
**EXTERNAL EVALUATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SCOPING PROJECT:
Findings and Recommendations**

Prepared for

The David and Lucile Packard Foundation

Prepared by

Melinda T. Tuan

P.O. Box 805

Narberth, PA 19072

610-368-1462

mtuan@melindatuan.com

www.melindatuan.com

FINAL PAPER

February 14, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. **OVERVIEW.....4**
 - 1.1. Introduction
 - 1.2. Background
 - 1.3. Methodology

- 2. **KEY FINDINGS:
EXTERNAL EVALUATION ADVISORY COMMITTEES6**
 - 2.1. Scan of External Evaluation Advisory Committees
 - 2.2. Eleven Examples of External Evaluation Advisory Committees
 - 2.3. Four Models
 - 2.4. Significant Differences Between Models
 - 2.5. Two Other Models
 - 2.6. Pros and Cons of Creating an External Evaluation Advisory Committee
 - 2.7. Advice for the Foundation

- 3. **KEY THEMES FROM INTERVIEWS.....13**
 - 3.1. The Evaluation Culture at the Foundation
 - 3.2. The Evaluation Director Position at the Foundation
 - 3.3. Evaluation Advisory Committee Pros
 - 3.4. Evaluation Advisory Committee Cons and Cautions from Foundation Staff
 - 3.5. Evaluation Advisory Committee Cons and Cautions from External Interviews
 - 3.6. Suggestions for Evaluation Advisory Committee Structure
 - 3.7. Advice for the Foundation

- 4. **IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FOUNDATION17**
 - 4.1. Possible Model A Committee
 - 4.2. Limitations on Model B Committee
 - 4.3. Possible Model C Committee
 - 4.4. Possible Model D Committee
 - 4.5. One Alternative Model

- 5. **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FOUNDATION..... 20**
 - 5.1. Create Foundation-Wide External Evaluation and Learning Advisory Committee
 - 5.2. Pilot Program or Initiative-Specific External Evaluation Advisory Committee
 - 5.3. Further Investigate Two Other Models
 - 5.4. Conclusion

- 6. **KEY QUESTIONS FOR THE FOUNDATION24**

- 7. **AUTHORSHIP AND RESEARCH CREDITS25**

APPENDICES

A. Foundation Internal Interview List	26
B. External Interview List	27
C. Foundation Interview Protocol	28
D. External Interview Protocol	30
E. Model A: Initiative-Specific Scope/Evaluation Team Audience Examples	32
F. Model B: Initiative-Specific Scope/Foundation Management Audience Examples	36
G. Model C: Foundation-Wide Scope/Evaluation Team Audience Examples	39
H. Model D: Foundation-Wide Scope/Foundation Management Examples	43
I. Independent Evaluation Group DGE’s External Advisory Group Terms of Reference	46

I. OVERVIEW

“The power dynamic between program and evaluation is a classic problem.”ⁱ

1.1. Introduction

In 2010, Patrizi Associates released the findings from its study of 30-some foundations with a history of strong evaluation use. The study benchmarked foundation practices regarding evaluation functions, responsibilities and how evaluation resources are deployed. The researchers found that demand across foundations is increasing for all evaluative services and products. However, use of evaluation information is most problematic when programs and strategies are “ongoing.” Additionally, most evaluation directors reporting to program expressed greater dissatisfaction with program use of evaluative information and felt their management and board were less supportive of evaluation than those reporting to the CEO or an administrator.ⁱⁱ

For many years now, foundations have “struggled mightily”ⁱⁱⁱ with the structure of the evaluation director position and how best to embrace evaluation as an integral part of effective strategy development and grantmaking within their institutions. One well-regarded evaluation consultant notes, “There is no one model that appears to consistently work...There’s something (in the way), a person thing or a structure thing; they don’t have any power or don’t exercise power, they’re not at the decision-making table.”^{iv} The Patrizi Associates study summed up its findings: “This is not just an evaluation issue, but an organizational challenge requiring the commitment of evaluation, program and management.”^v

In light of these challenges, there is an opportunity to explore other possible means to help foundations deepen their use of evaluative information to inform strategy and increase a culture of learning throughout their organizations. For the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, the key question is: “Other than changing reporting, grant control, or strategy control, is there some way to best balance the implicit power dynamic between programs and evaluation through using some kind of external evaluation advisory committee structure?”^{vi}

1.2. Background

The David and Lucile Packard Foundation (the Foundation) is currently transitioning its evaluation department to new leadership as the evaluation director position has been vacant since January, 2011. As part of this process, the Foundation has affirmed that:

- Its goals for evaluation are, broadly, developmental and formative rather than judgmental and summative
- It will use mixed methods and approaches to monitoring, evaluation and related assessments that fit the needs and goals of specific grantmaking programs/initiatives
- It will structure the execution of evaluation as being co-led between the evaluation director and each of the Foundation’s five program directors
- Ultimate responsibility for strategy development, assessment and refinement lies with the CEO and Board, and on a day-to-day basis the strategic leadership and grantmaking lie with the program directors

With this guidance in mind, the Foundation is interested in exploring models of pursuing monitoring, learning and evaluation goals that best utilize the talent and leadership of both program and evaluation

departments, without making changes to the hierarchy, resources, or control associated with the evaluation director position. Many of the Foundation’s current grant programs and strategies are “ongoing” and there are varying degrees to which programs and sub-programs have integrated the use of evaluation information into their grantmaking strategies.

The Foundation currently employs a total of 100 employees. The evaluation director position reports directly to the Vice President and Director of Programs, along with the five program directors; although four of the five program directors also have straight line reporting to the Foundation president and CEO. The Foundation endowment, which is currently valued at slightly under six billion dollars, supports an annual grants budget of \$235 million and a revolving fund of \$180 million in program-related investments. Each of the program areas invests anywhere from \$200,000 to \$1 million on evaluation annually and the evaluation department currently has a grantmaking budget of \$400,000 and a staffing allocation for 3 FTEs.

In 2011, Chris DeCardy, Vice President and Director of Programs, participated in a quarterly meeting of the Evaluation Advisory Council meeting of the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation. Based upon that experience, he became interested in the possibility of creating a similar external evaluation advisory committee to support and deepen the work of the evaluation director/department at the Foundation.

1.3. Methodology

In October 2011, the Foundation contracted with an independent consultant, Melinda Tuan, to conduct a series of interviews with Foundation staff and trusted external leaders in philanthropy. The purpose of these interviews was to learn how key Foundation staff and leaders in the field view the pros/cons of various models for structuring and supporting evaluation departments and particularly their opinions on the potential creation of an external evaluation advisory committee at the Foundation.

Between October, 2011 and January, 2012, I conducted interviews with 9 Foundation staff, 9 individuals at funding organizations which use an external evaluation advisory committee, and 24 trusted leaders in the field. The following sections summarize the key themes from these interviews and a review of documents pertaining to Foundation evaluation practices.

Please see Appendices A, B, C, and D for a list of internal and external interviewees and interview protocols.

II. KEY FINDINGS: EXTERNAL EVALUATION ADVISORY COMMITTEES

“I think it’s worth doing, regardless of what your set up is. It helps you be smarter, cleverer...It can help you wherever you are.”^{vii}

2.1. Scan of External Evaluation Advisory Committees

Over the course of interviews with forty-two different individuals both internal to the Foundation and external leaders in the philanthropic arena, I identified relatively few examples of foundations that have established an external evaluation advisory committee to aid in their overall evaluation work. These few examples were identified through general networking, a Foundation Center web search, and a post to the GEO listserv requesting names and examples of external evaluation advisory committees. I did not solicit additional examples of nonprofit grantee-specific evaluation advisory committees or internal evaluation advisory teams as the project was focused on foundation-specific efforts to use an external evaluation advisory committee.

2.2. Eleven Examples of External Evaluation Advisory Committees

I identified eight different funders who are currently using some form of an external evaluation advisory committee to inform their evaluation practices. These funders and eleven related examples include:

1. Annie E. Casey Foundation National Evaluation Advisory Team (NEAT) and Cross-Site Survey Advisory Team
2. Colorado Trust evaluation committees
3. Edna McConnell Clark Foundation (EMCF) Evaluation Advisory Council (EAC)
4. First 5 LA
 - Universal Preschool Research Advisory Committee
 - Research Advisory Committee
5. The Forbes Funds Evaluation Advisory Committee
6. Independent Evaluation Group evaluation advisory group
7. Rockefeller Foundation
 - Evaluation Advisory Committee
 - Reference groups
8. Skillman Foundation
 - National Advisory Committee
 - Evaluation and Learning Team

None of the foundations with external evaluation advisory committees are as large as the Packard Foundation, although three—the Rockefeller Foundation, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation—are among the top 75 largest U.S. foundations by asset size. The Colorado Trust and Skillman Foundation both have approximately \$400-450M in assets, whereas The Forbes Funds has \$5M in assets.

With the exception of the Rockefeller Foundation, all the foundations using external evaluation advisory committees are narrowly focused in one overarching program or issue area and sometimes a specific geography. For example, The Annie E. Casey Foundation focuses on children and families; the Colorado Trust on health for Coloradoans; the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation on youth development; the Forbes Funds on capacity building in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and the Skillman Foundation on good

schools and neighborhoods in Detroit, Michigan. Additionally, First 5 LA, which is a child-advocacy organization created by California voters, funds only early childhood development programs by investing the state’s tobacco tax revenues. Aside from Rockefeller, only the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) at the World Bank is evaluating a diversity of program areas, and the World Bank is clearly in a category by itself in terms of structure, governance, size, and mandate.

None of the evaluation advisory committees possess decision-making authority regarding foundation or grantee evaluation practices. They all serve in an advisory capacity and report to the evaluation director and/or foundation management. In the case of First 5 LA and the IEG, the committees also report to the commissioners and a board committee respectively. All of the committees meet between one to four times a year and all but one organization compensates its members for their participation.

A few funders, including the Annie E. Casey Foundation, First 5 LA, and Skillman Foundation have tried different models of external evaluation advisory committees over time as their evaluation advisory needs changed. The Rockefeller Foundation is the only foundation interviewed that is simultaneously using a foundation-wide evaluation advisory committee and program/initiative-specific evaluation advisory committees (reference groups) to help inform its work.

Please see Appendices E, F, G, and H for more detailed information on each of these examples.

2.3. Four Models

The eleven different examples of external evaluation advisory committees can be grouped into four models based on the scope of their work (program initiative-specific vs. foundation-wide) and their primary audience (evaluation director/team vs. foundation management).

The following matrix categorizes each of the external evaluation advisory committee examples into these four different models.

PRIMARY AUDIENCE	Foundation Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Forbes Funds Evaluation Advisory Committee • First 5 LA Universal Preschool Research Advisory Committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edna McConnell Clark Foundation Evaluation Advisory Council • First 5 LA Research Advisory Committee
	Evaluation Director/Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annie E. Casey Foundation National Advisory Team • Rockefeller Foundation reference groups • Colorado Trust evaluation committees • Skillman Foundation evaluation and learning team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rockefeller Foundation Evaluation Advisory Group • Independent Evaluation Group evaluation advisory group • Skillman Foundation National Advisory Committee
		Initiative-Specific	Foundation-Wide
		SCOPE	

The following is a more detailed description of the general characteristics of external evaluation advisory committees that represent each of the four models.

Model A: Initiative-Specific Scope/Evaluation Team Audience

Model A external evaluation advisory committees tend to be ad-hoc in nature, formed by the evaluation director for the purpose of advising the evaluation efforts related to a particular program or initiative. As such, the advisory committee is designed to last only as long as the initiative exists or for the life of the evaluation project. Committee members are recruited primarily for their evaluation methodology expertise in that particular program content area.

For example, in 2002, The Annie E. Casey Foundation formed its National Evaluation Advisory Team (NEAT) in order to provide technical and strategic advice on the cross-site evaluation of its family strengthening/community change demonstration project called Making Connections. This committee of eight members was composed of social science researchers with experience in other community change initiatives and charged with reviewing evaluation plans, survey design and analysis plans for Making Connections.

In some Model A examples, the committee is formed by the evaluation director because the evaluation team has a knowledge deficit in a particular content area they are trying to evaluate. For example, The Rockefeller Foundation forms program area advisory committees or “reference groups” to focus on an area in which the evaluation team lacks expertise, e.g. transportation.

Model B: Initiative-Specific Scope/Foundation Management Audience

Model B external evaluation advisory committees tend to also be ad-hoc in nature, formed by the evaluation director for the purpose of advising the evaluation efforts related to a particular program or initiative. However, in these cases, the audience for the advisory committee’s efforts is the foundation management in addition to the evaluation director. Similar to Model A, these committees are also time limited to the life of program or initiative being evaluated. The goal of these committees tends to be more around building consensus or support for the foundation’s approach to evaluating a program or initiative, and for that purpose the committee members are recruited for their diversity—to represent a variety of constituencies and stakeholders.

For example, First 5 LA initiated its Universal Preschool Research Advisory Committee in 2005 to provide technical input, guidance and advice on early childhood research relevant to Los Angeles and First 5 LA’s strategic plan for universal preschool. The audience for this Research Advisory Committee was First 5 LA management team and the First 5 LA Commissioners which includes members appointed by each of the Los Angeles County Supervisors, the L.A. County Departments of Public Health and Mental Health, and the L.A. County Office of Education. The Universal Preschool Research Advisory Committee served to validate the First 5 LA staff’s evaluation plans before they were presented to the Commissioners.

At The Forbes Funds, the management team created an evaluation advisory committee in 2010 to advise the foundation on their development of a new evaluation system. They were careful to invite committee members from key stakeholders in the Pittsburgh community who would be affected by the new system. Committee members included another foundation CEO and program officer, the CEO of a large nonprofit, a consultant, an academic, and a Forbes Funds board member. This diversity of members provided the foundation with a multitude of perspectives on their evaluation system development and gave them assurance that respected individuals from a variety of fields supported their efforts.

Model C: Foundation-Wide Scope/Evaluation Team Audience

In contrast to Models A and B, Model C committees are designed to be ongoing committees. Model C committees are formed by the evaluation director for the purpose of advising the evaluation team's efforts across the entire foundation. Committee members are recruited from each of the content areas and across evaluation methodologies and philosophies to provide as broad a set of advice as possible while still being relevant to the diversity of the foundation programs being evaluated. A couple evaluation directors who run Model C committees described their external evaluation advisory committees as collegial and serving as a peer-review for their evaluation efforts.

For example, the Managing Director of Evaluation at the Rockefeller Foundation created an Evaluation Advisory Committee in 2009 to provide her with ongoing advice on timely evaluation issues, serve as a sounding board for the politics of evaluation and provide the best intelligence on current trends and practices in evaluation. The Rockefeller Evaluation Advisory Committee consists of four individuals who represent a diversity of geographies and evaluation expertise relevant to the foundation's work, including the former head of evaluation at the World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group, a development economist from India, a results-based management specialist, and a former chair of the African Evaluation Association.

Model D: Foundation-Wide Scope/Foundation Management Audience

Model D external evaluation advisory committees are designed to be ongoing committees that advise the foundation management on foundation-wide evaluation issues. For both of the Model D examples, because the funders focus on a single issue area, the committee members are composed of individuals with content expertise and represent a diversity of evaluation methodologies, philosophies and research areas within that issue area. Each of the Model D examples has a secondary emphasis on staff education; the funder uses the evaluation advisory committee meetings as opportunities to ensure staff are informed about relevant research and evaluation projects in their field.

The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation (EMCF) founded its Evaluation Advisory Council (EAC) in 2000 to advise EMCF management and program staff on grantee evaluation strategies; provide advice on EMCF's theory of investment, goals and strategies; and work directly with grantees on evaluation issues. The original group of four members has grown to six and will likely be upwards of eight committee members by the end of 2012. The committee is composed of high-level evaluation methodologists and professionals with content expertise in EMCF-specific youth development focus areas. EMCF's president participates in every EAC meeting, along with the chief program and strategy officer, portfolio managers and other foundation staff.

It is worth noting that all of these examples of external evaluation advisory committees have between four and eight members serving on the committee, with the exception of First 5 LA which has upwards of thirty individuals serving on its Research Advisory Committee.

2.4. Significant Differences Between Models

In addition to differences in scope, primary audience, and the characteristics of the four models described above, there are several other ways in which the individual external evaluation advisory committee examples differ from each other:

Staffing of external evaluation advisory committee

Most of the external evaluation advisory committees are staffed and run by the evaluation director/team, including the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Colorado Trust (in some instances), Edna McConnell Clark Foundation (EMCF), Independent Evaluation Group at the World Bank, Rockefeller Foundation, and Skillman Foundation.

A few of the examples are staffed and run by consultants. Both Model D examples, EMCF and First 5 LA, relied on consultants to develop and manage their evaluation committees for the first few years. At EMCF, this responsibility was later assumed by the evaluation director, then EMCF's chief program and strategy officer in conjunction with the EAC Board Chair. First 5 LA also relied heavily on consultants to plan and run its Research Advisory Committee meetings in the early years then transitioned the planning function to staff but retains a consultant to facilitate the ongoing meetings. The Colorado Trust (in some instances) and the Skillman Foundation also use consultants to manage their evaluation advisory committees.

In all these cases, interviewees report that using consultants in the early years to plan and implement the evaluation advisory committee meetings helped to build the capacity of staff over time to take on this responsibility. And in some cases, consultants are still charged with facilitating the evaluation advisory meetings to allow the evaluation director and/or management to listen and fully participate in the meetings.

At the Forbes Funds, a staff member plans the evaluation committee meetings but a board member who also serves on the evaluation advisory committee chairs and runs the actual meetings.

Board member participation

A majority of the examples of external evaluation advisory committees do not have board representation on the committee. However, the leadership at The Forbes Funds and the Skillman Foundation decided to have board members participate on their committees for strategic reasons.

At The Forbes Funds, the foundation was developing a brand new evaluation system for the entire foundation and it was important to have a board member participate in and communicate the project and progress to the rest of the board of directors. For the Skillman Foundation, the foundation was launching a new comprehensive community change initiative. Board member involvement ensured that a board member would understand the complexity of the new initiative and the challenges of measurement related to community change, and translate the recommendations of the evaluation advisory committee to the board of directors.

Compensation

All but one of the examples of external evaluation advisory committees (The Forbes Funds) compensates its members for their participation. The forms of compensation for committee members include honoraria, per diem rates, and grants to members' home institutions. Individual honoraria compensation ranges from a low of \$100 per year (Colorado Trust) to a high of \$1,500 plus travel expenses per meeting day (Rockefeller Foundation). Most foundations offer honoraria in the range of \$1,000 per meeting or conference call plus travel expenses. Per diem rates vary widely depending on the individual's daily or hourly bill rates.

Conflict of interest policies

Foundations employ two different approaches regarding conflict of interest policies for external evaluation advisory committee members. A couple foundations, including the Rockefeller Foundation, have a policy whereby individuals serving on the committee cannot be considered as a consultant to or grantee of the foundation, with some special exceptions. One interviewee warns: “You really want good senior people who know what they’re talking about and can give direct, honest feedback, who don’t have a vested interest in the work...Some people tell you what you want to hear because they want to be part of the foundation’s giving.”^{viii}

A couple other foundations, including EMCF and the Skillman Foundation, explicitly contract with members of their external evaluation advisory committee to serve as knowledgeable consultants for the foundation and grantee organizations.

2.5. Two Other Models

Over the course of the interviews with leaders in the field of philanthropy and evaluation, I identified two other potential models for addressing the power dynamic between program and evaluation staff:

Centralized Evaluation Consultant Pool Model

Instead of hiring an evaluation director, Julia Lopez, a former Executive Vice President (EVP) at the Rockefeller Foundation paid a stable of evaluation consultants out of her own budget to work with program areas to develop their theories of change and evaluation plans. Program officers could choose to work with any one of four different evaluation consultants at no expense to their program budget, or they could opt to pay for their own evaluation consultants. According to one person familiar with the model, this created a robust market for evaluative services within the foundation. “She used it as a management tool to manage their performance. It was stunningly good.”^{ix}

Distributed Evaluation Consultant Model

In the 1980s, the Lumina Foundation evaluation director hired content-expertise consultants for each of the foundation’s program areas, and coordinated the efforts of the consultants. The job of these program evaluation consultants was not to conduct the evaluations for each program but rather to develop RFPs, find the appropriate evaluators, and oversee their work.

The first model served as an alternative to hiring an evaluation director and the second involves changes to the evaluation director position’s resources and control. As such, these two models fell outside the scope of this project and I did not investigate them further. It may be beneficial, however, for the Foundation to look into each of these models to better understand what worked well, what could have been improved in these approaches, why the foundations in question ultimately stopped using the particular model, and whether there might be aspects of the model that would be helpful for the Foundation to consider.

2.6. Pros and Cons of Creating an External Evaluation Advisory Committee

Pros

A majority of the individuals I interviewed from foundations that are currently using an external evaluation advisory committee extol the benefits of having such a committee at their foundation:

- Builds credibility for foundation evaluation practices

- Bolsters foundation confidence in evaluation practices
- Provides foundation management and/or evaluation director with a sounding board for evaluation
- Creates a forum for brainstorming around evaluation issues
- Brings field knowledge and learning into the foundation
- Presents a regular staff development opportunity
- Creates external accountability for foundation and program evaluation

While I did interview individuals who manage and serve on evaluation advisory committees, I did not interview program officers at those funders to gain their opinions on the value of these external evaluation advisory committees. This might be an interesting area for further research, especially related to the role of evaluation advisory committees in helping foundations embrace a culture of evaluation.

Cons

A majority of individuals interviewed consistently described one drawback of creating an external evaluation advisory committee which is the significant time and resources required to successfully develop and implement the committee. However, they were all quick to comment that the pros of the evaluation advisory committee far outweigh this con, and that time spent preparing for the meetings is time well-invested for the betterment of the foundation. Several individuals also mentioned a potential con regarding poor selection of committee members, saying “if you have the wrong people then it can be a distraction and not worth the effort;”^x but clarified this was not based on their own experience. When asked to elaborate on characteristics of “the wrong people”, interviewees describe individuals who “grandstand their technical prowess,”^{xi} are “dueling experts,”^{xii} and “don’t play well with others.”

2.7. Advice for the Foundation

Several of the individuals interviewed from foundations with external evaluation advisory committees are very enthusiastic about the prospect of creating such a committee at the Foundation and offer the following advice:

1. Be clear about the purpose of the external evaluation advisory committee
2. Be careful about committee member selection
3. Be sure to appropriately staff and resource the external evaluation advisory committee

III. KEY THEMES FROM INTERVIEWS

For this project, I gleaned information from three categories of individuals, including Foundation staff, trusted leaders in the field, and individuals at funding organizations which employ external evaluation advisory committees. The prior section summarized the themes and recommendations from interviews with the latter group.

The following sections summarize key findings and themes from interviews with Foundation staff and trusted leaders in the field.

3.1. The Evaluation Culture at the Foundation

Many external interviewees acknowledge the Packard Foundation's commitment to and leadership in the field of evaluation, pointing to and specifically praising the development and distribution of the Standards and the Organizational Effectiveness program's Glass Filing Cabinet project. However, external interviewees who are more familiar with the Foundation express concern about a mismatch between the proclaimed commitment to evaluation and the reality within the Foundation. One interviewee observed, "It is clear to me that staff get that the rhetoric is that evaluation is important but there hasn't been a lot standing behind it—any accountability mechanism to really follow through."^{xiii}

Several staff concur with this observation about the culture at the Foundation. One staff says, "Our culture is highly autonomous. If someone says 'evaluation is not for me,' that's kind of okay. There are no great consequences."^{xiv} Another staff member adds, "There has always been an imbalance in evaluation at the Foundation...Today we are seeing more staff comfort with evaluation and more effective evaluations, but it is very dependent on the program director/area."^{xv}

These comments from both external and internal interviewees are consistent with what the Foundation leadership has identified as a key issue; and confirm the impetus for investigating whether the creation of an external evaluation advisory committee might improve the evaluation culture at the Foundation.

3.2. The Evaluation Director Position at the Foundation

A number of external interviewees suggest that one of the causes of the power imbalance between program and evaluation at the Foundation is the existing evaluation director position reporting structure. One interviewee summarizes this concern as follows: "Having this evaluation person reporting two layers down from the CEO is a problem."^{xvi} The evaluation director at the Packard Foundation reports to the Vice President and Director of Programs and does not have dotted line reporting to the CEO as do four of the five program directors. The Patrizi Associates study found that in foundations where evaluation directors report to the CEO as opposed to program, the evaluation function has over twice the staff in FTEs and invests 33%+ more on evaluative information. The study summarizes that having the evaluation director report to program in foundations seems to be associated with less, rather than greater general "buy-in" and evaluation use throughout the foundation.^{xvii}

A couple of staff interviewees comment on the limited resources available to the evaluation director position. One interviewee says: "I feel we need to take a look at how it is structured...It feels like they want to be involved but they have no skin in the game, they only have the power of persuasion. But I may be in the minority in wanting a more robust evaluation department."^{xviii} Another staff questions: "Is one of the issues that our structure is wrong, and we're trying to cover it up with a Band-Aid?"^{xix} These concerns about the proper place of the evaluation director and evaluation function at the Foundation

are consistent with those raised across the field and the general consensus that few foundations have “got it right.” That said, there appear to be some possible benefits to establishing an evaluation advisory committee to help balance the implicit power dynamic between programs and evaluation.

3.3. Evaluation Advisory Committee Pros

Several internal and external interviewees imagine certain benefits associated with creating an external evaluation advisory committee at the Foundation. These benefits include bringing more expertise and peer engagement to the evaluation department; and providing an objective, outside perspective to the Foundation. One staff member suggests “having people who come from fundamentally different approaches to evaluation will enrich conversations at the Foundation level,”^{xx} while another Foundation interviewee states “I like having the opportunity to have more impartial folks less connected to programs, bringing in different perspectives, identifying blind spots.”^{xxi}

Several external interviewees share the opinion that “I always think having an independent group is a good idea,”^{xxii} although one warns that “like anything, it can go bad if not done well.”^{xxiii}

3.4. Evaluation Advisory Committee Cons and Cautions from Foundation Staff

Although a few Foundation staff are interested in the possibility of having more evaluation resources, most of the Foundation staff interviewed are not enthusiastic about the idea of creating a program-specific evaluation advisory committee. These staff express concerns about the workload involved, increased bureaucracy, and lack of relevance to their work.

Workload

One staff member states, “The constraint we face is staff time and bandwidth...Anything like this will have real staff commitments and the only place this will come from is the core work on strategy, with grantees and experts.”^{xxiv} Another internal interviewee echoes this concern and adds, “If we want program officers to make room for this, we need to take something off their plate.”^{xxv}

Increased bureaucracy

A staff member suggests the downside of creating an evaluation advisory committee is that “program officers already feel beholden to the trustees, senior management, and now a committee? It creates layers that work against you. Maybe the evaluation department could handle it and keep program staff out of it...inoculate them against having more layers.”^{xxvi}

Lack of relevance to their work

One interviewee questions the value of evaluation overall asking, “Will this committee improve our strategies? In our experience, for some programs evaluation adds value, for others the transaction costs of interacting with an evaluator are high—program officers spend huge amounts of time to get evaluators up to speed on the program and the evaluation doesn’t tell the program officer more than what s/he already knows.”^{xxvii} Another staff member wonders about the value of creating an evaluation committee saying: “I’m not sure what an evaluation committee would bring. We already work with top evaluators...To be honest my list of cons is larger than my list of pros.”^{xxviii} A couple of staff are also skeptical that any group of evaluation advisors will possess the depth and breadth of content expertise needed to help any single program area much less the entire Foundation.

3.5. Evaluation Advisory Committee Cons and Cautions from External Interviews

A handful of external interviewees express strong concerns about the Foundation creating an external evaluation advisory committee, but for somewhat different reasons than the staff. Their cautions relate

to the challenge of changing the culture of evaluation at the Foundation and potential conflicts of interest among committee members.

The Challenge of Changing the Culture of Evaluation at the Foundation

Several external interviewees believe that if the Foundation does not have a foundation-wide culture of embracing evaluation it is unlikely to address this by creating an external evaluation advisory committee. One person who has a bird's eye view of foundation evaluation practices comments more generally about the challenge of building a foundation culture: "Personally, I think it (an external evaluation advisory committee) is a management cop out...they (foundations) need to build an institutional culture—having outsiders who aren't there won't build a culture inside."^{xxxix} An interviewee who knows the Foundation well questions the value of creating a program-specific evaluation committee at the Foundation saying: "I'm overstating it by saying it's a punt. I just don't know if getting an external group is going to fix the problem they've identified."^{xxx} One additional external interviewee who has consulted to the Foundation observes, "Chris obviously thinks evaluation is important, but if the leadership can't create accountability for the Foundation, is there anything that would tell us that an external advisory committee would? I just fear that program officers will end up resenting it."^{xxxi}

Conflicts of Interest Among Committee Members

A couple of external interviewees feel very strongly that there is no way for evaluation advisory committee members to be objective in their advice for the Foundation. One states, "No matter who you put on that thing, they're all conflicted. It's not in their best interest to completely slam the organization."^{xxxii} Another interviewee reflects on the defensive/protective role of some external committees: "My experience with traditional advisory committees is they are 'CYA' entities."^{xxxiii}

3.6. Suggestions for Evaluation Advisory Committee Structure

Despite both internal and external interviewees' more extensive feedback on the cons rather than the pros of creating an external evaluation advisory committee; many internal and external interviewees offer suggestions for how such a committee might be structured. These recommendations fall into each of the four models of committees detailed earlier, with no real consensus. Most of the staff suggest Model A or B committees, with a program or initiative-specific scope which is not surprising given their focus on programs. Many external interviewees recommend Model C and D committees with a foundation-wide scope in addition to Model A or B committees.

3.7. Advice for the Foundation

Overall, most individuals interviewed offer consistent advice to the Foundation regarding the creation of an external evaluation advisory committee:

- ***Be clear about the purpose of the committee.*** "Management has to decide what the purpose of this group is;"^{xxxiv} "is it because they think it's going to be the most effective way of addressing evaluation within the Foundation? Or because you want to make a public statement? Or because you're trying to, through this evaluation group, affect the practice of evaluation beyond the Packard Foundation? Your answers would lead you to different formations of the group."^{xxxv}
- ***"Keep it small,"***^{xxxvi} between four and eight members
- ***Select committee members carefully.*** "Choose people who don't need to posture with one another; who see each other as peers; who can set aside the idea or possibility of getting the next Packard contract."^{xxxvii}
- ***Staff and resource the committee appropriately***

Several people suggest the decision to create an external evaluation advisory committee at the Foundation be based on the skill set (strengths in evaluation vs. strategy) of the new evaluation director. Some other people insist creating an external evaluation advisory committee will be beneficial to the Foundation regardless of the evaluation director’s skill set.

A few people also strongly urge the Foundation to let the new evaluation director make the decision about whether and how to create the external evaluation advisory committee, saying: “Ultimately I think this department should have some say about whether they want an external evaluation advisory committee or not,”^{xxxviii} and “I wouldn’t want to saddle a new evaluation director with a new process; I’d want that person to decide whether or not it would be useful.”^{xxxix}

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FOUNDATION

Based on the findings from the external evaluation advisory committee examples and interviews with both Foundation staff and external individuals, there are several options the Foundation might consider if it decides to move forward to create an external evaluation advisory committee.

4.1. Possible Model A Committee

While many Foundation staff interviewees are not enthusiastic about creating a program-specific external evaluation advisory committee, a couple program staff express keen interest in having more evaluation resources for their program and/or sub-programs. The Foundation may want to pilot a Model A committee with program-content specific experts in evaluation to meet this demand from interested programs. One program staff envisions this committee serving as “an evaluation thought partner through the life of a five-year program,” adding, “The evaluation director could work with the program director to manage this program level advisory group.”^{xl} This approach, however, would not address the issue of furthering an evaluative culture throughout the Foundation, although it is possible that if each successive program area embraces the idea of using an evaluation advisory committee the culture might eventually pervade the Foundation.

4.2. Limitations on Model B Committee

It is worth noting that the two examples in the Model B quadrant (initiative-specific scope, foundation management audience) are moving away from a program or initiative-specific scope into the D quadrant to address foundation-wide issues. First 5 LA originally founded a research advisory committee to focus solely on universal preschool evaluation issues. After several years of running this program-specific research advisory committee, they found the committee so beneficial to First 5 LA that they decided to disband the original committee and rebuild a research advisory committee to expand its scope to address all of its programs. In a similar manner, The Forbes Fund started out with an initiative-focus and an ad hoc committee, but is now planning to recast the evaluation advisory committee as an ongoing entity to address evaluation issues for the entire foundation.

Given the more singular issue area foci of both The Forbes Funds and First 5 LA, moving from a Model B to a Model D committee was more of a natural progression. In contrast, for a foundation like Rockefeller which has more diverse program areas, it has made more sense to have two separate, simultaneous external evaluation advisory committees as discussed below. As the Packard Foundation is more similar in program diversity to Rockefeller than First 5 LA or The Forbes Fund, Model B may not be the best structure for the Foundation to follow in creating an external evaluation advisory committee.

4.3. Possible Model C Committee

Of all the foundations that have an external evaluation advisory committee, the Rockefeller Foundation is the funder most similar to the Packard Foundation given the scale and diversity of its program areas. While the World Bank clearly has a different scale and structure than the Packard Foundation, its funding areas are also diverse, and its Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) evaluation advisory group is, similar to Rockefeller, commissioned to look at higher order evaluation issues across the World Bank activities (Please see Appendix I for the IEG evaluation advisory group’s Terms of Reference).

Both of these funders employ a Model C Committee with the evaluation director team as the main audience. The Rockefeller Foundation also uses Model A committees or “reference groups” to address

program or initiative-specific evaluation issues in addition to its Model C committee. A couple interviewees suggest this dual approach might work well for the Foundation. They observe, “If we have evaluation advisory committees, we need both: The first committee could advise the evaluation director on larger macro issues. The second committee could be schooled in program-specific evaluation challenges, more familiar with the content area, and more helpful to individual program areas.”^{xli}

While both model C or a dual Model C and A approaches have their merits, one Foundation interviewee observes that “having the evaluation director go off and engage only with program staff does not make sense to me.”^{xlii} This practice may serve to further silo the evaluation’s department work from the rest of the Foundation and would not help expand and reinforce an evaluative culture throughout the organization.

4.4. Possible Model D Committee

The two funders in the D quadrant both focus on a single issue area. The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation’s (EMCF) grantmaking is devoted to youth development and all of First 5 LA’s funding is invested in early childhood development. One external interviewee notes, “The thing EMCF has going for it is they’re so focused. Evaluation is easier for them, it’s like running one program whereby they can get people with the same content expertise and then diversify by methodological expertise.”^{xliii}

Because of this focus, these two examples of the Model D Committee—with a foundation-wide scope and foundation management audience—may have committee structures that are not easily transferable to the Packard Foundation and its diversity of program areas. Several interviewees, both internal and external, predict it will be difficult for the Foundation to engage a committee of evaluation experts with enough depth and breadth to advise on individual evaluations across the five program areas and 22 sub-program areas to be useful to the foundation as a whole.

That said, one internal staff suggests there is “value to having a foundation-wide evaluation advisory committee because we need a way to assimilate learning across programs...We don’t do enough of that kind of synthesizing and distilling at the Foundation.”^{xliv} Another Foundation interviewee adds: “The evaluation advisory committee could play a role in reviewing program strategy and look at the work we’re doing and the work of evaluators on a macro level across all our program areas.”^{xlv}

4.5. One Alternative Model

A couple external interviewees who know the Foundation well suggest an alternative model for the Foundation which is a variation on the Model D committee. This alternative model is an external evaluation and *learning* advisory committee with a foundation-wide scope and foundation management audience. The primary focus of this committee would be to examine cross-cutting evaluation issues across the five program areas and discuss the implications for strategy and further evaluation practices at the Foundation. The secondary goal of this committee would be to educate staff about best practices in integrating strategy and evaluation and using evaluative information to inform practice. One external interviewee suggests, “the committee could opine and keep the Foundation up to date on trends in the field and key issues.”^{xlvi}

Membership would include four to eight external members with strengths in strategy and evaluation. Foundation leadership, including Carol Larson, President and CEO; Chris DeCardy, Vice President and Director of Programs; and the program directors and evaluation director, would participate in each meeting, along with specific program staff if appropriate to the meeting topic(s). The focus of the committee’s work would not be on individual program evaluation methodologies but rather on

foundation-wide evaluation issues, and cross-cutting practices in evaluation and strategy development across the various programs and sub-programs.

One external interviewee suggests minimizing the burden on program directors/officers and instilling a greater sense of importance around using evaluation to inform practice by having “this group report to Chris...Chris would be the authority to invite the members, request their outside input, meet with them regularly...This would also allow the evaluation person to maintain a collegial supportive coaching relationship with program officers.”^{xlvii}

Overall, this alternative model of an evaluation and learning advisory committee may have the greatest potential impact on expanding and reinforcing an evaluative culture at the Foundation, with relatively low barriers to adoption and administrative burden for program staff.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FOUNDATION

I believe there are significant potential benefits associated with creating some type of external evaluation advisory committee for the Foundation if the purpose for the committee is clear; the committee is well-staffed, resourced, and managed; and the Foundation engages the right people to join the committee.

5.1. Create Foundation-Wide External Evaluation and Learning Advisory Committee

I recommend the Foundation consider creating a foundation-wide scope and foundation management audience (variation on Model D) committee with a focus on evaluation and *learning*. I suggest the Foundation establish this committee with the following purpose, scope, audience, and structure, and membership:

Purpose

- Advise Foundation management and program staff on Foundation strategy evaluation
- Engage/educate program staff on integration of strategy and evaluation

Scope

- Foundation-wide
- Emphasis on learning through evaluation and evaluating strategy

Audience

- Foundation management (e.g. CEO, VP, Program Directors)
- Program officers depending on meeting topic

Structure

- Pilot committee with an initial two-year term
- Half-to-whole day meetings, three to four times a year
- Compensate members for their participation

Membership

- Four to eight well-respected individuals with expertise in strategy/learning with significant knowledge of evaluation (vs. specific expertise in evaluation methodology or research), who know the Foundation well enough and have the stature to provide peer-level insights to Carol and Chris and the rest of the program executive team
- Foundation management and program director participation

I concur with the strong opinion of several interviewees that the new evaluation director should ultimately decide whether and how to create an external evaluation advisory committee. If the evaluation director and the Foundation management choose to go in this direction, I recommend that Chris DeCardy, Vice President and Director of Programs serve as primary champion for the committee in partnership with the evaluation director to give the committee more heft. In addition, Carol Larson, President and CEO of the Foundation should attend committee meetings along with the five program directors and evaluation director. One external interviewee who knows the Foundation well states, “Based on what I know of Packard, it is critical that Carol be on the committee, or attend the meetings, to address the power and frustration issue with the evaluation director role, and demonstrate executive ownership and buy-in.”^{xlviii}

Committee Staffing

Given the lean staffing structure at the Foundation, it may be helpful to use a consultant to help plan and develop the committee as well as facilitate the actual meetings to ensure the Foundation management can fully participate in the meeting discussions. Over time, as with other foundation examples discussed earlier, the consultant could transition the responsibilities for organizing the meetings to a Foundation staff person but perhaps continue in a facilitative role during the meetings.

Board Participation

Depending on the purpose and content of the external evaluation and learning advisory committee, it may or may not be helpful to have board member participation. For example, if the agenda is to discuss an overall change in the Foundation's approach to evaluation, it may be useful to have a board member participate and serve as a liaison to the board of directors.

Conflict of Interest Policy

The Foundation may not want to limit itself from benefiting from the consultative services of its committee members by developing a no conflict of interest policy. The key question for the Foundation to consider is whether specific potential committee members are likely to provide the objective advice and honest feedback desired if they know they also might be hired or funded by the Foundation. One external interviewee describes this challenge: "One of the hard things about being in a foundation is people won't tell you the truth. This group has to..."^{xlix} A careful and frank assessment of each potential committee candidate may yield some fruitful revelations on this topic.

Possible Meeting Agenda Items

The Foundation will want to devise criteria by which agenda items will be selected for discussion at the External Evaluation and Learning Advisory Committee meetings. Some possible criteria and agenda items include:

- Cross-program evaluation issues (e.g. similarities between evaluation practices at program X and program Y)
- Foundation-wide evaluation practices (e.g. revisiting the dashboards, revising the Standards to better meet needs of ongoing strategies vs. new strategies)
- Foundation-wide strategy evaluation practices (e.g. benchmarking Packard practices against other similar sized and diverse foundations)

In addition to all these considerations regarding purpose, scope, structure and content, one external interviewee urges the Foundation to remember: "One of the signatures of a successful advisory committee is that the advisors have chemistry with one another and enjoy the group...It's fun to talk with smart people who you enjoy spending time with."^l

5.2. Pilot Model A External Evaluation Advisory Committee

In addition, but not necessarily at the same time, the Foundation should consider piloting a program-specific external evaluation advisory committee for a larger, long-term initiative of the Foundation as desired by the program director or officer and new evaluation director. This type of initiative-specific/evaluation team audience committee could be a natural outgrowth of the needs and opportunities identified by the new evaluation and learning advisory committee over time and could serve as a pilot for other program areas.

5.3. Further Investigate Two Other Models

It may also be of value to further investigate the two other models briefly outlined in section 2.5. of this paper. While these models would require changes in evaluation resources, hierarchy and reporting, it may be worthwhile better understanding what aspects of these models worked for the foundations in question and why they stopped using these models.

5.4. Conclusion

Based on a review of existing research, my experience consulting with foundations on evaluation and strategy, and the forty-two Foundation and field interviews I conducted for this project, it is clear that many foundations struggle with how best to embrace evaluation as an integral part of effective strategy development and grantmaking within their institutions. Very few foundations have solved the problem of balancing the power between program and evaluation or cultivating a foundation-wide culture of using evaluative information to inform foundation strategy and practice.

That said, there are some examples of foundations that are successfully employing external evaluation advisory committees to not only improve their evaluation practices for particular programs but to address foundation-wide evaluation issues. The vast majority of individuals interviewed from the eight funders with external evaluation advisory committees recommend the Packard Foundation join them in creating such a committee. They extol the benefits of having an objective, outside body to provide evaluation advice and a sounding board, build credibility and confidence in evaluation at the foundation, present learning and professional development opportunities for staff, and create external accountability for foundation and program evaluation.

At the same time, a majority of Foundation staff interviewed express very real concerns about creating an evaluation advisory committee, citing stresses on staff time and resources to manage and participate in a program-specific committee and questioning the relevance of additional evaluation advice. External interviewees, on balance, also express concerns about the benefits of creating an evaluation committee, cautioning the Foundation against developing an external body that may not change the internal culture and/or may end up as a bureaucratic rubber stamp.

However, several staff and a handful of external interviewees who know the Foundation well believe creating an external evaluation and *learning* advisory committee focused on foundation-wide evaluation and strategy issues and engaging the foundation management and staff has great promise. Given the Foundation's stated plan to keep the evaluation director position unchanged with regard to hierarchy, resources, and reporting structure; I believe this new model of an external evaluation and learning advisory committee may be the Foundation's best chance to address the underlying power dynamic between program and evaluation and move the foundation-wide culture toward embracing the use of evaluation to inform practice.

If after two years, the Foundation has not realized the expected benefits of the committee, management can disband the committee and share the lessons learned to contribute to knowledge in the field. I am, however, cautiously optimistic about the potential positive impact of creating an external evaluation and learning advisory committee at the Foundation.

In summary, as one external interviewee who knows the Foundation well states, “This body of outside advisors on evaluation and learning could be a good thing...But this group would need to serve Chris and Carol at the center...It’s the best way to keep the evaluation director on the side of the team developing evaluations, have a true external check on the quality and rigor of evaluation, and strengthen the function of evaluation at the Foundation.”^{li}

VI. KEY QUESTIONS FOR FOUNDATION PROGRAM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND REFLECTION

After reviewing the content and recommendations in this paper, it may be useful for the members of the Foundation program executive committee to consider and discuss the following five questions:

- 1. What is the purpose for creating an evaluation advisory committee?**
- 2. Who is the primary audience for the committee?**
- 3. What is the appropriate scope (foundation-wide or initiative-specific) for the work of the committee?**
- 4. What key concerns or challenges do you anticipate related to creating an evaluation advisory committee?**
- 5. How might the Foundation address these concerns and challenges?**

Depending on the answers to these questions, the Foundation may then decide whether or not to create any type of external evaluation advisory committee.

VII. AUTHORSHIP AND RESEARCH CREDITS

This report was written and researched by Melinda T. Tuan.

Melinda is an independent consultant who works with the senior leadership of philanthropic organizations to research and create content regarding strategies for thoughtful and effective philanthropy. In addition to her current work with the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Melinda serves as a Senior Fellow at the Center for High Impact Philanthropy. Melinda has also served as a Senior Fellow with Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors and a Special Advisor to Bridgestar/The Bridgespan Group. Other clients include the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Grantmakers for Effective Organizations and the Eagles Youth Partnership, the philanthropic arm of the Philadelphia Eagles Football Team.

Previously, Melinda co-founded and managed REDF (formerly The Roberts Enterprise Development Fund) with Jed Emerson and George Roberts of KKR. REDF is a social venture capital fund that works with a portfolio of nonprofit organizations employing formerly homeless and low-income individuals in market-based business ventures. While at REDF, Melinda invested in a portfolio of fifteen nonprofit organizations running over thirty different businesses employing over 2,000 formerly homeless and low-income individuals over a seven-year period. In addition, she coordinated the design and development process for REDF's social return on investment (SROI) framework, and managed the development of REDF's ongoing assessment of social impacts (OASIS).

Prior to REDF, Melinda was a manager at a national healthcare nonprofit and a management consultant specializing in growth strategies for Fortune 500 companies. Melinda has volunteered with numerous community-based organizations in Honolulu, Boston, and the San Francisco Bay Area that serve homeless and very low-income populations. Additionally, she co-founded Boston Cares, a nonprofit volunteer service organization, and was involved in the start-up of a social-mission driven company called Dayspring Technologies in San Francisco.

Melinda is recognized nationally for her work in foundation effectiveness, evaluation, high engagement philanthropy, nonprofit capacity-building, and social enterprise. She has lectured at leading business schools in the country including Stanford and Wharton, and published articles, business school cases, and a book chapter entitled "Cultivating a Culture of Measurement" in *Funding Effectiveness* by Grantmakers for Effective Organizations. Melinda currently serves on the Board of Managers for Evergreen Lodge, a social-purpose destination resort located just outside Yosemite National Park, and the Advisory Council for REDF.

Melinda graduated from Harvard University *magna cum laude* with an AB in Social Studies focusing on urban poverty and homelessness and she holds an MBA and certificate in nonprofit management from the Stanford Graduate School of Business. She resides in Narberth, Pennsylvania with her husband and three children.

APPENDIX A: DAVID AND LUCILE PACKARD FOUNDATION INTERVIEW LIST

- Christie Callenback, Evaluation Associate, Evaluation
- Lester Coutinho, Program Officer, Population and Reproductive Health
- Chris DeCardy, Vice President and Director of Programs
- Gene Lewit, Program Officer and Manager, Children, Families, and Communities
- Meera Mani, Director, Children, Families, and Communities
- Kathy Reich, Program Officer, Organizational Effectiveness & Philanthropy
- Walt Reid, Director, Conservation and Science
- Mary Anne Rodgers, General Counsel
- Irene Wong, Director, Local Grantmaking

APPENDIX B: EXTERNAL INTERVIEW LIST

- Gale Berkowitz, Director of Evaluation and Learning, The MasterCard Foundation
- Hans-Martin Boehmer, Senior Manager, IEGCS, World Bank
- Paul Brest, President, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
- Phil Buchanan, President, Center for Effective Philanthropy
- Julia Coffman, Senior Consultant, Harvard Family Research Project
- Marie Colombo, Senior Program Officer for Knowledge Management, The Skillman Foundation
- Kyle Crawford, Evaluation System Designer, Forbes Funds
- Nancy Csuti, Director of Research, Evaluation and Strategic Planning, Colorado Trust
- Alexa Culwell, Strategic Advisor, Transformative Philanthropy and Social Change
- Stuart Davidson, Partner, Labrador Ventures
- Kathleen Enright, President and CEO, Grantmakers for Effective Organizations
- Kelly Fitzsimmons, Chief Program and Strategy Officer, Edna McConnell Clark Foundation
- David Hunter, Principal, Hunter Consulting LLC
- Armando Jimenez, Director of Research and Evaluation, First 5 LA
- Tom Kelly, Associate Director for Evaluation, Annie E. Casey Foundation
- Julie King, Director, Executive Search, The Bridgespan Group
- Steven LaFrance, Principal, LFA Group
- Murray Lamond, Director, Presidential Communications, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
- Cindy Esposito Lamy, Manager, Metrics, Robin Hood Foundation
- Rebekah Levin, Director of Evaluation and Learning, McCormick Foundation
- Nancy MacPherson, Managing Director, Evaluation, Rockefeller Foundation
- Kristin Moore, EMCF EAC; Senior Scholar and past president, Child Trends
- Patti Patrizi, Patrizi Associates
- Ed Pauly, Director of Evaluation, Wallace Foundation
- Elizabeth Singleton, Impact Planning and Analysis Officer, Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation
- Brad Smith, Executive Director, Foundation Center
- Daniel Stid, Partner, The Bridgespan Group
- Susan Stout, Retired Manager, World Bank Results Secretariat
- Carol Ting, Director, Impact Planning and Analysis, Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation
- Rosanna Tran, Program Officer, Research and Evaluation, California Healthcare Foundation
- Lauren Tulp, Impact Planning and Analysis Associate, Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation
- Fay Twersky, Senior Fellow, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
- Kathleen Yazbak, Partner, The Bridgespan Group

APPENDIX C: FOUNDATION INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

David and Lucile Packard Foundation
Evaluation Advisory Committee Assessment Project
Internal Stakeholder Interviews

Person to be interviewed, title David and Lucile Packard Foundation
--

Date
Time

Overall Objectives

The objectives of the Foundation internal interviews are to:

Better understand how key Foundation staff are involved with evaluation efforts at the Foundation
Learn how key Foundation staff view the pros/cons of various models for structuring and supporting evaluation, including the creation of an Evaluation Advisory Committee

Introduction to Interview

Hello. My name is Melinda Tuan and I am working with Chris DeCardy and Christie Callenback on a project to explore and assess the utility of an evaluation advisory committee or some form of it for the Foundation. Thank you for taking the time today to speak with me.

Before we begin, I would like to give you a brief background as to the purpose of this interview.

As you know, the Foundation is currently transitioning its Evaluation department to new leadership. As part of that process, I am working with Chris and Christie to explore models of pursuing monitoring, learning and evaluation goals that best utilize the talent and leadership of both program and evaluation departments. In particular, we are interested in the potential to create some kind of Evaluation Advisory Committee as a vehicle to ensure such best practice.

What I'd like to do today is ask you a series of questions about your involvement with evaluation efforts to date; benefit from your advice as to how the Foundation should plan for supporting future collaborative evaluation efforts between program and evaluation; and gain your perspectives on the pros and cons of and how to create an evaluation advisory committee at the Foundation.

I will be taking notes during our conversation which will be shared without attribution with the senior leadership at the Foundation. If I decide to quote you, I will ask your permission in advance. This interview should take about 45 minutes. Do you have any questions before we begin?

1. Opening question

Please tell me a little bit about your role at the Foundation and how you have been involved with evaluation efforts at the Foundation to date.

2. Engage interviewee on evaluation advisory committee scoping project questions

What are some examples of how the program and evaluation departments have successfully pursued the Foundation’s monitoring, learning and evaluation goals together?

What are some of the barriers to the Foundation successfully pursuing its monitoring, learning and evaluation goals?

What do you think the Foundation can do to overcome these barriers in support of its monitoring, learning and evaluation goals?

What do you think about creating an evaluation advisory committee to support the efforts of the program and evaluation departments? (probe: pros and cons)

What advice do you have regarding how such an evaluation advisory committee should be created? (probe: structure, representation, frequency of meeting, interaction with staff)

Whom else do you think we should interview to help inform this project? (probe: are there other foundations/experts you think we should speak with?)

3. Closing questions

Are there any other questions we should be asking regarding how to best support evaluation work at the Foundation going forward?

Is there anything else you’d like to add?

Close

Thank you very much for your time. If I have further questions, may I contact you again?

Follow-up: Send thank you email.

APPENDIX D: EXTERNAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

David and Lucile Packard Foundation
Evaluation Advisory Committee Assessment Project
External Stakeholder Interviews
Interview protocol

Person to be interviewed, title, organization
--

Date
Time

Overall Objectives

The objectives of the external interviews are to:

Learn from key external individuals who are familiar with the Foundation regarding the significant barriers to supporting evaluation at foundations; the best foundation models for supporting evaluation efforts; the pros/cons of those models; and their recommendations for how to best support evaluation at the Foundation

Learn how key external individuals view the pros/cons of and recommendations on structuring and creating an Evaluation Advisory Committee at the Foundation

Introduction to Interview

Hello. My name is Melinda Tuan and I am working with Chris DeCardy at the Packard Foundation on a project to explore and assess the utility of an evaluation advisory committee or some form of it for the Foundation. Thank you for taking the time today to speak with me.

Before we begin, I would like to give you a brief background as to the purpose of this interview.

As you may know, the Foundation is currently transitioning its Evaluation department to new leadership. As part of that process, I am working with Chris to explore models of pursuing monitoring, learning and evaluation goals that best utilize the talent and leadership of both program and evaluation departments. In particular, we are interested in the potential to create some kind of Evaluation Advisory Committee as a vehicle to ensure such best practice.

What I'd like to do today is ask you a series of questions about your involvement with foundation evaluation efforts to date; gain your perspectives on the barriers to supporting evaluation at foundations and the most successful foundation models to address those barriers; and benefit from your advice as to the pros and cons of and how and whether to create an evaluation advisory committee at the Foundation.

I will be taking notes during our conversation which will be shared without attribution with the senior leadership at the Foundation. If I decide to quote you, I will ask your permission in advance. This interview should take about 45 minutes. Do you have any questions before we begin?

1. Opening question

Please tell me a little bit about how you've been involved with evaluation efforts at foundations.

Please tell me how you have been involved with the Packard Foundation to date and particularly evaluation activities?

2. Engage interviewee on evaluation advisory committee scoping project questions

What are some of the barriers you see foundations face in successfully pursuing their monitoring, learning and evaluation goals? (probe: structural/organizational issues, content expertise, power dynamic between program and evaluation, tools, other)

What do you think foundations can do to overcome these barriers in support of their monitoring, learning and evaluation goals?

What foundation models have you seen that are successful in utilizing the talent and leadership of both the program and evaluation departments to pursue the foundation's monitoring, learning and evaluation goals? (probe: use of content experts, EMCF EAC example, pros and cons of models)

Given what you know about the Packard Foundation, which, if any of these models might be appropriate for the Foundation to explore?

What do you think about creating an evaluation advisory committee to support the efforts of the program and evaluation departments at the Foundation? (probe: pros and cons)

What advice do you have regarding whether and how to create an evaluation advisory committee? (probe: structure, representation, frequency of meeting, interaction with staff, other)

Whom else do you think we should interview to help inform this project? (probe: are there other foundations/experts you think we should speak with? Other relevant fields that use an advisory committee/panel?)

3. Closing questions

Are there any other questions we should be asking regarding how to best support evaluation work at the Foundation going forward?

Is there anything else you'd like to add?

Close

Thank you very much for your time. If I have further questions, may I contact you again?

Follow-up: Send thank you email.

APPENDIX D: MODEL A: INITIATIVE-SPECIFIC SCOPE / EVALUATION TEAM AUDIENCE

- Annie E. Casey Foundation National Evaluation Advisory Team
- Rockefeller Foundation reference groups—Rockefeller uses program area specific evaluation advisory committees addressing issues where the evaluation team might not have expertise, e.g. transportation. These are ad-hoc, only for the life of the evaluation, maybe 6 months to a year. Whoever from the evaluation team is managing the evaluation runs the reference group, not the program staff.
- Colorado Trust evaluation committees
- Skillman Foundation Evaluation and Learning Team

Organization	Annie E. Casey Foundation \$2.5B assets, foster public policies, human-service reforms, and community supports that more effectively meet the needs of today’s vulnerable children and families
Format	National Evaluation Advisory Team (NEAT) Cross-Site Survey Advisory Team
Purpose	Provide technical and strategic advice on the cross-site evaluation of Making Connections Provide technical advice on cross-site survey of Making Connections
Primary audience	Internal Foundation evaluation team and evaluation consultants
Founded	2002 Founded NEAT 2003 National advisory team was replaced by an ongoing cross-site survey advisory team
Number of members	8 in NEAT 10-11 cross-site survey advisory team (some overlap with NEAT members)
Type of members	Social science researchers with experience in other community change initiatives (university based, think tank based)
Terms of membership	Unspecified
Frequency of meetings	Annual/semiannual for NEAT broader evaluation Every other month for cross-site survey advisory team
Length of meetings	All day for annual NEAT meetings 2-4 hours for cross-site survey advisory team meetings
Content of meetings	Review of evaluation plans, survey design, and analysis plans for NEAT Review of survey data for cross-site survey advisory team
Expectations for work between meetings	Occasional review of additional products
Reporting structure/authority	Report to Casey staff person leading the evaluation/cross site survey
Compensation	Grants to researchers home institutions; daily stipends to others
Time to manage committee	Less for NEAT Significant for cross-site survey advisory team
Pros	NEAT: External advice and consulting from researchers with broad experience in evaluating community change and analyzing complex data For cross-site survey advisory: regular meetings with the actual implementers and analysts
Cons	For NEAT: Managing the level of interaction between higher order framing (not requiring ongoing attention/advice) and implementation issues not appropriate for an advisory group made of researchers

Source: Tom Kelly, Associate Director for Evaluation, Annie E. Casey Foundation

Organization	Colorado Trust \$ 411M assets, health care conversion foundation, focus on access to health for all Coloradans
Format	Evaluation committees
Purpose	Serve as peer review for interpreting results of large project evaluations; provide independent voice to evaluation officers on results; bring content expertise (program officers are generalists); ensure fidelity of communications on findings.
Primary audience	Director of Research, Evaluation & Strategic Learning
Founded	Ongoing, ten evaluation committees to date
Number of members	Varies by committee
Type of members	Program content and evaluation experts
Terms of membership	Duration of project, typically 3-4 years
Frequency of meetings	Ad-hoc: at beginning of project 1-2 meetings/year; more meetings when evaluation data come in
Length of meetings	Varies by committee
Content of meetings	Beginning – devise evaluation measures Middle of project – review results End of project – ensure fidelity of communications of evaluation findings
Expectations for work between meetings	None
Reporting structure/authority	Director of Research, Evaluation & Strategic Learning or consultant runs evaluation committee meetings
Compensation	Honorarium, \$100/year (up to \$500 a year)
Time to manage committee	“Very time consuming”
Pros	Balance power dynamic with program officers who are primarily advocates for grantees Balance power dynamic with communications department
Cons	Time consuming

Source: Nancy Csuti, Director of Research, Evaluation & Strategic Learning, Colorado Trust

Organization	Skillman Foundation \$450M assets, focused on good schools and neighborhoods in Detroit, MI
Format	Evaluation and Learning Team-ongoing, cadre of six evaluators
Purpose	Help evaluation officer and evaluation and learning implement evaluation and learning plan for foundation, evaluate components of the initiatives
Primary audience	Evaluation officer
Founded	2010
Number of members	Foundation senior program officer, evaluation coach, evaluation consultant plus six researchers
Type of members	Evaluation experts in school reform, neighborhood development, organizational capacity building, learning organization, and systems and policy change
Terms of membership	One year
Frequency of meetings	One group meeting
Length of meetings	One 1-1/2 day analysis session
Content of meetings	To synthesize findings from the individual evaluations
Expectations for work between meetings	None
Reporting structure/authority	Evaluation officer runs meetings
Compensation	Per diem and travel expenses
Time to manage committee	Foundation officer managed evaluators—consultant managed analysis synthesis meeting
Pros	Could point to external evaluation advisory group when meeting with trustees; built credibility given lack of experience with evaluation and philanthropy
Cons	If not clear about purpose, or get wrong people (who dominate conversations and go off track) then can be distraction and not worth the effort

Source: Marie Colombo, Senior Program Officer for Knowledge Management, Skillman Foundation

APPENDIX E: MODEL B: INITIATIVE-SPECIFIC SCOPE / FOUNDATION MANAGEMENT AUDIENCE

- The Forbes Funds Evaluation Advisory Committee
- First 5 LA Universal Preschool Research Advisory Committee

Organization	The Forbes Funds \$5M endowment, approximately \$600,000 annual grantmaking, (four staff), funds capacity-building projects with human service and community development organizations, conducts research, builds sector leadership
Format	Evaluation Advisory Committee
Purpose	Advise foundation on development of new evaluation system
Primary audience	Foundation leadership and staff
Founded	2011
Number of members	6
Type of members	Another foundation CEO, another foundation senior program officer, CEO of large nonprofit organization, CEO of consulting firm, academic, Forbes Funds board member
Terms of membership	Initially ad-hoc for 2 meetings; will continue for at least 4 more meetings and may become Quality Assurance Committee to assess The Forbes Funds' evaluation work in ongoing manner
Frequency of meetings	Quarterly
Length of meetings	1.5 hours
Content of meetings	Update on progress Gain feedback on new aspects of evaluation system
Expectations for work between meetings	None; Possible follow-up meetings or phone calls regarding specific evaluation pieces
Reporting structure/authority	Foundation board member runs meetings and provides communication between board of directors, foundation advisory committee, and evaluation advisory committee
Compensation	None
Time to manage committee	Approximately 10 hours each quarter
Pros	Provides foundation with multitude of perspectives on evaluation system development and assurance that respected people from variety of fields support what you are doing; invaluable sounding board
Cons	None

Source: Kyle Crawford, Evaluation Intern, The Forbes Funds

Organization	First 5 LA: Invests tobacco tax revenues in programs for improving the lives of children in Los Angeles County, from prenatal through age 5; since 1998 invested over \$699M
Format	2005 Universal Preschool Research Advisory Committee
Purpose	Primary: Provide technical input, guidance and advice to First 5 LA on early childhood research relevant to Los Angeles and First 5 LA's strategic plan for Universal Preschool Secondary: Help First 5 LA staff stay informed about relevant research and evaluation projects happening locally and nationally, as well as potential partnership opportunities
Primary audience	First 5 LA management and staff, First 5 LA Commissioners
Founded	2005 – Universal Preschool Research Advisory Committee
Number of members	28 members
Type of members	Locally and nationally recognized researchers with varied expertise in methodology and content areas children's health and safety, early childhood education, development, psychology and social, economic, cultural and political issues
Terms of membership	3 year-term
Frequency of meetings	2005 – Two to three times a year
Length of meetings	2005 – 2 days
Content of meetings	Discuss methodology and measurement challenges, research-to-practice, research-to-policy strategies, and dissemination approaches for findings as they emerge
Expectations for work between meetings	Ad-hoc two-hour conference calls for select members of the RAC
Reporting structure/authority	RAC makes suggestions (not formal recommendations) to First 5 LA staff who then make recommendations to the First 5 LA Commission
Compensation	\$1,000 plus travel expenses for each meeting or conference call
Time to manage committee	.5 FTE consultant manages and facilitates RAC meetings and calls
Pros	Provide validation for research design and methodology, far outweighs the cons
Cons	Hard to pull together, "Staff say organizing the RAC is more complicated and causes more anxiety than planning a wedding."

Source: <http://www.first5la.org/Community-Change/Research-Partnerships/Research-Advisory-Committee>; Armando Jimenez, Director of Research and Evaluation, First 5 LA

APPENDIX F: MODEL C: FOUNDATION-WIDE SCOPE / EVALUATION TEAM AUDIENCE

- Rockefeller Foundation Evaluation Advisory Group
- Independent Evaluation Group evaluation advisory group
- Skillman Foundation National Advisory Committee

Organization	Rockefeller Foundation \$3.3B assets, focus on basic survival and safeguards, global health, climate & environment, urbanization, social & economic security
Format	Evaluation Advisory Committee
Purpose	Provide advice to Managing Director, Evaluation (new function as of 2009) on timely issues, be sounding board for politics of evaluation, provide best intelligence
Primary audience	Managing Director, Evaluation
Founded	2009
Number of members	4
Type of members	Bob Picciotto, former Director General, Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank; development economist from India; results-based management specialist; former chair of African Evaluation Association
Terms of membership	Unknown
Frequency of meetings	1 – 2 times a year
Length of meetings	2 days; some members come in earlier to work on special projects
Content of meetings	All have particular purpose that matches what the foundation needs at the time. For example, at upcoming meeting will look at how to evaluate whole impact investing area, what methodologies to consider
Expectations for work between meetings	Advisors are involved in work between meetings as determined by foundation needs at the time; advisors are compensated at honorarium rate for work done between meetings
Reporting structure/authority	Nancy runs the meetings; program staff participate as appropriate if the subject interests them; Vice President sits in on meetings as he desires; up to 7-8 people total attend any given meeting
Compensation	Set honorarium of \$1500/day
Time to manage committee	2-3 days of preparation in advance of meeting, woven into way evaluation department does it work
Pros	Forces you to step back and think about your work
Cons	None

Source: Nancy MacPherson, Managing Director, Evaluation

Note: Rockefeller also uses “reference groups” – program area specific evaluation advisory committees addressing issues where evaluation team might not have expertise, e.g. transportation. These are ad-hoc, only for the life of the evaluation, maybe 6 months to a year. Whoever is managing the evaluation runs the reference group, not the program staff.

Organization	Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), World Bank
Format	“external advisory group”
Purpose	Provide advice on what types of evaluations IEG should be conducting; provide overall direction; how much to focus on accountability vs. learning; available evaluation methods; governance; and development priorities (not reviewing individual evaluations)
Primary audience	IEG Director General and Senior Leadership Team
Founded	2010
Number of members	7
Type of members	Mix of evaluation expertise and policy making experts in developing countries; people with seniority in their profession; geographic diversity
Terms of membership	Two years with option for second term
Frequency of meetings	Every six months
Length of meetings	1-1.5 days
Content of meetings	“Like facilitated retreat” – free flowing discussion on subjects
Expectations for work between meetings	None
Reporting structure/authority	Senior manager runs meetings so IEG Director General can participate; group meets regularly with IEG board committee on development effectiveness
Compensation	Honorarium which cannot exceed \$1000, plus travel expenses – “token of appreciation”
Time to manage committee	“Not very much” – senior manager does not prepare anything specific for group, puts issues on the table for discussion, issues ‘take-away messages’ that are non-binding and informal. Shares these with board committee.
Pros	Supportive peer review group for IEG Director General; advises IEG on higher level strategic questions; moving IEG evaluation into 21 st century
Cons	None – total allocation for two meetings per year, including travel, accommodations, and honoraria about \$50,000

Sources: Hans-Martin Boehmer, Senior Manager, IEGCS; Nancy MacPherson, Managing Director, Evaluation, Rockefeller Foundation

Organization	Skillman Foundation \$450M assets, focused on good schools and neighborhoods in Detroit, MI
Format	National Advisory Committee (NAC) (six members--disbanded after 18 months)
Purpose	NAC – Help new evaluation officer and evaluation and learning team think about how to frame and structure and implement evaluation and learning plan for foundation
Primary audience	Evaluation officer
Founded	2007 – national advisory committee, disbanded after 18 months
Number of members	2007 NAC – 6 members
Type of members	2007 NAC – qualitative researcher, quantitative researcher, community change evaluator
Terms of membership	2007 – met for 18 months
Frequency of meetings	2007 – 3-4 times over 18 months
Length of meetings	2007 – 1-1/2 days
Content of meetings	2007 – helped staff refine theory of change, clear logic model, developed indicators that drove the evaluation
Expectations for work between meetings	None
Reporting structure/authority	Evaluation officer runs meetings; board member sat in on 2007 evaluation advisory group meetings, served as conduit to board of directors, translator of complexity of community change initiatives
Compensation	Per diem and travel expenses
Time to manage committee	Paid consultant to manage evaluation advisory group in 2007
Pros	Could point to external evaluation advisory group when meeting with trustees; built credibility given lack of experience with evaluation and philanthropy
Cons	If not clear about purpose, or get wrong people (who dominate conversations and go off track) then can be distraction and not worth the effort

Source: Marie Colombo, Senior Program Officer for Knowledge Management, Skillman Foundation

APPENDIX G: MODEL D: FOUNDATION-WIDE SCOPE / FOUNDATION MANAGEMENT AUDIENCE

- Edna McConnell Clark Foundation Evaluation Advisory Council
- First 5 LA Research Advisory Committee

Organization	Edna McConnell Clark Foundation \$813M assets, high engagement philanthropy, twenty grantees focused on youth development
Format	Evaluation Advisory Council
Purpose	Advise EMCF management and program staff on grantee evaluation strategies; provide advice to EMCF on its theory of investment, goals and strategy; work directly with grantees on evaluation issues
Primary audience	EMCF senior management
Founded	2000
Number of members	Originally 4; currently 6 members, with plans to add 1-2 more in 2012
Type of members	High level evaluation methodologists and other professionals with content expertise in EMCF-specific youth development focus areas
Terms of membership	Ongoing, no terms
Frequency of meetings	Quarterly
Length of meetings	3 hours; Approximately 10 hours per year for preparation, questions, meeting attendance, travel
Content of meetings	EMCF update and strategic questions Grantee-specific agenda items
Expectations for work between meetings	Paired with grantees to assist with evaluations
Reporting structure/authority	Chair of EAC runs the meetings; EAC advises EMCF senior management
Compensation	Daily rate plus expenses for meetings; invoice at daily rate for work between meetings
Time to manage committee	Significant: EAC is run like a board of directors meeting; time required from EAC chair, senior management, middle management, administrative staff time
Pros	Tremendous asset to EMCF; helps EMCF better serve grantees; helps keep grantees at center of work; brings more knowledge/learning into EMCF; staff development (all senior and program staff attend EAC meetings); advances EMCF strategy
Cons	None

Sources: Kelly Fitzsimmons, Chief Program and Strategy Officer; Kris Moore, Senior Scholar and Past President, Child Trends

Organization	First 5 LA: Invests tobacco tax revenues in programs for improving the lives of children in Los Angeles County, from prenatal through age 5; since 1998 invested over \$699M
Format	2010 Research Advisory Committee
Purpose	Primary: Provide technical input, guidance and advice to First 5 LA on early childhood research relevant to Los Angeles and First 5 LA's strategic plan Secondary: Help First 5 LA staff stay informed about relevant research and evaluation projects happening locally and nationally, as well as potential partnership opportunities
Primary audience	First 5 LA management and staff, First 5 LA Commissioners
Founded	2010 – Research Advisory Committee
Number of members	28 members
Type of members	Locally and nationally recognized researchers with varied expertise in methodology and content areas children's health and safety, early childhood education, development, psychology and social, economic, cultural and political issues
Terms of membership	3 year-term
Frequency of meetings	2010 – Two times a year
Length of meetings	2010 – 1 day
Content of meetings	Discuss methodology and measurement challenges, research-to-practice, research-to-policy strategies, and dissemination approaches for findings as they emerge
Expectations for work between meetings	Ad-hoc two-hour conference calls for select members of the RAC
Reporting structure/authority	RAC makes suggestions (not formal recommendations) to First 5 LA staff who then make recommendations to the First 5 LA Commission
Compensation	\$1,000 plus travel expenses for each meeting or conference call
Time to manage committee	.5 FTE consultant manages and facilitates RAC meetings and calls
Pros	Provide validation for research design and methodology, far outweighs the cons
Cons	Hard to pull together, "Staff say organizing the RAC is more complicated and causes more anxiety than planning a wedding."

Source: <http://www.first5la.org/Community-Change/Research-Partnerships/Research-Advisory-Committee>; Armando Jimenez, Director of Research and Evaluation, First 5 LA

APPENDIX I: INDEPENDENT EVALUATION GROUP DGE'S EXTERNAL ADVISORY GROUP ON EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS *TERMS OF REFERENCE*

The Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) of the World Bank Group (WBG) assesses the effectiveness of the WBG's development efforts and its contribution to the results. This assessment is intended to provide accountability in the achievement of WBG's objectives and facilitate greater learning from the evaluations. IEG also seeks help bring in external stakeholders as a highly relevant audience into this process, and exchange the lessons learned from experience.

IEG is composed of three departments corresponding to the World Bank, International Finance Corporation, and Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, supported by a central unit to provide IEG leadership in knowledge, communication, and strategy. All four report to the Director-General, Evaluation (DGE), who in turn reports to the Board of Executive Directors. IEG works independently of World Bank Group managements according to his/her Board approved mandate. IEG's mandate, terms of reference, budget and work program are approved directly by the Board.

The **overall purpose** of the External Advisory Group (EAG) on Evaluation and Development Effectiveness is to provide *informal* advice to the Director-General, Evaluation, of IEG on evaluation agenda broadly and to provide guidance on strategic development issues and challenges affecting the development effectiveness of the World Bank Group, including;

- To help identify key linkages to emerging global, regional and country issues of great relevance to the evaluation and development effectiveness agenda;
- To provide advice on IEG's strategic directions – in light of these issues; and
- To provide feedback on IEG's work programs, product mix and methodologies.

To this end, the EAG would be invited, inter alia, to:

- Advise the DGE on evaluation priorities, methodologies and techniques and selectively comment on classes of evaluation products;
- Raise questions pertaining to IEG's independence as well as relevance and impact;
- Facilitate partnerships and knowledge transfer with organizations and networks.

The Group would meet about once a year in Washington. This meeting would be an opportunity for the DGE to raise important emerging issues with the Advisory Group, including views on the future directions of the World Bank Group (IBRD/IDA; IFC; MIGA) and implications for evaluation and other learning and knowledge activities.

Composition: Members (probably a maximum of 6) are invited to serve in their individual capacities on the basis of their professional, regional, and thematic perspectives. The Group should reflect a diverse range of backgrounds and experiences. Members would be invited to serve for an initial term of two years.

Source: Hans-Martin Boehmer, Senior Manager, IEGCS

ENDNOTES

- ⁱ E2.
- ⁱⁱ Patrizi Associates, “Use of Evaluative Information in Foundations: Benchmarking Data.” June 2010, p. 38.
- ⁱⁱⁱ E12.
- ^{iv} E13.
- ^v Patrizi Associates, p. 39.
- ^{vi} Chris DeCardy.
- ^{vii} M8.
- ^{viii} M8.
- ^{ix} E1.
- ^x M7.
- ^{xi} E14.
- ^{xii} M9.
- ^{xiii} E14.
- ^{xiv} I5.
- ^{xv} I6.
- ^{xvi} E8.
- ^{xvii} Patrizi Associates, pp. 17, 21, 38.
- ^{xviii} I2.
- ^{xix} I8.
- ^{xx} I7.
- ^{xxi} I9.
- ^{xxii} E2.
- ^{xxiii} E5.
- ^{xxiv} I3.
- ^{xxv} I5.
- ^{xxvi} I2.
- ^{xxvii} I3.
- ^{xxviii} I5.
- ^{xxix} E7.
- ^{xxx} E11.
- ^{xxxi} E13.
- ^{xxxii} E12.
- ^{xxxiii} E1.
- ^{xxxiv} I6.
- ^{xxxv} E10.
- ^{xxxvi} I5.
- ^{xxxvii} E12.
- ^{xxxviii} I2.
- ^{xxxix} E16.
- ^{xl} I7.
- ^{xli} I9.
- ^{xlii} I8.
- ^{xliiii} E5.
- ^{xliv} I7.
- ^{xlv} I9.
- ^{xlvi} E11.
- ^{xlvii} E8.
- ^{xlviii} E11.
- ^{xliv} M1.
- ⁱ E5.
- ^{li} E8.