

Level of involvement and participation of the project team, partners and stakeholders

Low	Medium	High
Purpose <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › to assess the project's progress › to improve project performance › to inform future decision-making › to provide accountability 	Purpose <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › to assess the project's progress › to improve project performance › to inform future decision-making › to provide accountability 	Purpose <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › to assess the project's progress › to improve project performance › to inform future decision-making › to provide accountability › to build capacity in monitoring and evaluation methods
Methods Use of primary and secondary sources. Extracting information through statistical analysis, documentation review, questionnaires, interviews.	Methods Use of primary and secondary sources. Variety of methods ranging from conventional to open-ended inquiries that are more participatory and interactive testimonials, focus groups, group brainstorming on key impacts, strengths and weaknesses. Reality, claims and issues of stakeholders taken into account.	Methods Use of primary and secondary sources. Some capacity-building in evaluation methods usually involved. Relies on highly interactive qualitative methods but does not disregard quantitative tools. Use of participatory rural appraisal tools, testimonials, semi-structured interviewing. Reality, claims and issues of stakeholders are an integral part of process and outcome.
Evaluation design Planned and implemented by external evaluation expert	Evaluation design Planned with the collaboration of the project team and implemented by the evaluator	Evaluation design Planned and implemented by the project team and stakeholders with the assistance of an outside facilitator
Advantages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › is less burdensome on partners and stakeholders 	Advantages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › may provide more insightful findings › involves project team in reflection and assessment › can provide macro view of project impact because of larger group dynamics versus individual interviewing 	Advantages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › builds monitoring and evaluation capacity › provides greater ownership of final product › combines both large-group and small-group dynamics
Disadvantages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › less engagement and ownership of the evaluation process and findings › greater likelihood of defensiveness/ rejection of critical results 	Disadvantages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › involves more time than an evaluation with a low level of participation 	Disadvantages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › requires more involvement and time of partners and stakeholders › can be more costly
Expertise required Evaluator	Expertise required Evaluator with some expertise in facilitation and participatory and qualitative methods	Expertise required Facilitator with expertise in participatory evaluation and report writing