evaluators	10,000
5.Support UEA to have a legal mandate to regulate evaluators	10,000
6. Support the establishment of an evaluation tribunal	15,000
7.Support a requirement for foreign evaluators to work with local evaluators to encourage transfer of skills;	10,000
8.Develop a communication strategy to create awareness about the need for evaluation	40,000
9.Support higher training institutions to mainstream monitoring and evaluation in the courses being taught.	30,000
10.Support both government and CSOs to establish Monitoring and Evaluation units/departments in their organizational structures	20,000
11.Support implementation of the National Monitoring and Evaluation policy	30,000
12.Support publication of evaluation reports.	15,000

Annex 2II: Staff Interviewed and Contacts

1. Violet Alinda valinda@twaweza.org
2. Susan Asio susiep112@yahoo.com
3. ROSEMARY WAYA rosemarywaya@yahoo.co.uk
4. suzan akello harrietakello80@gmail.com
5. atukwatse charity atukwatsecharity1@gmail.com



TWENDE MBELE

ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNANCE THROUGH COLLABORATION

6. James Baanabe baanabej@gmail.com
7. Edward Iwanga eddielwanga15@gmail.com
8. Charles Igga Charles_Igga@wvi.org
9. Vincent Ssozi ssoziv@gmail.com
10. Ceaser Kimbugwe ceaser.kimbugwe@wateraid.org
11. Eddie Lwanga eddielwanga15@gmail.com
12. Kato Emanuel ekato@gccu.or.ug
13. Edmond Owor emoworao14@gmail.com
14. Tukesiga Julius jtukesiga@gmail.com
15. Namaga Imelda namelda@yahoo.com
16. Watera Josephine watera.josephine@yahoo.com
17. sheilla mbabazi mbabazi.sheilla1989@gmail.com
18. Yusuf Kiwala kyosseuf2@gmail.com
19. Mutenyo John jmutenyo@gmail.com
20. Mukisa Ibrahim imukisa@gmail.com
21. Wokadara James jwokadara@gmail.com
22. Henray Sebukeera henrichsebs@gmail.com
23. Gerald Kato gerald.kato@ftp.org
24. Nakirya Caroline nakirya@acfode.org
25. John Bbaale jbbaale@gmail.com
26. Denis Muhangi denmuhangi@gmail.com
27. John Bosco Asiimwe asiimwejb@gmail.com
28. SABA MOHAMMED sabahmhayeli@gmail.com
29. Mbabule Derrick mbalulederrick91@gmail.com
30. Patrick Olowo olowopato@gmail.com
31. Edward Baale ebaale@yahoo.com
32. Nick Kilimani nick.kilimani1@gmail.com