



REPORT
OF
THE WORKING GROUP
ON
EVALUATION IN THE STATES

LANNING COMMISSION
GOVT. OF INDIA

1964



REPORT
OF
THE WORKING GROUP
ON
EVALUATION IN THE STATES

PLANNING COMMISSION
GOVT. OF INDIA

1964

PRINTED BY THE GENERAL MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS,
MINTO ROAD. NEW DELHI.

Planning Commission
New Delhi
16th October, 1964.

Dear Mr. Deputy Chairman,

You may recall that at the last meeting of the National Development Council I had suggested to the State Governments assembled that they might consider the advisability of strengthening the evaluation machinery in their States and putting them on a more systematic basis. I laid emphasis on the importance of such an evaluation machinery having a semi-independent status and also dwelt on the need of the State machinery being coordinated with our Central machinery of Programme Evaluation in the Planning Commission. I concluded by saying that I would like to discuss the subject with the State Planning Secretaries the next day.

2. Accordingly, a meeting of the State Planning Secretaries was called in the Planning Commission on November 11, 1963. After a full and free discussion, it was agreed that it would be very useful from the point of view of effective implementation of State developmental programmes if a well-organised evaluation machinery could be set up in the different States and their work coordinated with the work of the Programme Evaluation Organization. In order that the details of such an evaluation machinery could be worked out from the point of view of obtaining a certain amount of uniformity and co-ordination among the various States, it was decided to constitute a Working Group to examine this problem in all its bearings and submit concrete proposals. The Working Group had on its membership several State Planning Secretaries or Development Commissioners with myself as Chairman and the Director of the P.E.O., Dr. J. P. Bhattacharjee as convenor. Shri T. P. Singh, Secretary Planning Commission was also member of this group.

3. The Working Group have held several meetings and in addition have gone round a number of States and held discussions with the senior officers of these State Governments. They also had the privilege of having discussions with some of the Chief Ministers in the States they visited. As a result of the first-hand knowledge they thus gained not only of the working of evaluation machinery in the States where these are well-organised but also of the problems that

face the States in regard to evaluation, the Working Group have been able to bring a great deal of realism to bear on their deliberations. The report submitted herewith is unanimous and we trust that speedy action will be taken on our recommendations.

4. I may be permitted to mention briefly here some of our major findings. We have come to the conclusion that there is scope for two types of evaluation in the States, one of which is oriented to the current operational problems and arrangements for which should therefore be integrated with the implementing agencies concerned in the various developmental sectors. The other type of evaluation is much more similar to what the Planning Commission has been having made through its Programme Evaluation Organisation. The second type of evaluation requires that the evaluation agency should be independent of the machinery charged with the responsibility for administering programmes. We have recommended, therefore, that every State Government should have an evaluation organisation as an integral part of its planning machinery. This organisation should function either as a wing or a division of the Planning Department or as a Directorate attached to it. It should not be under the administrative control of any other department. Nor should it be located in the Bureau of Statistics either as a wing or a division. The State evaluation organisation, as conceived by the Group, will have a headquarter unit and a field organisation. On this basis, it has been recommended that in the Fourth Plan, provision be made for a sum of Rs. 150 lakh for evaluation schemes of States and Union Territories.

5. The envisaged expansion in the evaluation set-up and activities in the States will impose additional responsibilities on the evaluation machinery at the Centre, especially in respect of coordination and administration of plan schemes, extension of technical advice and information, and training of personnel. The Group have recommended that the P.E.O. should be adequately strengthened so that it can assume this added burden of duties.

6. The Group have recommended that there should be a Central Advisory Council on Evaluation on which the State Governments, the Planning Commission, the Central Ministries and the P.E.O. should be represented. It should meet, at least once a year, to review progress of studies, discuss problems, methods and techniques of evaluation and advise the Central and the State evaluation agencies on the programmes of study and the coordination of their activities.

7. With such an evaluation set-up extending from the States to the Centre, it will be possible to bring out an annual evaluation re-

view of the whole plan. The Group envisage this as one of the basic annual documents to be placed before the nation. The document will be discussed at the Central Council on Evaluation before it is finalised and will incorporate the evaluation experience during the year of the Central and the State organisations.

8. In addition, the Working Group also considered, though somewhat briefly, the existing arrangements for planning and progress analysis in the different States. They found that planning has not yet been fully organised as a separate department in a number of States and also that the planning machinery appears to stand in need not only of a larger staff but also of a better technical and organisational set-up. Though this is not directly within the terms of reference of the Working Group, I cannot help bringing prominently to your notice the importance of having a thorough review of the planning machinery in the States from the point of view of both the formulation and implementation of development programmes. Incidentally, it needs hardly emphasising that the better the planning machinery the more successful would be the use of evaluation.

9. I would also like to make a reference to another important finding of the Working Group which again perhaps does not come strictly within the terms of reference. Arrangements for progress analysis and implementation review display a wide diversity among the States. There is room for qualitative improvement in progress reporting and analysis in a number of plan sectors like irrigation and power, cooperation, education and health. In a number of States, there is scope for the systematisation and streamlining of the existing arrangements for reporting, e.g., coordinating and rationalising the progress reporting system in the districts and the routing and analysis of such data at higher levels. I think it would be very much worthwhile for the Planning Commission to take up this matter and perhaps have this referred for detailed consideration to the Study Team or a Working Group similar to ours.

10. In conclusion I should like to place on record my very deep appreciation of the splendid work that has been done in connection with this Working Group by Dr. J. P. Bhattacharjee, Director of the Programme Evaluation Organisation. As convenor of the Group, the main burden lay on his shoulders and as you can see from the report, he has discharged it in a commendable manner. I would also like to express my deep sense of gratitude to the other members of the Working Group, especially those from the State Governments who spared time to attend our meetings, accompanied the Working Group on the tours and gave us not only the benefit of their experience in their own States but also substantially contributed to the thinking

(iv)

that has gone into the findings of our report. I must also thank all the State Governments for having responded to our questionnaire and furnishing us with all the material that was required for our getting a complete picture of the state of evaluation and the problems connected therewith in the country.

11. I am confident that the implementation of our recommendations will be an important step in the streamlining of the administrative machinery in the States for economic development and this will go a long way towards our getting both larger and quicker returns from the investments that are being made in the States.

Yours sincerely

Sd/- (V. K. R. V. RAO)

Shri Asoka Mehta
Deputy Chairman
Planning Commission.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Pages
I. Introduction	1—3
II. Objectives and Orientation of Evaluation	4—10
III. Scope, Content and Method of Evaluation	11—17
IV. Review of Evaluation Arrangements and Activities in the States	18—28
V. Proposals for Evaluation in the States in the Fourth Plan	29—35
VI. Coordination of Evaluation work at the Centre and Role of the Programme Evaluation Organisation	36—37
SUMMARY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS	38—46
APPENDIX	
I. Summary Record of Discussions of the Working Group with the Governments of (A) Maharashtra, (B) Mysore, (C) U. P., (D) West Bengal and (E) Orissa	47—62
II. A—D Statements summarising the replies received from the State Governments to the Working Group's Questionnaire	63—101
A. Arrangements for Progress Analysis and Review.	
B. Objective and Scope of Programme Evaluation.	
C. Nature and Organisation of the Evaluation Machinery in the State.	
D. Role of the Programme Evaluation Organisation	
II. E. Questionnaire on Objective, Scope and Arrangements for Evaluation, Progress Analysis and Review in the States	102—104
III. Evaluation of Rural Development in the Third Plan—Talk by Prof. V. K. R. V. Rao at the Symposium on Evaluation organised by the Programme Evaluation Organisation on September 22, 1961.	105—111
IV. A. Statement of composition, staffing and budget of Evaluation cells and the Advisory Committees.	112—125
B. List of the Evaluation studies conducted in the States having Evaluation Units.	
V. A. List of the persons who participated in the deliberations of the working Group on Evaluation in the States.	126—130
B. Visits to States by the members of the Working Group on Evaluation and list of persons with whom discussions were held.	