

ANNEX 3. CONFERENCE ASSESSMENT

EXIT QUESTIONNAIRE: RATINGS BY PARTICIPANTS

Questionnaires were collected from 36 respondents out of an estimated 50-60 participants during the closing session of the conference. Ratings were given on a Likert scale from 1 (lowest) to 4 (highest). The mid-point rating is thus at 2.5 [= (1+4)/2]. Ratings above 2.5 are thus in the more positive range and those below 2.5 are in the more negative range.

The results show a general **high appreciation** for the individual sessions and the conference structure in general (Table 1).

Regarding the *individual sessions*, the first (opening) and the last (roundtable on emerging conclusions) display the highest averages, both at 3.24. This may reflect a stronger appreciation for sessions dealing with the 'general picture' and summary of the main contents. It may also reflect a trend of attention that peaks at the very beginning and very end of the event.

The lowest (in relative terms) averages are found in correspondence with session 1 and the open space in session 1. Even these averages are well above the 2.5 mid-point, which is quite encouraging. Few comments have been provided on the individual session and there is no clear reason for the relatively lower average grading of session 1, except that this session has received a low number of '4' (highest grades).

The **open space on day 1** received both the lowest average grading and the lowest number of responses (fewer people have attended it) and the **highest variability** of ratings (Standard deviation of 1.010 is the highest). So this section has elicited the **most diverse responses**. The general comments on the conference structure (see below) points to the fact that there is a perceived interest for more informal interaction among participants, but perhaps the organization of this session did not respond to expectations or needs.

Feedback on the *workshop structure* is also very high, with ratings of 3.34 for plenary presentations and 3.22 for plenary discussions respectively (table 1).

PERCEIVED STRENGTHS

The main assets are identified as the opportunity to exchange experiences with others from diverse contexts, with the emphasis on allowing dialogue and exchanges between participants without an externally driven agenda, and the general good quality of papers and event organization.

PERCEIVED WEAKNESSES

These are identified as the length of plenary sessions, long presentations, overlap of themes and issues, and sometimes confusion between monitoring and evaluation. Respondents also complained about the limited time and scope for informal discussions and breakout groups (including the 'open space', which was perceived as loosely connected with the rest of the event). It was also noted that the private sector as an actor in evaluation was not well represented. There were some remarks on session chairs, perhaps in connection with time keeping and the length and heaviness of plenary sessions. It was also noted that English simultaneous interpretation was not always of high quality.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE CONFERENCE ORGANIZATION

Regarding the conference organization, the main recommendations pertain to the opportunity for having a place / board where participants can post ideas throughout the conference.

Ideally, conference documents should be available much earlier and should be translated into all working languages.

TABLE 1. RATING: SUMMARY STATISTICS

| QUESTIONS | NUMBER RESPONSES | AVERAGE (1-4) | ST. DEVIATION |
|--|------------------|---------------|---------------|
| A. Did the various sessions help you achieve the workshop objectives? | | | |
| Opening Session | 33 | 3.24 | 0.605 |
| Session 1: Current evaluation practices of public programmes at the national level: governance, independence and credibility | 36 | 2.92 | 0.493 |
| Session 2: Evaluation quality and existing capacities at national and regional level: national evaluation practitioners, research institutions, evaluation associations and networks | 36 | 3.06 | 0.664 |
| Session 3: Supporting the demand for evaluation as an instrument of accountability: who are the key actors? | 35 | 3.00 | 0.632 |
| Session 4: Towards an enabling environment for evaluation capacity at the national level: what type of support is needed? | 35 | 3.06 | 0.674 |
| Open Space on day 1 (if you attended) | 23 | 2.61 | 1.010 |
| Roundtable discussion: Towards a longer-term initiative on national evaluation capacity. What is the way forward? | 35 | 3.09 | 0.732 |
| Roundtable on emerging conclusions | 34 | 3.24 | 0.689 |
| B. Was the way the workshop was structured and delivered useful in achieving the objectives of the workshop? | | | |
| Plenary presentations | 35 | 3.34 | 0.583 |
| Plenary discussions | 36 | 3.22 | 0.711 |