REPORT
OF
THE COMMITTEE
FOR
TRAINING IN EVALUATION

PROGRAMME EVALUATION ORGANISATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
NEW DELHI
1979

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Composition of the Committee

1.1 In pursuance of the recommendations of the Conference of the Heads of State Evaluation Organisations held in New Delhi in November, 1977, the Government of India vide their O.M.No.PEO/10-8/77-TE, dated June 23, 1978 set up a Committee for Training in Evaluation under the chairmanship of Secretary, Planning Commission (Appendix I). Although the Committee was initially constituted for a period of six months, its tenure had to be extended until September 30, 1979 in view of the organisation of three experimental Regional Workshops for the Senior[1] level evaluation personnel and preparing the syllabus for the Supervisory[2] level personnel by a sub-committee. On his taking over as Secretary, Planning Commission from Dr.Ajit Mozoomdar, Shri S.S. Puri assumed the chairmanship of the Committee w.e.f. August 1, 1979. The Committee consisted of 20 members, but 3 of them showed their inability to work on it in view of their pre-occupation. An additional member, Dr.J.N.Mongia, was co-opted by the Chairman on September 13, 1978. The final composition of the Committee was as follows:

---

1 & 2 The evaluation personnel were functionally categorised as:

Senior level Directors/Addl.Directors/Jt.Directors/Project Directors.

Supervisory level Dy.Directors/Sr.Research Officers/Assistant Directors/Research Officers/Evaluation Officers.

Junior level Investigators (I & II)/Statistical/Technical/Field/Research/Scientific Assistants/Analysts/Computors, etc.

Chairman

1. Shri S.S. Puri,
Secretary, Planning Commission,
New Delhi-110001.
(in place of Dr.Ajit Mozoomdar,
w.e.f. August 1, 1979)

Members

2. Shri T.N.Chaturvedi,
Director, Indian Institute of
Public Administration,
Indraprastha Estate,
New Delhi-110002.
(in place of Shri R.N.Haldipur)

3. Dr.C.H.Hanumantha Rao,
Director, Institute of Economic
Growth, University Enclave,
Delhi-110006.

4. Shri H.M.Mathur,
Joint Secretary (Training),
Department of Personnel &
Administrative Reforms, North
Block, New Delhi-110001.

5. Shri S.P. Bagla,
Joint Secretary,
Planning Commission,
New Delhi-110001.

6. Dr.S.M. Shah,
Joint Secretary (PEO),
Planning Commission,
New Delhi-110001.

7. Shri V.Venkatesan,
Secretary to the Government,
Department of Planning &
Finance, Government of
Maharashtra, Bombay.

8. Shri Prabhakar Ghate,
Director (Evaluation & Training),
Government of Uttar Pradesh,
Kalakankar House, Lucknow.

9. Shri U.K. Kohli,
Vice- President, Indian Society
of Training & Development,
New Delhi.

10. Shri G.Chidambaram,
Director, Evaluation & Applied
Research, Government of
Tamil Nadu, Madras.

11. Dr.J.N.Mongia,
Economic & Statistical
Adviser, Government of
Meghalaya, Shillong.

12. Shri K.K. Singh,
Chairman, Public Systems &
Policy Area, Administrative
Staff College of India,
Bella-vista, Hyderabad.

13. Prof.Nilkanth Rath,
Gokhale Institute of
Politics & Economics,
Pune (Maharashtra).

14. Prof.R.N. Pitale,
Lal Bahadur Shastri National
Academy of Administration,
Mussoorie (U.P.).
(in place of Prof.V.Gopalan,
w.e.f. July 5, 1979).

15. Shri D.C.Datta,
Joint Director, Field Operations
Division, National Sample Survey
Organisation, R.K. Puram,
New Delhi-110022.

16. Dr.S.K. Rau,
Director-General, National
Institute of Rural Development,
Rajendranagar,
Hyderabad-500030.

17. Dr.V.R. Gaikwad,
Professor, Indian Institute
of Management,
Ahmedabad.

Convenor:

18. Dr.B.N. Sahay,
Joint Director,
Programme Evaluation Organi-
sation, Planning Commission,
New Delhi-110001.
(in place of Shri G.D.Singh,
Dy.Adviser, w.e.f.
June 4, 1979)

Terms of Reference

1.2 The Committee was assigned the following terms of reference:

1. To assess the training needs of the personnel for manning the State and National Evaluation Organisations;
2. To review the existing training arrangements in evaluation methodology;
3. To suggest various types of courses to be organised, their contentsincluding the range of disciplines, frequency, and duration;
4. To suggest methods and techniques of training in relation to the courses;
5. To identify suitable agencies for conducting various courses suggested under (3) above;
6. To suggest the terms of deputation for the trainees;
7. To suggest guidelines for the preparation of a Manual for Training; and
8. To recommend measures for strengthening the agencies suggested under (5) above so as to enable them to undertake effectively the training tasks.

Meetings Held

1.3 The Committee held three meetings in New Delhi on July 28, 1978, March 31, 1979, and September 6, 1979. As a result of the deliberations of the first meeting, a sub-committee of five members; namely, Sarvashri (1) R.N. Haldipur, (2) H.M. Mathur, (3) U.K. Kohli, (4) D.C. Datta, and (5) G.D. Singh (Convenor), was constituted to go into the syllabus for the training of the Supervisory level

evaluation personnel, that is; Deputy Directors/Senior Research Officers/Assistant Directors/Research Officers/ Evaluation Officers. The syllabus developed by the sub-committee was discussed by the Committee in its second meeting. Since the training for the Supervisory level personnel was to be organised by the PEO in collaboration with other research and training institutions, two meetings were held with the Director (Training), Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms in this connection.

1.4 Similarly, as per the recommendations, three experimental Regional Workshops were organised for the Senior level personnel for the inter-change of ideas and experiences as also to facilitate the finalisation of the training programme for this category. The first such Workshop was organised at Chandigarh (March 19-24, 1979), the second in Madras (May 16-20, 1979), and the third at Gandhinagar (June 25-30, 1979). These Workshops were attended by 96 participants from 11 State Governments, 3 Union Territories, and the Central PEO. This gave spurt to evaluation work in the participating States/Union Territories and paved way for a closer collaboration between the Centre and the States and also among the States themselves.

1.5 In its third meeting in which the Committee adopted the draft Report also decided that the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation should take up the responsibility of coordinating, the training activities for the Junior level evaluation personnel, with the state evaluation organisations. Based on their experience of organising training courses for this category of personnel, the Central PEO may develop a suitable syllabus for them.

Main Chapters of the Report

1.6 The Report, as presented here in four Chapters, is a result of the deliberations of the Committee and its follow-up spread over a period of about a year. In the Chapter that follows, the importance of Training in Evaluation, over the plan period, in a historical perspective, has been brought out. Chapter III entitled, 'Existing Training Arrangements' takes stock of the arrangements available to the evaluation personnel for their training. In Chapter IV, the Proposed Training Arrangements have been discussed, embodying the training needs and core recommendations of the Committee with regard to the training of different levels of evaluation personnel. Besides, the measures to be taken for strengthening the training agency(ies) have also been suggested in this Chapter. At the end, the 'Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations' have been placed.

Acknowledgements

1.7 The Committee places on record its appreciation for the cooperation extended by the State Governments and the Union Territories in making the relevant information available to it. The Committee also expresses its gratefulness to the Chairman, Dr.Ajit Mozoomdar and his successor Shri S.S. Puri, for their valuable guidance. Thanks are due to Dr.S.M. Shah, Joint Secretary (PEO) for a closer supervision of the Committee's work and for finalising the Report. The work related to the follow-up of the deliberations of the various meetings of the Committee were looked after by its Convenor, Shri G.D. Singh and his successor Dr.B.N. Sahay. The responsibility of drafting and revision of the Report rested primarily with Dr.B.N. Sahay and his team consisting of Sarvashri B.L. Varma, O.N. Munshi, Ram Kishan, and J.L. Kapoor. The Committee is also thankful to them. Last but not the least, the stenographic assistance received from Sarvashri Lalit Kumar and M. Ramankutty deserves special mention.

CHAPTER II

TRAINING IN EVALUATION - A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Concept of Evaluation

2.1 Evaluation is an assessment or judgment or appraisal of the value of a programme or a project. The assessment has to be made on the basis of the norms fixed for the programme. Evaluation aims at understanding the cause and effect relationship (valid), arriving at reasonable consistent conclusions (reliable), and is relevant to the objective and purpose. It should be acceptable to the persons concerned, definite enough to determine whether something has been achieved or not and reasonable to the extent it should be possible to accomplish. Although the purpose of evaluation may be immediate, short-term or long-term, its ultimate objective is continuous feed-back (immediate, timely, and continuous) for endless improvement. Evaluation does not fulfil its ultimate goal if there is no feed-back or if the feed-back is delayed.

Importance of Evaluation

2.2 Realising the importance of evaluation in the planning process, it is accepted that plan formulation, plan administration, and plan evaluation go as a continuous planning process - interlinked, integrated and in-built.

Feed-back through evaluation results is an important requirement for assessing the performance, compare the intended with the actual operations, and use this information to guide the future line of action. The principle of feed-back is a requirement of all the self-governing and goal-seeking systems.

2.3 In view of the multi-dimensional nature of the problems connected with the socio-economic development programme vis-a-vis heterogenity in the rural population (including the various socio-economic levels), the quality of evaluation results depends upon the extent to which in-depth probing and analysis of the latent factors responsible for the successful implementation (or otherwise) of the programmes have gone into. This would also mean going for different types of evaluation at different levels and stages of development so that continuous feed-back for necessary improvement in the planning and administration of the socio-economic development programmes is possible in time. While evaluating, the focal point would be to ascertain whether the programme could achieve what it intended to achieve. Thus, in terms of purpose of evaluation of socio-economic development programmes, it is necessary to raise the four basic and pertinent questions:-

1. What to evaluate?
2. When to evaluate?
3. How to evaluate? and,
4. Who is to take up the work of evaluation?

2.4 The importance of evaluation for continuous feedback in the planning process was realised as early as 1952 when the Programme Evaluation Organisation (PEO) was set up. Although in the beginning, the PEO was more concerned with the evaluation of the community development and other allied programmes, its role and scope widened over the plan periods. From the Third Five Year Plan, the PEO extended its activities to other rural development programmes. The importance of evaluation was further realised with the setting up of evaluation machineries in the States during the Third and Fourth Five Year Plans. At present, evaluation organisations exist in one form or the other in almost every State in the country.

Evaluation Skill

2.5 Evaluation forms the very basis of decision-making for bringing about desirable changes. It has to be based on objective evidence and element of subjectivity must be avoided while interpreting and passing judgments. Better information for improvement is the key-note to an evaluation. From this point of view, evaluation involves an element of skill, the systematic and methodological acquisition of which provides an optimum efficiency to an evaluator. A sound training in evaluation may help to acquire specific skill and specialised knowledge necessary

for the satisfactory performance of the job. Besides, the knowledge of the fundamental subject(s) (such as economics, sociology, statistics, and allied disciplines), an inter-disciplinary approach with good grounding in social science research methodology is essentially needed for the evaluation of the socio-economic development programmes. An evaluator, therefore, must have adequate grip over the subject-matter under evaluation, be able to formulate the problem, delineate the objectives, frame the hypotheses, determine the method of approach, develop a sound sampling design, select the most appropriate tools of data collection, scrutinise and process the data efficiently, analyse them objectively and scientifically, and adhere to the time schedule for enabling 'purposive' and 'timely' feed-back.

2.6 The quality of evaluation largely depends upon the nature and type of training an evaluator has undergone and also his personal and professional qualities. Such qualities may include: scientific attitude; imagination and insight; perseverance; quick grapsing power; clarity of thinking; good knowledge of the subject; uptodate knowledge of the techniques of research; aptitude for field research; familiarity about the information; unbiased attitude; effective communication ability; planning and coordination competence; humility and dynamism; managerial

skill and knowledge of PERT/CPM, etc. These qualities, if lacking in an evaluator, can be developed by drawing out his potentialities through a well thought-out regular training arrangement.

Training in Evaluation through the Plans

2.7 Although the importance of training in evaluation has been realised over the plan periods, the Fourth and Fifth Five Year Plans make a specific mention about it. In the sub-section on 'Training in Methods and Techniques of Economic Planning' of the Fourth Five Year Plan, it is suggested that the training programmes be organised to 'impart competence in the latest techniques of formulation, implementation and evaluation of Plan programmes and projects.'[3] Similarly, in the Fifth Five Year Plan, the role of training in the planning process has been highlighted and the need for institutional and on-the-job training emphasised. It has been suggested to set up the training activities to ensure that the identified needs of the plan programmes are adequately met.[4] Besides the general recommendations in the Five Year Plans, the

---

3. Fourth Five Year Plan, Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, 1970.

4. Draft Fifth Five Year Plan (Vol.I), Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, 1973.

specific recommendations on training for evaluation can be noticed in the reports of the various Committees/Commissions/ Study Teams/Working Groups, etc. Some of these deserve specific mention.

Study Team of the Administrative Reforms Commission(ARC)

2.8 While emphasising the need for in-service training, this Study Team recommended in 1967, the creation of training cells in each department of the Government of India and in the States. Besides imparting actual training, such cells were also considered useful in the formulation and development of the training programmes, supervision of training arrangements, collection of data on training techniques and reading material, and liaison with the similar units in other government organisations.[5] Making specific observations on activities of the plan evaluation, the Study Team also identified the work of the Programme Evaluation Organisation as 'current evaluation' and emphasised the importance of training in evaluation.[6]

Working Group on Evaluation in the States

2.9 While recommending the setting up of the evaluation machineries in the States, the Working Group (Chairman -

---

5. Conference on Training, Training Division, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi, 1969.
6. Report of the Study Team on Machinery for Planning (R.R.Morarka), Administrative Reforms Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, 1967.

V.K.R.V. Rao) stressed the need for providing training facilities to the evaluation personnel. The Working Group particularly recommended the creation of a separate wing in the Programme Evaluation Organisation to operate a regular and round-the-year training programme in evaluation (of suitable duration) for personnel in the State Governments and other agencies.[7]

Working Group on Training in Evaluation

2.10 Based mainly on the working paper prepared and circulated by the Programme Evaluation Organisation on Training in Evaluation and in the background of the recommendations of the Working Group on Evaluation in the States, the Working Group on Training in Evaluation (Chairman - S.R. Sen) strongly felt that there was a need for strengthening the Programme Evaluation Organisation adequately to undertake the responsibility of training of personnel in evaluation.[8]

2.11 The Group dwelt, at length, on the questions of training (on-the-job) the Junior and Senior level officers, duration and contents of the courses, techniques of training, infrastructural support, stipends, T.A., etc.,

---

7. Report of the Working Group on Evaluation in the States (V.K.R.V. Rao), Planning Commission, Government of India, New Delhi, 1964.

8. Report of the Working Group on Training in Evaluation (S.R.Sen), Programme Evaluation Organisation, Planning Commission, Mimeographed, 1967.

of the participants. The main recommendations made were:

1. The duration of the training course for the Junior officers should be about 9 to 10 weeks;
2. More emphasis should be given on statistical methods and techniques of evaluation in the course;
3. Apart from lectures, group discussions should be arranged on aspects of Indian economy, society, planning, and on field projects;
4. Arrangements for the stay of trainees may preferably be made at one place;
5. Each trainee should be given a suitable stipend to cover his expenses while on training;
6. 'On-the-job' training should be arranged for the senior officers. For this purpose, one or two supernumerary posts might be created at the level of SROs and selected senior officers appointed to the posts, each for a period of not less than four months and not more than six months at a time on deputation terms;
7. In addition to on-the-job training for the selected few, it might be useful to organise syndicate type of training, for a period of two or three weeks at a time; and
8. The Programme Evaluation Organisation should be adequately strengthened to undertake the responsibility of arranging the course(s) for training. An officer of the level of Joint Director should be placed in full-time charge of the programme. He may be assisted by a Senior Research Officer and two Assistants.

<u>First Conference of the Heads of State Evaluation Organisations</u>

2.12 In view of the increased importance of evaluation, the Programme Evaluation Organisation, Planning Commission, held a Conference of the Heads of State evaluation

organisations in November, 1977 in New Delhi. Although the purpose of the Conference was to re-inforce the role that the evaluation had to play in the planning process and to improve the evaluation system, it made a number of important recommendations, including the setting up of the present Committee for Training in Evaluation.

CHAPTER III

EXISTING TRAINING ARRANGEMENTS

3.1 To know the existing training arrangements for the evaluation personnel, some background information was sought from the State evaluation organisations. The response from the States in this regard was encouraging.

Existing Training Arrangements

3.2 Information received from 21 States and 3 Union Territories revealed that training facilities for the evaluation personnel were lacking in most of the States. Only Gujarat and West Bengal reported the availability of training facilities, and that too, for their Junior level staff. Other States/Union Territories had no training facilities at all. The States were generally deputing their staff for training to Programme Evaluation Organisation, New Delhi and to other research institutions.

At the Programme Evaluation Organisation

3.3 The Programme Evaluation Organisation has been extending ad-hoc training facilities in the methods and techniques of evaluation, to the officials as and when nominated by the State Governments and other Central Ministries and Departments since 1962. The regular courses for the Supervisory and Junior level personnel were, however, organised since 1968, after the

recommendations of S.R. Sen Working Group on Training in Evaluation (1967). A Training Cell with a Joint Director[9] a Deputy Director[10] and two Assistants was created. With this limited resources, the Programme Evaluation Organisation could organise only five training courses of 9 weeks' duration each for the Supervisory level officers of the State Governments, besides training the Junior level staff of the Programme Evaluation Organisation, the I.E.S. probationers, and officers from other countries like U.A.R. (1969), Malaysia (1970, 1971, and 1972), Philippines(1971), Sweden (1971), Nigeria (1972), and Nepal (1974-75).

3.4 The details of the five training courses organised for the Supervisory level officers are as follows:

Table 3.1 Training Courses organised by the Programme Evaluation Organisation, 1968-72.

Course No.	Period	No.of participants	Coming from	
			State	Union Territories
1	2	3	4	5
1.	20.5.1968 to 27.7.1968	12	9	1
2.	20.2.1969 to 26.4.1969	10	6	1
3.	23.2.1970 to 28.4.1970	15	10	3
4.	13.10.1970 to 10.12.1970	11	9	-
5.	23.10.1972 to 23.12.1972	12	8	1

9. As a result of the recommendations of the Internal Reorganisation Committee of the Planning Commission(B.Venkatappiah - 1971) the post of Jt.Director(Training) was abolished in 1973 and the functions were merged with Jt. Director (Statistics & Coordination).
10. The post of Dy.Director(Training) was surrendered as a result of the recommendations of the Staff Inspection Unit of the Ministry of Finance.

3.5 The Programme Evaluation Organisation has not been able to organise any further course for the Supervisory level staff after 1972, though there have been persistent demands from the States for the organisation of such courses. However, a few Supervisory level personnel could participate in the three Regional Workshops recently organised, in the year 1979, as a result of the recommendations of the Committee.

At the Institutions

3.6 Evaluation personnel were also reported to be sent by a few States to various institutions like the Institute of Economic Growth, the Institute of Public Administration, the Indian Institute of Management, the Bureaux of Economics and Statistics, the National Institute of Rural Development, the Central Statistical Organisation, the Indian Society for Training and Development, the Administrative Training Institute, and the Institute for Financial Management and Research. However, it was felt that some of the courses organised by these institutions were of general nature and were not suited to the present needs of the evaluation personnel, specially in view of their job requirements.

3.7 Thus, we find that the existing training arrangements for the evaluation personnel are far from satisfactory in almost all the States and the Union Territories.

CHAPTER IV

TRAINING NEEDS AND ARRANGEMENTS PROPOSED

Training Needs of Evaluation Personnel

4.1 There is an urgent need to train the evaluation personnel and provide them with necessary evaluation skills in the interest of improvement of the quality of evaluation and its timely feed-back to the planning process. In this connection, it was considered necessary to obtain information about the various categories of evaluation personnel engaged in the State evaluation organisations and at the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation.

4.2 Although the Working Group on Evaluation in the States (1964) recommended a uniform evaluation machinery in the States comprising of a Director, two Deputy Directors, one Assistant Director, three Research Assistants, six Investigators, six Computors, and three to six field units, the information received from different States and the Union Territories gave a diverse picture. This gets reflected in the table that follows:

Table 4.1 Personnel engaged in the State Evaluation Organisations by category

State/U.T.	Personnel engaged by category			
	Senior level	Supervisory level	Junior level	Total
1	2	3	4	5
State				
1. Andhra Pradesh	1	1	2	4
2. Assam	1	10	18	29
3. Bihar	1	13	58	72
4. Gujarat	1	6	43	50
5. Haryana	1	6	19	26
6. Himachal Pradesh	–	1	4	5
7. Jammu & Kashmir	1	8	8	17
8. Karnataka	1	11	18	30
9. Kerala	1	11	21	33
10. Madhya Pradesh	–	2	23	25
11. Maharashtra	1	10	43	54
12. Manipur	–	1	11	12
13. Meghalaya	–	3	3	6
14. Nagaland	–	3	7	10
15. Orissa	1	9	22	32
16. Punjab	1	3	13	17
17. Rajasthan	1	25	79	105
18. Tamil Nadu	1	12	19	32
19. Tripura	–	2	17	19
20. Uttar Pradesh	1	9	35	45
21. West Bengal	1	11	28	40
Union Territory				
22. Delhi	–	1	8	9
23. Goa, Daman & Diu	–	1	12	13
24. Pondicherry	–	1	3	4
Total	15	160	514	689

Senior level: Director/Additional Director/Joint Director/Project Director, etc.

Supervisory level: Deputy Director/Senior Research Officer/Assistant Director/Research Officer, etc.

Junior level: Investigator/Technical Assistant/Research Assistant/Statistical Assistant/Computor/Field Assistant/Junior Statistical Supervisor/Analyst, etc.

4.3 The above table reveals that 689 evaluation personnel are engaged in the State evaluation organisations. A total all-India picture of the evaluation personnel emerges only when the personnel engaged in the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation are also taken into account. This is reflected from the following table:-

Table 4.2 Personnel engaged in the Central PEO and State Evaluation Organisations

Central PEO/ States & U.Ts.	Personnel engaged by category			
	Senior Level	Super-visory Level	Junior Level	Total
1	2	3	4	5
Central PEO	8	51	120	179
States/UTs	15	160	514	689
Total	23	211	634	868

4.4 From the above table it is observed that there are, in all, 868 evaluation personnel engaged in the State evaluation organisations and the Central PEO throughout the country. Of these, 23 are Senior, 211 are Supervisory, and 634 are Junior levels.

4.5 A majority of the State evaluation machineries are engaged in carrying out evaluation studies only. However, in a few States, these are also engaged in the work of monitoring, appraisal, plan formulation, etc. (Table 4.3).

Table 4.3 Evaluation Machinery in the States/Union Territories

State/U.Ts	Name of the Evaluation Organisation/Machinery	Department to which attached	Year when set up	Main functions
1	2	3	4	5
States				
1.Andhra Pradesh	Evaluation Wing	Finance & Planning Department (Planning Wing)	1961	Evaluation
2.Assam	Directorate of Evaluation & Monitoring	Planning & Development Department	1965	Evaluation & Monitoring
3.Bihar	Directorate of Statistics & Evaluation	Planning Department	1964	Evaluation
4.Gujarat	Directorate of Evaluation	Planning Department	1965	Evaluation
5.Haryana	Evaluation Unit	Economics & Statistics Organisation	1964	Evaluation
6.Himachal Pradesh	Evaluation Cell	Planning Department	1972	Evaluation & Project Appraisal
7.Jammu & Kashmir	Directorate of Evaluation & Statistics	Planning & Development Department	1965	Evaluation
8.Karnataka	Directorate of Evaluation	Planning Department	1964	Evaluation
9.Kerala	Evaluation Division	Planning Department	1969	Evaluation & Plan Formulation
10.Madhya Pradesh	Evaluation & Plan Progress Unit	Directorate of Economics & Statistics	1964	Evaluation
11.Maharashtra	Evaluation, Monitoring & Information Unit	Directorate of Economics & Statistics	1959	Evaluation & Monitoring
12.Manipur	Evaluation Unit	Department of Statistics	1967	Evaluation

(Contd.)

1	2	3	4	5
13.Meghalaya	Evaluation Cell	Directorate of Economics & Statistics	1971	Evaluation
14.Nagaland	Evaluation Unit	Planning & Co-ordination Department	1968	Evaluation
15.Orissa	Evaluation Organisation	Planning & Co-ordination Department	1961	Evaluation
16.Punjab	Evaluation Unit	Economics & Statistics Organisation	1964	Evaluation
17.Rajasthan	Evaluation Organisation	Planning Department	1960	Evaluation
18.Tamil Nadu	Evaluation & Applied Research Department	Finance Department	1971	Evaluation & Project Appraisal
19.Tripura	Evaluation Unit	Directorate of Statistics & Evaluation	1966	Evaluation
20.Uttar Pradesh	Evaluation & Training Division	Planning Department	1965	Evaluation & Training
21.West Bengal	Directorate of Evaluation & Monitoring	Development & Planning Department	1966	Evaluation
Union Territories				
22.Delhi	Evaluation Cell	Planning Department	1966	Evaluation & Monitoring
23.Goa, Daman and Diu	Evaluation Cell	Bureau of Economics & Statistics and Evaluation	1971	Evaluation
24.Pondicherry	Evaluation Cell	Planning & Research Department	1976	Evaluation

4.6 Being convinced of the training needs of the various categories of personnel engaged in the work of evaluation, it is necessary to evolve suitable training strategies so that the right type of training may be imparted in the interest of the quality of evaluation. There is ample scope for improvement in the skill needed in designing, field work, tabulation, analysis and interpretation, and reporting which are sine-qua-non for an evaluation enquiry.

Proposed Training Arrangements

4.7 With a view to evolving suitable training strategies to upgrade the skills in evaluation, various aspects were deliberated. These include: (1) type of courses to be organised including their frequency and duration; (2) methods and techniques of training to be followed; (3) locating suitable agency(ies) for organising the training courses; (4) laying down terms of deputation for the trainees; (5) preparation of a manual for training; and (6) strengthening of the training machinery. The recommendations regarding the training of Senior, Supervisory, and Junior level evaluation personnel are detailed out in the paragraphs that follow.

4.8 The training of the Senior and Supervisory level evaluation personnel should primarily be the responsibility of the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation. For training the Junior level evaluation personnel also, it was suggested that the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation should take up the responsibility of coordinating the training activities with the State evaluation organisations and develop suitable syllabus for them. On the other hand, the State evaluation organisation may take the necessary guidance and support from the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation in organising and planning the courses.

4.9 The training arrangements for different levels of evaluation personnel are mentioned hereafter:

Training Arrangements for the Senior Level Personnel (Director/Additional Director/Joint Director/ Deputy Adviser/Project Director)

4.10 The Senior evaluation personnel are responsible for selecting the subjects of evaluation, directing the field investigations, and reporting the findings to the government. The quality of an evaluation report largely hinges on the quality of this category of personnel. With a view to having positive experience of their specific needs, it was proposed that the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation should organise three experimental

Workshops for the mutual exchange of ideas and experiences amongst the Senior level evaluation personnel. Accordingly, three regional Workshops were organised at Chandigarh (March 19-24, 1979), Madras (May 16-20, 1979), and Gandhinagar (June 25-30, 1979) in which 96 participants from the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation, 11 State Governments, and 3 Union Territories had attended. The proceedings of these three Workshops, including the programme contents are given in Appendixes II, III, and IV. The course contents that emerge from the Workshops are as follow:

Course Contents for Senior Level	Duration (Hours)
1. Introductory - highlighting the current evaluation problems.	3
2. Discussion on the design, methodology, and findings of the six selected Evaluation Reports on different aspects of rural development from the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation and the participating State evaluation organisations.	18
3. Special lectures-cum-discussion related to the theories and concepts of evaluation/rural development, etc., such as:	15
(a) Role of evaluation in the planning process;	
(b) Conceptual and methodological issues of a sound evaluation system;	

Course Contents (Contd.)	Duration (Hours)
(c) Evaluation and monitoring of Plan Programmes;	
(d) Evaluation and feed-back;	
(e) Estimational surveys and evaluation;	
(f) Cost-benefit analysis;	
(g) Social development and not social welfare - a planning strategy;	
(h) Formulation of state plans;	
(i) Coordination of evaluation work between centre and states; and	
(j) Others (Approach and Methodology of evaluation/ research)	
4. Field visit(s)	9
5. Evaluation of the workshop and conclusion	3
	48 hrs. or 8 days.

4.11 Frequency: Five regional Workshops per year may be organised for the Senior level personnel for a group of 5 to 6 States each. This should be a continuous feature of evaluation work in the country. These Workshops would generate awareness and recognition of evaluation work in the States concerned. Thus, a good evaluation environment would be built up. The course

contents for the second round of regional Workshops should include actual exercise on the development of an evaluation design by each participant on the topic/project/programme/scheme which is likely to be taken up for evaluation by him/his organisation (Appendix IV, para 6). The design should include; formulation of the problem, delineation of the overall and specific objectives, framing of the hypotheses, determining the method of approach and focus, developing a sampling design, and selecting the appropriate tools of data collection. This would go a long way in providing better skill in evaluation planning and consequent direction. In view of this, the emphasis on the theoretical and conceptual lectures and discussion on the completed evaluation reports would have to be suitably lessened in view of the 8-day duration of the Workshop.

4.12 Terms of Deputation: The participants of the Workshop would be treated as on tour and would draw TA/DA, etc., from their respective Governments as per rules. The non-official guest lecturers, if invited, would be paid an honorarium of Rs.100/- per lecture, besides TA/DA.

Training Arrangements for the Supervisory Level Personnel (Deputy Director/Senior Research Officer/Assistant Director/Research Officer/Evaluation Officer)

4.13 The PEO had, in the past, trained over the period, the Supervisory level personnel. Based on this

experience, the PEO should continue organising training courses for this category of personnel. Furthermore, the training programmes should also be organised, in course of time, on a regional basis at the suitable training and research institutes, such as the Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi; Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad; National Institute of Rural Development, Hyderabad; Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune; Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi; Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Mussoorie, etc., in collaboration with the Training Division of the Department of Personnel & Administrative Reforms in the Government of India.

4.14 As already discussed, in the meeting held on July 28, 1978, a sub-committee of five members was appointed to go into the details of the syllabus for the Supervisory level personnel to be organised by the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation. The syllabus designed by the sub-committee was discussed in the next meeting held on March 31, 1979. This syllabus which was designed to orient the Supervisory level personnel in the planning process, acquaint them with the latest techniques of evaluation, and upgrade their evaluation skill, has the following course contents:

Course Contents for Supervisory Level		Duration (Hours)
1. Introductory Highlighting the current evaluation problems and discussion on the expectations of the participants from the course.		5
2. Lecture-cum-Discussion		47 (Total (a) to (f)
(a) Planning of an evaluation enquiry; grouping of programmes/projects in terms of the nature of objectives to be achieved. Knowledge about the contents of the programme/project and administrative and organisational arrangements for achievement of the objectives; choice of methodology dependent on the characteristic of the programme; determining the objectives of the study and linking these with the methodology to be followed for conducting the study; sampling design and evolving various instruments of observation (Schedules, questionnaire, guide points, instructions, etc.); interview/observation techniques; analysis and interpretation.	15	
(b) Measurement of levels of living and measurement of impact of programme/project on employment and income distribution: Choice of indicators of measurement; sources of data for indicators of measurement; impact of the programme/project on yield, pattern of income distribution; extent of additional employment provided directly and indirectly; changes in attitudes and social relations.		

Course Contents(Contd.)

(c) Benefit/Cost - analysis: 5

Target group approach (use of shadow prices, estimating direct project cost, estimating direct project benefit, indirect benefits and costs, non-quantifiable effects); estimating project effects outside the target group; criteria of project attractivity (benefit/cost-ratio, internal rate of return or net present value); and sensitivity analysis.(A case study will be presented to illustrate methodology followed in benefit/cost analysis).

(d) Implementation of planning, monitoring and information system: 5

Detailed planning for the implementation of projects/programmes in terms of their input requirements such as manpower, materials, equipment and finance in relation to their time schedules of completion and physical targets; reporting and information systems and monitoring of actual progress in relation to targets and identification of shortfalls and action areas.

(e) Use of computer in data processing: 5

The participants will have a round of the Computer Services Division. They will be told about data preparation (card design preparation, punching and verification of data, range checking of codes, etc.) and programming for different tables (analysis of the problem, programming and actual execution of the programme on the machines).

Course Contents (Contd.)		Duration (Hours)
Others (Coordination, joint studies, feed-back and follow-up, characteristics of rural/tribal economy/society, evaluation and planning process)	12	
3. Practical/Field work/Report writing		72 (Total (a) to (c)
(a) Designing of an evaluation study by each participant and discussion.	24	
(b) Field work/data collection	24	
(c) Tabulation/analysis/interpretation and Report writing.	24	
4. Presentation and discussion on Individual Reports		15
5. Evaluation of the Course and Conclusion		5
		144 hours or 24 days/4 weeks

4.15 It will be seen that the course contents of the Supervisory level personnel is more comprehensive as compared to the Senior level. This is because of the recognition of the fact that the Supervisory level personnel in the State evaluation organisations have not received adequate exposure to evaluation methods and techniques. Their exchange of experience with the fellow-participants from other States is also very limited. They will also be given practical assignment to develop an evaluation design for a selected study.

4.16 Depending upon the training needs, planning priorities, and evaluation requirements, the contents of the course(s) may be suitably adjusted/modified.

4.17 Frequency: Three such basic courses be organised per year with 30 to 35 participants in each course for four weeks' duration to enable all the 211 Supervisory level evaluation personnel to avail of this facility in about two years. In this regard, some preliminaries have already been worked out with the Training Division of the Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms. Two weeks of Refresher/Study/Inter-disciplinary Courses, etc., (Appendix V) may have to be organised for those who have undergone the above course.

4.18 Terms of Deputation: The participants should be governed by their respective State Governments' rules with regard to their TA/DA, etc. For other facilities like boarding, lodging, etc., they should be guided by the existing rules of the Training Division of the Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms. The honorarium for the guest speakers/faculty for the course and their TA/DA, if any, should also be paid as per the rules of the Training Division of the Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms.

Training Arrangements for the Junior Level Personnel
(Investigator/Technical/Research/Field/Statistical Assistant/Junior Statistical Supervisor/Analyst/Computor)

4.19 The field investigators are important functionaries in evaluation work, for, the quality of evaluation reports depends largely upon the quality of the data collected by them. The Central Programme Evaluation Organisation should take up the responsibility of coordinating the training activities of this category of personnel with the State evaluation organisations. The State evaluation organisations may take the necessary guidance and support from the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation. Based on their experience of organising the training courses for this category of personnel, the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation has developed a syllabus for their job course with the following contents:

Course Contents for Junior Level	Duration (Hours)
1. Introductory Highlighting the role and importance of evaluation as a planning process as also the use of primary/field data in evaluating the socio-economic development programmes/projects. Expectations of participants from the course.	6
2. Lecture-cum-Discussion	46
(a) The planning process	2
(b) Genesis, philosophy, concept, and objectives of evaluation	2

Course Contents (Contd.)	Duration (Hours)
(c) Evaluation and feed-back	2
(d) Evaluation steps	2
(e) Evaluation types and approaches	2
(f) Characteristics of Indian rural society and its change	4
(g) Characteristics of Indian rural economy and its change	4
(h) Sampling techniques – sampling and non-sampling errors	2
(i) Measures of Central tendencies	2
(j) Measures of dispersion and correlation	2
(k) Houselisting (0.1) and selection frame (0.2)	2
(l) Interviewing is an Art - Rapport/ natural personal identification - types of interview – guide points for qualitative assessment	2
(m) Observation – participant and non-participant	2
(n) Schedules and Questionnaire as tools of data collection	2
(o) Field canvassing of various instruments of observation	2
(p) Scrutiny and editing of instruments – checking up of the internal consistencies	2
(q) Tabulation plan and processing of qualitative and quantitative information	2
(r) Analysis and interpretation	2
(s) Drafting of an evaluation report	2
(t) Others	4

Course Contents (Contd.)		Duration (Hours)
3. Field Work/Placement		72
(a) Developing a short evaluation study and its instruments (with the help of Faculty)	24	
(b) Field work/data collection	24	
(c) Tabulation/analysis and interpretation	24	
4. Discussion on Field Work		15
5. Evaluation of the Course and Conclusions		5
		144 hrs. or 24 days/4 weeks

4.20 The above course contents for the Junior level evaluation personnel are closely linked with their job-requirements and contain both theoretical and practical inputs. However, depending upon the training needs and evaluation requirements, the course contents may suitably be adjusted.

4.21 Information collected from the various States and the Union Territories indicate that only two States, viz., Gujarat and West Bengal had certain training facilities for their Junior level personnel. In view of this, it may be worthwhile to take advantage of the existing arrangements and develop a workable training

strategy at the regional level for a group of States, particularly where the number of investigators in a State is small. Based on the data collected, it appears that as many as 634 Junior level personnel would require to undergo such training. The training programme for them should be phased in such a manner that their entire number is covered in the next five years.

4.22 Frequency: Five job courses be organised per year for a group of 25 to 30 participants from the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation and the State evaluation organisations. One to two weeks of reorientation/study courses (Appendix-V) may be organised for those who have undergone the above course.

4.23 Terms of Deputation: The participants should be governed by their respective State Governments' rules, with regard to their TA/DA, etc. The honorarium for the guest speakers/faculty and their TA/DA, etc., be paid as per the rules of the Training Division of the Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms.

Preparation of a Manual for Training

4.24 Although the idea of preparing a Manual for Training in Evaluation is laudable, it would be better if such a Manual is prepared after the above courses are

given a trial. The question may be taken up at a more appropriate time when sufficient experience of conducting various training courses is attained.

Measures for Strengthening the Training Agency

4.25 In view of the expectations from the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation regarding the organisation of the training programmes for the various levels of evaluation personnel, documentation and editing of the evaluation reports, assessment/reassessment of the training needs, coordination with the State evaluation organisations, etc., suitable strengthening of the Training Division of the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation is required. The Training Division should be headed by a fairly senior officer of the rank of a Director (Rs.1800-2250) so that he can develop the evaluation training work at the Centre and in the States on almost a campaign manner. He will be overall incharge of the Training Division and be responsible for coordinating the activities of five different cells - each under the charge of a Senior Training Specialist.

4.26 In the light of the above broad functions, namely; training, research, coordination, and editorial, it is necessary to take a pragmatic view of the situation

and to have five cells/branches, i.e., (1) Training of Senior Level; (2) Training of Supervisory Level; (3) Training of Junior Level; (4) Evaluation Methods and Techniques; and (5) Documentation and Editing. Each cell/branch will be led by a Senior Training Specialist (Rs.1200-1600) and assisted by a Training Specialist (Rs.700-1300) and two Technical Assistants - one senior and one junior (Rs.550-900/425-700); besides a supporting staff of one Section Officer (Rs.650-1200), one Assistant (Rs.425-800), and two Clerk-cum-typists (Rs.260-400) for the Training Division as a whole.

4.27 The first three cells/branches would be responsible for organising regional workshops and training courses (in all, 13 per year) for the Senior, Supervisory, and Junior level evaluation personnel. This would also include coordination with the concerned Departments/Ministries of the Central and State Governments, State Evaluation Organisations, Training and Research Institutes, etc., and preparation of background material for each Workshop/Course. Besides, a scientific assessment/reassessment of training needs and developing syllabii for the refresher/study/interdisciplinary courses (for the second round of training for those who have undergone the basic/job course training) will also be taken up.

by these cells/branches. They will act as regular faculty for the different courses organised during the year and be associated with the evaluation studies of the socio-economic development programmes. The fourth cell on Methods and Techniques of Evaluation will be responsible for covering the theoretical lectures on methodology and other methodological exercises related to the preparation of evaluation design, field work, processing of data, and report writing as envisaged in the various courses. In course of time, it will be able to prepare a Manual for Training in evaluation. The fifth cell/branch, namely, Documentation and Editing, will be responsible for editing the reports prepared by the participants of the various courses. It will also act as a clearing house for the evaluation material and document the evaluation reports brought out by the Central and the State evaluation organisations, etc.; besides bringing out the Newsletter/ Journal.

4.28 In the light of the facts stated above, the manpower requirement (including academic qualifications, experience, etc.) of the Training Division of the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation will be as follows:

Manpower Requirement for the Training Division of Central Programme Evaluation Organisation

Category	No.	Academic qualifications, experience, etc.
1	2	3
1. Director	1	A Ph.D. degree in Social Science with 10/12 years experience in organising training courses and adequate background of evaluation/ research/training techniques and administration.
2. Senior Training Specialist	5 (One each for Training of Senior level/. Training of Supervisory level/Training of Junior level/ Evaluation methods/Documentation and Editing)	A good post-graduate degree in social science with 8 years experience of evaluation/research. Background of conducting training courses would be desirable. For the post of Senior Training Specialist on Methods and Techniques, a Ph.D. degree would be preferable.
3. Training Specialist	5	A good post-graduate degree in social science with 5 years of evaluation/research experience. Background of conducting training courses would be preferable.
4. Technical Assistant	5 (Senior) 5 (Junior)	A post-graduate degree in social science (with 3 years experience in evaluation/research/training for Senior Technical Assistant).
5. (a) Section Officer	1	Experience of working in a Technical Division would be preferable.
(b) Assistant	1	
(c) Clerk-cum-typist	2	

4.29 Some elements (two investigators) of the above manpower requirement are available in the existing Training Division of the Programme Evaluation Organisation.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Committee held three meetings, organised three Regional Workshops for the Senior level evaluation personnel, appointed a sub-committee to go into the syllabus for the Supervisory level evaluation personnel, and also collected relevant information in respect of the structure and function of the Central PEO and the State evaluation organisations (1.3, 1.4 & 3.1).

2. The summary of conclusions and recommendations are mentioned in the paragraphs that follow:

1. The evaluation personnel have been broadly categorised, for the purpose of organising the training programme, into three levels – the Senior level (Director/Additional Director/ Joint Director/Deputy Adviser/Project Director), the Supervisory level (Deputy Director/Senior Research Officer/Assistant Director/Research Officer/Evaluation Officer), and the Junior level (Investigator/Technical/Research/Field/ Statistical Assistant/Junior Statistical Supervisor/Analyst/Computor) (1.1 & 4.2).

2. The number of evaluation personnel engaged both in the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation and the State evaluation organisations comes

to 868. This consists of Senior level (23), Supervisory level (211), and Junior level (634) (4.4).

3. Training facilities for evaluation personnel are lacking in almost all the States/Union Territories. Whatever little training is there, it is by deputing their staff for training to Central Programme Evaluation Organisation and other Research institutes. There is a need to organise systematic training for the evaluation personnel and to tailor the training programmes to suit the requirement of evaluation work (3.2 to 3.6).

4. There is scope for improving the quality, timeliness, and follow-up action of the reports completed by the various State evaluation organisations. Training would go a long way in improving the quality of these evaluation reports (4.1 & 4.6).

5. The training of the Senior and the Supervisory level personnel should be the direct responsibility of the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation. For training the Junior level evaluation personnel also, the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation should take up the responsibility of coordinating

the training activities with the State evaluation organisations. On the other hand, the State evaluation organisations may take the necessary guidance and support from the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation in organising and planning the courses (1.5 & 4.8).

6. The Regional Workshops on Evaluation should be a continuous feature to train Senior level personnel. The syllabus for this category of personnel should include conceptual/theoretical lectures besides discussion on the design, methodology, and findings of the selected evaluation reports of the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation and the participating State evaluation organisations. Emphasis should also be laid on the development of an evaluation design by each participant, on the topic likely to be taken up by him/his organisation for evaluation, in the second round of Workshop. Five such Regional Workshops per year should be organised, each for a duration of eight days. The participants of the Workshop should be treated as on tour and the non-official guest lecturers, if invited, should be paid an honorarium of Rs.100/- per lecture, besides TA/DA (4.10 to 4.12).

7. The syllabus for the Supervisory level evaluation personnel adopted by the Committee envisages the course contents of four weeks' duration. The course contents mainly include theoretical and conceptual lectures, designing of an evaluation study, data collection, and report writing. Three such courses should be organised per year with the help of the Training Division of the Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms. The TA/DA of the participants should be paid as per the rules of their respective Governments. The honorarium for the guest speaker/faculty should be paid as per the rules of the Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms (4.13 to 4.18).

8. For the training of Junior level evaluation personnel, the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation should be responsible for coordinating the training activities with the State evaluation organisations. The State evaluation organisations, however, may take the necessary guidance and support from the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation. The course contents of four weeks duration has both theoretical and practical inputs. Five courses be organised per year to cover the

entire number of Junior level personnel in the next five years. The TA/DA of the participants should be paid as per the rules of their respective Governments. The honorarium for the guest speakers/faculty should be paid as per the rules of the Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms (4.19 to 4.23).

9. The idea of preparing a Manual for Training may be taken up at the appropriate time when the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation/State evaluation organisations have gained sufficient experience of conducting various training courses (4.24).

10. In the light of the expectations from the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation regarding the organisation of training programmes for various levels of evaluation personnel, documentation and editing of evaluation reports, assessment/ reassessment of training needs, coordination with State Eevaluation organisations, etc., a pragmatic staff requirement has been recommended. This should include a Director, five Senior Training Specialists, five Training Specialists, ten Technical Assistants, and four other supporting staff. (4.25 to 4.29).

A P P E N D I X E S

A P P E N D I X E S

Appendix-I

No.PEO/10-6-/77-TE
Government of India
(Bharat Sarkar)
Programme Evaluation Organisation
(Karyakaram Mulyankan Sangathan)
Planning Commission)
(Yojana Ayog)

Yojana Bhavan, New Delhi.
23rd June, 1978

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Subject: Setting up of a Committee for Training in Evaluation

In pursuance of the decision arrived at the Conference of the Heads of State Evaluation Organisations held on 14th and 15th November, 1977 it has been decided to constitute a Committee on Training for Evaluation. The Constitution of the Committee will be as under:-

1. Shri Ajit Mozoomdar, Secretary, Planning Commission, New Delhi .. Chairman

2. Shri S.P. Bagla, Joint Secretary, Planning Commission, New Delhi .. Member

3. Joint Secretary (Training), Department of Personnel & Administrative Reforms, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi .. Member

4. Director, Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi or his nominee .. Member

5. Principal, Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Mussoorie or his nominee .. Member

6. Principal, Administrative Staff College of India, Hyderabad or his nominee .. Member

7. Director, Institute of Economic Growth, New Delhi .. Member

8. Director, National Institute of Community Development, Hyderabad or his nominee .. Member

9. Dr. Kanta Prasad, Member, .. Member
National Flood Commission, New Delhi

10. Director, .. Member
Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad
or his nominee

11. Shri U.K. Kohli, .. Member
Vice-President,
India Society of Training & Development, New Delhi

12. Shri D.C. Datta, .. Member
Director,
National Sample Survey Organisation,
New Delhi.

13. Prof. Nilkanth Rath, .. Member
Gokhale Institute of Politics & Economics,
Pune

14. Shri V. Venkatesan, .. Member
Secretary, Department of Planning,
Government of Maharashtra, Bombay

15. Shri Prabhakar Ghate, .. Member
Director of Evaluation and Training Division,
State Planning Institute,
Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow

16. Shri G. Chidambaram, .. Member
Director of Evaluation and Applied Research,
Government of Tamil Nadu, Madras

17. Shri T.N. Krishnan, .. Member
Centre for Development Studies,
Trivandrum

18. Dr. H.B. Shivamaggi, .. Member
Officer-in-Charge, Economic Department,
Reserve Bank of India, Bombay

19. Dr. S.M. Shah, Chief, .. Member
Programme Evaluation Organisation,
New Delhi.

20. Shri G.D. Singh, .. Convenor.
Deputy Adviser,
Programme Evaluation Organisation,
New Delhi.

2. The terms of reference of the Committee will be as follows:-

(i) To assess the training needs of the personnel for manning the State and National Evaluation Organisations;

(ii) To review the existing training arrangements in evaluation methodology;

(iii) To suggest various types of courses to be organised, their content including the range of disciplines, frequency and duration;

(iv) To suggest methods and techniques of training in relation to the courses;

(v) To identify suitable agencies for conducting various courses suggested under (iii) above;

(vi) To recommend measures for strengthening the agencies suggested under (v) so as to enable them to undertake effectively the training tasks;

(vii) To suggest the terms of deputation for the trainees; and

(viii) To suggest guidelines for the preparation of a Manual for Training.

3. The Headquarters of the Committee will be at New Delhi. The Committee may undertake studies commensurate with the above terms of reference and may make field visits for this purpose as and when necessary.

4. Non-official Members of the Committee will be entitled to T.A./D.A. as admissible to Grade I Officers of the Government of India, for journeys undertaken by them in connection with the work of the Committee.

5. The Committee is requested to furnish its report within six months.

Sd/- K.K.Srivastava
Joint Secretary to the Govt. of India.

Copy forwarded to:-

1. Chairman and all Members of the Committee.
2. P.S. to Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission
3. P.S. to Member (K)
4. P.S. to Member (S)
5. P.S. to Member(R)
6. All Heads of Divisions, Planning Commission
7. Chief Secretaries of all the States and Union Territories
8. Planning Secretaries of all the States and Union Territories
9. Heads of all the State and Union Territory Evaluation Organisations.
10. Director of Administration, Planning Commission
11. Deputy Secretary (Admn.), Planning Commission
12. All Dy. Advisors/Joint Directors, PEO, Planning Commission
13. All REOs/PEOs
14. Admn.IV Branch
15. Accounts IV Branch
16. General Branch
17. Technical Coordination (PEO)
18. Pay & Accounts Office, Planning Commission
19. Accounts I, Planning Commission.

Sd/- K.K. Srivastava
Jt. Secretary to the Government of India.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON EVALUATION HELD AT CHANDIGARH FROM 19th to 24th MARCH, 1979

In pursuance of the decision arrived at the Conference of the Heads of State Evaluation Organisations held in November, 1977, Planning Commission constituted a Committee on Training for Evaluation under the Chairmanship of Secretary, Planning Commission. The Committee in its first meeting held on 28th July, 1978 recommended that three experimental workshops should be organised for senior level officers for inter-change of ideas and experiences on evaluation. Accordingly, the first workshop was held at Chandigarh from 19th to 24th March, 1979. The six-day workshop was organised by the PEO in collaboration with the Economic Adviser to the Government of Punjab. The participants included senior officers from the PEO and the States of Punjab, Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh and Delhi Administration. The list of participants is placed at Annexure I.

2. The workshop was inaugurated by Shri S.S.Puri, Chief Secretary, Government of Punjab. Dr. S.M.Shah, Joint Secretary (PEO), attended the workshop and presided over the various sessions for two days on the 19th and 20th March, 1979. Shri S.P.Bagla, Joint Secretary, Planning Commission, chaired the concluding session on 24th March. Shri G.D. Singh, Deputy Adviser (PEO), attended all the sessions in order to guide and monitor the deliberations at the workshop.

3. The programme followed at the workshop is placed at Annexure II. The main focus was on critical discussion of selected evaluation reports of the PEO and State Evaluation Organisations. The reports discussed also in the workshop are given in Annexure II. The cyclostyled material regarding objectives, methodology, main findings, etc. of the reports were circulated to the participants before hand in the workshop and there were free and frank discussions on them with a view to improving the techniques and methodology of the reports in future.

4. Some important aspects of evaluation between the Centre and States, like coordination of evaluation work, training of evaluation personnel, joint studies, feed-back and follow-up of evaluation studies were also reviewed and discussed. Interesting talks were given by senior specialists on 'Role of Evaluation in the Planning Process', 'Social Development and Social Inequalities', 'Plan Implementation, Monitoring and Information Systems'. These were highly appreciated by the participants.

5. One full day was devoted for on-the-spot evaluation of Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) in Ludhiana district, Punjab. Useful discussion on IRDP were held with experts of the Punjab Agricultural University at Ludhiana. Evaluation Unit of the Economic Adviser's office in Punjab is planning to take up a pilot study of IRDP in one district of Punjab. The participants in the workshop discussed the outline for the proposed study and helped in evolving a suitable methodology for concurrent evaluation of this important programme. The last session was devoted to 'Workshop Evaluation'.

6. The following important points and suggestions emerged as a result of the deliberations at the workshop:-

(i) The evaluation reports were generally delayed for release as they were held up by the concerned Departments. It was emphasised that the time-lag between finalisation and release of reports should be minimised as far as possible.

(ii) The evaluation reports were not given any publicity in the press. It was suggested that a simple hand-out of the report should be given to the Press for wider publicity.

(iii) Follow-up action of the findings was generally lacking in most of the States. The strengthening of the machinery for proper follow-up and feed-back was recommended by the workshop.

(iv) Evaluation was a specialised subject and therefore evaluation work should be looked after by competent technical personnel. Besides, there should not be frequent transfer of evaluation staff to other state departments. Training of evaluation staff for 1 to 2 weeks could be arranged in PEO on the request of the States where such staff was newly appointed or required training. The mutual visits of officers engaged in evaluation work among different States should be encouraged to widen their outlook and enrich their experience.

(v) For study of Power and Irrigation Projects, the help of engineering personnel should be sought. Similarly, agronomists should be associated with the studies where their help was required.

(vi) The workshop welcomed the idea of conducting joint studies. Some programmes/projects of national or regional importance should be clearly earmarked for conducting the joint studies.

(vii) There should be proper coordination of evaluation work between the Centre and the States. PEO should be represented in State Evaluation Committees wherever it had not been done so far. The REO and State evaluation staff should meet frequently for mutual exchange of ideas. A quarterly meeting may be helpful. A Central advisory council was considered necessary for coordinating the evaluation work between the Centre and the States.

(viii) While conducting a new study, it was necessary to ensure that the main objectives of the study were covered in the instuments of observation and in-service training was imparted to the field staff before launching the study. The preparation of a dummy tabulation plan along with the schedules and questionnaires should also be of great help in analysing the data at a later stage.

7. The Regional Workshop at Chandigarh was the first of its kind on evaluation. The participants took keen interest in the deliberations of the workshop. They were of the view that such regional workshops would prove extremely useful for mutual exchange of ideas and improving the techniques of evaluation. It was suggested that such regional workshops should be made a regular feature and should be organised at least once a year.

Annexure-I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON EVALUATION, CHANDIGARH (19 -24 March, 1979).

I. Programme Evaluation Organisation

1. Dr. S.M.Shah, Joint Secretary
2. Shri G.D. Singh, Deputy Adviser
3. Shri S.B. Saharya, Deputy Adviser
4. Shri S.N. Dar, Deputy Adviser
5. Dr. B.N.Sahay, Joint Director
6. Shri K.S. Ludu, REO, Chandigarh
7. Shri M.S. Narula, PEO, Ludhiana
8. Shri S.P. Sharma, PEO, Srinagar
9. Shri O.P. Bhatia, R.O., Chandigarh
10. Shri B.L. Verma, R.O.(Hq.

II. Punjab State

1. Economic & Statistical Organisation

11. Shri J.S. Sandhu, Economic Adviser
12. Dr. Ajit Singh, Joint Director (Eval.)
13. Shri T.S. Bhasin, Research Officer (Eval.)
14. Shri D.S. Sandhu, Research Officer (Eval.)
15. Shri H.S. Gill , Research Officer (Eval.)

2. Irrigation Department

16. Shri B.D. Bali, Director (Eval)
17. Shri R.L. Suri, Ex. Egr. (Eval)
18. Shri Ujagar Singh, Asstt. Director(Eval)
19. Shri Gian Chand, Asstt. Dir.(Eval)

3. Agro-Industries Corporation

20. Shri S.S. Bawa, Service Engineer, Ludhiana

4. Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana

21. Dr. A.C. Sharma, Farm Economist
22. Dr. B.S. Dhillon, Asstt. Farm Economist

III. Haryana

23. Shri R.P. Chopra, Economic & Statistical Adviser
24. Shri [illegible].L. Katyal, Deputy Economic & Statistical Adviser
25. Shri I.M. Soni, Research Officer
26. Shri K.N. Jain, Research Officer

IV. Jammu & Kashmir

27. Shri G.R. Malik, Deputy Director (Eval)
28. Shri S.U. Jhangar, Asstt. Director (Eval)
29. Shri Manohar Khajuria, REO, Jammu

V. Himachal Pradesh

30. [illegible], Research Officer (Planning Deptt.)

VI. Delhi Administration

31. Shri T.R. Talwar, Deputy Director (Planning)

VII. Punjab University, Chandigarh

32. Dr. Satya Deva, Chairman, Deptt. of Public Admn.

VIII. Rural Electrification Corporation

33. Shri P.C. Anand, Deputy Director

Annexure-II

PROGRAMME FOR THE REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON EVALUATION AT CHANDIGARH (19th to 24th MARCH, 1979)

Date	Time	Topic	Speaker/Discussion Leader
19.3.79 Monday	10.30	Registration of participants	
	11.30	Inaugural Address	Shri S.S. Puri, Chief Secretary, Punjab
	14.30	Role of Evaluation in Planning process	Dr. S.M. Shah, Joint Secretary (PEO)
	16.00	Discussion of selected evaluation study on Agro-service Centres in Punjab	Shri J.S. Sandhu, Economic Adviser, Punjab
20.3.79 Tuesday	9.30	Continuation of Discussion of Evaluation Study on Agro-service Centres in Punjab	-do-
	11.00	Discussion of PEO Report on 'Soil and Water Management Study'	Shri S.B. Saharya, Dy. Adviser (PEO)
	14.30	Co-ordination of evaluation work - Centres and States	Shri G.D. Singh, Dy. Adviser (PEO)
	16.00	Discussion on Evaluation study of the Milk Plant, Jind	Shri R.P. Chopra, Economic & Statistical Adviser, Haryana
21.3.79 Wednesday	9.30	Discussion on evaluation study of SFDA Irrigation Scheme in Paonta Valley	Shri O.N. Kaul, Research Officer, H.P.
	11.00	Discussion on "Accessibility of the Poor to the Rural Water Supply"	Dr. B.N. Sahay, Jt. Director (PEO)
	14.30	Social Development and Social Inequalities	Dr. Victor de Suza, Punjab University
	16.00	Discussion on evaluation study of Working of Poultry Marketing Wing, Belicharna, Jammu	Shri G.R. Malik, Dy. Director (Eval.) Jammu & Kashmir.
	16.30	Field visit to Forest Research Institute, Haryana and Industrial Complex at Parwanu (H.P.) for on-the-spot evaluation.	

Date	Time	Topic	Speaker/Discussion Leader
22.3.79 Thursday	9.30	Implementation Planning, Monitoring & Information Systems (2 Sessions).	Shri U.K. Kohli, Chief (Monitoring), Planning Commission
	14.30	Discussion on selected evaluation study of Mid-day Meal programme of Delhi Administration.	Shri T.R. Talwar, Dy. Director (Planning)
	15.30	Discussion on 'Syllabus for Training in Evaluation Methodology for Supervisory Level Staff'.	Shri G.D. Singh, Dy. Adviser (PEO)
	16.30	Discussion on Rural Electrification Study being conducted by PEO	Shri S.N. Dar, Dy. Adviser (PEO)
23.3.79 Friday	9.00 to 18.00	Field trip to a selected Integrated Rural Development Project (IRDP) and Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana.	
24.3.79 Saturday	9.30 to 11.00	Discussion on evaluation of IRDP based on previous day's field trip.	
	11.00	Workshop evaluation and concluding session.	

Appendix-III

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECOND REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON EVALUATION HELD IN MADRAS FROM MAY 16-20, 1979

The Second Regional Workshop on Evaluation was organised by the Programme Evaluation Organisation, Planning Commission in collaboration with the Department of Evaluation and Applied Research, Government of Tamil Nadu in Madras from May 16-20, 1979. Although a six-day programme was originally designed, it had to be cut short by a day as a few of the participants, including those from the Government of Karnataka, could not attend due to one reason or the other. The participants in the Workshop represented the Central PEO; the state evaluation organisations of Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, and the Union Territory of Pondicherry; and the Universities of Tirupathi and Madras. The representatives from the States mainly constituted the Directors and the Deputy Directors (Annexure-I).

2. Inaugurating the Workshop, Shri S.L.N. Simha, Director, Institute of Financial Management and Research, Madras, emphasised that evaluation organisations should be allowed to be free to give their findings on a given study objectively - without any fear or favour. While welcoming the participants to the Workshop, Shri A.M. Swaminathan, Joint Secretary to the Government of Tamil Nadu, Department of Finance, stressed the importance of the role of evaluation machineries in the States and wanted the evaluators to help the administrators in respect of mid-course corrections and in selection of projects for implementation. In his presidential address at the inaugural session, Dr. S.M.Shah, Joint Secretary, Programme Evaluation Organisation, Planning Commission, expressed that many of the evaluation organisations in the States were weak and not viable. Elaborating the point further he stressed that there was an urgent need for strengthening the evaluation machineries in the larger national interest. The vote of thanks was moved by Shri G.Chidambram, Director, Evaluation, Government of Tamil Nadu.

3. The programme that followed constituted discussion on seven evaluation reports presented by the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation, the participating States, and the University of Madras (Annexure-II). These related to the Rural Electrification Programme (PEO), Soil and Water Management (PEO), Monopoly Scheme of Agro-Pumpsets and Implements Ltd. (Andhra Pradesh), Intensive Paddy Development (YEL.) Programme (Kerala), Minor Irrigation Scheme (Tamil Nadu), Key Village Scheme (Pondicherry), and SFDA in Cuilon (University of Madras). For a critical appraisal on the above studies with a special reference to their objectives, methodology, including sampling, instruments of observation, etc., and main findings, the reports were circulated among the participants in advance. The detailed discussion on the various evaluation reports helped in developing, among the participants, an appreciation for a better design and methodology of an evaluation study.

4. The theoretical and conceptual aspects related to the planning process and evaluation were also covered by the guest speakers. The topics covered were : Project Monitoring through PERT and CPM techniques; Cost Effectiveness in Welfare Economics; Cost Benefit Analysis - Theory and Practice; and Investment on Human Capital. Besides, a special lecture on theRole of Evaluation in the Planning Process was also arranged. On May 18, 1979, the participants were taken to Pillaipakkam (near Sriperumbudur) for an on-the-spot study of an irrigation tank. The various features of the proposed modernisation of the tank were explained to them by the officials of the Government of Tamil Nadu.

5. The following suggestions emerged as a result of the deliberations at the Workshop:-

1. To cope up with the present evaluation needs, the state evaluation organisations needed strengthening. The evaluation organisations in the States and the Union Territories should be a part of the planning department and work as an independent body without the administrative control of other departments.

2. The State Evaluation Committees should take active interest in evaluation reports, especially in the follow-up action of the main findings. In this connection, it was realised that the follow-up action on the evaluation findings was lacking in many cases. It was also felt that a wider publicity of the main findings of the study should be given through mass media.

3. The evaluation staff should be an inter-disciplinary team. Each member of this team must have adequate technical/professional competence. Besides, the staff members should be imparted training in evaluation methods and techniques.

4. The Central Programme Evaluation Organisation and the state evaluation organisations should take-up joint evaluation studies on subjects of national importance.

5. The specific time schedule fixed for the preparation of an evaluation report should be strictly adhered to.

6. The Central Programme Evaluation Organisation should publish a directory/catalogue of evaluation reports brought out by the various state evaluation organisations. The summary of individual reports in the directory should sharply bring out the main findings of the study.

7.

7. More emphasis may be laid on the concurrent and quick evaluation of the on-going programmes. Plan priorities should guide the choice of areas for evaluation. Evaluation studies should bring out suggestions for alternatives - capable of finding delivering goods. The fault/attitude, if any, should be discouraged.

6. The above suggestions, besides others, were discussed in detail during the concluding session on May 20, 1979 afternoon, held under the Chairmanship of Dr. S.M. Shah, Joint Secretary, Programme Evaluation Organisation, Planning Commission.

Annexure-I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS OF THE SECOND REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON EVALUATION HELD IN MADRAS FROM MAY 16 to 20, 1979

I. Central P.E.O. (Hqrs.)

1. Dr. S.M.Shah, Joint Secretary, Planning Commission
2. Shri S.B. Saharya, Deputy Adviser.

II. Regional P.E.Os.

3. Shri V.K.Manoharan, Project Evaluation Officer, Cochin.
4. Shri T. Yagiah, Project Evaluation Officer, Bangalore.
5. Shri K. Prasad Rao, Regional Evaluation Officer, Hyderabad.
6. Shri K.T. Verkey, Regional Evaluation Officer, Madras.
7. Shri T. Narayanan, Research Officer, Madras.
8. Shri K.N. Narayanan, Project Evaluation Officer, Tiruchy.

III. State Directorates

Kerala

9. Dr. M.V. George, Chief (Evaluation)
10. Shri N. Kuchummari, Deputy Director.
11. Shri K. Appukuttan, Deputy Director.

Tamil Nadu

12. Prof. G. Chidambaram, Director (Evaluation).
13. Prof. H.J.K. Suganthan, Deputy Director.

Andhra Pradesh

14. Shri V. Raman Rao, Director (Planning)
15. Shri N. Lakshmi Prasad, Deputy Director.

Pondicherry

16. Shri V.A. Vasudevaraju, Deputy Secretary, (Planning & Research).
17. Shri S. Shanmugaraj, Evaluation Officer.
18. Shri R. Mogane, Planning Officer.
19. Smt. B. Vijayalakshmi, Planning Officer.

IV. Tirupathi University

20. Shri B. Venugopal, Senior Research Officer.

V. Madras University

21. Dr. C. Arputharaj, Deputy Director and Head Agricultural Economics, Research Centre.

Annexure-II

PROGRAMME FOR THE SECOND REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON EVALUATION HELD IN MADRAS FROM MAY 16-20, 1979

Date	Time	Topic	Speaker/Discussion Leader
15.5.79 Wednesday	9.30 AM	Registration of participants	
	11.00 AM	Welcome Address	Shri A.M. Swaminathan, Joint Secretary, Finance Deptt., Tamil Nadu.
	11.30	Inaugural Address	Shri S.L.N. Simha, Director, Institute for Financial Management & Research, Madras.
	1.30 to 2.30 PM	Lunch	
	2.30 to 4.00 PM	Role of evaluation in Planning process	Dr. S.M. Shah, Joint Secretary, PEO, Planning Commission.
	4.00 to 5.00 PM	Project monitoring through PERT & CPM techniques - Guest Lecture	Prof. S.K. Ekambaram, Chairman, Institute of Management of Statistics & Economics, Madras.
17.5.79 Thursday	10.00 to 11.30 AM	Cost effectiveness in welfare Economics - Guest Lecture	Dr.V. Shanmugasundram, Member, State Planning Commission, Tamil Nadu.
	11.30 to 1.30 PM	Evaluation Study on Key Village Scheme - presentation and discussion (Pondicherry)	Shri V.A. Vasudevaraju, Deputy Secretary, Planning & Research Deptt., Pondicherry.
	1.30 to 2.30 PM	Lunch	
	2.30 to 4.00 PM	Evaluation study on 'Rural Electrification Programme' - presentation & discussion (PEO)	Shri K.T. Verkey, Regional Evaluation Officer, Madras.
	4.00 to 5.00 PM	Evaluation Report on SFDA in Quilon - presentation & discussion (Madras University)	Dr. C. Arputharaj, Dy. Director & Head, Agricultural Economics Research Centre, Madras University.

contd..

18.5.79 Friday		Field Study : Visit to Pillaipakkam Tank, Sriperumbudur	
19.5.79 Saturday	10.00 to 11.30 AM	Evaluation study on 'Monopoly' Scheme of Agro-Pumpsets and Implements Ltd., A.P.' - presentation & discussion (Andhra Pradesh)	Shri V.Raman Rao, Director (Planning), Andhra Pradesh.
	11.30 to 1.30 PM	Evaluation Study on 'The Intensive Paddy Development Programme' - presentation & discussion (kerala)	Dr. M.V. George, Chief (Evaluation), Kerala.
	1.30 to 2.30 PM	Lunch	
	2.30 to 3.30 PM	Cost-Benefit Analysis : Theory and Practice - Guest Lecture	Dr. D. Bright Singh, Member, State Planning Commission, Tamil Nadu.
20.5.79 Sunday	10.00 to 11.30 AM	Evaluation Study on 'Minor Irrigation Schemes in Tamil Nadu' - presentation and discussion (Tamil Nadu)	Shri H.J.K. Suganathan, Dy.Director, Evaluation, Tamil Nadu.
	11.30 to 1.30 PM	Evaluation Study on 'Soil and Water Management' - presentation and discussion (PEO)	Shri S.B.Saharya, Dy. Adviser, PEO, Planning Commission.
	1.30 to 2.30 PM	Lunch	
	2.30 to 3.30 PM	Investment on Human Capital and Appraisal - Guest Lecture	Dr. D.M. Nalla-Gounden, Prof. of Economics, University of Madras.
	3.30 to 5.00 PM	Concluding Session.	

Appendix-IV

PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRD REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON EVALUATION HELD AT GANDHINAGAR (GUJARAT) FROM JUNE 25-30, 1979

In consonance with the recommendations of the Committee for Training in Evaluation, the Programme Evaluation Organisation, Planning Commission, in collaboration with the State Governments, organised three Regional Workshops on Evaluation for the senior level officials of the State Evaluation Organisations and the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation. While the first two workshops were held at Chandigarh (March 19-24, 1979) and in Madras (May 16-20, 1979), the third was organised at Gandhinagar from June 25-30, 1979 in collaboration with the Government of Gujarat. The participants of the Gandhinagar Workshop represented the States of Gujarat, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, the Union Territory of Goa, Daman, and Diu, the All India Radio and the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation. In all, there were 42 participants. Apart from the officials of the Directorates of Evaluation, the Government of Gujarat also deputed senior officials from other departments for the Workshop (Annexure-I).

2. The Workshop was inaugurated by Shri Dineshbhai V.Shah, Minister for Planning and Finance, Govt. of Gujarat. Among the special invitees who attended the inaugural session were: Shri H.K.L.Capoor, Chief Secretary to the Government of Gujarat, Dr. V.S. Vyas, Vice-Chairman, State Planning Board, and Prof. A.R. Desai, Member, State Planning Board. In his inaugural address, the Minister for Planning and Finance stressed the need for evaluation of the plan programmes and highlighted its role in programme administration. Elaborating the point further, he suggested that evaluation was an aid to planning and policy formulation. While welcoming the Hon'ble Minister, the guests, and the participants, Shri R.Parthasarathy, Secretary, Planning and Finance, Government of Gujarat, emphasised that the evaluation studies may also enquire into the social forces, at work, besides other types of analyses including cost-benefit. The vote of thanks was moved by Dr. B.N.Sahay, Joint Director, Programme Evaluation Organisation.

3. The programme that followed in eight Business Sessions included presentation and discussion on evaluation reports, special lectures by eminent speakers, and field visits.(Annexure-II). In all, eight evaluation reports were presented by the Central Programme Evaluation Organisation and the participating States. These related to : Working of Antyodaya Programme in Rajasthan (PEO), Accessibility of the Poor to the Rural Water Supply (PEO); Rural Electrification Programme (PEO); Drought Prone Area Programme (Gujarat); Labour Contract Societies (Maharashtra); Model Industrial Training Institute, Bhopal (M.P.); Agricultural Extension Programme (Rajasthan); and Family Planning Programme (Goa).

4. In all, nine special lectures were delivered by the distinguished speakers from the Government of Gujarat and the Planning Commission, Government of India, The lectures covered by the speakers from the Government of Gujarat were: (1) The Role of Evaluation in the Planning Process by Dr. V.S.Vyas; (2) Some Issues of the Sound Evaluation System by Prof. A.R. Desai; (3) Feed-back and follow-up of Evaluation Studies by Shri R. Parthasarathy; (4) Joint Studies by PEO and the State Evaluation Organisations by V. Krishnamurthy; (5) Use of Computer in Socio-economic surveys by Shri P.B.Buch; and (6) Estimational Surveys and Evaluation - Similarities and Differences by G.S.Shah. Similarly, the special lectures delivered by the speakers from the Planning Commission were : (1) Social Development and Not Social Welfare - A Planning Strategy by Smt. P.P.Trivedi (Adviser); (2) Formulation of State Plans by Shri P.H.Vaishnav, Joint Secretary (State Plans); and (3) Evaluation and Monitoring of Plan Programmes by Dr. S.M.Shah, Joint Secretary (PEO). The above lectures were not only informative but also though provoking - providing leads in terms of methodology and approach to evaluation.

5. The field visits included : Gujarat Small Industries Corporation Limited (GSIC), Ahmedabad; Indian Institute of Management (IIM), Ahmedabad; Gujarat State Fertiliser Corporation, Fertilisernagar; Gujarat Refinery; and Operation Research Group (ORG), Vadodara. The field visits were well organised and were both informative and educative to the participants.

6. During the first two days of the deliberations of the Workshop, some doubts related to the scope and coverage of evaluation were raised. Subsequently, some questions pertaining to the format of the evaluation reports and the programme contents for the second round of the Workshop also arose. As a result, a sub-committee consisting of five members, one from each of the participating states, was constituted to examine the above issues. The Sub-committee presented the following recommendations during the Closing Session of the Workshop which was presided over by Dr. S.M.Shah, Joint Secretary (PEO):-

1. The scope of evaluation may be confined to the concurrent and ex-post evaluation of the project/programmes;

2. The format of the State and Central PEO evaluation reports should be uniform; and

3. The second round of workshops may also include development of an evaluation design, by each of the participants, in their programme contents.

7. Besides, each participant was asked to give his frank views on the various aspects of the Workshop. The participants felt that the workshop was very useful and they were fully satisfied with the Programme contents, the duration of the Workshop, arrangements for stay, etc. They opined that such Workshops be made a regular feature. According to them, the special lectures and field visits were well thought of and meaningful. The discussion on evaluation reports developed in them better appreciation for an approach to the designing and reporting of an evaluation study for their States. They, however, suggested that the reports to be discussed in such workshops be made available well in advance. Some important suggestions of general nature were also made by the participants which are as follows:-

1. Efforts may be made to go in for the concurrent and quick evaluation studies of the on-going programmes in more numbers. This would be in the interest of timely feed-back to the plan formulation and plan-implementation machineries;

2. The evaluation reports should not only be brought out in time, but also be given wider publicity. If the circulation of main report is likely to take longer time, the summary of findings may be brought out quickly;

3. The concerned departments should provide necessary cooperation in the collection of data required for an evaluation study;

4. The present evaluation staff requires strengthening and job-training urgently. Until this is done, the present staff should be utilised rationally for the evaluation of important schemes. It would be better if the state governments organise their own workshops in the interest of better performance of their evaluators;

5. The Central PEO and State / Evaluation Organisations should undertake joint studies of national importance; and

6. The detailed proceedings of the Workshop may be brought out in a printed form by the Directorate of Evaluation, Government of Gujarat. This would act as reference material for the other Workshops.

8. In his concluding remarks, Dr. S.M.Shah, Joint Secretary (PEO), claimed that the credibility of the Evaluation Organisations had increased and their importance realised. Expressing satisfaction over the deliberations of the workshop, he pointed out that maximum participation, business-like sessions, excellent arrangements, and active co-operation were some of the special features of this Third Regional Workshop on Evaluation. He thanked the Government of Gujarat, particularly Shri N.R.Nagar, Director, Evaluation, and his team for making the workshop a grand success.

Annexure-I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS FOR THE THIRD REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON EVALUATION HELD AT GANDHINAGAR (GUJARAT) FROM JUNE 28-30, 1979

PEO, Planning Commission

1. Dr. S.M. Shah	Jt. Secretary, (PEO), Planning Commission.
2. Shri S.B. Saharya	Dy. Adviser, Programme Evaluation Organisation, New Delhi.
3. Shri S.N.Dar	Deputy Adviser, Programme Evaluation Organisation, New Delhi.
4. Dr. B.N. Sahay	Joint Director, Programme Evaluation Organisation, New Delhi.
5. Shri B.L. Verma	Research Officer, Programme Evaluation Organisation, New Delhi.
6. Shri K.S.Shetty	Regional Evaluation Officer, Programme Evaluation Organisation, Bombay.
7. Shri S.K. Roy	Regional Evaluation Officer, Programme Evaluation Organisation, Jaipur.
8. Shri V.V. Oak	Project Evaluation Officer, Programme Evaluation Organisation, Ahmedabad.
9. Shri V.K.Kalavade	Project Evaluation Officer, Programme Evaluation Organisation, Bhopal.
10. Shri K.N.Chandrasekharan	Project Evaluation Officer, Programme Evaluation Organisation Trivandrum.

All India Radio

11. Shri S.R. Hiwarale	Audience Research Officer, All India Radio, Ahmedabad

Goa, Diu and Daman

12. Shri B.S.C.C. Dias	Statistical Officer, Department of Planning and Statistics, Goa.

Madhya Pradesh

13. Shri B.K. Mishra	Deputy Director, Directorate of Economics & Statistics, Government of Madhya Pradesh, Bhopal.
14. Shri M.B. Gandhi	Assistant Director, Directorate of Economics & Statistics, Government of Madhya Pradesh, Bhopal.

Maharashtra

15. Shri D.S. Kulkarni	Additional Director (Evaluation), Directorate of Economics & Statistics, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay.
16. Shri C.L. Amin	Deputy Director (Evaluation), Directorate of Economics & Statistics, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay.
17. Shri S.S. Choudhari	Deputy Director (Evaluation), Directorate of Economics & Statistics, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay.
18. Shri S.A. Alwani	Deputy Director (Evaluation), Dte. of Economics & Statistics, Govt. of Maharashtra, Bombay.

Rajasthan

19. Shri B.D. Agarwal	Director, Evaluation Organisation, Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
20. Shri B.R. Dubey	Deputy Director, Evaluation Organisation, Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
21. Shri B.L. Choudhari	Dy. Director, Evaluation Organisation, Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

Gujarat

22. Shri N.R. Nagar	Director, Directorate of Evaluation, Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.
23. Shri B.T. Dabhi	Deputy Director, Directorate of Evaluation, Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.

24. Shri Y.M. Shukla	Evaluation Officer, Directorate of Evaluation, Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.
25. Shri C.M. Parekh	Evaluation Officer, Directorate of Evaluation, Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.
26. Shri D.K. Pandya	District Planning Officer, Vadodara Collectorate, Vadodara.
27. Shri P.M. Acharya	District Planning Officer, Jamnagar Collectorate, Jamnagar.
28. Shri G.C. Shah	District Planning Officer, Panchmahals Collectorate, Panchmahals.
29. Shri B.K. Avashia	Assistant Development Commissioner, Office of the Development Commissioner, Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.
30. Shri Z.C. Chavada	Project Administrator, Khedbrahma, District : Sabarkantha.
31. Shri J.J. Vaishnav	Project Administrator, Vansada, District : Valsad.
32. Shri S.K. Saiyed	Under Secretary (S.F.D.I.) Agriculture, Forests and Co-operation Deptt., Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.
33. Shri L.J. Mehta	Under Secretary (Evaluation & Monitoring) Agriculture, Forests and Co-operation Department, Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.
34. Shri J.B. Bhatt	Deputy Director, Directorate of Evaluation, Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.
35. Shri C.C. Shah	Deputy Director, Bureau of Economics & Statistics, Govt. of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.

36. Shri K.R. Lad	Officer on Special Duty, Monitoring Cell, Irrigation Department, Government of Gujarat.
37. Shri I.M. Patel	Executive Engineer, Central Design Organisation, Irrigation Department, Government of Gujarat.
38. Shri B.J. Shukla	Under Secretary, P.P.M. Cell, Irrigation Department, Government of Gujarat.
39. Shri D.R. Mali	Deputy Engineer, Monitoring Inventory, Control Cell, Irrigation Department, Government of Gujarat.
40. Shri N.G. Vakharia	Superintending Engineer, P.P.M. Cell, Buildings & Communication Department, Government of Gujarat.
41. Shri B.K. Gohel	Deputy Director, Office of the Industries Commissioner, Government of Gujarat.
42. Shri A.R. Lakadawala	Deputy Engineer, Gujarat Electricity Board, Baroda.

Annexure-II

PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON EVALUATION HELD AT GANDHINAGAR FROM JUNE 25-30, 1979

Date	Time	Topic	Speaker/Discussion Leader
25.6.79 Monday	9.30	Registration of participants	
		INAUGURAL SESSION	
	10.45	Welcome address	Shri R. Parthasarathy, Secretary, Planning, Government of Gujarat.
	11.00	Inauguration of the Workshop	Shri Dineshbhai V. Shah, Minister for Planning & Finance, Govt. of Gujarat.
	11.30	Vote of thanks	Dr. B.N. Sahay, Joint Director, Programme Evaluation Organisation, Planning Commission, Government of India.
	11.45	Tea	
		BUSINESS SESSION I	
	12.00	Role of Evaluation in planning process	Dr. V.S. Vyas, Vice-Chairman, State Planning Board, Government of Gujarat and Director, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad.
	13.00	Lunch	-
		BUSINESS SESSION II	
	14.30	Some issues of Sound Evaluation System	Prof. A.R. Desai, Member, State Planning Board, Government of Gujarat & Vice-Chancellor, South Gujarat University, Surat.
	15.30	Tea	-
	15.45	Use of Computer in Socio-economic Surveys	Shri P.B. Buch, Director, Gujarat Computer Centre, Government of Gujarat.

e	Time	Topic	Speaker/Discussion Leader
	16.45	Study of D.P. .P. - presentation & discussion (Gujarat)	Shri N.R. Nagar, Director of Evaluation, Government of Gujarat.
		BUSINESS SESSION III	
26.6.79 Tuesday	9.30	Formulation of State Plans	Shri P.H.Vaishnav, Joint Secretary(State Plans), Planning Commission, Government of India.
	10.45	Tea	-
	11.00	Study of the Scheme of Labour Contract Societies- Presentation & discussion (Maharashtra)	Shri D.S. Kulkarni, Additional Director, Directorate of Economics & Statistics, Government of Maharashtra.
	12.00	A Case Study of Model Industrial Training Institute, Bhopal - presentation & discussion (Madhya Pradesh)	Shri B.K. Mishra, Deputy Director, Dte. of Economic & Statistics, Govt. of Madhya Pradesh.
	13.00	Lunch	-
		BUSINESS SESSION IV	
	14.30	Working of Antyodaya Programme in Rajasthan - a quick evaluation study by PEO - presentation & discussion	Shri S.B. Saharya, Deputy Adviser, Programme Evaluation Organisation, Planning Commission, Government of India.
	15.45	Leave for Ahmedabad	
	16.30	Study visit to Gujarat Small Industries Corporation Ltd., Ahmedabad.	
		BUSINESS SESSION V	
27.6.79 Wednesday	9.30	Estimational Surveys and Evaluation - Similarities and Differences	Shri C.S. Shah, Director, Bureau of Economics & Statistics, Govt. of Gujarat.
	11.15	Joint Studies by PEO and State Evaluation Organisations	Shri V. Krishnamurthy, Commissioner, Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation, Ahmedabad.
	12.45	Lunch	-

Date	Time	Topic	Speaker/Discussion Leader
	BUSINESS SESSION VI		
	14.00	Rural Water Supply - A Quick Evaluation Study by PEO, presentation & discussion	Dr. B.N. Sahay, Joint Director, Programme Evaluation Organisation, Planning Commission, Govt. of India.
	15.00	Tea	-
	15.15	Feed-back and follow-up of Evaluation Studies	Shri R.Parthasarathy, Secretary, Planning, Government of Gujarat.
	16.15	Visit to Ahmedabad	-
	BUSINESS SESSION VII		
28.6.79 Thursday	8.30	An Evaluation Study of Family Planning Programme - presentation & discussion (Goa)	Shri B.S.C.C. Dias, Statistical Officer, Department of Planning & Statistics, Govt. of Goa, Daman, & Diu.
	9.30	Evaluation and Monitoring of Plan Programmes	Dr. S.M. Shah, Joint Secretary (PEO) Planning Commission, Government of India.
	11.00	Tea	-
	11.15	Social Development and Not Social Welfare - A Planning Strategy	Smt. P.P. Trivedi, Adviser, Planning Commission, Government of India.
	12.45	Lunch	-

Date	Time	Topic	Speaker/Discussion Leader
		BUSINESS SESSION VIII	
	14.00	Rural Electrification Programme - Study being conducted by PEO - presentation & discussion	Shri S.N. Dar, Deputy Adviser, PEO, Planning Commission Government of India.
	15.00	Study of Agriculture Extension Programme in the Rajasthan Canal and Chambal Command Area - presentation & discussion (Rajasthan)	Shri B.D. Agarwal, Director, Evaluation Organisation, Government of Rajasthan.
	16.45	Visit to Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad.	
29.6.79 Friday	7.30	Field Visit to Gujarat State Fertiliser Company, Fertiliser-nagar, Gujarat Refinery and Operation Research Group, Vadodara.	
		CLOSING SESSION	
30.6.79 Saturday	9.30	Workshop on Evaluation	Dr. S.M. Shah, Joint Secretary (PEO) Planning Commission, Government of India.
	11.45	Tea	
	12.00	Closing Session	Dr. S.M. Shah, Joint Secretary (PEO), Planning Commission, Government of India.

RECOMMENDED COURSES FOR TRAINING

(Extracted from pp.63-65 of the first Conference of the Heads of State Evaluation Organisations, November - 1977, PEO, Planning Commission, New Delhi).

Suggested Programmes for Training in Evaluation

Although identification of specific training needs for specific jobs/categories of personnel, development of various types of syllabii, list of trainers/training institutions, etc., are matter of systematic understanding of the details, one may suggest the following types of training courses on the basis of the broad assessment of the existing situation and the experience gained as a result of past efforts:

(a) Orientation Course in Evaluation

(i) Purpose : To provide basic orientation in evaluation as a planning process - particularly for the new entrants (but all must undergo this course if not completed immediately after joining the evaluation organisation(s).

(ii) Contents : The Planning Process - genesis, philosophy, concept, and objective of evaluation - evaluation standards and types - evaluation and feed-back - steps and processes in evaluation - various approaches to evaluation - sampling methods - techniques of evaluation - development and use of various instruments of observation - field work - planning, supervision and scrutiny - tabulation, analysis, interpretation, reporting, etc. (content vis-a-vis training techniques would be decided on the basis of the requirement for a particular category of officers).

(iii) Category of Personnel - Junior[1], Supervisory[2], and Senior[3] levels.

(iv) Duration - Three months for Junior level, two months for Supervisory level, and one month for Senior level officials.

(v) Frequency - 3 courses per year - one for each category of personnel.

---

1. Junior Level - Investigators (I & II)/Statistical/Technical/Scientific Asstts.
2. Supervisory Level - Research Officers/Asstt. Directors/Evaluation Officer/ Sr. Research Officers/Deputy Directors.
3. Senior Level - Directors/Jt. Directors/Project Directors.

(b) Refresher Course in Fundamental Subjects

(i) Purpose - To acquaint the Supervisory and Senior levels evaluation personnel with the latest techniques of evaluation and enabling them to become up-to-date in the subject(s) of specialisation.

(ii) Contents - Method and approach to evaluation - analysis/interpretation techniques - latest trends in Social Research/Economics/Statistics/Sociology and allied disciplines.

(iii) Category of Personnel - Supervisory and Senior levels.

(iv) Duration - 3 weeks for Supervisory level and 2 weeks for Senior level.

(v) Frequency - 2 courses per year for each category mentioned above.

(c) Study Course in the subject-matter of Evaluation Studies

(i) Purpose - To provide a detailed knowledge of the subject-matter/project/scheme/programme to be evaluated. This is all the more important in the context of the Rolling Plan concept.

(ii) Contents - The scheme/project/programme - objective - financial outlays - physical targets - relevant references - selection of variables/indicators/parameters, etc.

(iii) Category of Personnel - Junior, Supervisory, and Senior Levels.

(iv) Duration - 2 weeks for Senior level, 1 week each for Supervisory and Junior levels (may be organised at the regional training Seminars together with discussion on instruments, etc.).

(v) Frequency - As per the number of studies (to be organised at least four weeks before the designing of the study for Senior level).

(d) Inter-disciplinary Course

(i) Purpose - For better appreciation of various latent socio-cultural and economic factors and understanding of the different inter-disciplinary theories/concepts.

(ii) Contents - Habitat, society, and culture - infrastructure - economy - innovations and change - planning for development - state/regional/district/block level planning - research methodology and project assignment from designing to reporting - coordination, supervision, administration, etc.- concept of PERT and management.

(iii) Category - Supervisory and Senior levels.

(iv) Duration - 16 weeks for Supervisory level and 12 weeks for Senior level.

(v) Frequency - Two courses per year - one each for the above two categories.

(e) Job-course

(i) Purpose - To build-up one's professional competence vis-a-vis his job requirement.

(ii) Contents - To be developed after a systematic study of the job requirements of each category of personnel.

(iii) Category of Personnel - All the three broad categories.

(iv) Duration - 12 weeks for junior level, 8 weeks for supervisory level, and 6 weeks for senior level.

(v) Frequency - 3 courses in a year - one for each category - to be imparted within a year of appointment, but all must undergo this course.

In the conduct of the above courses, various training techniques will have to be selected keeping in view the topics to be covered and the level of the participants. While more reliance may have to be placed on conference, workshop, seminars, symposia, syndicate, etc. for the Senior and Supervisory (partly) levels; panel discussion, individual session, lecture-cum-discussion, etc. may be found useful for the Junior level officials. Field placements and field trips for problem-oriented case studies/pilot studies in the case of courses of longer duration would be useful for all the three levels of officials.