



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.	

CHAPTER I

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON EVALUATION IN THE STATES

INTRODUCTION

1. At a meeting of the State Planning Secretaries with the Planning Commission on November 10, 1963, Prof. V. K. R. V. Rao referred to the diversity in the approach to evaluation found in the States which had instituted a machinery for undertaking evaluation work. At his instance, the role, the objective and the arrangements suitable for evaluation in the States were taken up for further discussion with the State Planning Secretaries at a special meeting on November 11, 1963. Emphasizing evaluation as an integral instrument of planning and recognizing the need for strengthening evaluation activities and arrangements in the States, the meeting recommended, among other things, that "a small Working Group should be set up to examine the whole question of evaluation machinery in the States and do some thinking on the basic issues bearing on the organizational set-up and the content of evaluation". A suggestion was also given about the broad composition of this Group.

2. In pursuance of this recommendation, the Planning Commission constituted a Working Group for reviewing evaluation arrangements and activities in the States and formulating proposals for the Fourth Plan, with the following composition:—

1. Prof. V. K. R. V. Rao, Member, Planning Commission—
Chairman.
2. Secretary, Planning Commission.
3. Secretary (Planning), Andhra Pradesh.
4. Development Commissioner*, Uttar Pradesh.
5. Secretary (Finance-Planning), Maharashtra.
6. Development Commissioner, Bihar.
7. Director of Evaluation, Rajasthan.
8. Director, Programme Evaluation Organisation, Planning Commission—*Convenor.*

3. The terms of reference of the Working Group were as follows:—

- (i) to examine the current orientation and approach to evaluation in the States and review the nature, progress

*With the re-organisation of the set-up for planning and development, the designation has changed to Commissioner for Planning and Evaluation.

and follow-up of evaluation studies they have conducted during the Third Plan period;

- (ii) to broadly formulate, in the light of current thinking on the subject and foreseeable trends in the near future, the scope, content and method of evaluation to be adopted in the States from the beginning of the Fourth Plan, if not earlier;
- (iii) to critically examine in the light of (ii) above, the adequacy of the existing arrangements for evaluation, specially in respect of the organizational set-up, independence in work, the quality and strength of staff;
- (iv) to roughly estimate the financial resources likely to be required for properly setting up and/or strengthening the evaluation machinery in the States; and
- (v) in general, to suggest ways and means of coordinating the evaluation activities in different States with those at the Centre and making arrangements for the training of evaluation personnel.

4. The Group decided at its first meeting to invite Advisers (Programme Administration) and Chief (Programme Administration) of the Planning Commission to associate themselves with the Group. The Group had the benefit of their participation not only in their deliberations but also in the discussions and visits with the State Governments. Additional Development Commissioner, Maharashtra, Deputy Secretary (Planning), Maharashtra, Deputy Secretary (Planning), U.P., and Joint Director, P.E.O., participated in all the meetings and tours of the Group. A list of persons associated with the Group as members and otherwise, is given in Appendix IV.

5. The Group held four business meetings; three in New Delhi and one in Lucknow. They also met a number of times in the course of their tours. In order to study the nature, content and arrangements for planning, evaluation, and progress analysis and ascertain future plans for strengthening these in some of the States, the Group visited Maharashtra, Mysore, U.P., West Bengal and Orissa. They had the benefit of discussions with the Chief Ministers of Maharashtra and Mysore, Chairman of the State Planning Board, Orissa, and Chief Secretaries, Development Commissioners, Planning Secretaries, Finance Secretaries and the administrative and technical heads of most of the departments in these States. The itinerary of the Group and the list of officials with whom discussions were held in these States are given in Appendix IV.

6. Through these visits and thorough discussions with the members from Andhra, Bihar and Rajasthan, the Group could obtain a clear picture of the approach to, and arrangements for planning, evaluation and progress analysis in eight States. Much as the Group wanted to, it could not find time to visit the other States. To elicit needed information and data from these as well as other States, a questionnaire (Appendix II) had been issued, replies to which were received from nearly all the State Governments. These data have been summarised in Appendix II and used in the report in appropriate places. In Appendix III is included the text of a talk Prof. V. K. R. V. Rao gave at a Symposium on Evaluation of Rural Development in the Third Plan, organised by the Programme Evaluation Organisation in September 1961. The views expressed by Prof. Rao in the course of this talk are relevant as well as stimulating.

7. The Group want to place on record their appreciation of the response they have received from the State Governments and the Planning Commission. They are especially thankful to the Governments of Maharashtra, Mysore, Orissa, U.P. and West Bengal for the courtesy and hospitality extended during their visits to these States. The Programme Evaluation Organisation has helped and serviced the Working Group in different ways. The Group acknowledge with thanks all such help and assistance.

CHAPTER II

OBJECTIVES AND ORIENTATION OF EVALUATION

Concept of Evaluation:

8. An attempt has been made by the Planning Commission to define this concept in the three successive plan documents. Over these years, three separate activities have come to be recognized in the area that can be loosely designated as evaluation. These are continuous analysis of programmes and projects, periodical evaluation of selected programmes and schemes, and occasional review of implementation of the plan in different sectors. These activities have progressively come to acquire a degree of specialization at the centre. Progress analysis has become a primary responsibility of the Ministries. Though the Planning Commission is vitally concerned with it, it relies on the Ministries for progress data. A review of the implementation of the plan is a primary responsibility of the Planning Commission. Evaluation of programmes is undertaken by the Programme Evaluation Organization; but it is not the only agency at the centre undertaking such work. The Committee on Plan Projects has conducted evaluation studies of a number of programmes through study teams. Of late, a few *ad hoc* and other arrangements have also been made in the Ministries for evaluation of special and important programmes.

9. Broadly speaking, the objectives of programme evaluation at the centre include assessment of progress and impact, finding out areas of success and failure in implementation, analysing the reasons for success or failure, ascertaining people's acceptance of the programme benefits and their reactions, and deriving lessons for improvement in the formulation and implementation of programmes. Evaluation in this sense is distinct and separate from progress analysis and review, on the one hand, and inspection, checking and scrutiny of schemes and works, on the other. It means purpose and problem oriented studies of programmes under implementation and schemes under execution. Evaluation has thus come to be recognised in India as an integral instrument of planning.

10. While assessment of progress is a part of evaluation, it has to go beyond progress data and probe deeper. It may be said that real evaluation begins where progress analysis ends. The distinctive features of evaluation may be summarized as:—

- (a) Analysis of the objectives of the programme under study, the approach to its formulation and target-setting at

different levels and the system evolved for its implementation;

- (b) Examination of the suitability and effectiveness of the organisation, methods, procedures and schedules used for its administration and execution at different levels;
- (c) Assessment, in the light of the programme objectives, of the impact through analysis of the flow and distribution of benefits and the use made of these;
- (d) Ascertaining the factors and reasons underlying the differential impact—successes and failures—on different areas and groups, and people's acceptance, cooperation and involvement at the level of execution;
- (e) Ascertaining wastages of men, materials and money, if any; and
- (f) Suggesting methods of improvement in programming, administration, organisation, execution and extension.

This concept of evaluation obviously relates to programmes which affect large areas and/or involve considerable sections of the people, and in which people's cooperation forms an integral part of the method of implementation. As a concept, it is, therefore, broader than "appraisal and evaluation", which is related to a study of the economic feasibility or desirability of large but concentrated investment projects.

Evaluation and its interpretation in the States

11. The meaning and objectives of evaluation, discussed above, have taken shape over the last twelve years through the activities of the Programme Evaluation Organization. They reflect the needs felt at the centre by the Planning Commission and the Central Ministries; and they have to be understood against the background of the planning and developmental functions performed by the Government of India and the relationship between the Centre and the States in these matters. The duties and responsibilities of the State Governments are, in some ways, different from those at the Centre. The Working Group are of the opinion that the meaning and objectives of evaluation in the States should be related to the specific requirements of the development work undertaken by the State Governments and the felt-needs of their administration machinery for the implementation of plans and programmes. In both these respects, the present position in the States displays considerable diversity.

12. The Group sought the views of the State Governments on the meaning and objectives of evaluation. Three of the State Governments did not express any opinion on this point, possibly because they had not given sufficient consideration to it in the past and, indeed, had not yet set up any evaluation units in their States. Among the State Governments which have expressed their views, two tend to interpret evaluation as 'achievement audit' and 'study of changes in cost estimates'. The others appear to take a line closer to the one discussed in the earlier paragraphs. Some of their statements explaining evaluation are: "qualitative and quantitative assessment of schemes and their impact with a view to suggesting improvements", "assessment of the impact of plan schemes, objective analysis of implementation problems and the role of implementing machinery, and indication of corrective measures", "studying the achievement of aims and objectives of schemes and highlighting difficulties in the formulation and execution of plans.....and to analyse the reasons for failure and success", "assessment of progress and impact and analysis of problems and difficulties". A closer examination of these responses indicates that while the majority of the States have emphasized progress analysis in one form or another, the emphasis on the study of problems varies in nature and extent, depending on experience in the field of evaluation.

13. The diversity noticed by the Group in the approach of the State Governments to the field of evaluation leads them to emphasise two desiderata for the effective development of this activity. In the first place, the purpose and objective of evaluation should be understood and interpreted in a uniform way in all States, as there is, otherwise, a danger of misunderstanding, ineffective use, or even mis-use of this potent and sensitive instrument in the planning armoury. This understanding should be shared by the Government at all levels in the States. Secondly, while a clear understanding and appreciation of the nature and object of evaluation is necessary, it is not a sufficient condition for ensuring the needed growth of this activity and the effective use of its results. Evaluation as a specialised function requires for its success the existence of a strong planning department with adequate strength and technical expertise, coordinated arrangements for the reporting of progress data from the field, and systematic analysis of such data for purposes of plan follow-up. The Group feel that development of all these arrangements are inter-related and should receive simultaneous attention from the State Governments.

14. Evaluation, as it may be practised in the States, should have some special features or areas of special emphasis among the objectives set forth in paragraph 10. In deriving these, the Group have

taken note of the role of the State Governments in the planning and implementation of programmes. These governments are closer to the ground than the Central Government; they are directly charged with the responsibility of administration of execution of the programmes in most parts of the rural and the community sectors of the plan (State Plan schemes as well as Centrally sponsored schemes). Keeping this in view, the following areas of emphasis among the general objectives are recommended:

(a) The departmental machinery and methods are generally the same or similar all over a State. While evaluation at the Centre has to deal with the comparative assessment of different systems and methods of administration, at the State level performances and problems will have to be related to a given system of administration in its working in different regions and as a whole. This implies the need for special studies of methods, efficiency and economy in the operation of the given system.

(b) Most of the programmes and schemes in the States involve, in their implementation, statutory and other institutions—Panchayati Raj, Boards, Cooperatives, etc. With the progressive transfer of functions and responsibility to these bodies, specially the Panchayati Raj institutions, the need for observing and assessing their activities and performance has been gaining in urgency. Regular or periodical evaluation of the functioning of these institutions *per se* should receive special attention in the States.

(c) In assessing the impact of development programmes the distribution of benefits among different regions and socio-economic groups deserves special study. Inter-regional differences and inter-group disparities should be of special concern to the State evaluation organisations.

(d) There is also a strong case for studying in depth the extension methods and recommendations and relating them to the special needs and problems of local areas.

(e) Other areas deserving special emphasis in evaluation in the States are people's participation, public cooperation, and voluntary organisations.

Orientation and Types of Evaluation

15. The orientation needed in evaluation depends on the intended use of its results. Broadly speaking, three groups of users can be distinguished—(a) the implementing departments concerned, (b) the planning agency and the Government, in general, and

(c) the legislature, the press and the public. The interest and concern of the three groups in the implementation of plans and programmes are not the same, though there is some common ground among them. Unless, therefore, evaluation studies are planned with a very comprehensive coverage of all problem areas, they are not likely to serve the needs of the different groups of users either fully or equally. Such comprehensiveness in breadth and depth may not, however, be feasible because of limitations of time and cost. Besides, the different groups may have, on occasions, conflicting interests that cannot be reconciled. It is for these reasons that the Group have felt the need for classifying evaluation into two types, each requiring separate orientation and set-up. For convenience in description, they may be termed "internal", and "independent" evaluation.

16. *Internal Evaluation.*—The department or agency charged with the implementation of a programme faces a number of problems and difficulties which have to be tackled and overcome at different stages of administration and different phases of execution. In action programmes of a routine nature, these are solved by the administration and do not require any special study. But in important programmes tackling areas in which enough of knowledge and experience are not available as a guide for charting out the strategy, course and tempo of action, the operational problems involved may not be either easy to solve or be capable of once-for-all solution. In fact, they could be of a cumulative nature and be determined by the actions of the administration itself. For such programmes, therefore, there is a strong case for advance or concurrent studies of operational problems as they arise or are foreseen. The objective of such studies is to help the administrative or executive personnel decide on the course of strategy and action in problem situations, by providing them with an understanding of the nature and dimension of the problems and the implications of alternative methods of tackling them. All this is, however, an integral part of the process of implementation of the programme and requires no outside or independent machinery. It can, as such be reasonably described as "internal" evaluation.

17. Arrangements for internal evaluation should be built into the administrative structure of every programme and activity. In many cases, there may not be the need for special studies; regular reviews and critical analyses of experiences in meetings and discussions will do. But in impact programmes of critical importance, there is a strong case for having small cells for such studies as a part of the programme set-up. This has been tried in the Intensive Agricultural District Programme and can be extended to a number

of other big programmes. Carrying this point further, it is recommended that cells should be created in the major spending departments like the P.W.D., Irrigation and Electricity, in every State, for the purpose of internal evaluation of their major programmes. The expenditure for such internal evaluation should be included in the programme outlay or the departmental budget, as the case may be.

18. *Independent Evaluation.*—Internal evaluation cannot take the place of objective assessment and evaluation by an independent body or department not concerned with implementation. The former is meant primarily for intra-departmental use, while the latter caters to the need of the planning and other concerned departments and the government, in general. Besides, it can also meet the demand of the legislature, the public and the press. It is with this independent or "external" type of evaluation that the Group have been concerned primarily in this report. The objectives of evaluation, as formulated earlier, relate to this type. The orientation in this case is mainly on studying a programme and its set-up as a whole system, analysing the difficulties, hindrances and bottlenecks in the functioning of this system, examining its efficiency, assessing the direction and pace of achievement, and formulating suggestions for improvement in the implementation of the programme. Programme studies of this type demand objectivity in approach and should be carried out by an agency other than the ones charged with the administration of the programme. The findings and results help the planning department in its review and follow-up of plan implementation, provide the Government with an unbiased picture of the nature, course and pace of achievement, and offer suggestions for improvement to the concerned administrative departments. Independent evaluation should, therefore, be looked upon as a positive service and conducted in that spirit.

19. Evaluation has also an educative function in that it can create informed and responsible public opinion. Dissemination of the results of objective and unbiased assessment of programmes helps curb exaggerated accounts of failure and un-informed or misinformed criticism. It creates among different sections of the Government and of the people a clear understanding of the problems of planned development. The case for this educative function is particularly strong in a democratic society such as ours; and this purpose can be served only by the independent type of evaluation, whether conducted by an evaluation organisation or Study Teams or Committees. An issue that was posed to the Group was whether the effectiveness of evaluation could be enhanced by keeping its results strictly for official use. This view, according to the Group, is based on an

exaggerated fear of criticisms. While there may be special reasons for conducting certain studies only for official inter-departmental use, the Group are of the view that except where such decisions have been taken at the time of undertaking the studies, the findings of evaluation studies in the States, if not the full reports thereon, should be made available to the legislators, the press, the public and the Central Government. In fact, the Group attach some urgency to the need for improving communication about plan programmes not only within the Government but also between the Government and the other agencies and the people. Evaluation in States will certainly help in this direction and, at least, lead to a better understanding and appreciation, both at the Centre and in the country at large, of the approach, effort, achievement, and difficulties of the State Governments in the implementation of their plan programmes.

20. There are some other aspects of orientation to which only a brief reference need be made. It has already been stated that evaluation should be based on an objective approach to the study of problems, subjective or impressionistic elements not being allowed to enter in the findings. The implications of this objectivity will be mentioned in the section on 'Method of Evaluation'. Secondly, the Group would like to repeat that evaluation is not fault-finding but a positive service designed to suggest methods of improvement and measures for correction and remedy, based on analysis of successes and failures, shortcomings and weaknesses. It is this service combined with the educative functions of evaluation that should be understood and appreciated not only by those engaged in it but also and equally so, by the organs of the Government. Without this appreciation, there may develop a resistance to evaluation, whether it is of the internal or the independent type, on the part of the departments implementing the programme and even of the Government at its highest level. Finally, evaluation should be forward-looking, not just a post-mortem of the past in a static framework. Such an *ex ante* orientation would help the Government in using evaluation findings for understanding the future course and prospect of achievement. In this connection, the point that was posed before the Group was whether evaluation should also include a forecast achievement of targets. In the present state of development of evaluation and forecasting techniques, the Group feel that this may not be feasible in many cases. It would, however, be useful to attempt such exercise in those cases where suitable methods and adequate progress and evaluation data are available.

CHAPTER III

SCOPE, CONTENT AND METHOD OF EVALUATION

Scope

21. In India, evaluation started, developed and spread along with the community development programme. From 1952 to 1960, the Programme Evaluation Organisation was engaged in evaluating only this programme in its different stages and aspects. It was from the later part of 1960 that the scope of evaluation by the P.E.O. extended to other programmes in the rural and the community sectors, with special emphasis on the agricultural programmes.

22. In the States, evaluation started much later (In U.P., however, it was initiated in 1953-54) and has spread slowly and unevenly. But there also, the impetus came from the community development programme and the arrangements made for the progress analysis of its administrative intelligence data. In fact, the Annual Conferences on Community Development had in the late fifties, persistently asked for evaluation at the State level and in 1960, recommended that all State Governments should set up evaluation units. In short, till lately, whatever evaluation work had been done in the States was only in relation to the community development programme, except in a few States like Andhra Pradesh where evaluation covered some other schemes also.

23. Since 1960, two important developments have given a further push to evaluation in the States. With the introduction of Panchayati Raj, a few State Governments felt the need for regular evaluation of the working of these institutions. As a result, a well-conceived Evaluation Organisation was set up in Rajasthan in 1960; and in Orissa arrangements were instituted in 1962 for assessing the performance of these bodies. The second development has been the growing emphasis on strengthening the planning machinery in the States. This has led, during the last year or two, to the creation or strengthening of the evaluation machinery in States like Andhra and Maharashtra and extending the scope of evaluation to State Plan programmes and schemes other than community development.

24. Against this background of expanding scope of evaluation, the Working Group sought the views of the State Governments on

areas or plan sectors where the need for programme evaluation was felt urgently. Governments of Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Madras, Maharashtra, Punjab and Rajasthan do not apparently want the scope of evaluation to be confined to any particular sectors of the State Plan. They want it to cover, irrespective of sectors, selected programmes or schemes, the selection being either on the basis of magnitude of outlay (more than Rs. 10 lakh or even Rs. 50 lakh), or importance of impact or benefit or problem situations like slowness of progress. In the replies received from Assam, Orissa, Rajasthan, U.P., West Bengal, Himachal Pradesh and Tripura, there is mention of certain sectors of the State Plans, which are summarised in the following Statement. (Responses from all States are presented in a summary statement in Appendix II).

Statement showing the sectors where the need of evaluation is felt urgently

Sectors	States specifying the sector
1. Agriculture	Assam, Rajasthan, U.P., West Bengal, H.P. and Tripura.
2. Irrigation	Assam, Rajasthan, U.P., West Bengal and H.P.
3. Community Development	Assam, Orissa, and H.P.
4. Village and Small Industries	Assam, Rajasthan, U.P., West Bengal and H.P.
5. Employment	Assam and U.P.
6. Panchayat	} Assam
7. Welfare of backward classes	
8. Transport, Road	} H.P.
9. Forestry, Animal Husbandry	
10. Medical and Water Supply	} U.P.
11. Family Planning	
12. Primary Education	

25. *Scope of evaluation in the States.*—In the light of the views expressed by the State Governments and the growing sense of urgency attached by them to evaluation, the Group make the following recommendations on the scope of evaluation in the States in the Fourth Plan.

- (a) Evaluation need not be confined only to the community development programme and should extend to the other sectors of the State plan. In sectors like power (barring rural electrification), manufacturing and mining industries, however, the approach and methods of evaluation of projects are different from those relating to programmes which are community-based and, as such, may not be included in the regular scope of evaluation by the State units at this stage.

- (b) The importance of different sectors from the point of view of the need for evaluation should vary from State to State, depending on the structure of the State plans. Thus, in hilly areas like Himachal Pradesh, transport and communication, forestry, animal husbandry and allied programmes should receive greater emphasis; similarly, animal husbandry in State like Rajasthan, and welfare of the tribals in States such as Madhya Pradesh, Assam, Orissa and Bihar.
- (c) Within this broad scope, there should be a scheme of priority followed in the selection of programme for evaluation. There is a strong case for attaching a higher priority in evaluation to production-oriented schemes in the field of agriculture, animal husbandry, fisheries cooperation, community development, irrigation, rural industries and rural electrification. It is not the Group's intention to suggest that important programmes relating to social services and welfare like drinking water, public health, family planning, education, housing and backward classes should not ordinarily, be taken up for evaluation. On the contrary, these should be evaluated according to a phased programme. To avoid any conflict among the programmes in respect of their claims for evaluation, it would be desirable for each State Government to work out, as early as possible, a tentative three-year programme of evaluation studies, keeping in view the need to cover over the period of the Fourth Plan a cross-section of the sectoral programmes not only for agriculture, community development, irrigation etc. but also for the social and welfare services sectors, the emphasis being greater on the former group.
- (d) Apart from the subject matter sectors, there are also the implementation sectors to be considered within the scope and content of evaluation. The success of the Fourth Plan in nearly all the sectors discussed above will depend on systematic planning at the district, block and village levels and effective implementation through the Panchayati Raj institutions. In the evaluation of programmes, the performance in the Panchayati Raj and cooperative sectors should receive special attention in the States.

26. *Selection of programmes for evaluation*—For the selection of programmes and schemes, the State Governments will have to use certain criteria. In general, the States are likely to be guided in this

matter by their knowledge and importance of different programmes. The Group feel that the following guide lines for selection might be helpful to the State Governments:

- (a) all projects and programmes of a pilot nature;
- (b) programmes showing persistent shortfalls, lags, problems and difficulties in implementation except for well-known reasons like want of foreign exchange;
- (c) impact programmes of a 'crash' nature like the intensive cultivation schemes;
- (d) programmes and schemes involving large outlays and relying for their success on the cooperation and participation of the people and institutions; and
- (e) special programmes for the benefit of tribal and backward areas or weaker sections.

In the application of some of these criteria, the State Governments would have to have some prior knowledge of the progress of different programmes. It is here that progress analysis can help in selecting problems for evaluation and narrowing down the areas of study.

27. *Areas of continuous or 'current' evaluation.*—With such a large scope of evaluation, it appears that most of the programmes could be covered only through *ad hoc*, occasional studies. The Group, however, feel that the evaluation agency in each State should have one or two important items, whether programmes or institutions, for current evaluation of a regular nature, an annual report on each of which would be a normal feature of the activities of the evaluation organisation. One of the important advantages in having one or two areas of continuous observation and assessment is that it enables the evaluation agency to be in touch with field conditions and with the district and block staff in selected areas. Such current evaluation also enables the evaluation agency to undertake limited studies of operational problems and thereby help the local administration. There are also other advantages that flow from having a core of regular work for the staff. Some of the State Governments have also emphasised this need and mentioned certain programmes or topics for this purpose. The topics suggested for such regular evaluation show a general preference for areas like agricultural practices and programmes, utilisation of irrigation, achievement and impact of community development, performance of Panchayati Raj institutions, and family planning. In selecting problems for such regular evaluation, the States would naturally be guided by their own needs. The Group would suggest, however, that preference might be given to items like pilot projects, Panchayati Raj institutions, family planning and agricultural extension.

Content and Method

28. The content and method of evaluation should have their basis in the methodology of the social sciences. Objectivity in approach, so essential for evaluation, requires that evaluation studies should follow the 'scientific' method evolved for social science research. This requirement applies equally to the formulation of problems selected for study, the specification of criteria and hypotheses, and the methods of collection and analysis of data. The questions and issues that come up are many and varied; and it is not possible to go into these in any detail in this report. Nor do the Group think that their terms of reference include preparation of anything like a manual on evaluation. The need for such a manual is, however, recognised; and it is recommended that the P.E.O. should address itself to this task.

29. The Group propose to confine their comments and suggestions to some of the broader issues in this area. Since evaluation relates to policies and programmes under implementation, schemes and projects under execution, and institutions and organisations in operation, such studies should, by and large, be action-oriented field enquiries. The field to be studied at the primary level is an area-population. Generally speaking, the instruments of observation, investigation and assessment to be used at action-levels and on the field will be those derived from four main disciplines—economics, sociology, public administration and statistics—in their application to the particular technical area or subject involved in the programme under study. The study should be so conducted as to throw light on each of the levels of action and on the field of impact, if a programme is to be fully evaluated. Against this general background, a few points of relevance to content and method are discussed below. These have bearings on the three areas that figure either separately or jointly in evaluation studies, namely, administration and operation, organisation and institutions, benefits and impact.

30. *Evaluation and Statistics.*—Evaluation studies are different from pure estimational surveys; they are problem-oriented, diagnostic studies yielding therapeutic results. The problem areas may relate to policy issues, programme formulation, organisational forms and methods, administrative practices, extension of the technical content of the programmes, people's cooperation, and attitude and impact. To diagnose these problems, evaluation studies are generally designed to compare operation and impact in different 'type' situations and according to different phases, catch the unanticipated effects, bring out the different underlying causes and factors and analyse them in an operational framework. The diagnosis has to be done in such a

way that remedies or correctives can be derived from the findings and results. Activities of the State Governments in the field of statistics are not designed to meet the needs of such studies. Evaluation is, therefore, an activity not to be confused with the collection and analysis of progress data or other statistics as done by the Bureau of Statistics or other agencies.

Methods.

31. As a first step, the problems to be studied have to be spelled out in detail. This will mean adequate consultation with the planning, finance and implementing departments and the technical specialists concerned with individual programmes. Available data and literature need to be looked into; and a quick reconnaissance-survey in one or two areas may have to be undertaken. After the problems are thus formulated, they should be discussed finally again with the departments and agencies concerned.

32. The problems will then have to be broken down in terms of measurable data and obtainable information. These are to be assessed against criteria, norms, and yardsticks that have to be developed as objectively as possible. Ideally these should be derived from the plan assumptions and targets, the programme objectives and contents, and the methods and procedure evolved by the implementing agencies. Sometimes, these are not worked out in sufficient detail and in a dynamic way. In such a situation, these will have to be worked out through discussions with the concerned agencies. Once these criteria and norms are decided, the requirement of data and information is *ipso facto* determined.

33. The third step is to chalk out the design of the field study and prepare the instruments of observation—schedules, questionnaires, guide-points etc. The Group would like in this connection to clarify an issue that crops up time and again about the representativeness of evaluation data. It has already been stated that evaluation usually involves studies of problems in *type situations* and investigation of these in *depth*. The greater is the depth in probing required for a study, the stronger becomes the case, other things remaining the same, for limiting the universe or area in which the investigation is to be conducted. There cannot, therefore, be any insistence on the representativeness of data that is basic to the design of statistical surveys for estimation purposes. Case studies and studies of particular type situations are necessary and useful for evaluation purposes; and it is only through such studies that insight into less known areas can be obtained.

34. In sample studies, survey techniques will have to be used. The P.E.O. has evolved certain techniques for such evaluation surveys, which the Group would like to recommend to the States. The main elements in the design of study are as follows:

- (a) The universe of primary sampling units is restricted to the districts or similar units where the programme under study has been in operation for a reasonable period. The subjective restriction of the universe generally helps in stratifying the districts according as the programme in question shows relatively better, average and poorer progress.
- (b) From this frame, primary units are selected, more or less purposively, so as to present a cross-section of the development of the programme over time and space.
- (c) A scientific (or probability) sample is drawn of the beneficiaries and the non-beneficiaries in the areas selected. The selection should not be purposive at this stage.
- (d) The study of a special purposive sample of knowledgeable persons from the sample villages or institutions has been found useful. The knowledge of the average respondent and his ability to communicate is often a great limitation in depth probing through the household interview method.
- (e) The design of the study should, as far as possible permit both time and space comparisons. The sample should, in these respects, be a self-contained and self-weighted one of a cross-section of different type situations.
- (f) Besides information collected through schedules and questionnaires, it has been found necessary to have qualitative, analytical notes on the working of the programme—problems, difficulties and bottlenecks—at different levels of operation, namely, State, district, block and village. These qualitative notes have to be assimilated and integrated in the analysis with the tabulated data collected through structured schedules and questionnaires.

35. Bench mark and assessment surveys constitute another type of evaluation study. The objective in these studies is principally to estimate progress and impact on a statistically valid basis. The comparisons are generally over time, though attempts have been made, so far without much success, to compare with a control universe over space. Representativeness is a necessary requirement of such surveys which should, therefore, be designed with a proper eye on the margin of permissible error. For evaluating area development programmes, such surveys of impact have been found useful.

CHAPTER IV

REVIEW OF EVALUATION ARRANGEMENTS AND ACTIVITIES IN THE STATES.

36. In reviewing the present organisation and functions of evaluation in the States, the Group considered it necessary also to study, however briefly, the existing arrangements for planning and progress analysis. Even though these areas are not within the terms of reference strictly interpreted, they have, as has been pointed out in Section II, a vital bearing on the present status and the future growth of evaluation. It is for this reason that the Group would like to refer briefly to a few aspects of the system as it has been observed by them.

37. The Group visited five States—Maharashtra, Mysore, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal—and had useful discussions with the respective State Governments. The summary record of these discussions which covered planning, progress analysis and evaluation activities, is given in Appendix I. The Government of these States might find it useful to refer to the observation and views noted there.

Planning Department

38. In a number of States, planning activity has been organised as a separate department of the Government. With the virtual abolition of the office of Development Commissioner in the States that have fully implemented the recommendations of the Working Group (Ram Subhag Singh Committee) on Inter-departmental and Institutional Coordination, the Planning Department has been given a new independent status by being placed under the secretaryship of a senior officer of the rank of Commissioner. In the other States which form the majority, either the Development Commissioner is in charge of planning also, or planning is a small department, or else it is a wing or part of the Finance Department. It has been noticed in a few States that the Planning Secretary is also burdened with the administrative responsibility of departments like social welfare or tourism. It is also reported that in the States where the Bureau of Economics and Statistics is attached to a department other than planning, or of which planning is not a part, there arise difficulties in making use of the services of the Bureau for progress reporting and analysis.

39. In a number of States, the Planning Department does not appear to be adequately staffed. Perhaps an extreme example is

of a State where the Planning Secretary is assisted in his planning activities by an Under Secretary and a complement of clerical staff. This may be contrasted with the reorganised set-up of the Planning Department in Andhra Pradesh. Apart from the Bureau of Economics and Statistics which is attached to this department, there are three Wings—Economics, Resources and Evaluation—each with a team of technical and administrative officers (Directors, Deputy Directors, Assistant Directors, Investigators, etc.). The reason these facts are being mentioned is that effective and useful functioning of the evaluation machinery will be determined to a large extent by the importance the State Governments will attach to the building up of an adequately staffed and technically competent planning department.

Arrangements for Progress Analysis and Review

40. Within a broad pattern of similarity, each State Government have evolved their own method of keeping themselves informed about the progress of plan schemes, and of reviewing their implementation. The detailed information received from the State Governments has been summarised in the statements given in Appendix II. For the purpose of progress reporting, the programmes may be divided into two categories (a) those implemented by the Community Development (C.D.) agency and (b) those administered by the departments concerned. In the case of programmes implemented through the C.D. blocks, the progress data are reported quarterly at the block, district and State levels, in almost all the States. In fact, the system of quarterly and annual progress reporting was introduced at the instance of the Ministry of Community Development, and the Programme Evaluation Organisation played a role in initiating the system in the earlier stages. At the Block level, the Progress Assistant prepares the progress report for the Block which is forwarded by B.D.O. to the District Officer-incharge of the C.D. programme and also to the District Statistical Officer who scrutinises and consolidates them. In most of the States, the District Magistrate is generally responsible for the progress reports for his district. The West Bengal Government do not, however, have the system of progress reporting at the district level; nor do they have District Statistical Officers.

41. In the States of Uttar Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, and Maharashtra, the reports are forwarded by the District Officers to Divisional Commissioners. The Divisional Commissioners also record their observations about the quality of work done in their divisions. The consolidated reports from the Divisions are sent to the Planning Department of the State. In the States where progress reports at

the divisional level are not prepared, these are forwarded from the District to the Planning Department. On receipt of such reports at the State level, a consolidated report for the State is prepared; and this is done in many but not all the States by the Bureau of Statistics. This report is both statistical and descriptive. Manipur, Tripura and Pondicherry administration do not have the system of quarterly progress reporting.

42. In respect of the plan schemes implemented directly by the departments, consolidated reports on monthly or quarterly expenditure are prepared by the department concerned on the basis of reports received from their district officers. In some States, notably Maharashtra, copies of these district reports also come to the Planning Department. In other States, it is only the State reports that are submitted to the Finance and Planning Departments. Apart from the statement of expenditure, the reports also contain estimates regarding the utilisation of funds in the year and physical achievements against the targets fixed for the programmes. The reports are also accompanied by brief descriptive reviews of difficulties and bottlenecks experienced in implementation. These reports are examined in the Planning Department and form the basis of discussion with the Heads of the Departments. In some States e.g., Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal, annual progress reports are also prepared and reviewed.

43. In most States, the responsibility of the Planning Department extends from coordination of progress analysis to consolidation, scrutiny, review and follow-up of these reports. Action on the decisions taken as a result of the discussions held between the Planning and the implementing departments is the responsibility of the former to pursue. On the financial side, the Finance Department is responsible for watching the financial progress of plan schemes, and forwarding the expenditure statements to the concerned departments, Central Ministries and the Planning Commission. It also renders advice on financial aspects of the plan schemes to the implementing departments, besides carrying out post-budget scrutiny of plan schemes.

Review of Plan Implementation

44. The review of plan implementation is attempted regularly in all the States. As far as the C.D. sector is concerned, it is done at the block level by the Panchayat Samities or the Block Development Committee in their meetings, and at the district level by the Zilla Parishad or the Development Council the meetings of which are held regularly once in three months or sometimes more frequently. For nearly all the sectors of the plan, quarterly and annual reviews

at the State level are done by the Planning Department in meetings and discussions with the implementing departments concerned. These reviews have been quite critical in some States and, according to these State Governments, quite effective also. The shortfalls and bottlenecks are pin-pointed and remedial action suggested. Reviews of the programmes executed through the departments are also carried out by the departments concerned. The administrative and the technical wings of the departments jointly carry out such reviews. The departments of Finance and Planning are also associated in some cases. On the whole, it appears that different States have evolved different pattern of such reviews.

45. There are certain high level forums also, where either the reviews are noted and discussed or the review itself is undertaken. The Andhra Government has a State Coordination Committee, and Assam a Committee at the ministerial level, which carry out reviews of plan progress. In Madras, the State Panchayat and Development Consultative Committee meets once in six months for this purpose. The review undertaken by the Planning Department of Kerala is sent to the Chief Minister for perusal. At the State level a committee of the Planning Board in Orissa and the Board itself in Pondicherry have been entrusted with the work of review of implementation.

46. Except Mysore, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur and Pondicherry, all the States have undertaken a mid-term appraisal of the Third Plan. However, it appears that in many States this has been done in response to the Planning Commission's request to furnish the mid-term appraisal data and qualitative information. This appraisal has covered all the sectors and, more particularly, agriculture, minor irrigation, industries, power, and transport. The Planning Department has been mainly responsible for this mid-term appraisal which has been conducted separately with each department.

Comments on Progress Analysis and implementation Review

47. This brief review of progress analysis and implementation follow-up serves, at least, to highlight the diversity in the system and the arrangements existing in different States. It appears that most of the departments of each State Government evolved the basic elements of their system of progressing and review in the pre-plan period, to which additions and modifications have been made from time to time to satisfy particular administrative requirements in particular States. It is only for the community development sector, i.e., the programmes and activities executed by the block agency, that a systematised pattern has been laid down and is being followed

in all States. Many of the programmes in other sectors have not been subjected to the same degree of systematisation in respect of administrative intelligence for planning purposes. In fact, there appears to be a good case and scope too for introducing a planning orientation in the types of data reported for these and the processing made of these at different levels. That there is room for qualitative improvement in progress reporting and analysis in a number of plan sectors has been admitted by at least one-half of the State Governments. Assam Government have reported that scope for improvement in adequacy and depth exists in their system at all levels. The Group got a similar impression in the course of visits to West Bengal and Orissa. The Governments of Madhya Pradesh, Mysore, Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh and Himachal Pradesh consider agricultural production programmes, irrigation and power, cooperation, education and health as the weak sectors of the plan from the point of view of progress analysis and implementation review.

48. Within the framework of their respective systems, the State Governments have instituted arrangements for the reporting, analysis and review of progress and implementation data. The pattern of such arrangements was in the past determined by the organisation of administration that was built up in each State. With the expansion of the developmental activities in the plan period, such arrangements proved inadequate in many sectors and new or additional ones had to be grafted to the earlier structure. In a number of States, therefore, there is scope for the systematisation and streamlining of the existing arrangements. For example, there is, in a number of States, a considerable scope for coordinating and rationalising the progress reporting system in the districts and the routing and analysis of such data at higher levels. In at least one State, the Bureau of Statistics does not play any role in the reporting of progress data from the blocks and districts or in their analysis at the State headquarters. In a number of States the Bureau is involved in the scrutiny, checking and reporting of progress data from the districts only for a few sectors like community development and agriculture. Only seven State Governments have reported that they are making use of tour reports and inspection notes of senior officers to supplement or modify the progress reports and obtain an insight into implementation problems. On the whole, the Group feel that in most States, the Bureau of Economics and Statistics and its district organisation could be involved more effectively than at present in the systematic reporting and analysis of planning-oriented progress data, specially for sectors like rural industries, education, health and welfare of the backward classes. The Group noted in the course of their visits that the State Planning Secretaries and other departmental

heads were conscious of some of these inadequacies and keen to bring about improvements in their system and arrangements. It is suggested that the Planning Commission may give due attention to this matter and consider referring these problems to a Study Team or Committee.

Evaluation Arrangements and Set-up in the States

49. A distinct organisation for evaluation work, whether as a cell, or as a wing, or as a unit, exists in ten States, while in another State evaluation studies are being conducted though no separate machinery has been set up. In three other States there is a proposal to establish an evaluation unit, the details of which have, however, been worked out by only one of these State Governments. The Governments of Himachal Pradesh, Manipur and Tripura have also reported proposals for setting up evaluation machinery of their own. Of the evaluation units functioning in 1964, one (U.P.) was set up in 1953-54, three in 1960, and the remaining since 1961, though evaluation studies were being conducted in about three of the latter groups of States prior to 1960. Thus the period since 1960, particularly the Third Plan period, has marked a rapid growth of evaluation organisations and activities in the States. During this period, not only has a machinery for evaluation been created for the first time in a few States but also most of the other State Governments have reorganised the earlier arrangements and instituted separate or distinct units for this purpose. Broadly speaking, four patterns of evaluation set-up are noticeable among the States. One isolated pattern is represented by the Planning Research and Action Institute in U.P. which is the largest of the organisations. However, only one section of this organisation has been engaged in evaluation studies in the strict sense. The P.R.A.I. is an independent institute drawing its funds from the State and the Central Governments and is not an integral part of the administrative structure of the U.P. Government. The other three patterns are represented by the respective organisations in Andhra, Maharashtra and Rajasthan. These organisations form part of the planning machinery of the respective State Governments. The details of the evaluation arrangements in the States are reviewed in the following paragraphs, mainly in respect of committee arrangements, staff and administrative structure, follow-up of evaluation and the budget and expenditure. State-wise detailed information is given in the statements in Appendix II, part C and Appendix IV (A).

Evaluation Committee

50. Committees either to advise or to direct the evaluation units and activities have been constituted in most of the States. Broadly

speaking, two patterns are noticeable. In some States, the evaluation committee is constituted wholly of government officials; and its functions include directing the evaluation activity and follow up the findings. A second pattern obtains in States where non-officials are also represented on the committee, the functions of which are generally advisory. There are, however, some departures from these patterns. Evaluation committees of officials have been formed in Maharashtra, Andhra and Gujarat, whereas in Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh the evaluation committees include MLAs and academic personnel. In U.P., there is a Planning Committee of the P.R.A.I., which is presided over by the Chief Minister. This Committee has an overall control over the Planning Research and Action Institute. The evaluation wing of the P.R.A.I. has an Internal Advisory Committee which consists of State officials, senior members of the staff of the P.R.A.I., representatives of the C.S.O., P.E.O, Community Development Ministry and of the Universities. In Gujarat, there is a committee in the General Administration Department for evaluation of programmes costing Rs. 20 lakhs and over, and departmental committees for schemes costing between Rs. 10 and 20 lakhs. Coordination of these committees is done by the Coordination Committee. In Rajasthan, the Evaluation Committee is headed by Vice-Chancellor of the Rajasthan University and includes MLAs, Principal of Agricultural College and Head of the Department of Political Science of Rajasthan University. In Maharashtra, the evaluation committee is composed of representatives of the planning department, evaluation wing, Bureau of Statistics, the Departmental head concerned with power to coopt a non-official expert. As for the other States, the State Planning Board in Orissa functions as the State Evaluation Board; in Kerala, the State Informal Consultative Committee functions as the Evaluation Committee. Evaluation Committees have been constituted in a few other States also.

The Administrative Structure

51. The evaluation organisation created and built up in different States does not follow any uniform pattern either in its administrative set-up or in its size and strength. The largest organisation is the PRAI in U.P.; but it is engaged in other activities also. Among other States, where the evaluation organisation forms a part of the administrative set-up, the largest unit is the Evaluation Organisation in Rajasthan. It deals directly through the Cabinet Secretariat with Chief Secretary and Chief Minister. The Organisation has a Director who is Deputy Secretary, Planning, one Deputy and one Assistant Director, four Regional Evaluation Officers, one Research Officer and a complement of other staff required for headquarters work and field investigation. Since March, 1963, the Maharashtra Government have

reorganised their evaluation wing which is now located in the Planning Division of the Finance Department. The evaluation unit is under the charge of an officer of the status of Deputy Secretary. He is assisted by 1 Under Secretary, 3 Planning Supervisors, 6 Research Assistants and other staff. From September, 1963 the Andhra Government made evaluation a separate wing in the Planning Department. The staff sanctioned for this unit, include a Director in the senior IAS scale, 3 Deputy Directors, 2 Superintendents, 4 Evaluation Assistants and supporting staff. The smallest unit is probably the one in Kerala where the staff may not be more than 5 or 6 in number including the Evaluation Officer incharge. It appears that except for Rajasthan, Orissa and the PRAI, in no other State there is any field staff for evaluation work. In most of the States, the field staff of the P.E.O. posted there is larger than that of the respective State evaluation units. However, the field organisation of the Bureau of Statistics and Economics is utilized by the evaluation unit in some of these States for the collection of field data.

52. A significant aspect of the administrative arrangements is the relationship between the evaluation organisation and the Bureau of Economics and Statistics. Historically, the initial evaluation studies were undertaken by the Bureau of Economics and Statistics. Later, in States like Rajasthan, Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh, separate evaluation organisations were established. Among the eleven States in which evaluation work is being undertaken in 1964, the evaluation unit is located outside the Bureau in six. In all these States except four, however, the two work in close organic co-operation. An interesting development in 1964 has been the opening of evaluation units in two States as wings or divisions in the Bureau of Statistics. One or two of the States that are planning to set up their evaluation unit are proposing to locate it in the Bureau. The Group feel that while the evaluation and the statistics organisations in the States should work in close cooperation, the two need to be kept separate inasmuch as their orientation and activities are different in nature.

Follow-up of Evaluation

53. Though forums for discussing the findings of evaluation reports exist in one form or another in all the relevant States, their nature and composition show a wide variation. Broadly, three patterns are noticeable in the system followed in the different States. One pattern obtains in Punjab and Madhya Pradesh where the reports are submitted by the Directorate of Statistics and Economics to the State Planning Department. In the Punjab, the points

arising out of the studies are discussed by the Planning Commissioner with the Secretaries of the concerned departments for necessary action. U.P., Maharashtra and Gujarat fall in another group. In Maharashtra, the report is submitted to Secretary's Committee after it is discussed in the Project Evaluation Committee which holds discussion with the heads of implementing departments. On the decisions of the Secretary's Committee, follow-up action is taken by the Evaluation Unit through the Additional Development Commissioner. In Gujarat, the reports are prepared by the Bureau of Economics and Statistics and are presented to the concerned department through the administrative department of the State Bureau (Finance Department till September, 1963 and General Administration Department, Planning, thereafter). Follow-up action is taken both by the concerned administrative department and the Co-ordination Committee. In U.P., the arrangements are of the mixed type.

54. The third pattern exists in the States of Rajasthan and Andhra where the Evaluation Reports are presented to the State Evaluation Committee (though the Chairman of the Committee is a non-official in Rajasthan but an official in Andhra). Details of the system for follow-up do not seem to have been as clearly and formally laid down in Rajasthan as in Andhra. The most effective arrangement has been found to exist in Andhra; and the Group would like to commend it for consideration by other State Governments. In this State, the decisions arrived at by the State Evaluation Committee, after considering the evaluation findings are, for all practical purposes, final. It is obligatory on the part of the Administrative Departments concerned in the Secretariat to issue formal orders (Government Orders) for the implementation of the recommendation of the Committee after obtaining orders, where necessary, in circulation to the Minister or Ministers concerned. In order to watch the follow-up action on the recommendations of the State Evaluation Committee, the action taken by the Departments on the various recommendations is reviewed at every meeting of the State Evaluation Committee and the former are requested to ensure that further action on all recommendations awaiting implementation is expedited. Action taken is required to be reported to the Planning Department which prepares agenda and notes for the State Evaluation Committee.

Budget and expenditure

55. Information about budget and expenditure of the evaluation units is rather difficult to obtain; as there is no separate budget of the evaluation unit in many States. This is reported by U.P. Andhra, Maharashtra and Gujarat. The actual expenditure of the

Evaluation Unit in Rajasthan ranged from Rs. 70,000 to Rs. 1,30,000 between 1960-61 and 1962-63. In Gujarat the expenditure of the evaluation unit was estimated at Rs. 15.6 thousands in 1962-63 and that in Andhra Pradesh at Rs. 20 thousands in 1962-63 and about Rs. 75,000 in 1964-65. All the State Governments are bearing this expenditure out of their regular administrative budget. It is only in Orissa that the evaluation cell is financed out of the plan funds as a scheme in the programme for public cooperation.

Field of Evaluation activity in the States

56. Information received from the States on the evaluation studies undertaken by them during the last three years is reproduced in Appendix IV(B). In the Punjab and Kerala, evaluation work is confined to the Community Development programme and that too, to what can be strictly called progress analysis; Mysore to the Plan schemes for the backward classes; and Madhya Pradesh to Plan schemes costing above Rs. 50 lakhs. In Gujarat, evaluation by the Co-ordination Committee is confined to schemes involving an outlay of Rs. 20 lakhs and over, and by the Departmental Committee to schemes in the range of Rs. 10—20 lakhs.

57. Out of the 20 publications of the Evaluation Wing of the Andhra Government listed in the Appendix, seven relate to agricultural programmes, five to social welfare and backward classes schemes and two each to animal husbandry and education. Among the 9 studies still in hand, one is on agriculture, three on social welfare, two on industries and cooperatives, and one each on education, training and office work. The Rajasthan Evaluation Organisation had published two Reports—one on 'Panchayat Elections in Rajasthan, 1960' and the other on 'The working of Panchayati Raj in Rajasthan (April 1961, March 1962)'. In addition, it has undertaken some rapid survey and correspondence studies for internal use. These are mainly concerned with institutions and minor irrigation projects. The Evaluation Unit of the Maharashtra Government has completed two studies both in the agriculture sector—one on utilization of loans sanctioned for construction and repair of wells and the other on the consumption and distribution of fertilisers. The studies in hand are on industrial estates, cooperative marketing and processing societies, and rural electrification. The Evaluation Unit of the Gujarat Government has so far completed five studies, three of which relate to the agricultural sector (agricultural demonstration plots, distribution of fertilisers and multiplication and distribution of improved seeds) and two case studies on the Community Development programme—one on Block and Department expenditure in the Block areas and the other on different

items of activity in the C.D. Lately, it has extended its activity to rural industries programmes and those for the scheduled tribes. In U.P., the Planning Research and Action Institute (PRAI) has conducted, among other things, evaluation studies mainly dealing with agricultural programmes, Panchayati Raj, training, communication and leadership. Among the other States from which information has been received, the Punjab Government's Economic and Statistical Organisation, has completed nine studies, of which three relate to the agricultural programmes and another three to rural industries. The following table summarizes the number of studies completed according to the different fields, for the 8 States from which positive replies have been received :—

No. of Studies Completed

States	No. of studies completed and finalized	Agri-culture	Industry	Panchayati Raj	Social welfare & Backward classes	Educa-tion	Others
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Andhra . . .	20	7	1	..	5	2	5†
2. Gujarat . . .	5	3	2
3. Maharashtra . . .	2	2
4. M. Pradesh . . .	4	2	2
5. Orissa . . .	5	1	..	1	3
6. Punjab . . .	9	3	2	1	3
7. Rajasthan* . . .	2	2
8. U. P. . . .	33	7	3	3	..	3	17

†Relate to C. D. programme.

*Excludes rapid survey and correspondence studies for internal use.

CHAPTER V

PROPOSALS FOR EVALUATION IN THE STATES IN THE FOURTH PLAN

58. Almost all State Governments have indicated their intention in the Fourth Plan to strengthen the evaluation organisation wherever it exists or to start one if it is not there yet. The Government of Gujarat have decided to expand their unit during the Fourth Five Year Plan. Expansion of the evaluation wing in Maharashtra is under consideration. It has been decided in U.P. to set up an Evaluation Advisory Board under the chairmanship of the Chief Minister and a directorate of evaluation in the Planning and Evaluation Department. Rajasthan and Punjab are also planning to strengthen their units on the technical side. Andhra visualise some expansion in the near future, and Madhya Pradesh and Kerala propose to expand their units according to the needs from time to time. The Madras Government started their evaluation wing in 1964 and envisage a budget of Rs. one lakh for it. Orissa have already reorganised the unit into a full-fledged evaluation wing in the Planning Department. The Bihar Government have only recently reorganised their evaluation set-up. The remaining States have yet to start evaluation units. Some of these namely, Assam, West Bengal, Himachal Pradesh and Tripura are planning to do so in the near future.

59. On the question of optimum size of the evaluation organisation in States, only five States, namely, Andhra, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat and Orissa, have given their estimates. The Andhra Pradesh Government foresee an expenditure of Rs. three lakh per year if their Evaluation Wing is expanded to the optimum size needed to cover all the sectors of the plan programmes. For the Rajasthan Evaluation Organisation, an annual budget of Rs. three lakh is considered the optimum for the State. Similarly, the U.P. Government have estimated the likely annual expenditure on a full-fledged evaluation directorate at Rs. three to four lakh. The Gujarat Government's estimate is of the order of Rs. three lakh. The Government of Orissa have observed that the annual expenditure on the optimum unit will be of the order of Rs. two lakh. Most of the other State Governments have stated that the optimum size of the organisation, its budget and other aspects would be thought of after they gain some or more experience of evaluation studies and are able to assess the quantum of work involved.

60. Views of the State Governments have also been ascertained as to whether they are in a position to bear the expenditure on the evaluation organisation from their own administrative budget. The Maharashtra Government have observed that the nature and order of the Central assistance required would be communicated later. The Madhya Pradesh Government do not need any central assistance at the moment. The West Bengal Government want to examine the

question further. The remaining State Governments have expressed their inability to bear the burden of expenditure on evaluation and are looking to the centre for some sort of sharing and assistance. Their estimate of the extent of such assistance is given in the table below.

Statement giving the extent of central assistance required by the States submitting estimate

Responding State	Extent of central assistance required	Remarks
1. Andhra	66 % to 75%	
2. Assam	100%	} Scheme may be treated as Centrally sponsored
3. Gujarat	100%	
4. Kerala	100%	
5. Madras	100%	
6. Mysore	75%	
7. Orissa	60%	
8. Punjab	50%	
9. Rajasthan	100%	
10. U. P.	100%	It should be made a plan-scheme and extent of aid should be discussed from year to year.
11. H. P.	100%	

All these eleven States have asked for central assistance to the extent of 50% or more of the total expenditure. Seven State Governments want assistance to the extent of 100%. The Government of U.P. have not stated any specific proportion, but suggested that the scheme might be made a plan scheme and the extent of aid discussed every year during the annual plan discussions.

Proposals for Evaluation in the Fourth Plan

61. The Group have noted the views and suggestions offered by the State Governments. They are convinced that the State Governments attach or intend to attach as much importance to evaluation as the Group consider necessary in the interests of successful implementation of development programmes. There is also no doubt that all State Governments are keen on building up a suitable organization for the "independent" type of evaluation, either by strengthening the existing unit, or reorganizing and expanding it, or by creating a new one. This does not mean that the growth of evaluation in the States on sound lines can now be left to the dynamics of its process. To do so will not be wise, for the review attempted by the Group clearly shows a wide diversity existing among the States in their approach to evaluation and the organizational pattern evolved by them. Besides, the financial limitations will stand in the way of even the best of intentions. The State Governments need to be helped and assisted in their efforts to develop evaluation organization and activity.

62. A scheme of sponsorship is thus necessary not only for providing the needed financial resources, but also to ensure uniformity and common approach to the objective, orientation, scope and method

of evaluation in the States, along the lines discussed in sections II and III. This will also help in securing what the Group consider to be the desirable administrative set-up, and the minimum organizational size for the evaluation unit in the States. The Group accordingly recommend that evaluation should be included among the Plan programmes and the resources needed for carrying on evaluation work in the States should be adequately provided for in the Plan outlay on evaluation. In recommending this, the Group have in mind only the "independent" type of evaluation and not the "internal" type, the resources and set-up for which should be a part of those for the relevant programme or department as suggested in paragraph 17. The details of the evaluation organization recommended for the States in the Fourth Plan are discussed in the following paragraphs.

63. Every State Government should have an evaluation organisation as an integral part of their planning machinery. The functions and activities of this organisation should be along the lines recommended in Sections II and III. Through *ad hoc* and continuous studies and current reports, it will help the State planning machinery as well as the Government in its departments in understanding, assessing and following up the implementation of plan programmes, projects and schemes, watching the working of institutions and administration, and reviewing and appraising the implementation of the Plan, in general.

64. The evaluation organisation should function either as a wing or division of the Planning Department/Division (wherever it is not a separate department) or as a directorate attached to it. It should not be under the administrative control of any other department. The Director of the organisation should be a technically competent and responsible person and given a status high enough to enable him, on the one hand, to function directly in relation to other departments and, on the other, to impart the requisite independence and objectivity to evaluation activities. The organisation should be insured against possible interference in its studies by other agencies.

65. While the Bureau of Economics and Statistics and the evaluation organization in the States should work in full cooperation, the two should be kept organizationally distinct and separate. The nature of work and the scope of functions of the two are different. The former deals with statistical measurement and estimation; and the latter with problem-oriented studies of type situations and cases. Since the two organizations have different areas of functional responsibility, the evaluation machinery should be independent of the Bureau and not located in it as a wing or division. To the extent statistical tools and methods are used in evaluation studies and *vice versa*, the two organizations will have to secure technical advice and guidance from each other. Formal arrangements for such cooperation may be made through a technical coordination committee.

66. A question which the Group have considered at length is whether the Bureau of Economics and Statistics should be relied on for the collection of field data needed for evaluation studies. It may be possible for the Bureau in some cases to organize the collection of such data through its field staff, on behalf of the evaluation unit. The Group do not, however, consider this a feasible arrangement on a regular basis. In the first place, there is no indication that the field staff of the Bureau are not being fully utilized. Secondly, the evaluative type of data have to be collected by staff specially trained in this line of work; and this job cannot be entrusted to personnel mainly engaged in other lines of work. Thirdly, as has been pointed out in Section IV, the Group envisage an expanded role of the Bureau in the reporting, scrutiny and analysis of progress data at all levels. For all these reasons, it will not be desirable to burden the Bureau with additional field work on behalf of the evaluation organization. The main point emerging from this discussion is that additional field staff will be needed for investigation and observation work in connection with evaluation studies. Since the design and coverage of such studies is likely to be much smaller than the statistical surveys of the Bureau, the staff needed will be correspondingly smaller and should best be placed under the evaluation organization. This will ensure a regular contact of this organization with the field situation. The Group do not, however, envisage a field organization of the evaluation agency in each district.

67. Usefulness of evaluation depends on prompt and effective follow-up of the findings and suggestions thrown up by evaluation studies. Utmost attention should be given to this follow-up work which can be broken up into three activities. First, the reports should be discussed, and decisions arrived at on the findings and suggestions in the reports. Secondly, responsibility will have to be fixed for the implementation of these decisions; and, thirdly, a periodical review should also be made of the implementation of these decisions. It should be the responsibility of the Planning Secretary to initiate follow-up action on each evaluation report. In the first instance, the reports could be considered by an official committee (the State Evaluation Committee) with Chief Secretary as Chairman, Planning Secretary as convenor, and Finance Secretary and one or two other departmental heads as members. The departmental head concerned in the scheme evaluated should be coopted as a member if he is not so. At the second stage, the recommendations of this committee should be placed before a sub-committee of the Cabinet for decision. Once a decision is taken at this level, it can, as in Andhra, be made the responsibility of the departmental heads concerned to imp'ement. And the extent of such implementation can be reviewed periodically by the committee of officials or the evaluation committee.

68. The evaluation Organization, as conceived by the Group, will have a headquarters unit and a field organization. The field organization will include a nucleus task force unit to be located at the headquarters and 3 to 6 field units according to the size of the State, the intention being to locate at least one unit in each of the major regions of each State. The field units will make continuous observation of the operation of the core programmes and collect data for the *ad hoc* studies. They will operate as eyes and ears of the organization. Each field unit will comprise one evaluation officer, one investigator and one typist-clerk and a peon. The field task-force at headquarters will have one evaluation officer, one senior and one junior investigators, as shown in the Statement on page 35. The evaluation officer should have the qualifications of research officer in the field of economics, statistics or sociology, and experience of rural surveys.

69. The headquarters strength would include Director, 2 Deputy Directors, 1 Assistant Director, 3 Research Assistants, 6 Investigators and 6 computers, along with supporting clerical and other staff as shown in the Statement on page 35. The headquarters organization will have four subject matter divisions—economics, statistics, administration and sociology. There will also be a small computation section. On the administrative side, there will be a general office which will also build up a small library. For guidance and advice on technical aspects of the programmes taken up for study, the organisation may obtain the consultancy services of specialists on payment of honorarium, provision for which should be made in the budget. In recommending this staffing pattern, the Group have in view an organization which will have a balanced structure and appropriate and adequate staffing pattern. There will, however, be room for local adaptations to suit local conditions and special requirements. The recommended organization has, therefore, to be regarded more as a guide than a rigid model to be followed in every respect.

70. The likely expenditure on State evaluation organisations of the recommended size and composition has been worked out in the Statement on page 35 on the basis of scales of pay obtaining in some States. Though there may be some variations among the State in respect of these scales, these are not likely to affect the total estimate appreciably. For an average-sized State, the estimated expenditure per year on an evaluation directorate of this size comes to about Rs. 1,86,000/-. This works out to a total of Rs. 9,30,000/- for five years. The approximate total expenditure to be incurred on the evaluation organization in the 15 States will thus work out to a sum of Rs. 1,40,00,000/- for the Fourth Plan. There will also be a non-recurring expenditure on the purchase of calculators and typewriters of the order of Rs. 13,200/- per State or a total of Rs. 2,00,000/- for

the 15 States. To these have to be added the provision needed for some of the Union Territories, specially H.P. and Manipur. The estimates for the Union Territories can be placed at a minimum of Rs. 8 lakh. Accordingly, it is recommended that in the Fourth Plan, provision be made for a sum of Rs. 150 lakh for evaluation schemes of States and Union Territories.

71. Most of the State Governments desire Central assistance of a high order for financing evaluation arrangements and activities. The Group recognise the need for central assistance to the State Governments in respect of schemes for evaluation organization, but consider it premature at this stage to suggest any proportion or pattern.

Advance Action

72. Finance is not, however, the only limiting factor in the growth of evaluation in the States; a far more important one is the availability of technically qualified and experienced manpower. The establishment in each State of an evaluation organization of the size recommended by the Group would require the services of 15 senior persons with qualifications in economics and experience of rural surveys and administration, 30 persons in the next lower scale of seniority, one-half in the field of administration and the other half in Statistics, and nearly 80 persons in the scale of evaluation/ research officers or assistant directors drawn from the fields of sociology, economics and statistics. With the shortage of personnel in the established services at the Centre and the much greater shortage of qualified and experienced people in the States, the State Governments will be well advised to formulate from now on a policy regarding recruitment and service of personnel in the field of economics, statistics, sociology, and similar fields. A suggestion that the Group have in mind is that the State Governments might approach the Central Government with a request for deputation of officers from the Indian Economic and Statistical Services for manning these posts. An advance indication of the number of such officers required in different years and on different scales will help the Home Ministry in formulating their recruitment quota for these services in the next year or two.

73. Advance action during 1965-66 should also include the setting up or strengthening of the core unit of the evaluation organisation, creating the recommended set-up and providing for funds in the budget. It is suggested that two of the top posts, namely Director and Deputy Director (Statistics), and a small complement of assisting and investigating staff be created in the States where these do not yet exist, and included in the plan for 1965-66. In States where the basic organisation exists, the expansion of the headquarters organisation may be included in the plan for 1965-66.

74. The Group recommend that the outlay needed for such advance action in 1965-66 should be treated as additional outlay to be made with 100 per cent central assistance; and such assistance should be provided over and above the annual plan ceiling.

Statement showing Staff and Funds needed for the Evaluation Directorate in the States

I. Recurring

Post	No. of posts	Scale of Pay Rs.	Anticipated expenditure (Rs.)
A. Headquarters Unit			
1. Director (Economics with experience of rural surveys and studies)	1	900—1800	14,400
2. Deputy Directors (One in administration and one in Statistics)	2	600—1100	20,400
3. Assistant Director (Sociology)	1	300—900	7,200
4. Research Assistants	3	170—385	6,120
5. Investigators	6	130—250	9,360
6. Computers	6	105—240	7,560
7. Accounts clerk	1		
8. Stenographers	3		
9. UDC and LDC	6		
10. Peons	4		
	Sub-Total (Hqrs)		83,640
B. Field Task Force (at Hqrs)			
1. Evaluation Officer	1	300—900	7,200
2. Senior Investigator	1	180—300	2,160
3. Junior Investigator	1	130—250	1,560
	Sub-Total		10,920
C. Field Units (Average 3.5 per State)			
1. Evaluation Officer	1	300—900	7,200
2. Investigator	1	130—250	1,560
3. Steno-typist	1		
4. Clerk	1		
5. Peon	1		
	Sub-Total		2,400
	Sub-Total		900
	Sub-Total		12,060
	For 3½ Units		42,210
	Total		1,36,770
D. Allowances (at 10%)			13,677
E. Travelling Allowance			20,000
F. Contingencies			15,000
	Total (annual per State)		1,85,447 or 1,86,000
	Total for five years		9,30,000
	Grand Total for 15 States		1,39,50,000
	or		1,40,00,000

II. Non-recurring

Desk Calculators	6		
(@Rs. 1,000)			6,000
Typewriters	6		
(@Rs. 1,200)			7,200
	Total		13,200

Total for 15 States

Rs. 1,98,000 or 2,00,000

III. Total for the Fourth Plan

A. Recurring	1,40,00,000
B. Non-recurring	2,00,000
	1,42,00,000
	Total

CHAPTER VI

COORDINATION OF EVALUATION WORK AT THE CENTRE AND THE ROLE OF THE PROGRAMME EVALUATION ORGANISATION

75. The envisaged expansion in the evaluation set-up and activities in the States will impose additional duties and responsibilities on the evaluation machinery at the Centre. These can be discussed under five functional areas—(a) administration of the plan schemes on evaluation, (b) coordination of the evaluation activities of different agencies, (c) extension of technical advice and guidance on evaluation methods, (d) arranging for the exchange of information and literature, and (e) providing facilities for the training of evaluation personnel. Attention of the Working Group has been drawn to the importance of these functions by some of the State Governments also. They have in this connection suggested that the P.E.O. should function *vis-a-vis* the State units in the same way as the C.S.O. does in relation to the State Bureaux of Statistics. It has also been suggested that the number of regional offices of the P.E.O. should be increased and the staff of these strengthened so that the State units can derive guidance, collaboration and assistance from these in their activities.

76. The Group generally agree with these suggestions of the State Governments. They are convinced that the successful implementation of the evaluation programme and schemes in the Fourth Plan would be possible only if the P.E.O. is enabled to assume adequate responsibilities in the four areas enumerated in paragraph 75. The implication of this recommendation is that the P.E.O. should have at least two wings. One wing will include the organisation as it exists now with some expansion of the regional offices. This wing, apart from conducting studies on its own, will also be responsible for extending technical advice and guidance on evaluation to the State Governments and other agencies. The other wing will deal with the following functions: |

- (a) Administration, processing and coordination of the evaluation schemes in the Plan;
- (b) Operating a regular and round-the-year training programme in evaluation (of suitable duration) for personnel of the State Governments and other agencies;
- (c) Running a clearing house and documentation centre for evaluation literature and information.

77. (a) The additional minimum staff needed for strengthening the first wing will be two new Regional Evaluation Units, each having one Regional Evaluation Officer and the supporting technical and administrative staff.

(b) For the second wing, the minimum staff needs are 1 Joint Director and the supporting technical and administrative staff.

78. The estimated expenditure on this addition staff for the Fourth plan period is not likely to exceed Rs. 10 lakh. The Group strongly feel that additional funds of this order should be provided for in the budget of the P.E.O. for the Furth Plan period to enable this organization to equip itself for the tasks it will have to face.

79. In addition to this expansion in the strength of the P.E.O., there is also the need for a suitable all-India forum which can impart to evaluation a higher technical and administrative status. With this end in view, the Group recommend 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, atleast 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 programme of study, and the coordination of the activities of the different agencies. The composition and terms of reference of this Council may be similar to those of the Central Advisory Council on Statistics.

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

V. K. R. V. Rao—Chairman.

T. P. Singh—Member.

Krishan Chand—Member.

C. Narasimhan—Member.

P. N. Damry—Member.

T. P. Singh—Member.

A. M. Lal—Member.

J. P. Bhattacharjee—Convenor.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WORKING GROUP ON EVALUATION IN THE STATES

1. In pursuance of a recommendation of the last meeting of the State Planning Secretaries, the Planning Commission constituted the Working Group on Evaluation in the States with Member (ES&IT) as Chairman, Secretary, Planning Commission and representatives (mostly Planning Secretaries) of five State Governments as members, and Director PEO as convenor. On the basis of visits and discussion in five States, and data and information obtained from all the State Governments, the Group have examined the objective, orientation, scope and content of evaluation work undertaken so far in the States and assessed the organisation and arrangements for evaluation set up by some of them. In the light of this assessment, the Group have offered recommendations on the technical and administrative issues involved in extending the scheme of evaluation in the States, and assisting and coordinating it from the Centre. The financial estimates for the Fourth Plan, and the advance action needed during the last year of the current plan have been formulated on this basis.

Background

2. The State Governments are attaching increasing importance to evaluation—an essential aid to their efforts for improving the formulation and implementation of programmes. Whereas prior to 1960, there was a full-fledged evaluation organisation in only one State and arrangements for undertaking limited evaluation work in three other States, since 1960 as many as nine State Governments have set up a separate machinery (directorate, wing or cell) for evaluation; and nearly all the other State Governments have either formulated plans for setting up a unit or indicated their desire to do so. While this is the general trend, the actual position in respect of activity and organisation varies from State to State, depending on the administrative set-up, the availability of resources and the specialisation as well as systematisation achieved in planning, progress analysis and evaluation work. The Group have noted a wide diversity among the State Governments in their approach to, and interpretation of the role and function of evaluation and in the administrative arrangements made or envisaged for undertaking this work. The Group have emphasised that since evaluation is a

potent instrument, it should be used positively, satisfactorily and effectively. There should be in all State Governments a common measure of understanding of the objective, orientation, scope and method of evaluation. An adequate and competent organisation should be built up on the basis of such understanding and enabled to function within the appropriate administrative framework and with the needed cooperation and support from all the implementing departments and agencies.

Objective and orientation of evaluation in the States

3. Broadly speaking the objectives of evaluation at the Centre include purposive assessment of progress and impact of a programme, finding out areas of success and failure at different stages of administration and execution, analysing the reasons for success or failure, examining the extension methods and people's reactions thereto, and deriving lessons for improvement in the formulation and implementation of programmes. Evaluation in this sense is distinct and separate from progress analysis and review on the one hand, and inspection, checking and scrutiny of schemes and works on the other. Most often, it means problem oriented type or case studies of programmes under implementation and schemes under execution, and should as such be clearly distinguished from large-scale statistical surveys for estimation purposes.

4. The case for two separate types of evaluation with different objectives has been recognised by the Group. One type has been described as 'internal evaluation', which is oriented to the current operational problems that the implementing agency is facing. The objective of such evaluation is to help the administrative and executive personnel decide on the course of strategy and action in problem situations by providing them with an understanding of the nature and implications of the problems and alternative methods of solving them. Arrangements for such evaluation should be built into the programmes, especially the more important ones, and made a part of the programme set-up. Cells for internal evaluation could also be created in the major spending departments like the P.W.D., Irrigation and Electricity, in every State. Expenditure on such evaluation should be included in the programme outlay or departmental budget, as the case may be.

5. The second type of evaluation—and this is the one with which the Group have been concerned in their report—is "independent" assessment by an agency not charged with the responsibility for

administering programmes. For this type of evaluation, the following areas have been mentioned as requiring special emphasis in the States:

- (a) In the States, performances, problems and achievements will have to be related to the given system of administration in its working in different regions and as a whole. This implies the need for special emphasis on the study of methods, efficiency and economy in the operation of the given system.
- (b) The functioning of statutory and other institutions—Panchayati Raj, Boards, Cooperatives etc.—requires regular observation and assessment, in view of their crucial role in planning and implementation.
- (c) The area approach to the assessment of development programmes is of special concern to the State Governments and, as such, study of inter-regional differences and inter-group disparities becomes an important objective of evaluation.
- (d) Extension methods and recommendations in relation to the special needs and problems of local areas.
- (e) People's participation, public cooperation and voluntary organizations.

6. The following points bearing on the approach and orientation in evaluation have been emphasized:

- (a) Evaluation should be based on an objective approach to the study of problems; subjective or impressionistic elements should not be allowed to enter in the findings.
- (b) Evaluation should be in the nature of a positive service—designed not only to find out shortcomings, failures and weaknesses but also to suggest methods of improvement and corrective and remedial measures.
- (c) Evaluation has also an educative function, as its findings can create a better and enlightened understanding of the implementation and achievement of different programmes and schemes, and, in general, of the progress toward the goals underlying the plan. The results of evaluation should be made available not only to the organs of the Government, but also the people, except in special cases or for special reasons.

(d) Evaluation should be forward-looking, not merely a post-mortem of the past in a static framework. Such an *ex ante* orientation would help the Government in using evaluation findings for understanding the future course and prospect of achievement.

Scope, Content and Method of Evaluation

7. *Scope.*—The scope of evaluation in the States in the Fourth Plan has been envisaged as follows:

- (a) Evaluation should extend to most of the sectors of the State plan, the possible exceptions being sectors like power (barring rural electrification), manufacturing and mining industries.
- (b) However, the importance of different sectors from the point of view of need for evaluation should vary from State to State, depending on the structure of the State Plans.
- (c) It would be desirable for each State Government to work out, as early as possible, a tentative three-year programme of evaluation studies keeping in view the need to cover over the period of the Fourth Plan, a cross-section of the sectoral programmes not only for agriculture, C.D., irrigation, rural industries and electrification, but also for the social and welfare services sectors, the emphasis being larger on the former group.
- (d) Among the implementation sectors, the performance in the Panchayati Raj and cooperative sectors should receive special attention in the States.

8. *Selection of Problems.*—For the selection of programmes and schemes, the following guide lines and criteria have been suggested:

- (a) all projects and programmes of a pilot nature;
- (b) programmes showing persistent shortfalls, lags and problems and difficulties in implementation;
- (c) impact programmes of a 'crash' nature like the intensive cultivation schemes;
- (d) programmes and schemes involving large outlays and relying for their success on the cooperation and participation of the people and institutions; and

- (e) special programmes for the benefit of backward areas or weaker sections.

Prior knowledge based on progress analysis helps in selecting problems for evaluation and narrowing down the areas of study.

9. The evaluation agency in each State should have one or two important programmes and/or institutions for current evaluation of a regular nature, an annual report on each of which should be a feature of the evaluation organization. Special emphasis may be given in selecting such topics to pilot projects, agricultural extension and Pachayati Raj institutions.

10. *Content and Method.*—The content and method of evaluation should have their basis in the methodology of social science research. The need for a manual on evaluation is recognized, and it has been recommended that the P.E.O. should address itself to this task.

11. Evaluation studies are different from statistical estimational surveys; they are problem-oriented diagnostic studies yielding therapeutic results. The diagnosis has to be done in relevant type situations and cases in such a way that remedies or correctives can be derived from the finding and results. Within this framework, the place of type studies, case studies and bench-mark surveys in evaluation has been indicated in the report. Broad guide lines for the formulation of problems, hypothesis and criteria and the working out of the design of the field investigation have been suggested on the basis of the methodological work done in the P.E.O.

Review of Evaluation Arrangements and Activities in the State

12. In reviewing the present organization and functions of evaluation in the States, the Group have also analysed, however briefly, the existing arrangements for planning and progress analysis. It has been mentioned that in a majority of the States, planning has not yet been organized as a separate department with adequate status and free from any other administrative responsibilities. In a number of States, the Planning machinery does not also appear to be technically well organized and adequately staffed. In a few States, it is also having difficulties in making use of the services of the Statistics Bureau for progress reporting and analysis.

13. Arrangements for progress analysis and implementation review display a wide diversity among the States. It is only the community development sector, i.e., the programmes and activities executed by the block agency, that a systematised pattern of reporting

and review has been laid down and is being followed in all States. Many of the programmes in other sectors have not been subjected to the same degree of systematisation in respect of administrative intelligence for planning purposes. In fact, there appears to be a good case and scope too for introducing a planning orientation in the types of data reported for these and the processing made of these at different levels. 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.

14. 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. In most States, the Bureau of Economics and Statistics and its district organisation could be involved more effectively than at present in the systematic reporting and analysis of planning-oriented progress data at least for sectors like rural industries, education, health and welfare of the backward classes. It has been suggested that the Planning Commission might give due attention to this matter and consider referring these problems to a Study Team or Committee.

15. A distinct organization for evaluation work, whether as a cell or as a wing or as a unit, exists in ten States, while in another evaluation studies are being conducted, though no separate machinery has been set up. In three other States, there is a proposal to establish an evaluation unit. The Governments of Himachal Pradesh, Manipur and Tripura have also reported proposals for setting up evaluation machinery of their own. Four broad patterns of State evaluation set-up have been distinguished. One isolated pattern is represented by the Planning Research and Action Institute in U.P., one section of which is engaged in evaluation studies of pilot projects in rural areas. The other three patterns are represented by the respective organizations in Andhra, Maharashtra and Rajasthan. These form part of the planning department in these States. Details of evaluation set-up like Committee arrangements, staff and administrative structure, budget and expenditure, the evaluation studies conducted and the follow-up of their findings have been reviewed in the report. The survey reveals varied patterns, sizes and effectiveness of the evaluation arrangements in the States. The evaluation studies so far conducted by the State units relate mainly to programmes in the field of agriculture, community development and Panchayati Raj, though of late there has been a tendency to go into fields like rural industry, education and welfare of backward classes.

Proposals for Evaluation in the States in the Fourth Plan

16. Noting the importance attached to evaluation by the State Governments and their keenness to build up a suitable organization for this purpose, the Group have taken the stand that the State Governments need to be helped and assisted in their efforts to develop evaluation organization and activity. They have recommended that evaluation should be included among the Plan programmes and the resources needed for carrying on evaluation work should be adequately provided for in the Plan outlay on this programme.

17. Every State Government should have an evaluation organization as an integral part of their planning machinery. This organization should function either as a wing or 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.

18. There should be an evaluation committee in each State with Chief Secretary as Chairman, Planning Secretary as convenor and Secretaries in charge of Finance and a couple of other departments as members. This committee will be responsible for selection of problems for evaluation, securing coordination and cooperation and taking follow-up action. It should be the responsibility of the Planning Secretary to initiate follow-up action. The arrangements made in Andhra for follow-up action have been considered effective and commended to other State Governments.

19. The State evaluation organisation, as conceived by the Group, will have a headquarters unit and a field organization. The field organization will include a nucleus task force unit to be located at the headquarters and 3 to 6 field units according to the size of the State, the intention being to locate at least one unit in each of the major regions of each State. There is no need for a field unit in every district. The headquarters strength would include Director, 2 Deputy Directors, 1 Assistant Director, 3 Research Assistants, 6 Investigators and 6 computers, along with supporting clerical and other staff, as shown in the Statement on page 35. The headquarters organization will have four subject matter divisions—economics, statistics, administration and sociology.

20. The likely expenditure on State evaluation organizations of this size and composition has been worked out in the Statement on page 35 on the basis of scales of pay obtaining in some State. For an average-sized State, the anticipated expenditure per year on an evaluation Directorate of this size would come to about Rs. 1,86,000.

This works out to a total of Rs. 9,30,000 for five years. The approximate total expenditure to be incurred on the evaluation organisation in the 15 States will thus work out to a sum of Rs. 1,40,00,000 for the Fourth Plan. There will also be a non-recurring expenditure on the purchase of calculators and typewriters of the order of Rs. 13,200 per State or a total of Rs. 2,00,000 for the 15 States. For Union Territories, a provision of Rs. 8 lakh has been suggested. 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.

21. Most of the State Governments desire Central assistance of a higher order for financing evaluation arrangements and activities. The Group have recognised the need for central assistance to the State Governments in respect of schemes for evaluation organization, but considered it premature at this stage to suggest any proportion or pattern.

Advance Action

22. In view of the shortage of qualified and experienced personnel, the group have suggested that the State Governments should try from now on to formulate a policy regarding recruitment and service of personnel in the field of economics, statistics and other social sciences. It has also been suggested that the State Governments might approach the Central Government with a request for deputation of officers from the Indian Economic and Statistical Services for manning these posts, along with an advance indication of the number of such officers required in different years and on different scales.

23. Advance action during 1965-66 should also include the setting up or strengthening of the core unit at the headquarters of the evaluation organisation, creating the recommended set-up and providing for funds in the budget. In States where the basic organisation exists, the expansion of the headquarters organisation may be included in the plan for 1965-66.

24. The Group recommend that the outlay needed for such advance action in 1965-66 should be treated as additional outlay to be met with 100 per cent central assistance; and such assistance should be provided over and above the annual plan ceiling.

Coordination of Evaluation Work at the Centre and Role of the P.E.O.

25. 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. It has been envisaged that P.E.O. will have two wings. One wing will include the organisation as it exists now with the addition of two more regional offices. This wing, apart from conducting studies on its own will also be responsible for extending technical advice and guidance on evaluation to the State Governments and other agencies. The other wing will deal with the following functions:

- (a) Administration, processing and coordination of the evaluation schemes in the Plan;
- (b) Operating a regular and round-the-year training programme in evaluation (of suitable duration) for personnel of the State Governments and other agencies;
- (c) Running a clearing house and documentation centre for evaluation literature and information.

26. The additional minimum staff needed for strengthening the P.E.O. has been estimated as 1 Joint Director with the supporting technical and administrative staff, and two new Regional Evaluation Units on the present scale of staffing. The staff expenditure for the Fourth Plan period has been estimated at Rs. 10 lakh.

27. In addition to this expansion in the strength of the P.E.O. there is also the need for a suitable all-India forum which can impart to evaluation a higher technical and administrative status. With this end in view, 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 coordination of the activities of the different agencies. The composition and terms of reference of this Council may be similar to those of the Central Advisory Council on Statistics.

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

APPENDIX I

SUMMARY RECORD OF DISCUSSIONS HELD BY THE WORKING GROUP WITH THE STATE GOVERNMENTS

A. *Discussions with the Maharashtra Government (Bombay, February, 3-4, 1964).*

1. The Working Group on Evaluation in States visited Bombay on 3rd and 4th February, 1964, met the Chief Minister and held discussions with the following officers of the Maharashtra Government.

1. Chief Secretary—Shri N. T. Mone
2. Secretary, Finance (Planning)—Shri P. N. Damry
3. Secretary, Agriculture—Shri R. C. Joshi
4. Addl. Development Commissioner—Shri V. S. Tambay
5. Deputy Secretary (Planning)—Shri G. H. Lalwanl
6. Director of Economics & Statistics—Shri M. A. Telang.

One basis of discussion was the questionnaire circulated earlier, and the reply of the Maharashtra Government thereto. Some of the more important points which emerged from the discussions are recorded below.

2. The Maharashtra Government have been very keen on developing systematic and adequate methods and procedures for progress analysis and review. Under the present arrangements, plan schemes are watched through quarterly and annual progress reports. The responsibility for collecting the data for regional, district and lower levels and for consolidating scheme-wise report is thrown on the Heads of Departments in charge of implementation of the schemes. After consolidation, these quarterly progress reports are submitted by them to the Secretariat Department concerned, the Finance Department (Planning), the Bureau of Economics & Statistics and the Accountant General, Bombay. The State's Third Plan has been broken down into district and division level schemes and data from lower levels are collected scheme-wise. Thus quarterly reports are called for from the Collectors/Commissioners and the Chief Executive Officers of the Zila Parisads in respect of district/divisional schemes in the State sector and district-level schemes in the local sector respectively. For the district-level schemes, each District Officer submits to the Collector of the district quarterly reports for the schemes indicated as district scheme and sends a copy to his

department also. The Collector consolidates the progress report for the district as a whole (the District Statistical Officer helps him in this work) and forwards three copies, one each to the Commissioner of the concerned Division, Finance Department (Planning) and the Bureau of Economics & Statistics, Bombay. Similarly, for the divisional-level schemes, each Divisional Officer submits periodical reports to the Commissioner of the Division, who consolidates the progress report for the Division as a whole and forwards it to the Finance Department (Planning) and the Bureau of Economics & Statistics, Bombay. The bureau also attempts quantitative analysis of the data received in the block reports on inputs and performance.

3. A Mid-Plan Appraisal was undertaken by the Finance Department (Planning) in consultation with the implementing officers and the representatives of the administrative departments concerned. The report on this appraisal will be placed before the Assembly along with Budget papers.

4. The Working Group appreciated the steps already taken by the Maharashtra Government for systematising progress analysis. It was hoped that the present arrangements would be further looked into with a view to improving adequacy in respect of content, periodicity of review, etc. There was need for examining more fully the techniques of progress reporting and analysis presently adopted. Progress reporting should also feed selection of topics for evaluation.

5. While progress reporting confines itself to the elements of the programme, evaluation starts where progress reporting ends. It involves assessment of impact and analysis of the problems and difficulties in the administration and implementation of programmes and schemes with a view to finding out methods of improvement in programming and administration. In addition, it has another important role, namely improving communication between the Centre and the States and of dispelling un-informed criticism. The Chief Minister stated that had the pilot paddy scheme of the Maharashtra Government been properly evaluated and its results communicated to the Centre, the scheme might have been better appreciated by the Central Government. The same is more or less true of the Maharashtra Government scheme on rural works programmes.

6. The Maharashtra Government has also entrusted one senior official, Additional Development Commissioner, with the task of reporting on implementation. He is associated both with watching progress as well as evaluation. His field visits help improve the

quality of progress reporting. On the other hand, he is in the Project Evaluation Committee (consisting of Additional Development Commissioner, Deputy Secretary, Planning, Director, Bureau of Economics & Statistics and one non-official Economist) which considers the reports prepared in the Evaluation Wing, gives them final shape and submits them to the Secretaries' Committee.

7. The Maharashtra system has another focal point where progress analysis and evaluation are integrated. The State Government has set up a Planning Sub-Committee of the Cabinet for providing effective and authoritative guidance in the process of formulation and implementation of policies and programmes. One of the functions of the Planning Sub-Committee is to watch the progress, evaluate achievements and make periodical appraisal of the Plan and important projects in it.

8. The practice of the Maharashtra Government whereby the Planning Department spells out in detail the objectives of evaluation studies and draws up a check-list of items to be investigated, in consultation with the implementing department, was considered worthy of study and adoption by other States.

9. It is generally held that the agency responsible for assessing impact and conducting evaluation studies should be different from the agency entrusted with the work of progress analysis, though the location of the evaluation agency, its structure and strength may follow different patterns. In Maharashtra, progress reporting and analysis is generally done by the Bureau of Economics and Statistics. For purposes of evaluation, the Maharashtra Government have set up an Evaluation Wing in the Planning Division of the Finance Department. The Evaluation Wing and the Bureau of Economics and Statistics work in close cooperation; the collection of field data for evaluation studies is done through the field staff of the Bureau of Economics and Statistics, the analysis and interpretation of the data so collected is done in the Evaluation Wing which also prepares the draft Report for the consideration of the Project Evaluation Committee. The Director, Bureau of Economics and Statistics, is a member of the Project Evaluation Committee and is associated with the formulation of guide points for evaluation studies and with finalizing the evaluation reports. This set up is different from that recently introduced in Bihar where the Evaluation Directorate is being merged with the Directorate of Statistics so that the field staff of the latter may be used for evaluation surveys. The Development Commissioner, Bihar, felt that the Bureau of Economics and Statistics could be considered as an organisation independent of the

implementing departments and the merger of evaluation with statistics would not only ensure timely completion of field work for evaluation studies but also improve the statistics collected by the State Government and reorient these to the plan needs. These points were agreed to be considered further at the next meeting of the Group.

10. The system evolved by the Maharashtra Government whereby quantitative analysis is mostly done by the Bureau of Economics and Statistics and qualitative analysis by the Evaluation Wing of the Planning Division, was reported to be working more or less satisfactorily and in a coordinated manner. Whether such a method will work satisfactorily in all cases or in all types of study needs to be watched.

11. It was recognised in the course of discussion that appropriateness and adequacy of evaluation arrangements could not be assessed except against the background of the objectives and purposes sought in evaluation. In Maharashtra, the objective and function of evaluation is to help the implementing departments and in this process to improve the methods and techniques of planning. The evaluation reports are meant for internal utilization by the departments; and non-officials were not associated with the evaluation reports. Without in any way minimizing the usefulness of this approach, most of the members of the Group felt that the objective of evaluation should, *in addition*, include keeping different sections of the people apprised of progress, and achievements, problems and difficulties in the implementation of programmes. In this view of evaluation, the need is recognised for releasing evaluation reports to the legislators, press and the public, associating non-official specialities in the task of advising the evaluation agency, as in Rajasthan or U.P.

12. The Chief Minister, Maharashtra, emphasized the following points in the course of his meeting with the Working Group:—

- (a) Evaluation should not only help policy formulation, planning and implementation, but also seek to inform the Government and the public as to whether plan schemes were achieving the desired results as set forth in the Plan and its perspective, whether these results were being acknowledged by the people.
- (b) The longer plan perspective behind the programmes to be evaluated should also be taken into account in the frame for evaluation.

- (c) Evaluation was needed in all sectors of the State Plan in order especially to understand whether these schemes would enable us to achieve the goal of socialism within the next 12 years.
- (d) Special priority might be given in the evaluation programme to the study of the productive schemes specially in the field of agriculture.
- (e) The developmental programmes operated by Zilla Parishads and Panchayat Samitis should also be evaluated.
- (f) Evaluation should also serve to keep the Central Government better informed about the approach and achievements of the schemes planned and executed by the States.

13. The role of the PEO for coordinating evaluation enquiries conducted by different States, for developing uniform techniques and standards and for the training of evaluation personnel, was emphasized. It was felt that the State Governments might not be able to keep their staff out for a long period; a short-term training programme of 6 to 8 weeks' duration should better be organised. Director, PEO, explained that facilities for such short-term training were already available and Andhra Pradesh had taken advantage of this limited facility. The PEO would be happy to make available similar facilities to other State Governments.

B. Discussions with the Mysore Government (Bangalore), February 5-6, 1964.

1. The Working Group visited Bangalore on 5th and 6th February, 1964, met Chief Minister, Shri Nijalingappa and had discussions with the following officers of the Mysore Government:

1. Chief Secretary—Shri K. Balachandran
2. Secretary (Finance)—Shri Mathias
3. Development Commissioner—Shri M. Vasudeva Rao
4. Secretary (Planning)—Dr. B. V. Iengar
5. Secretary (Agriculture)—Shri Y. C. Hombalayya.
6. Chief Engineer (Irrigation), Director of Agriculture and other Heads of Development Department.

The basis of discussion was the questionnaire circulated earlier, and the reply of the Mysore Government thereto. Some of the more important points which emerged from the discussions are recorded below.

2. The Mysore Government has a separate Planning Department, (not a part of the Finance Department as in Maharashtra). The Planning Department also looks after housing and social welfare. It was felt both by the Mysore Government and the Working Group that the department was not staffed adequately and needed strengthening.

3. At present no evaluation machinery exists in Mysore State. There is no systematic arrangement for detailed investigation and evaluation. There is, of course, some internal progress reporting, *ad hoc* investigation and judgment on cases and situations arising out of field inspection by the departmental officers. In the Irrigation Department, there is an *ad hoc* arrangement for internal evaluation or performance audit. Some Executive Engineers have been put on this job directly under Secretary, Irrigation.

4. The need for evaluation machinery has been recognized by the State Government; and some steps had been taken by the Planning Department. Full details of its location either in the Planning Department or the Finance Department remain to be worked out. The Finance Secretary and the Development Commissioner felt that the Planning Department is more involved in the plan schemes and to that extent may not be as objective in the evaluation of plan programmes. As such, the evaluation cell should be located in the Finance Department. Some of the members of the Working Group, particularly the representative from U.P., did not agree and wanted to know why the Planning Department could not be 'objective' in evaluation. The consensus in the Working Group was that since the Finance Department's approach was likely to be more limited, the Planning Department was better equipped to undertake evaluation studies of the type oriented more to implementation and impact and less concerned with evaluation of policies.

5. At present, the State Department of Statistics is not very much in the picture either in progress reporting or in evaluation; the question does not arise for the latter because there is no evaluation set-up nor any evaluation studies have been undertaken by them. The Planning Department has, however, initiated a study of the plan schemes for backward classes, scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. It appeared from the discussions that there was room for better orienting the Department of Statistics to, and utilising it for planning needs. The Department of Statistics could be utilized for the collection of field data for evaluation studies.

6. The Chief Secretary keenly felt the need for strengthening planning and setting up arrangements for evaluation. It was agreed in the discussion with the Chief Secretary that the State Government might prepare a detailed note on the nature, size and location of the evaluation set-up envisaged in the State. The different patterns in existence in different States were explained by the Group. In the note, the State Government might usefully state the envisaged expenditure on evaluation and the magnitude of assistance required from the Central Government.

7. On the issue of whether evaluation studies should be circulated within the Departments at the Government level or should be released to the public, the Chief Minister felt that these studies should be made available to the people. There should be State-level Evaluation Committee and the Report, as finalized by the Committee, should be printed. If there was divergence of opinion between those who assessed the schemes and those who implemented them, the Report for printing might consist of two parts—(i) the Evaluation Committee's Report and (ii) comments of the implementing Departments and Government's acceptance of the recommendations.

8. On the question of the topics for evaluation, a broad suggestion was made that evaluation might have a two-fold approach—(i) to evaluate all schemes in one area and (ii) to evaluate one scheme in all areas.

9. On the whole, the visit of the Working Group served to open up the question of setting up an evaluation agency which had been earlier decided in principle by the Cabinet but got held up on financial considerations. The Group helped in some measure in creating a climate in favour of evaluation and probably also in the removal of some of the road blocks.

C. Discussions with U.P. Government (Lucknow, March 7, 1964)

The Working Group on Evaluation in States visited Lucknow on March 7, and held discussions with the following officers of the U.P. Government:—

1. Shri K. K. Das, Chief Secretary.
2. Shri Krishan Chandra, Additional Chief Secretary.
3. Shri M. A. Quraishi, Commissioner and Sachiv, Agriculture Production and Rural Development.
4. Shri V. M. Bhide, Finance Commissioner.
5. Shri S. S. Sidhu, Joint Secretary, Planning.
6. Shri S. D. Srivastava, Deputy Secretary (Planning).

7. Shri J. K. Pande, Director of Economic Intelligence and Statistics!

8. Dr. Ram Das, Director, P.R.A.I.,

and other Heads of Departments.

The basis of discussion was the questionnaire circulated earlier and the reply from the U.P. Government. Some of the more important points which emerged from the discussions are recorded below.

2. The Government of Uttar Pradesh have been very keen on developing an adequate system for progress analysis and review and had laid down detailed procedure for this purpose. The Plan programmes are classified under two categories—(a) Plan schemes and (b) programmes, under the Plan schemes as well as outside, implemented through the Block agency and included in the District/Block Plans. For the first category, reports of monthly expenditure are submitted to the Finance Department with copies to the Planning Department. In addition, the Planning Department receives quarterly reports from the Departments on the utilisation of funds and on physical achievements against the fixed targets. For the second category, a comprehensive system of quarterly progress reporting is adopted. At the Block level, the quarterly progress reports are prepared by the Progress Assistant and are forwarded by the B.D.O. to the District Planning Officer through the District Statistics Officer (D.S.O.). The District Planning Officer consolidates them with the help of the D.S.O. The District Magistrate is finally responsible for preparing the quarterly progress report of the District and sending it to the Divisional Commissioner and a copy is simultaneously sent to the Directorate of Economics and Statistics. The Commissioner consolidates the quarterly progress report of the Division and then sends it to the Secretary, Planning. On receipt of reports from all Divisions, a quarterly progress report for the State as a whole is prepared in the Directorate of Economics and Statistics. This report is both statistical and qualitative in content. The proforma for quarterly progress review requires both qualitative and quantitative information. On the qualitative side, the review covers main achievements, short-falls, analysis of causes, remedial measures taken and specifically raises points needing attention at higher levels.

3. The detailed proforma designed for the collection of quantitative data shows the painstaking attempt made by the U.P. Government to achieve comprehensiveness in progress reporting. But a concern was expressed about the time it would be consuming in collection and tabulation at various levels. Very rightly, the U.P. Government have recently decided to reduce the number of items for

progress reporting to certain key items in agricultural production, etc.

4. While the progress reporting is adequate for the C.D. sector, experience shows that it has not been qualitatively adequate in education, health and industry sectors. Partly this is due to the fact that the executive agencies in these sectors in the districts have generally been outside the community development set-up, with the result that the channels of communication and supervision have tended to be irregular and uneven.

5. The State Government have not undertaken any Mid-Term Appraisal of the Third Plan. However, as a regular feature, the Planning Department prepares a review of the development activity in the State in each quarter. This is also supplemented by a review of progress of expenditure under the Annual Development Plan in each quarter. The review for April to September 1963, and the latest note entitled "Progress of State Plan Schemes during the third quarter of the Annual Plan 1963-64" were shown to the Group. These were found to be much more analytical and evaluative than the earlier reviews.

6. While discussing the functions of evaluation, Chief Secretary, U.P. suggested that evaluation should also attempt a forecast of achievement. According to him, evaluators should help the top functionaries in assessing whether with the present tempo of the programme, targets would be achieved in time, or earlier or later. Such forecasting would involve more than a study of problems and ways to tackle them. It would mean more adequate and integrated use of both progress analysis and evaluation assessment.

7. The need for adequate, purposeful and scientific evaluation has been strongly felt by the State Government. At the same time, the Chief Secretary emphasised that to be helpful, evaluation had to be very simple and in a very condensed form, at least when the findings came to the top level. This would help the top functionaries feel the pulse of the situation in the field and also facilitate quick follow-up of evaluation.

8. In order to be objective, evaluation has to be done by an independent agency. In the State set-up, this would imply that the evaluation organisation of the State should be with the Chief Minister. Further, it should be in the Planning Department and not with Finance, which develops a different angle of approach. And, as the

Planning Secretary in U.P. is not vested with executive responsibilities, the Planning Department could rightly be considered as independent of the implementing departments.

9. The State Government is keen to build up a suitable and adequately staffed evaluation organisation in the State. With the re-designation of the post of the Planning Secretary as Commissioner for Planning and Evaluation, a decision has already been taken that the evaluation machinery should continue to remain in the Planning set-up of the Government. Details regarding the size of the staff, etc. in the evaluation organisation are being considered. The likely expenditure on a full-fledged Evaluation Directorate is expected to be between Rs. three and four lakh annually. This does not include the present expenditure on the Evaluation Wing of the P.R.A.I. but includes a lumpsum provision of research fund for studies to be conducted through Universities, etc.

10. Viewed against the background of the Maharashtra pattern, the system followed so far by the U.P. Government in conducting its evaluation studies shows one conspicuous feature, namely that the State Bureau of Statistics and Economics has not been utilised for collection of field data, even though the field staff of the Evaluation Wing of the P.R.A.I. does not seem to have been adequate. One possible explanation might be that the State Bureau had no spare capacity. At any rate, there is a need for the State Department of Economics and Statistics to be more integrally involved in the evaluation work. In this connection, the Maharashtra Government's mechanism of a Technical Coordination Committee with the Bureau Director as a member was mentioned. Such a Committee has been found useful for the utilisation of the State Bureau for collection of field data for evaluation.

11. The Commissioner for Planning and Evaluation emphasised that a parallel field agency in each district would not be necessary for the purposes of Evaluation. Full use should be made of the field agency of the Statistical Bureau, existing in each district. At the same time, the need of a small nucleus field unit attached to the Directorate of Evaluation, should be carefully considered.

12. It was felt that evaluation work done so far in U.P. had been oriented more in favour of sociological and anthropological studies (like studies on factionalism and leadership, attitudes and values of Kshetra Pramukhs, nutrition, training and education). This was partly because of the staffing pattern in the Evaluation Wing of the P.R.A.I. The Rural Life Analyst is expected to have qualifications in sociology or anthropology. In the P.R.A.I., emphasis has been

given only two disciplines—sociology and statistics—in the qualifications of their evaluation personnel. It was pointed out that experts in economics and public administration needed also to be represented in this set-up.

13. The need for training of the evaluation personnel was stressed. It was, however, felt that the State Government would not be in a position to spare their officers for long durations. Training courses should, therefore, be organised only for short durations like a month or six weeks. As far as U.P. was concerned, the training programme could start in 1964-65 broadly on the following pattern:—

March-September 1964: Research Officers—2.

September 64—March 65: Research Officers—2, Assistant Directors—2.

1965-66 : Deputy Director—1, Asstt. Directors/Divisional/District Statistics Officers—5, Research Officers—5.

D. Discussions with the West Bengal Government (Calcutta, April 8-9, 1964).

The Working Group on Evaluation in States visited Calcutta on 8th and 9th April, 1964, and held discussions with the following officers of the West Bengal Government:—

1. Development and Planning Commissioner—Shri S. K. Banerjee.
2. Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development—Shri R. Ghosh.
3. Secretary, Forest & Fisheries—Shri D. N. Banerjee.
4. Secretary, Irrigation & Cooperation—Shri G. D. Goswami.
5. Joint Secretary, Agriculture—Shri S. R. Das.
6. Secretary, Health—Shri S. K. Chakrabarty.
7. Deputy Secretary, Industries—Shri S. K. Sengupta.
8. Director of Industries—Shri N. K. Biswas.
9. Registrar, Cooperatives—Shri S. Dutta.
10. Director of Economics & Statistics—Smt. C. Bose.

The basis of discussion was the questionnaire circulated earlier and the reply of the West Bengal Government. Some of the important points which emerged from the discussions are recorded below.

2. Progress reports on block plans are submitted quarterly to the Community Development Department by the Block Development Officers through the District Magistrates. There is, however, no system for reporting on the progress of the district plan. Even about the block plans systematic progress analysis is attempted mainly in respect of the agricultural items.

3. In West Bengal the system of progress reporting and progress analysis has been geared more to the particular administrative requirements of the departments than for planning purposes. The planning machinery was reported to be undergoing reorganization and strengthening. Since progress analysis is one of the instruments for the follow-up of plan implementation, it was suggested to the State Government that they might utilize this occasion to suitably review and modify the set-up and system of progress analysis.

4. The Statistical Bureau is, administratively, under the Finance Department. The Bureau has not been involved either in progress reporting from the districts or its analysis at the headquarters. The Progress Assistant in the blocks are not under the technical control of the Bureau; and the progress reports from the blocks do not go to the Statistical Bureau but to the Administrative Intelligence Unit in the C. D. Department. While the Bureau has conducted, over the years, a number of important and useful surveys, its major pre-occupation seems to be large-scale sample surveys on area and yield. The structure of its field organisation also indicates this orientation in its activities. There is apparently a strong case for giving fresh thought to the role the Bureau should play in servicing the planning department *vis-a-vis* other departments.

5. A Mid-Term Appraisal of Third Plan was undertaken by the Planning Department in consultation with individual departments and the Finance Department of the State Government.

6. There is no evaluation machinery as such at the State level. A beginning has, however, been made with the setting up of an Evaluation Advisory Board with the Development Commissioner as Chairman and the Director of Research and Evaluation, Finance Department, as Member-Secretary. The other Members are Secretaries of Finance, Agriculture, Education, and Health and Director, State Statistical Bureau. The Board is to provide advise and guidance to the Programme Evaluation Organisation of the State Government in selecting problems for investigation, assist the Government in developing facilities for evaluation and advise the State Government generally in the evaluation of development programmes.

7. With the setting up of the Evaluation Advisory Board, the time has come for the State Government to take final decisions on the functions, location and staffing of the Evaluation Organisation. In this connection, the Working Group felt that in West Bengal evaluation as a part of the planning set-up could make a useful contribution towards improving coordination and communication between the different departments. This is, of course, apart from the other positive purposes it serves.

8. The Group acquainted the State Government with the three main patterns of evaluation set-up currently in existence in the States. Andhra has an Evaluation Committee at the State level, consisting of officials, (Chief Secretary, Secretary Finance, Secretary Education and Deputy Secretary, Evaluation). There is an Evaluation Wing in the Planning Department with a Deputy Secretary and four Deputy Directors. The Bureau of Economics and Statistics is, administratively placed in the Planning Department; and its field organisation is used for the collection of data for evaluation purposes. The evaluation reports are presented to the State Evaluation Committee and published. The decisions of the Evaluation Committee are final; and administrative departments concerned are requested to take necessary action on their recommendations. The State Evaluation Committee is also expected to have follow-up of the action taken on the recommendation of the Report. In Maharashtra, the Evaluation Committee consists of Additional Development Commissioner, Deputy Secretary Planning, Director of Economics and Statistics and one non-official Economist. For conducting evaluation studies, they have set up an Evaluation Wing in Planning Division of the Finance Department. This Evaluation Wing and the Bureau of Economics and Statistics work in close cooperation. The Bureau collects field data and does the quantitative analysis of such data. The qualitative analysis is done by the Evaluation Wing of the Planning Division; and an integrated Report is prepared. The distinctive feature of the Andhra pattern vis-a-vis the Maharashtra pattern is that while in Maharashtra evaluation reports are meant for internal utilisation by the departments, in Andhra the Evaluation Reports are released to the press in order to apprise the people of the progress and achievements, problems and difficulties in the implementation of the programmes. In many respects, the set up in Rajasthan is similar to that in Andhra. The distinctive features of the Rajasthan set-up are two-fold. Firstly, the Chairman of the State Evaluation Committee is a non-official. Secondly, it has a Directorate of Evaluation with a field agency.

It was made clear by the working Group that in deciding on their evaluation set-up, the West Bengal Government should ensure that

the organisation would function as an independent body and act as an integral part of the Planning Department.

E. Discussions with Orissa Government (Bhubaneswar, April 11, 1964)

The Working Group on Evaluation in States visited Bhubaneswar on 11th April, 1964, met the Chairman, Planning Board, Shri B. Patnaik and held discussions with the following officers of the Orissa Government:—

1. Secretary Planning and Co-ordination and Development Commissioner—Shri M. Ramakrishnayya.
2. Secretary, Finance—Shri H. K. Ghosh.
3. Additional Secretary, Industries and Commerce—Shri K. C. Ramamurty.
4. Joint Secretary, Health—Shri B. K. Mohanty.
5. Deputy Secretary, Planning—Shri J. K. Misra.
6. Deputy Secretary, Zilla Parishad—Shri N. C. Naik.
7. Financial Adviser-cum-Secretary (C.D.)—Shri G. C. Patra.
8. Director, Gram Panchayats—Shri B. B. Rath.
9. Under Secretary, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry—Shri N. Parija.
10. Director, Bureau of Economics and Statistics—Shri Chakradhar Misra.

2. The Basis of discussion was the questionnaire circulated earlier and the reply of the Orissa Government. Some of the more important points which emerged from the discussions are recorded below.

3. Chairman, Planning Board, expressed the view that evaluation of plan programmes, specially agricultural programmes, would be incomplete if it only attempted an assessment of the growth of input factors. The effect on output was the crucial test and he wondered whether any assessment of this effect could be built into the reporting system prescribed for programmes. He further observed that the effect on marketed surplus of agricultural produce should also be assessed in an evaluation of the *plan* for the agriculture sector.

4. The Chairman, Planning Board, emphasized the need for evaluation not only of particular programmes, but also of the plan for individual sectors. The objective in such evaluation should be to throw

light on the policies, priorities, linkages and other basic issues. The priorities in planning and time sequence for implementation should be viewed in perspective over a longer period; and the task of evaluation should include critical examination of the approach to policies laid down from these angles.

5. In the course of discussion with the senior officers, it was pointed out that the State Government had already undertaken steps to stream-line progress reporting and analysis. At present, the BDOs send monthly progress reports in prescribed forms to the District headquarters. These are reviewed by the Administrative Coordination Committee of officials and the zilla parishad. The District Collectors send reports to the Revenue Divisional Commissioner as well as to the Government. Review of progress of plan schemes entrusted to the Panchayati Raj sector for implementation, is made in annual conferences held at District headquarters and attended by Development Commissioner, Heads of Departments and Additional Development Commissioner. At the State level, the Planning and Coordination Department receives quarterly progress reports on physical performance and monthly reports on expenditure. The report on expenditure also goes to the Finance Department. The State Cabinet is apprised of the financial position every month.

6. Coordination and effective implementation of the different schemes has been made the responsibility of the Development Commissioner and the Additional Development Commissioner. While administrative departments undertake progress analysis in respect of programmes under their jurisdiction, there is a Committee of the Planning Board functioning in the Planning and Coordination Department with Development Commissioner, Additional Development Commissioner and Secretary, Finance, to review the progress and keep an overall watch on plan expenditure as well as achievement of targets. When there are differences in the opinion of two departments, the matter goes to the Planning Board and not to the Cabinet. The State Planning Board with the ex-Chief Minister as Chairman and the present Chief Minister as Vice-Chairman, has been constituted to advise the Government in all matters relating to planning in general and social and economic development plans in particular. It is assisted by the planning and coordination department in the preparation of Five Year Plans and the long term plan, reviews periodically the progress of the plan programmes and brings to the notice of the Government all important points requiring action.

7. A Mid Term Appraisal of the Third Plan has been completed; and the Report is in press.

8. The Bureau of Economics and Statistics is in the Planning Department and has a cell for analysing the progress of plan schemes. The Progress Assistants are not under the State Bureau and the progress reports from the blocks go to the Administrative Intelligence Unit attached to the C.D. Department for progress analysis.

9. The function of evaluation, as envisaged by the State Government, shows an orientation towards efficiency audit. The State Government is conscious that reviews of physical performance are at present not very satisfactory. Attempts are being made to evaluate, through the technique of bar-charts, progress in terms of time, money and physical performance. The bar diagrams help deciphering at a glance the sectors which are lagging in actual achievement behind the prescribed targets and show the number of months of such lag.

10. The Evaluation Unit is an integral part of the Planning and Coordination Department and has been set up under the plan scheme, "Public Cooperation: Research Training and Pilot Project", for which Central assistance at the rate of 60 per cent is admissible.

11. Both the Evaluation Unit and the State Bureau of Economics and Statistics are under the administrative control of the Secretary, Planning and Coordination Department. For the regular assessment of performance of Panchayati Raj Institutions and the C.D. blocks in connection with prize competitions, the field work is done by the statistical staff of the Bureau. It was felt that with the growth of evaluation work, the relationship between the Bureau and the Evaluation Unit might need some systematizing.

12. The State Government held the view that continuous evaluation was needed for the Rural Works Programme and the functioning of Panchayati Raj Institutions.

APPENDIX II

Statement summarising the replies received from the State Governments to the Working Group's Questionnaire

II-A. Arrangements for Progress Analysis and Review

STATEMENT A. 1

Nature, content and frequency of the progress reporting

State	Nature	Contents	Frequency	Levels at which progress reporting is done	Brief procedure
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Andhra Pradesh	..	Targets and achievements	Monthly and quarterly	Block, Dist. Regional and State level	The reports are prepared at Dist. and Regional levels and submitted to the Heads of Depts. These are then sent to the Planning Dept. for scrutiny and consolidation. Shortfalls are pointed out so that these may be overcome.
2. Assam	..	Expenditure, achievements and targets.	Annually and quarterly	Block, Dist. and State level	The reports are received by the Heads of the Depts. and sent to the Planning Dept.
3. Bihar	..	Progress of expenditure and physical achievement.	Quarterly.	Block and State level	Block Reports are submitted quarterly to the Development Commissioner. At the Block level, BDO was assisted by the Progress Assistant in the Progress reporting. But, since March, 64, the posts of Progress Assistant have been abolished.
4. Gujarat	..	Expenditure incurred, physical achievements and administrative measures regarding implementation.	Quarterly	Dist. and State level	Heads of the Depts., who receive these report send in turn to the Gen. Adm. Dept. (Planning).

1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Kerala	Review of the Planning Dept. has been more effective and critical	Expenditure and physical progress of the schemes	Monthly and Quarterly	Block, Dist. and State level	The reports are submitted to the Planning Dept. through the Heads of Depts. These are examined in the Planning and Finance Dept. The Planning Dept. offers necessary advice also.
6. Madhya Pradesh.	..	Financial and physical targets and achievements	Quarterly and annual	Dist. and State levels	Quarterly progress report is collected for the whole State. Annual report is obtained from all the Heads of the Depts.
7. Madras	..	Physical and financial progress.	Quarterly	Sub-divisional, Dist. State level	These reports are reviewed by the Planning Dept. in the meeting with Heads of Depts.
8. Maharashtra	..	Estimates of expenditure and physical achievements	Quarterly and annually	Regional, District and lower levels also	The reports are submitted by the Heads of the Depts. to the Planning Depts. Bureau of Ecos. & Stats. and Accountant General.
9. Mysore	..	Expenditure and Physical achievements	Progress reports are received by the Planning Deptt. The Chief Minister reviews these reports periodically.
10. Orissa	..	Physical performance and expenditure	Monthly	Block, District, Regional and State level	Reports are received by the Planning Department and the Finance Department. State Cabinet is apprised of the financial position.
11. Punjab	Monthly review has been of general nature and quarterly review of comprehensive nature.	Achievements of financial and physical targets.	Monthly and quarterly	District and State level	General review is made on monthly basis and comprehensive reporting is done every quarter.

12. Rajasthan . . .	Physical against specific defined targets as well as financial against annual plan allocations	Statistical as well as narrative, explaining shortfalls, if any, difficulties and other relevant points.	Monthly, quarterly and annually	State, Dist. and lower levels	The progress of development programmes is reported by the executing agency to the Dist. level officers in cases in which the programme is in the Dist. plan, otherwise to the Heads of Depts. who in turn report the progress to the State Govt. in the Planning and Administrative Dept. every month. Special reports are prepared by the Heads of Depts. quarterly.
13. Uttar Pradesh . . .	Brief descriptive reviews are made.	Physical achievements and expenditure.	Monthly, quarterly and annually	Block, Dist. Divisional and State level	The reports are discussed in a meeting under the Chairmanship of Addl. Chief Secretary with Heads of Depts.
14. West Bengal . . .	Critical reviews are done	Progress and expenditure	Quarterly and annually	Block and State level	The Block reports are submitted quarterly to the C.D. Dept. Annual reports are sent to the Planning as well as the Finance Dept.
15. Himachal Pradesh	Progress of expenditure	Monthly	Block, Dist. and State level	The Block and Dist. level reports are reviewed at B.D.C and Zila Parishad. The State level reports are discussed in the Progress Committee at the highest level.
16. Manipur	Physical and financial achievements	Monthly and annually	State level	Progress reports are compiled and analysed in the Planning and Finance Departments.
17. Tripura	Do.	Quarterly and annually	State level	Administrative Intelligence Unit of Statistical Office collects and compiles the reports.
18. Pondicherry	Physical targets and plan expenditure	Monthly	State level	Monthly Progress reports are prepared for Plan schemes.

STATEMENT A.2
Contents of Progress Analysis

State	Is such analysis done for all programmes or only for more important ones ?	Whether only expenditure is covered or physical achievements also.	Role of Planning and Finance Departments.
1	2	3	4
1. Andhra Pradesh	Progress reporting is done for all Plan projects and programmes.	Physical targets and achievements also.	The Heads of Depts. furnish the State level reports to the Planning Dept. Such reports are reviewed monthly at the Govt. level.
2. Assam	For all the Plan schemes included in the Annual Plan of the State.	Expenditure and Physical targets and achievements also.	The reports received from the Heads of Depts. are consolidated by the Plann. Dept. and reviewed in the month of May, Oct., Dec., and Feb., with the Heads of the Depts. concerned. Annual review is also done. Post budget scrutiny of plan schemes is carried out by the Finance Deptt.
3. Bihar	Broadly covers all Plan schemes but more attention to the C.D. sector.	Expenditure, physical targets and achievements.	..
4. Gujarat	The progress reports are obtained for all plan schemes.	The expenditure incurred, physical achievements and administrative measures taken with regard to implementation of Plan schemes.	The G.A.D. (Planning) compiles State-wise information on the basis of the plan progress reports. Finance Dept. is not directly concerned with it.
5. Kerala	All projects and plan programmes	Expenditure and physical progress.	Planning Dept. is responsible for the coordination and overall supervision of various programmes. The Planning wing of the Finance Dept. watches the financial progress of the schemes and renders advice on the financial aspects of the plan.
6. Madhya Pradesh	All Plan schemes are covered in the progress reports on quarter and annual basis. Detailed information is also collected for a few selected important projects.	Both physical and financial aspects are considered.	Progress reports are analysed in the Directorate of Eco. and Stat. and the Planning Dept. The progress is also reviewed by the State Development Committee where Finance Dept. is also represented.

7. Madras	Various projects under Plan	Both physical and financial progress is assessed.	The progress reports are reviewed by the Plann. Dept. at the meeting with the Heads of Depts. The State Development Committee also discusses the progress of plan schemes. The Secretary, Planning and Finance, is also the Secretary of this Committee.
8. Maharashtra	Schemes included in Plan	Estimate of expenditure and physical achievements.	The quarterly progress reports received from the Depts. are analysed by the Planning Section of the Finance Dept. The Planning sub-committee of the Cabinet also reviews such reports. Bureau attempts the quantitative analysis of reports on inputs and programme achievements.
9. Mysore		Progress of expenditure and physical achievements.	The progress reports are received and consolidated by the Plann. Dept. Finance Dept. sends expenditure statement to the Government of India.
10. Orissa	Progress reports of Plan programmes.	Physical performance and expenditure.	Coordination and effective implementation have been the responsibility of Dev. Commissioner. There is a committee of the Planning Board with Dev. Commissioner, Addl. Development Commissioner and Secretary, Finance to review the progress and to keep an overall watch on plan expenditure.
11. Punjab	Plan schemes	Achievements of financial and physical targets.	C.D. and Planning Dept. has got the Evaluation Directorate for compilation of statistics.
12. Rajasthan	All plan programmes	Both expenditure and physical achievements.	Progress analysis and reviewing—both financial and physical—is done by the Planning Dept. The Finance Dept. reviews the progress of expenditure only.
13. Utter Pradesh	Such analysis is done for all plan schemes.	Along with the estimates of expenditure, the reports are also received on physical achievements against the targets.	The progress reports are examined in the Planning Dept. which form the basis of the discussions with the Heads of Depts. and Addl. Chief Secretary Afterwards Planning Dept. prepares and circulates, a descriptive review of the progress. Copies are also placed before Chief Secretary and Minister in-charge of the Department.

1	2	3	4
14. West Bengal	Programmes and projects in the State plan are covered in the reports.	Progress of expenditure and physical targets are submitted.	The annual progress reports are received in the Planning and Finance Departments.
15. Himachal Pradesh	All developmental plans. Heads of the Depts. review and analyse the progress of programmes executed by their Depts.	Pace of expenditure on developmental programmes.	Progress committee consisting of Lt. Governor, Chief Secy. Finance Secy. and Developmental Commissioner review the progress every month.
16. Manipur	All plan schemes	Physical and financial targets and achievements.	Progress reports are compiled and analysed by the Planning and Finance Department.
17. Tripura	The progress reports are on all Plan programmes including Welfare of Backward Classes, CD and Intensive Development of Inland Fisheries. Annual report on the CD programme's physical achievements is also prepared.	Physical achievements and financial aspects are covered.	The collection and compilation of monthly progress reports in respect of all programmes obtained from the Heads of Depts. are done by the Planning Department.
18. Pondicherry	Plan schemes.	Plan expenditure and physical targets.	Planning Department reviews the report.

STATEMENT A. 3

Nature and Frequency of Implementation Review.

State	Nature and frequency of review of implementation of the Plan	Has any mid-term appraisal of the Third Plan been done? if yes—for all sectors and by whom?
1	2	3
1. Andhra Pradesh . . .	Review of the Plan implementation is undertaken at every meeting of the State Coordination Committee of the Heads of the Dept. The Departmental Coordination Committee also reviews it, which meets once in two months.	Mid-term appraisal was done for all sectors by planning Department.
2. Assam . . .	Quarterly and annual review of progress reports is done by the Heads of Depts. At highest level, State Dev. Committee, consisting of Ministers and Heads of Dept., carry out review.	Mid-term appraisal of Third Plan was done for all sectors by the Dept. concerned and was reviewed by the Planning Dept.
3. Gujarat . . .	A review of implementation of plan is made quarterly and annually both at Dist. and State levels. Specific mention is made in the review about schemes lagging behind in performance and difficulties experienced.	A mid-term appraisal of the Third Plan covering all the sectors was made.
4. Kerala . . .	Progress is reviewed by B.D.C. and Dist. Dev. Council in their meetings. Quarterly progress reports are sent by the Heads of Depts. to the Planning Dept. which, in turn, are submitted to the Chief Minister for perusal.	Mid-term appraisal for all sectors done by the Planning Dept.

1	2	3
5. Madhya Pradesh	Review is done annually at State level.	Mid-term appraisal for all plan schemes was done by Directorate of Stat. & Economics and the Planning Dept.
6. Madras	At District level, Dist. Development Council review once in two months the progress, which is further reviewed by State Panchayat and Dev. Consultative Committee once in six months.	Mid-term appraisal for all the subjects is done by the Heads of the Depts. and reviewed by the Planning Department.
7. Maharashtra	Planning Sub-Committee of the Cabinet consider the progress of Plan implementation quarterly.	Mid-term appraisal was undertaken by Finance (Planning) Dept. in consultation with other Departments.
8. Mysore	Each Secretary reviews the progress of plan for his department.	No mid-term appraisal. However, a mid-term review in skeleton published.
9. Orissa	At Dist. level, Zila Parishad and at State level, a Committee of Planning Board review the progress quarterly and annually.	A mid-term appraisal of plan schemes in Third Plan has been completed by the Planning Dept. and Administrative Depts.
10. Punjab	Review of implementation of plan schemes undertaken by State Government on annual basis. The report is an analysis of progress achieved.	Mid-term appraisal for all sectors was done by Planning Dept.
11. Rajasthan	Monthly, quarterly and annually.	A complete scheme-wise mid-term appraisal of the Third Plan was carried out early in 1964 and the report was published and sent to all Depts. as well as the Planning Commission. The appraisal was done by the Planning Dept. in consultation with administrative Depts. concerned.
12. Uttar Pradesh	Discussions on the progress reports of the Depts. are held within a month and a half or two months or at the end of the quarter with Heads of Depts. and Addl. Chief Secretary. Heads of Depts. also held meetings in their depts. at least once a quarter.	Mid-term appraisal has been done.
13. West Bengal	Planning and Finance Depts. review State Plan annually. Recommendations are submitted to Cabinet.	Mid-term appraisal of the Third Plan practically for all the sectors was undertaken.

14. Himachal Pradesh . . . Review is done quarterly at Dist. and blok levels monthly by State Planning Committee and Quarterly by State Planning Board at State level. No mid-term appraisal. The concerning depts. reviewed their plans.
15. Manipur Planning and Finance Dept. reviews implementation of Plan once a year in consultation with the Depts. concerned.
16. Tripura Annual reviews are undertaken in respect of all schemes. Mid-term appraisal was done.
-

STATEMENT A. 4

Machinery and Methods of Analysis and Review

State	Is there a machinery for progress reporting ?	If so, methods used — our reports, memoranda, working paper, field surveys, etc.	Has such review been extended to all schemes or only to some ?	What are considered to be relatively weak sectors of Development Plan ?
1	2	3	4	5
1 Andhra Pradesh	Heads of Depts.	The reports are sent in the prescribed proforma.	All schemes and projects.	No sector is considered weak.
2. Assam	No regular machinery. However, progress is submitted by the Heads of Depts.	Progress reports are sent in the prescribed proforma and compiled in Planning Dept. by the Statistical Cell.	..	There is much scope for improvement at all levels.
3. Bihar	Regular machinery for progress reporting only in the C.D. sector. For the rest, progress is mainly submitted by the Heads of Departments.	Progress reports for the C.D. sector are sent in the prescribed proforma to the Dev. Com.-office and compiled by the Adm. Intelligence Unit. State Bureau is not associated with progress analysis in the C.D. sector.	..	There is scope for improvement at different levels and different sectors.
4. Gujarat	The machinery is through the Heads of Depts.	Officers in G.A.D. (Planning) visit other Dev. Depts. at State, Regional and Dist. levels to assist and guide different officers.	All projects.	Agriculture has remained a relatively weak sector

Plan implementation is also reviewed during such visits. Tour reports are followed.

5. Kerala	Heads of Depts.	Notes on progress.	Plan as a whole
6. Madhya Pradesh	Plg. Dept. consolidates reports received from Heads of Depts	Progress reports proforma and D.O. letters reviewing the progress of plan.	All schemes and so far as the major project involving an outlay of Rs. 50 lakh. Agriculture, irrigation and power and education.
7. Madras	No separate machinery except Heads of Depts.	Progress reports from the Depts. and tour reports of the Heads and other senior officers are used for modifications.
8. Maharashtra	No separate machinery. It is done by Heads of Depts. through monthly, quarterly and annual reports.	Through monthly, quarterly and annual reports by Heads of Depts. and field surveys by Evaluation Cell.	Field surveys for selected programmes and projects. ..
9. Mysore	No machinery. Each Dept. reports its own progress.	Progress report from every Department.	.. Agricultural Production programmes. 73
10. Orissa	No special or Central machinery for current reporting. The depts. undertake progress analysis which is reviewed in a Committee of Planning Board.	Field surveys are conducted for selected schemes while tour reports focus attention on major schemes.	All plan programmes. ..
11. Punjab	Planning Cell for current reporting at the State level.	Through prescribed proforma in the form of quarterly and annual reports.	All the individual plan schemes. ..
12. Rajasthan.	All development Depts. are required to report progress periodically to Govt. & special staff has been sanctioned for the purpose. The Dist. and Block	Regular periodical reporting is the main source, tour notes by senior officers and special studies and surveys are also carried out from time to time.	Yes, all schemes with emphasis on selected schemes. No weak sectors.

1	2	3	4	5
	<p>statistical staff also report progress separately to Planning Dept. A special section of the Planning Department reviews and follows up the progress reports.</p>			
13. Uttar Pradesh .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A comprehensive system of reporting has been introduced. It consists of the Bureau and its field staff at div., dist. and block levels on the one hand and Planning and Dev. Dept. and its field staff on the other. 	<p>While statistical reporting from the village level to the block, from block to Dist. and from Dist. to Division continues on a monthly basis in respect of certain essential items, detailed analytical reports are required every quarter. Touring, inspection and field visits all have their place in ensuring accuracy and timely flow of the reports.</p>	<p>All plan schemes for quarterly reporting and certain selected items for monthly reports.</p>	<p>Progress reporting has not been qualitatively adequate in education, cooperative and industries sector.</p>
14. West Bengal .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Periodical reports are obtained by Heads of Depts. 	<p>Tour reports also contain review of the projects.</p>
15. Himachal Pradesh .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No regular machinery. Progress is being reported by Heads of Depts. 	<p>Through tour notes and inspection reports.</p>	All schemes.	Industries.
16. Manipur .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No machinery for current reporting.
17. Tripura .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heads of the various Depts.
18. Pondicherry .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly progress reports by Departments.

STATEMENT A. 5

Role of Statistics Bureau and Evaluation unit in Progress Analysis

State	Role of Evaluation unit in progress analysis	Role of Bureau of Economics and Statistics in progress analysis
1	2	3
1. Andhra Pradesh	No role	Not directly associated.
2. Assam	..	Administrative Intelligence Unit in the Directorate and Statistical Cell in Planning Department work under one officer (Director and Additional Secy) and analyse impact of development programme.
3. Bihar	..	Evaluation unit is merged with the Statistical Bureau in order to collect progress and other statistical data to the requirements of planning and systematic progress analysis.
4. Kerala	No Evaluation Unit. Evaluation Unit of Development Department confined to CD programme.	It is proposed to have Evaluation Cell in the Directorate of Economics and Statistics to be assisted by the Field Survey Division of the Directorate.
5. Madhya Pradesh	Evaluation Unit has been engaged in the evaluation of major plan projects costing Rs. 50 lakh and above only.	Evaluation unit has been set up in the Directorate itself.
6. Madras	Regular evaluation of specific projects to be undertaken by newly set-up Evaluation Cell.	Evaluation Cell is being set up in the Directorate of Economics and Statistics.
7. Maharashtra	A full-fledged Evaluation Unit takes up field surveys.	Directorate functions as the main statistical wing of the administration.
8. Orissa	Evaluation unit is entrusted with the task of evaluating selected programmes, progress analysis has not been attempted so far.	Bureau of Economics and Statistics is under the Planning Department and has a unit for progress analysis

1	2	3
9. Punjab	No separate evaluation unit as yet. Directorate of Economics and Statistics takes up evaluation studies.	Directorate of Economics and Statistics undertaking studies of important programmes.
10. Rajasthan	Evaluation Organisation is not directly concerned with progress analysis as such but by evaluation impact of programme can be judged.	Data regarding physical and financial achievement are collected by Directorate and compiled on monthly and quarterly basis. Bureau does not review the progress. It is done by Planning Department.
11. Uttar Pradesh	Evaluation Wing of the P.R. A.I. is at present not directly associated.	On receipt of the reports from all Divisions, a quarterly progress report of the State is prepared in the Planning and Statistical Division of the Directorate. The Directorate is also responsible for building up and compiling the Statistical data.
12. West Bengal	State Govt. have not much experience of evaluation work.	Director of the Bureau is a member of Advisory Board of programme evaluation.
13. Himachal Pradesh	No evaluation unit as yet.	..
14. Manipur	No evaluation unit.	Statistical Bureau undertakes verification and spot-checking of the progress reports of CD blocks and tribal Dept.
15. Pondicherry	Evaluation Officer recently appointed.	The Evaluation Officer attached to Statistical Department.

APPENDIX II-B

Objective and Scope of Programme Evaluation

STATEMENT No. B 1

Need and Purposes of Evaluation

State	Purposes & objectives of Programme Evaluation as the State Govt. views it.	Does the State Govt. consider it a useful activity and feel the need of such machinery?	At what level the evaluation is felt more urgently at present.
1	2	3	4
1. Andhra Pradesh	To have a qualitative and quantitative assessment of various schemes and their impact to determine the improvements to be brought about.	Quite useful activity and so the State Govt. have created a cell in Planning Department.	At all levels, but more urgently at the State level.
2. Assam	To assess progress and impact of the programme and to analyse the problems and difficulties in its implementation.	A very useful activity; accordingly Evaluation unit is to be set up.	At block level.
3. Bihar	To initiate studies with the object of evolving suitable form of organisation, methods, standards and techniques for achieving economy and ensuring efficient execution of projects, to organise investigations in the field of important projects and to initiate special studies in the working of commercial undertakings of the State Government.	Quite useful activity and a decision has already been taken to set up an Evaluation Board with the Chief Minister as Chairman.	..
4. Gujarat	Purpose of the Programme Evaluation is to under-take a detailed qualitative analysis of the major schemes with a view to study achievements of the	State Govt. considers evaluation as an important and useful aid to Planning and implementation of development programmes.	..

1	2	3	4
	aims and objectives, high-lighting difficulties in their formulation and execution, to assess their progress and impact and to analyse the reasons of failure and success.		
5. Kerala	No evaluation unit.	..	Will be decided after it is set up.
6. Madhya Pradesh	To keep close watch on progress of implementation, study bottlenecks and difficulties and changes in cost estimates <i>vis-a-vis</i> changing economic situation.	State Govt. attaches great importance to this activity.	At the district and project level.
7. Madras	To know the real worth of the schemes and the manner of their implementation.	Considers evaluation as a useful process and propose to set up one unit.	..
8. Maharashtra	Assessment of the impact of the Plan schemes, an objective analysis of implementation, problems and role of the implementing machinery, to indicate corrective measures and to improve the working of Plan schemes.	Evaluation is a necessary part of Planning and hence the State Govt. have set up a separate evaluation Wing in Planning Division of the Finance Department.	At the State level.
9. Mysore	..	Planning Department agrees that there is a necessity of evaluation.	..
10. Orissa	The function of evaluation as envisaged by the State Govt. shows an orientation towards efficiency audit.	Usefulness of evaluation has been long realised by the State Govt. and one Evaluation Unit was set up in July, 1961.	Evaluation programme is primarily undertaken at Block level.
11. Punjab	Evaluation consists of assessment of the progress made and of the difficulties experienced in the implementation of the programme.	Evaluation is one of the elements of the developmental programmes.	..
12. Rajasthan	Programme Evaluation should primarily concern itself with the evaluation of the quality of implementation, assessment and impact of	Yes.	There can be no hard and fast rule. The level at which observations are needed most depends on the nature

1	2	3	4
	development programmes, degree of success achieved over a period of time.		of the study and the intentions of the State Govt.
13. Uttar Pradesh	The studies by the Institute so far have been related to action projects and confined to C.D. and rural life etc. The State Govt. feel that the scope and coverage of evaluation need now to be further widened to include selected programmes in all sectors of the plan.	The State Govt. has all along been alive to the need & importance of evaluation and has set up an Evaluation unit in P. R. A. I. The State Govt. is keen at building up a suitable and adequately staffed evaluation organisation.	The need for evaluation exists at all levels—blocks district and state since all are vital. To start with, the unit will remain a State level orgn. It may utilise the field staff of State Dept. •
14. West Bengal	This point requires further examination.	At the moment, the State Govt. has set up an Evaluation Advisory Board with Development Commissioner as the Chairman.	..
15. Himachal Pradesh	To study the progress of a programme and to measure its impact on Socio-economic life to ascertain shortfall and indicate the directions in which improvements may be necessary.	Yes.	State level.
16. Manipur	To undertake critical assessment of progress and of difficulties encountered in execution of schemes. To conduct impact assessment.	There is need of evaluation machinery	State level.
17. Tripura	..	There is proposal to setup an Evaluation Unit.	..

STATEMENT B. 2

Selection of Programmes for Evaluation.

State	Sector of State Plan where need for evaluation is felt most urgently	Whether all or a few are proposed for evaluation	If a few are to be taken up, criteria for selection
1	2	3	4
1. Andhra Pradesh	..	All are impossible, hence some of the schemes.	Criteria for selection Plan provision for schemes, extent of impact, coverage, increase in per capita income and pilot programmes.
2. Assam	Panchyat, C.D., agriculture, irrigation, cooperation, village & small industries, welfare of backward classes and employment.	Only key items in each sector indicating the success of programme.	Outlay is not considered as the only criterion.
3. Gujarat	Schemes with an outlay of Rs. 10 lakh or more are considered for evaluation. The Evaluation committee selects the schemes to be taken up for evaluation.	Schemes with an outlay of Rs. 10 lakh or more.	..
4. Kerala
5. Madhya Pradesh	Selected schemes costing more than 50 lakhs.	Not all	Schemes costing more than 50 lakhs.
6. Madras	Schemes involving considerable outlay.	Only those involving considerable outlay.	Schemes involving considerable outlay.
7. Maharashtra.	Need for evaluation is felt most in the sectors where progress is slow and the results achieved are not commensurate with physical and financial inputs.	Ultimately all programmes and schemes are desired to be evaluated.	Financial outlay is given due weight.
8. Mysore
9. Orissa	Although all the plan programmes should be evaluated, programmes in C.D. blocks are given priority. With the expansion, other programmes will also be taken up.	No	..

1	2	3	4
10. Punjab	Important development programmes are being evaluated.	Only important programmes	Only important programmes.
11. Rajasthan	Important schemes in each sector but greater attention to be paid to (i) programmes having direct impact on the people, and (ii) production programme.	Production programmes and also those having direct impact on people	The choice will depend on their relative importance at a point of time. It will be upto the State Govt. to select the subjects according to the importance and need for modifications etc.
12. Uttar Pradesh	In an agricultural State like U. P., agricultural programmes are obviously the most important sector needing evaluation. In other production sectors programmes relating to utilisation of irrigation potential and employment intensity of rural industries programmes would form good subject-material for evaluation studies. In welfare sectors, evaluation of primary education and family planning programmes would have particular significance for U.P.	It is obvious that all schemes in all sectors cannot be taken for evaluation at the same time since only selected programmes will have to be taken up.	The following are some of the types of programmes suitable for evaluation: (i) Programmes which involve committing of large funds. (ii) Programmes designed to encourage investment, improve productivity, or generate employment on an individual or institutional basis: (iii) Programmes of special benefit of certain areas or weaker sections. (iv) Programmes which are of pilot nature. (v) programmes which depend for their success on the institutional framework provided for execution. (vi) Programmes showing persistent shortfalls or other weaknesses.
13. West Bengal	Obviously programmes in agricultural sector are the primary ones, rural industries may come next. Minor irrigation and the programmes for utilization of water provided by major irrigation projects may be taken up on an ad-hoc basis.	Not all	..
14. Uttar Pradesh	Agriculture, minor irrigation, roads, forests, transport, industries, C.D., animal husbandry, medical and water supply.	All schemes.	..
15. Manipur.	Socio-economic conditions	All fields of planning	..
16. Tripura	Agricultural programmes.

STATEMENT B. 3

Programmes suggested for Ad-hoc and Regular Evaluation.

State	Among the programmes, is it possible to specify some which could be taken up for regular evaluation	Programmes and schemes for ad-hoc evaluation within next 2 years
1	2	3
1. Andhra Pradesh	Agricultural programmes.	Schemes should depend on the criteria of selection given in Statement B-2
2. Assam	(i) Improved agricultural practices, (ii) benefits from irrigation, (iii) kharif and rabi campaigns, (iv) local manurial resources, (v) impact of CD programme on income, consumption, living and employment, (vi) part played by Panchayat in CD programme and building leadership etc., (vii) co-operatives and (viii) basic amenities.	(i) V.V.F. & DLBs, (ii) co-ordination among different departments at block, district and State levels, (iii) seed multiplication and distribution, (iv) agricultural demonstration, (v) rural works programme, (vi) loan schemes, (vii) rural artisans, (viii) training and follow up in rural and small industries sector.
3. Gujarat	(i) Family Planning Programme, (ii) establishment of industrial estates, (iii) B.C.G. vaccination, T.B. control and mass miniature, radiographic-cum-domiciliary treatment, (iv) milk distribution to mothers and children of low income families, (v) hostel for ST students, (vi) medical and health facilities to ST, (vii) welfare of physically handicapped, and (viii) post-graduate medical education.	(i) Study of impact of irrigation facilities on crop pattern and on the income level of different classes of agriculturists, and (ii) utilisation of credit provided by cooperative institutions.
4. Kerala
5. Madhya Pradesh	(i) Distribution of improved seed, (ii) Fertilisers, (iii) organisation of Joint Cooperative Farming Societies, (iv) industrial estates, (v) progress analysis aspect can be evaluated every year.	The output benefits and impact effects of these schemes can be evaluated on an <i>ad-hoc</i> basis. Projects with long gestation can be evaluated during the construction phase and after completion and commission stage so that impact effect can be studied.

I	2	3
6. Madras	(i) State seed farm, (ii) minor irrigation programme, (iii) industrial estate, (iv) farm forestry (v) economic plantation (vi) ice plants of fisheries department.	..
7. Maharashtra.	(i) Performance of Zila Parishad with regard to plan schemes, (ii) achievement of CD blocks, (iii) Family Planning Programmes, (iv) National Malaria Scheme (v) utilisation of irrigation potential.	(i) Rural electrification, (ii) horticultural development in Konkan region, (iii) seed multiplication and distribution, (iv) cattle improvement schemes (v) fisheries development scheme (vi) Mafussil dairy schemes (vii) schemes transferred to Zila Parishad (viii) schemes relating to scheduled and backward classes.
8. Mysore
9. Orissa	Evaluation cell continuously evaluates the performance of all Panchayati Raj institutions and CD blocks in connection with the prize competitions.	(i) Agricultural demonstration (ii) motivation of farmers for achieving higher yield per acre. (iii) economic benefits of soil conservation (iv) regulated markets, (v) rural electrification (vi) hand-looms (vii) evaluation of primary schools (viii) evaluation of industrial training institutes, (ix) loan stipend schemes, (x) foreign training with particular reference to period and utilisation, (xi) Primary Health centres and (xii) Radio Rural Forums and community listening centres.
10. Punjab.	It is proposed to strengthen Evaluation Organisation so that regular and systematic evaluation is carried out.	1964-65—evaluation of impact of plan programmes. In 65-66 selected schemes under Animal Husbandry, Poultry, Cooperation, Panchayat etc.
11. Rajasthan	Programmes relating to Agricultural Production, Small Industries and co-operatives and the schemes implemented by local bodies.	Same as in col. 2.
12. Uttar Pradesh	(i) Programmes directed at improving agricultural yields. (ii) the role of Panchayati Raj institutions and particularly the development of local resources by these institutions, would	(i) Rural electrification and its use in agriculture. (ii) changes in agricultural practices in areas of new irrigation. (iii) poultry and fishery programmes among Harijans. (iv) impact of

1	2	3
	also provide a subject for repetitive studies, (iii) Loans and grants programme in the industries sector.	industrial training-cum-production centres on development of technical skills and divisions of labour from agriculture (v) evaluation of special schemes for girls' education. (vi) response to family planning programmes in densely populated districts of Eastern UP. (vii) small savings programmes in rural areas.
13 West Bengal	. Programme for agricultural production which includes animal husbandry, fishery and community development.	(i) Minor irrigation programmes and (ii) programme for utilisation of water provided by major irrigation projects.
14 Himachal Pradesh.	(i) Agriculture, (ii) minor irrigation, (iii) roads, (iv) forests and (v) C.D.	(i) Agriculture, (ii) minor irrigation and (iii) industries
15 Manipur	. (i) Agriculture, (ii) industries, (iii) cooperation.	(i) Agriculture and (ii) household industries.
16 Tripura	. Agricultural production, development of roads and industries.	Health and education.

Appendix II-C.—Nature and Organisation of the Evaluation Machinery in the States

Statement C. 1

Nature and Size of the Evaluation Organisation.

State	In case there is no Evaluation Cell, what are the nature, location and size of the evaluation organisation envisaged by the State Government.	Order of annual expenditure being thought.	How do the envisaged set-up strength & budget compare, with requirements of the 'optimum' evaluation organisation for the State?
1	2	3	4
1. Andhra Pradesh	. Evaluation Unit exists.	Annual expenditure Rs. 75,000/-	Annual expenditure of optimum cell is Rs. 3 lakh.
2. Assam	. No evaluation cell. At present it is proposed to start at a very modest scale i.e. 1 S.R.O. & 2 R.O.s. The unit is to be located in the Directorate of Economics and Statistics.	Annual budget for 64-65 is Rs. 20 thousand.	The optimum size has not been thought of. It will be decided after some experience is gained & volume of evaluation work is assessed.
3. Bihar	. Evaluation Unit exists in the State.	Rs. 28,200/- were spent during 1962-63.	..
4. Gujarat	. Evaluation machinery has already been set up.
5. Kerala	. Evaluation unit exists. The present unit attends to the evaluation of the Block programmes. It is proposed to set up an Evaluation Unit attached to Directorate of Economics & Statistics with a view to study impact	Annual expenditure will come to Rs. 46,000/-.	The optimum requirements can be assessed after knowing the quantum of work involved in the study.

1	2	3	4
	of plan schemes in the Socio-economic life of the people. Size—One Dy. Director, One Special Officer, ROs.—3, Research Assistants—3.		
6. Madhya Pradesh.	Unit is functioning in the Directorate of Ecos. and Statistics.
7. Madras.	There will be a small cell in the Directorate of Statistics. A senior officer of the rank of the Member, Board of Revenue or Secretary to the Govt. will be made responsible for evaluation. Director, Ecos. & Stats. will function in his guidance.	The expenditure may not exceed Rs. 1 lakh per annum. However, it will depend on the number of schemes taken up for evaluation.	..
8. Maharashtra.	The Unit has already been set up in the Planning Division of Finance Dept. Officer-in-charge of the rank of Under Secretary, 2 Plan Supervisors, and one Research Officer form the technical team.	Budget is included in the general budget of Finance Department.	..
9. Mysore	No Evaluation machinery at present. Planning Dept. has envisaged an Evaluation set-up consisting of an Administrator assisted by necessary field staff. However, Finance Dept. has not agreed to it. In principle it has been decided to start the Evaluation Unit, but the size, location etc. are still under consideration.
10. Orissa	Unit is functioning in the Planning and Coordination Department in the Plan scheme.	Annual expenditure Rs. 1 lakh.	When the unit attains optimum size, the expenditure will be 2 lakhs.
11. Punjab	No regular and separate evaluation machinery exists in the State and evaluation is being done by the Directorate of Ecos. and Statistics. It is proposed to set up necessary machinery consisting of Dy. Secy. (Plan Evaluation), one Joint E.S.A., Research Officers and other supporting staff at Hqrs. and Technical Assistants in field.	Actual position of budget and staff can be indicated only after the proposal has been approved by the Govt.	..

12. Rajasthan.	There is a regular Evaluation Organisation with a separate field agency.	Annual expenditure Rs. 3 lakh.	It should be considered to be optimum for the State. It should have its own field agency & research & statistics section.
13. Uttar Pradesh	Evaluation wing of P.R.A.I. is an integral part of the planning set-up in the State.	..	The likely expenditure on a full fledged Evaluation Dte. would be between Rs. 3 lakh & Rs. 4 lakh annually.
14. West Bengal.	This will have to be examined further.
15. Himachal Pradesh	The machinery proposed has been—One Asstt. Development Commissioner (Eva. & Appraisal), Statistician-1, Stat. Asstt.-4, Sr. Computers-6, Supervisors-9 & field investigators-8 in field. In order to guide the working of Evaluation Cell, it is proposed to set up a high power Evaluation Advisory Board.	Estimated expenditure on the proposed Evaluation cell comes to Rs. 1 lakh per year.	..
16. Manipur	Unit may be opened in the Statistical Bureau.	Annual expenditure Rs. 35,000/-.	..
17. Tripura	The proposed staffing pattern (i) Evaluation Officer/ Research Officer—1, (ii) Investigator—1 and (iii) Deputy Investigators—3.

Statement C. 2.

Central Assistance for Evaluation Organisation.

State	Can State Govt. bear this burden of expenditure from administrative budget ?	If not, what is the nature and order of Central assistance required if it is included in the Plan ?
1	2	3
1. Andhra Pradesh	State Government cannot bear this expenditure.	66 to 75% should be shared by the Central Government.
2. Assam	No.	It should be treated as a centrally sponsored scheme outside the State Plan.
3. Gujarat	Present expenditure is met from administrative budget. But the Bureau has got an expansion programme. The programme for evaluation of schemes shall be treated as centrally sponsored and not centrally assisted.	The programme for evaluation of schemes shall be treated as centrally sponsored and not centrally assisted.
4. Kerala	State Govt. is not in a position to bear the entire expenditure.	The State Govt. has already requested the Planning Commission for 100% assistance.
5. Madhya Pradesh	Does not arise.	Does not arise.
6. Madras	Should be treated as a centrally sponsored scheme.	It should be treated as a centrally sponsored scheme and the central assistance thus given over and above the Plan ceiling.
7. Maharashtra	At present the budget forms part of the general administration.	The nature and order of the Central assistance that may be required will be communicated to the Planning Commission.
8. Mysore	So far as the Mysore State is concerned, on account of its financial position it is difficult for the State to bear the burden of having a whole time machinery without central assistance.	The Planning Deptt. feels at least 75% of expenditure should come as central assistance.
9. Orissa	Evaluation unit is under Public Cooperation, Research, Training and Pilot Project and getting 60% central assistance.	60% assistance may continue.
10. Punjab	It will not be possible for the State Govt. to bear the entire expenditure from the budget of Economics and Statistics Bureau. The evaluation will have to be included in the plan schemes.	Central assistance to the extent of 50% of the total outlay will be required.

1	2	3
11. Rajasthan	Central assistance will be required.	Central assistance of approximately Rs. 2 to 3 lakhs per annum.
12. Uttar Pradesh	Financial cost involved is not large but it appears necessary that some central assistance should be available.	It is necessary both to enable Planning Commission and PEO to ensure certain minimum standard of staffing and administrative arrangements in all States and to encourage State Govts, to set up such evaluation units urgently. It can be made a plan scheme and discussed from year to year during annual plan discussions.
13. West Bengal	This will have to be examined further.	
14. Himachal Pradesh	State cannot meet the total expenditure.	The estimated expenditure on the proposed set up, comes to one lakh rupees per year. This provision should be made in the State Budget as a central grant.
15. Manipur	The whole plan expenditure is being borne by Centre.	
16. Tripura	This will have to be examined further.	
17. Pondicherry	The whole expenditure is being borne by the Centre	

Statement C. 3.

Arrangement for Follow-up Evaluation Findings.

State.	What is the forum at which evaluation reports are discussed?	Who is responsible for follow up action on the reports and what are the ways in which the evaluation findings have been implemented ?
1	2	3
1. Andhra Pradesh	The reports are presented to the State Evaluation Committee, consisting of Special Secretary (Edn. Dept.), Secretary (Planning Department) and Secretary (Finance Department) as members, Dy. Secy. (Evaluation) as ex-officio Secy. and Chief Secy. as Chairman. Secretaries and Heads of the Depts. are also invited for the meetings in which reports are discussed.	The decisions arrived at this committee are for all practical purposes final and it is obligatory on the part of the dept. concerned to issue formal orders. The action taken by the Depts. on various recommendations is reviewed at the next meeting of the State Evaluation Committee. Action taken is required to be reported to the Planning Dept. which prepares agenda & notes for the State Evaluation Committee.
2. Assam	No unit at present. When the Unit is started; the report might be discussed by the State Planning Committee consisting of Chief Minister, Finance and Development Ministers.	Planning & Development Dept. will be responsible for follow up action.
3. Bihar]	Reports are put up to Development Commissioner and shown to Planning Minister or Chief Minister, if necessary.	..
4. Kerala	Will be decided after taking the work in hand.	Will be decided after taking work in hand.
5. Gujarat	The Evaluation Reports of selected schemes and field surveys by the Bureau are discussed by the concerned Evaluation Committee.	The follow-up action is to be taken up by the concerned administrative departments.
6. Madhya Pradesh	The reports are discussed at the Board, consisting of Director, S.R.O. (N.S.S. & S.S.) and S.R.O. (Plan), and forwarded to the Planning and Development Department.	The Planning and Development Department, in turn takes up the matter with the concerned Departments for such action as may be considered necessary .

1	2	3
7. Madras . . .	The reports will be discussed by the State Dev. Committee consisting of entire Cabinet.	The Planning Dept. will be responsible for taking follow up action.
8. Maharashtra . . .	The reports are prepared by the Evaluation Wing and put up before Project Evaluation Committee consisting of Addl. Dev. Commissioner, Dy. Secy. Planning, Director, Bureau of Ecos. & Stats. and non-official Economist. Committee considers the report and afterwards it is discussed in the Secretaries' Committee with the representatives of the concerned departments.	The concerned department takes up necessary action in the light of decisions taken. The Evaluation Wing is at present entrusted with the follow-up action.
9. Mysore . . .	No Unit, hence no forum	..
10 Orissa . . .	Reports are discussed with the concerned departments	Follow-up action is taken by the P & C Department.
11. Punjab . . .	Main points of the report are brought before the State Development Board.	The concerned departments are mainly responsible for taking action on the findings in the reports.
12. Rajasthan . . .	The reports are discussed in the State Coordination Committee presided over by Chief Secretary with Administrative Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Planning, and representatives of Finance and concerned departments. The reports are submitted to State Evaluation Committee and all Ministers and sometimes to State Legislative Assembly and State Planning Board.	The administrative departments concerned as well as the Planning Department.
13. Uttar Pradesh . . .	Evaluating reports of P.R.A. I. are discussed with the sponsoring agency. They are finally placed before the Institute Planning Committee of which Chief Minister is the Chairman.	The Institute also keep itself informed of the action taken on its evaluation reports sent to the departments.
14. West Bengal . . .	This will have to be examined further.	
15. Himachal Pradesh . . .	Does not arise as yet.	
16. Manipur . . .	Evaluation reports may be discussed by the high level Review Committee.	Follow-up action may be done in the Planning Department.

Statement C. 4

Link between the Evaluation Organisation and the Statistics Bureau.

State	What is the link between evaluation unit and State Bureau of Economics and Statistics ?	To what extent the field staff of Bureau is utilised for collection of data on evaluation ?	Is Director of Ecos. & Statis. is associated in analysis & write-up of evaluation report?
1	2	3	4
1. Andhra Pradesh	Practically no link between evaluation unit and State Bureau of Ecos. & Statistics.	The field staff of the Bureau is not utilised for collection of data.	No, he is not associated in any work.
2. Assam	Unit will be in Directorate of Economics and Statistics' and will work under the guidance of the Director.	The field staff particularly Progress Assistants will be utilised for collection of data. The District Statistical Officers and Inspectors will undertake supervision and render on the spot guidance.	As the Unit will be under Director of the Bureau, he will be associated at all the stages.
3. Bihar	Evaluation unit and Directorate of Economics and Statistics have been merged.	Field staff of Bureau is utilised for collection of data on evaluation.	Yes
4. Gujarat	The evaluation Unit headed by a Deputy Director works as a part of the Bureau of Economics and Statistics.	The Unit is a part of the Bureau. It utilises the services of the field staff of the Bureau.	Director of Bureau is administrative head of the Unit. He is member of all Evaluation Committees and ensures close link between Evaluation machinery and State Bureau.
5. Kerala	The Evaluation Unit will form a wing of the Bureau and Deputy Director will be incharge of evaluation.	The services of investigators of field survey division will be utilised for collection of data.	Director will be responsible for analysis and write-up of reports.
6. Madhya Pradesh	The Unit has been set up in the Directorate.	Yes	Yes
7. Madras	The Unit will be set up in the Directorate.	The field staff will be utilised for collection of data.	The Director will be associated throughout.

1	2	3	4
8. Maharashtra	Evaluation wing and Bureau of Statistics work in close cooperation. The analysis and interpretation of data are done in Evaluation Wing.	Sampling and collection of field data are done through the field staff of Bureau.	Director of Bureau is a member of Project Evaluation Committee and is associated with the guide lines for studies and with finalisation of reports.
9. Mysore	No evaluation unit;	hence question of relationship does not arise.	
10. Orissa	Evaluation Unit and Bureau are both under the administrative control of Secretary, Planning and Coordination Department.	Evaluation studies are conducted by the Evaluation Unit with its own staff.	Director of Bureau is not associated with the preparation of evaluation reports.
11. Punjab	Directorate of Economics and Statistics is itself responsible for the conduct of evaluation studies.	All the studies conducted so far have been completed with the field staff of the Economics and Statistical Organisation.	Analysis and write-up is also done by the Economic and Statistical Adviser.
12. Rajasthan	The two units supply information to each other whenever needed. But they are independent organisations with no integral relationship.	Staff of Bureau is not utilised but data sometimes are utilised by Evaluation Organisation.	No.
13. Uttar Pradesh	There has been a formal link to the extent that the Director of Bureau is member of Institute Planning Committee.	So far P.R.A.I. has not found necessary to use the Bureau in its evaluation studies.	Director of Bureau is member of the Institute Planning Committee.
14. West Bengal	This will have to be examined further.		
15. Himachal Pradesh	The proposed Unit will be under technical control of Directorate of Economics and Statistics.	The staff in the field and at the Hqrs. of the Directorate will collaborate with the cell.	Director will be overall technical incharge of the said cell and responsible for analysis and write-up of the evaluation reports.
16. Manipur	Evaluation unit will be opened in the Bureau as its branch.
17. Tripura	Evaluation unit will be under the administrative control of Statistical Department.

STATEMENT C. 5
Future Plans for Expansion of Evaluation Machinery

State	What are the future plans of the State Government on the expansion and reorganisation of the evaluation machinery and making it more effective?
1	2
1. Andhra Pradesh	Due to present financial stringency expansion is not being pressed though the need for bringing a large number of plan schemes under evaluation is recognised. However, a slight expansion in the near further is proposed.
2. Assam	The State Government propose to start one Evaluation Unit with an annual budget of Rs. 20 thousand. The staff for the moment will consist of one SRO and two ROS. The field staff of the Directorate of Statistics and Economics would be utilised for collection of field data.
3. Bihar	The Directorate of Evaluation has been merged with the Directorate of Statistics so that evaluation and statistics can be dealt with in one organisation under the control of Finance Department and the overall charge of Development Commissioner.
4. Gujarat	State's Study Group on Statistics and Intelligence in its draft proposals has considered and accepted the need for strengthening the evaluation unit in the Bureau and the total estimated cost of expansion during the Fourth Plan period is placed at Rs. 3·00 lakh.
5. Kerala	The question of re-organising the machinery will be taken up according to necessity.
6. Madhya Pradesh	It is proposed to strengthen this unit according to the work load.
7. Madras	Does not arise in the present context.
8. Maharashtra	State Government proposes to expand the present strength of Evaluation Wing.
9. Mysore	Nil
10. Orissa	The Evaluation Unit has recently been reorganised.
11. Punjab	A full fledged Evaluation Unit is proposed to be set-up in the Economic and Statistical Organisation. It will consist of one Dy. Secretary (Plan Evaluation), One Joint E.S.A., Research Officers and other supporting staff.
12. Rajasthan	Strengthening of technical wing at Hqrs. as well as field is envisaged.
13. Uttar Pradesh	A decision has already been taken that the Evaluation machinery should continue to remain in the planning set-up of the Govt. Details regarding the

1

2

size of the staff etc. are being considered. It is proposed to set up an Evaluation Advisory Board under the Chairmanship of Chief Minister. It will provide the highest forum for discussion of Evaluation reports, and will authorise their publication and circulation and ensure follow-up action. The Bureau will also be associated for collection of data and for designing of studies and also for preparing the final write-up of the reports.

14. West Bengal This will have to be examined further.
15. Himachal Pradesh The Evaluation cell is yet to be established and the expansion will be examined at a later stage.
16. Manipur Expansion and reorganisation will be considered after the Unit has worked for 2 years.

APPENDIX II D—ROLE OF THE PROGRAMME EVALUATION ORGANISATION

STATEMENT-D. I

Suggested Role of P.E.O. in helping Evaluation in the States

State	What functions the State Government would like the Programme Evaluation Organisation to discharge in order to help the State Evaluation agencies ? In particular, what may be expected of the P.E.O. in the matters like				
	Developing uniform techniques and standards	Training of evaluation personnel	Functioning as clearing house for evaluation literature	Arranging Seminars on Evaluation etc.	Any other
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Andhra Pradesh	Guidance in the techniques and methods of evaluating different programmes.	Should provide training of personnel engaged in evaluation.	Should act as a clearing house & supply of evaluation literature.	Should arrange periodical conferences and seminars.	..
2. Assam	PEO should function similar to C.S.O. vis-a-vis S. S. Bs. in respect of studies.	There should be provision of training for officers also. It is being done for junior officers.	PEO should bring out a monthly report indicating evaluation undertaken by different States as well as PEO—their contents, significance etc.	PEO should annually convene seminars of evaluation officers to discuss new problems, difficulties and progress of evaluation works in different States.	..

1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Gujarat	It is suggested that for developing uniform techniques & standards, as a first step, one or two programmes common in implementation may be recommended by the PEO for evaluation alongwith an outline of approach and standard definition for key concepts.	Present arrangements provide for training of all categories of evaluation personnel. It would be most convenient if it is intensified & confined only to junior officers and senior officers. Training of other officers and field staff should be left to the State Government.	Most of the State organisations keep each other informed about their activities, studies & surveys through exchange of published data. Reports of PEO are also available. It would be useful if PEO can arrange for extracts and details of evaluation studies in other countries and provide a bibliography of available new literature from other countries and also from Research Programmes Committee.	Seminars should be arranged periodically to assist in developing uniform techniques and standards. Regional seminars could be considered to enable participation by junior officers and supervisory staff of the State.	
4. Kerala	The scheme has not been finalised and a decision on the points mentioned will be taken after evaluation organisation is set up.				
5. Madhya Pradesh	Standardizing concepts, procedure and methodology.	Imparting training.	Yes, clearing house for literature. A paper on the methodology of PEO studies may be circulated by the P.E.O.	..	It is also felt that by taking up evaluation of various projects before implementation and by suggesting priorities this organisation can enhance its utility.
6. Madras	Does not arise in the present context.				
7. Maharashtra	Evolving uniform patterns & interpretation.	Training of Evaluation personnel in collection of data, analysis and interpretation	It would be helpful if literature pertaining to Evaluation enquiries of plan projects in other countries	Seminars will be useful in resolving common difficulties in conducting the studies and evolving	

1	2	3	4	5	6
		will be helpful.	are made available to evaluation personnel.	uniform patterns & interpretations.	
8. Mysore	..	It is rather difficult to envisage the role of PEO since the State has no Evaluation Unit.			
9. Orissa	Developing uniform techniques & standards.	Training of evaluation personnel.
10. Punjab	Developing uniform methods & techniques of evaluation.	Training of personnel.	It will be helpful if the PEO acts as a clearing house for evaluation literature issued by Centre and other States.	Arranging of seminars by the PEO on Evaluation will also be useful for personnel of the State Evaluation Unit.	..
11. Rajasthan	PEO should play advisory role mainly technical in nature. Choice of technique and approach to studies should be largely left to the State Evaluation Organisation.	Also these three functions could with great benefit be performed by the PEO and in these matters an integral link between the PEO and the State Evaluation agencies should be established.			
12. Uttar Pradesh	It should help in developing uniform techniques and standards.	It can help in imparting training to evaluation personnel of State Government.	It should function as a clearing house of evaluation literature.	Provide a forum for discussion and seminars.	At present PEO units are somewhat small and link between them and the State Govt. is of a formal nature only. These links have to be strengthened by strengthening the PEO units. Evaluation of centrally sponsored programmes would require the collaboration and assistance of P.E.O.

1	2	3	4	5	6
13. West Bengal	This will have to be examined further.	
14. Himachal Pradesh.	For development of uniform techniques and standards a Technical Committee may be set up in the P.E.O. represented by C.S.O. & other Ministries.	P.E.O. should take responsibility of giving training to evaluation personnel.	P.E.O. should be responsible for clearing other technical matters in order to ensure efficient and smooth functioning of evaluation machinery in States.	..	P.E.O. should be the Central Coordinating agency for all matters connected with evaluation.
15. Manipur	Developing of uniform techniques and standards are urgently needed.	Training of personnel is also needed.	Yes.	Yes.	..
16. Tripura	The guidance of the PEO as indicated would be very helpful for the Evaluation Unit of this Government.				

STATEMENT D.2

Training Requirements for State Evaluation Personnel

State	What are the number and categories of evaluation personnel for whom training facilities are desired by State Government during the next			For how long such categories of persons be spared for purpose of training?
	Six months	One year	Two years	
I	2	3	4	5
1. Andhra Pradesh	..	One or two officers and 4 Evaluation Assts. in two batches.	..	3 months.
2. Assam	Asstt. Director of Statistics.	One SRO and 2 ROs.	..	6 weeks.
3. Gujarat	2 officers, if intensified courses of longer duration are organised 2 more officers will be deputed for training.	6 weeks.
4. Kerala	A decision will be taken after the organisation is set up.			
5. Madhya Pradesh	..	Two officers & 2 other staff	Two batches of two officials	Officers—6 weeks. Officials—3 months.
6. Madras	Does not arise in the present context.			

1	2	3	4	5
7. Maharashtra	Availability of training facilities will be appreciated. The possibility of sparing evaluation personnel for training will be considered if specific training programmes can be forwarded to the State Government.			
8. Mysore	As and when an Evaluation Unit is set up the Government of India will be approached for training facilities.			
9. Punjab	Can be stated only when Evaluation staff is in position.			
10. Rajasthan	Technical Director and Deputy Director (for 3 months), Research Officers, Research Asstts, Investigators, Regional Evaluation Officers (1 month each).	3 to 6 months
11. Uttar Pradesh	Two Research Officers	Two ROs and Asstt. Directors-2	Deputy Director—1, Asstt. Directors/Divisional/Dist. Statistical Officers-5 and ROs—5.	4 to 6 weeks.
(An assessment of the requirements of the State Govt. for training can be made only when specific information regarding the training courses is available. It is, however, felt that the State Govt. will not be in a position to spare its officers for long durations).				
12. West Bengal	This point may be further examined.			
13. Himachal Pradesh	For the present training of the Asstt. Development Commissioner (Evaluation & Appraisal) is considered essential and urgent. Further requirements in this behalf shall be intimated later on.			
14. Manipur	One Deputy Statistical Officer, two Inspectors and four primary Investigators require training.			
15. Pondicherry	..	Two Research Associates and 4 Investigators	..	3 months

APPENDIX II E

QUESTIONNAIRE ON OBJECTIVE, SCOPE AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR EVALUATION, PROGRESS ANALYSIS AND REVIEW IN THE STATES

The Working Group on Evaluation in States is engaged in a study of the arrangements in the States for the reporting of progress and the review of implementation of plan projects and programmes, the evaluation machinery established or proposed to be set up, the objective and scope of evaluation work done so far, the importance attached to evaluation as an aid to planning and implementation of development programmes, and the plans for the future. The Working Group is planning to visit a few States to study the present position in these respects and ascertain the plans for the future. The Group would like to hold discussion with the Chief Secretary, Development Commissioner, Finance and Planning Secretaries, and also seek the views of the Chief Minister and the Planning Minister. The main points of interest to the Group are listed below:

I. Arrangements for Progress Analysis and Review:

Each State Government has evolved its own method and keeping itself informed about the progress of plan schemes and programmes and reviewing their implementation. In their scope details, these methods and practices are likely to differ from State to State. The relevant questions have, therefore, been formulated rather in general terms.

(1) What is the nature, content and frequency of reporting on the progress of programmes and projects in important sectors of the State Plan, at different levels—block, district, state? Is such progress analysis done for all projects and programmes or for the more important ones only (Please specify)? Does such progress analysis cover in all cases not only expenditure but physical achievement? What is the role of the Planning and Finance Departments in such progress analysis?

(2) What are the nature and frequency of review of implementation of the Plan undertaken by the State Governments? Has any mid-term appraisal of the Third Plan been done for all sectors or for some only? Has it been done separately by each department or by the Planning Department?

(3) Is there a machinery for current reporting on progress and problems in implementation? If so, what are the methods used—tour reports, memoranda, working papers, field surveys, etc. Has such review been extended to all schemes and projects, or only to some. What are considered to be the relatively weak sectors of the development plan from the point of view of analysis of progress and review of implementation?

(4) What is the role of the evaluation unit in progress analysis and/or implementation study? (Relevant only in States where Evaluation units have been set up). What is the role of the Bureau of Economics and Statistics?

II. *Objective and Scope of Programme Evaluation:*

Evaluation is usually interpreted as assessment of progress and impact, and analysis of the problems and difficulties in the administration and execution of programmes and schemes, with a view to finding out methods of improvement in programming and operation. Viewed in this light, evaluation can be oriented to policy consideration, implementation problems and/or impact assessment. Its objectives do not include scrutiny and examination of new schemes and projects, or progress reporting or inspection work. Against this background, the following questions can be asked.

(5) What are the purposes and objectives of programme evaluation as the State Government views it? Does the State Government consider it a useful activity and, in case no arrangements for evaluation have been made, feel the need for a suitable machinery? At what level of administration is the need for evaluation felt more urgently at present—block, district, State?

(6) Which are the sectors of the State Plan where the need for evaluation is felt most urgently? Is it proposed or desired that all the programmes and schemes in these sectors will or should be taken up for evaluation, or only those involving outlay above a minimum amount? In the latter case, what would be the criteria for selection of programmes and schemes?

(7) Among the programmes, the need for evaluation of which is recognised, is it possible to specify some which could be taken up for regular evaluation every year? Which are the programmes and schemes which the State Government would recommend for *ad-hoc* evaluation during the next two years?

III. *Nature and Organisation of the Evaluation Machinery in the State:*

Information was sought from State Governments on the existing arrangements for evaluation, the nature of the set-up and its liaison with the Planning machinery, its location, structure, staff, budget and activities. Replies have been received from some of the State Governments. Data on these points may kindly be furnished by the State Governments from which these have not yet been received. The following additional questions are also relevant.

(8) In case there is no Evaluation Directorate or Wing or Cell or Unit in the State Government, what are the nature, location and size of the evaluation organisation envisaged by the State Government? What is the order of annual expenditure being thought of? How do the envisaged set up, strength and budget compare, with the requirements of the 'optimum' evaluation organisation for the State?

(9) Can the State Government bear this burden of expenditure from the administrative budget? If not, what are the nature and order of Central assistance required, if evaluation schemes are to be included in the Plan?

(10) What is the forum at which evaluation reports are discussed? Who is responsible for follow-up action on the reports and what are the ways in which the evaluation findings have been implemented?

(11) What is the link between the evaluation unit and the State Bureau of Economics & Statistics? To what extent the field staff of the Bureau is utilised for collecting data on evaluation? Is the Director of the Bureau associated in the analysis and write-up of evaluation reports?

(12) What are the future plans of the State Government on the expansion and re-organisation of the evaluation machinery, and making it more effective?

III. *Role of the P.E.O.*

(13) What functions the State Government would like the programme Evaluation Organisation to discharge in order to help the State evaluation agencies? In particular, what may be expected of the P.E.O. in the matters like (i) developing uniform techniques and standards, (ii) training of the evaluation personnel, (iii) functioning as a clearing house for evaluation literature, and (iv) arranging seminars on evaluation, etc?

(14) What are the number and categories of evaluation personnel or whom training facilities are desired by the State Government during the next (i) six months, (ii) one year, and (iii) two years? For how long such categories of personnel be spared for purposes of training?

APPENDIX 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.

What is Evaluation

What do we understand by the word evaluation? Perhaps it is not necessary at this fairly mature stage in the history of evaluation in our country to spend much time on this particular topic. Nevertheless, I think it is important to say one thing, namely, that evaluation does not just mean criticism. It does not mean "Daniel come to judgment", taking himself as somebody who is wise and aloof and who passes judgment or who awards remarks. An evaluator is not an examiner. It is not as if the projects or the programmes that are to be evaluated would provide answer-books written by the officers concerned or the administrations concerned in response to questions set by the Planning Commission. I do not think this should be the approach. I don't think evaluation means this kind of what you may call super-objective attitude of criticism and examination with a view to finding out how many marks should be given to the party concerned for the work that it has done. I am giving entirely my own conception of this subject. It may well not be the same as that either of the Planning Commission or of those who are directly responsible for conducting the evaluation. This is something which I have always felt even during the few months for which I was connected with the PEO in this country. We must not understand by evaluation sitting in judgment.

Then you may ask me what is the object of evaluation. Obviously, again, the object of evaluation is not propaganda. The evaluator should try and find out what should be done in order to make the programme more effective than it perhaps actually is. If the programme is completely effective there would be no need for any evaluation. The very fact that there is an Evaluation Organisation suggests that things are not cent per cent all right. Obviously, there are things wanting. Therefore, one need not labour on the fact that things are not perfectly all right. The function of evaluation is to find out what is wrong, to find out why things do not happen as they were expected to happen; to find out how we can have cent per cent success either in the implementation of a programme or in the implementation of the policy behind the programme. The policy may be in terms of production, distribution, public cooperation.

social, cultural and economic change, changes in the structure of society, creating the wherewithal or the pre-conditions for a self-sustaining and self-accelerating economic growth. Now there are programmes and policies, and there are reactions of the various persons who are affected by rural development.

Rural Development

There is the policy of rural development which is laid down in the Planning Commission. They want to bring about a certain increase in agricultural production; they want to bring about certain reduction in agricultural employment, certain targetted increases in different crops. In order that this may be done, they want certain irrigation programmes to be carried through, certain soil conservation programmes to be carried through, seed multiplication to be carried through, fertiliser application programmes to be carried through and so on and so forth. They have got as an objective an increase in agricultural production. They are contemplating certain increase in agricultural employment. Over and above, they want to deal with the problem of under-employment existing in the agricultural sector. The Third Plan has set a target of additional employment in agriculture during the Third Plan period to the tune of 3.5 million persons.

Rural development implies education; it also implies the development of a new mentality, what one may call a progressive mentality, a scientific mentality, technological mentality, an attitude which implies work in new directions, going in for new ideas, taking risks, wanting to know things, wanting to find out new things. All this mean, of course, literacy, education, reading material, administration, extension and communication. So there are so many things. It is not just a matter of pure economics, in the quantitative and commodity sense of the term. It is a whole society which is being changed in the rural area. This is a very vast field and it implies social change, technological change, structural change and also, I think, uplift of the weaker sections of the community which has been highlighted in recent years and, if I am not mistaken, a Committee is sitting at the moment to consider it. How do you distribute the benefits of economics in rural areas? How are the benefits distributed in rural development? Why are they distributed as they are? Suppose a lecture is given to some students and there are 50 students. The same lecture is given to all the students and the same library facilities are there. The teacher or the lecturer is the same. But you find some students do much better than some other students. Could you therefore say that there is unequal distribution of benefits? There is unequal receipt of benefits There

is inequality in taking advantage or unequal utilisation of a given volume of facilities. But does this mean that there is something deliberate which is responsible for the unequal utilisation which is immoral and unethical? I agree that it is very important, when you are talking of evaluation, to see whether the majority in the rural areas have got any advantage at all in the matter of irrigation works, improved agricultural practices and implements and fertilisers. It is also important to find out why they have not utilised these facilities. It may be due to want of financial facilities, want of credit worthiness in the banking sense, or to the fact that lands are not available. I do not want to develop this argument. All that I want to say is that when you talk of rural development you have to think in all these terms, in terms of commodities, in terms of human beings, in terms of relationship between human beings.

The technique of Evaluation

So how are you going to evaluate it? How are you going to find out what is taking place? Here I would like to say again that I am speaking with diffidence and I am not absolutely certain that I am right, but I do feel that, once we have extended our rural development programme on a nationwide basis, which is more or less what we are doing now, I rather doubt, if evaluation is a correct way of passing judgments on the quantitative aspects of rural development. I rather doubt if it would be possible for the Programme Evaluation Organisation, with its 35 or 36 officers—now it is 45—whatever the number may be, I rather doubt if it is possible for the Programme Evaluation Organisation, through its own team, through its own investigations, and officers, through its own agency, to pass what I call a quantitative judgment on the implementation of the development programme. If you want to do that, how will you do it? There will be the question of sampling, the nature of sampling, the extent of sampling. Also you have the National Sample Survey which is publishing reports, bearing among other things, on evaluation of rural development. Also, there is a difference between qualitative and quantitative assessments being made on a nationwide scale. But at the same time we want some quantitative conclusions. The legislature wants it, the Cabinet wants it, the Planning Commission wants it, the public wants it. But in the case of rural development it is much more difficult to satisfy this desire, because the targets are not easily quantifiable. This is specially so in regard to the targets in fields like structural changes, changes in attitude, education and so on. I believe that judgments on a nationwide scale cannot be attempted by the Programme Evaluation Organisation, specially if conclusions are sought to be expressed in

a quantitative manner. I suggest that this aspect of evaluation has got to be the function of administrative reporting by economic intelligence or statistical departments. Administrative reporting has got to be developed on a much more organised system than perhaps we have done in the whole field of economic development and in India, economic development means rural development. If we are talking of economic development, the development has got to be in the rural areas, where 83% of the people live. It is not enough to make a return. Returns have got to be checked and super-checked and there should be a suitable machinery for this purpose. Otherwise, administrative reports are no good.

I was saying that we should not expect P.E.O. to perform the function which is really that of the administration. It is a part of the function of the administration to keep itself informed about what is happening in regard to various instructions it issues for the implementation of the programmes. It is a part of the function of the administration to get detailed reports on what is happening and also to seek and implement remedial measures to see that things happen as they should happen. This is entirely a problem of administration and I do not think it should be the business of evaluation to give quantitative assessment year after year. Once in a way, it is a useful thing. Evaluation may just come across those rare cases which show the administration very much to its disadvantage. But it is possible to supplement those administrative reports with the statistics which are collected by the P.E.O. But, on the whole, these should not be made the basis of passing *ad hoc* judgments on what happens to the programme as a whole.

What does then evaluation do? I suggest, that essentially, evaluation is intended to be a qualitative and not a quantitative assessment. It is essentially a quality tool and not a quantitative measure. When I say it is a quality tool what I mean is that if evaluation is done properly then it should be able to reveal the reasons why a particular programme is not functioning as it should function. It should be in a position to find out inter relationship between various factors, ponderable as well as imponderable, and the kind of way in which they should function so that the desired results might be achieved. Quality approach functions best when you take different types of performances and compare those different types of performances. Even in the same village, for example, one will find that the performance in terms of agricultural production varies in different cases. Why do some people take more advantage and others less? Why do some areas do better and others worse? I think it is only by comparing that we can find the reasons, though it is very difficult to have the kind of scientific accuracy which, for example, it is possible for a natural scientist to have.

It is sometimes suggested that evaluation should be regarded as operational research. I do not agree with that. Operational research is something where you are able to experiment and thereby able to try out an idea and correct the hypothesis. Now that kind of operational research is different from this kind of research where we are not going to conduct the experiment. The evaluation agency deals with the programme that is given. It does not try the other programme. The evaluation agency is not in a position to say that it would like to do a programme in a different way. In the field of social sciences, even if you have the authority to do so, different types of complexities arise. The other factors involved are so complex and they are so inter-related. It is very difficult to draw results from these. We want to get the same results that the operational research achieves without having the facilities that a person operating operational research has. Now, that is almost asking for the impossible. What I should ask for from the evaluation agency will only be what can be achieved by investigation and analysis, above all analysis based on comparative studies. You have got 5 or 7 or 10 types of achievements on many different things. Take them, examine them and by examining different situations and by making different assessments, it will be possible to arrive at the truth much more than by going in for only special kind of cases. The object is not to pass a judgment on an official or government, but rather to find out what are the reasons contributing to success; what are the obstacles coming in the way of success, how far they are removable, how far the success is due to deliberate action or to natural factors and how far due to other factors. May I make one or two further remarks?

Evaluation Agencies

One is the question of agencies—the different types of agencies. I think that the kind of agencies the Planning Commission has set up have been functioning very well indeed. But, by the very nature of the case, unless you expand the evaluation agency out of recognition and make it a gigantic department, you cannot deal with all the various problems that are within the range of economic development and I do not think it is possible to do that. For the time being I would therefore advance the thesis that evaluation requires more than the P.E.O., more than a whole-time and a continuous evaluation agency. I think we want to supplement it, i.e., we want to have in addition a number of other agencies conducting evaluation. In fact, we are doing it through studies which are made by the R.P.C. and by universities and research institutions, not to talk of individual scholars, by people who do not draw their salaries from Government and do not form part of a full-time evaluation agency.

I suggest that we should not think only in terms of full-time agencies of evaluation. We want *ad hoc* agencies, plus universities and research institutions. As a matter of fact with 800 or 900 colleges with about 45 Universities in the country, it should be possible for us to have enquiries conducted in different parts of the country. There is not a single place where you do not have social scientists. Therefore, one has to find some method by which the latent talents of these scientists could be used for this investigation. I, therefore, suggest that we should make much more use of Universities and research institutions than perhaps we have been making for the purpose of evaluating one or the other aspect of the rural development programme. You have in our colleges, universities and research institutions persons who have considerable knowledge and experience they need to be used. They should be given all the material which becomes available on matters relating to rural development; it should be processed and given to them. Some machinery should be set up which will provide a planned and coordinated use of analytical talent in the academic field for the evaluation of rural development programmes. Incidentally, this will also help to bring the academician down from his ivory tower and thus help also in better communication among intellectuals on the subject of rural change. | |

There is also something to be said for gathering impressionistic bird's eye view reports of rural change, provided you get them from experienced administrators who have a rich background of knowledge of rural conditions. When such men go round in rural towns in the course of their work—they may be senior civil servants, or even non-official public workers or journalists—they should be requested to maintain diaries and submit reports to the Planning Commission on what they see and think of one or other aspect of the rural development programme they come into contact with. It is especially important to get from them their uninhibited views on what they think the real difficulties are, as, quite often, official reports tend to slur over these either because of excessive politeness or some other understandable reason.

The final thing I would emphasise is the need for training. I suggest that since we want evaluation not only from the P.E.O., but also from universities, research institutions and others, we should go in for a programme of rigorous training in research methodology in the social sciences. This should be done not only in terms of field work, not only in terms of statistics, but in terms of relationships, in terms of analysis, in terms of looking for contradictions, of consistencies and inconsistencies. It is important that

we have such a programme of training in research methods, if we want to go in for a large scale programme of evaluation of rural or many other kind of development programme. The Planning Commission is already seized of this subject of training in research methodology and I hope that early action will follow, not only from the point of view of programme evaluation but also from the larger one of the development of social science research in general in the country.

APPENDIX IV-A

Statement of composition, staffing and budget of Evaluation

State	Name of the agency (Ministry/Dept.) under which functioning & the year of starting	Composition of Advisory Committees	Staffing pattern at Headquarters
1	2	3	4
Andhra Pradesh.	Evaluation Wing (Planning Dept.) Feb. 1962	<p><i>State Evaluation Committee</i></p> <p>1. Chief Secretary (Chairman); 2. Secretaries (three)—Planning, Education and Finance. 3. Dy. Secretary incharge of Evaluation Wing.</p>	<p>1. Director. 2. Dy. Dirs. (three) 3. Supdts. (two) 4. Evaluation Asstts. (four) 5. Lower Staff (Eleven)</p>
Gujarat	Evaluation Unit in Bureau of Ecos. & Stats. General Admn. Dept.;	<p>1. <i>General Admn. Dept. (Planning); Committee</i> (to evaluate schemes of over 20 lakhs). (a) Chief Secy. (Chairman) (b) Secretaries—Finance & the Dept. concerned. (c) Director; Bureau of Ecos. & Stats. (d) Head of the Dept. concerned. (e) Dy. Secy., Planning.</p> <p>2. <i>Departmental Committee</i> (to evaluate schemes between 10 & 20 lakhs). (a) Secy., Dept. concerned (Chairman). (b) Secy. Finance or his nominee. (c) Dy. Secy., Planning. (d) Director, Bureau of Ecos. & Stats. (e) Head of Dept. concerned. (f) Dy. Secy. of Dept. concerned.</p> <p>3. <i>Coordination Committee</i> (a) Chief Secy. (Chairman). (b) Secy., Finance. (c) Director, Bureau of Ecos. & Stats. (d) Dy. Secretary, Planning.</p>	<p>1. Dy. Director. 2. Asstt. Dir. (one) 3. Research Asstts. (three) 4. Statistical Asstts. (eleven) 5. Lower Staff (eight)</p>
Maharashtra	Evaluation Wing of Planning Div. (Finance Dept.) March, 1963.	<p><i>Project Evaluation Committee</i></p> <p>1. Dy. Secy. Planning. (2) Director, Bureau of Ecos. & Stats. (3) Director, Development & Planning, Cooperation & Rural Development.</p>	<p>1. Evaluation Officer. 2. Planning Supervisors (three) 3. Research Asstts. (Six). 4. Lower Staff (two)</p>

APPENDIX IV—A

Cells and the Advisory Committees

Regional level		Budget			Expenditure			Remarks
Location	Staff	61-62	62-63	63-64	61-62	62-63	63-64	
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Nil	Nil	No separate budget, it is a part of Planning Dept.			3,000 Feb., 1962 only	20,000	40,000 (upto Nov.)	..
Nil	Nil	No separate budget for evaluation unit			1,700	15,651	11,576 (upto Nov.)	..
Nil	Nil	No separate budget for evaluation wing			Roughly Rs. one lakh per year on Evaluation Wing & Bureau of Ecos. & Stats.			Bureau Ecos. & Stats. provides field staff for field work.

1	2	3	4
Rajasthan	Evaluation Orgn. (Cabinet Sectt.) 1960	<i>Evaluation Committee</i> 1. Vice-Chancellor, Rajasthan University. 2. M.L.As. (three) 3. Principal, Agricultural College. 4. Head of the Dept. Political Science. 5. Director, Evaluation Organisation.	1. Director. 2. Dy. Dir. (one) 3. Asstt. Dir. (one) 4. R.O. (one) 5. Research Asstt. (one) 6. Investigators (two) 7. Computers (three) 8. Lower Staff (thirteen)
Uttar Pradesh	Evaluation Wing (Planning, Research and Action Institute.)	1. <i>Planning Committee</i> : (a) Chief Minister (Chairman). (b) Secys. & Heads of all Depts. (c) Representatives of Lucknow University (d) Some MLAs nominated by C.M. 2. <i>Internal Evaluation Advisory Committee</i> : (a) Achyut Patwardhan (Chairman). (b) 16 other members including senior staff of PRAI. (c) Representatives of Universities, State & Central Officials. (d) Representatives of U.S.A.I.D. MISSION & Ford Foundation.	1. Rural Life Analyst (One) 2. Sr. Associate to R.L.A. (one) 3. Statistician (one) 4. Jr. Associate to R.L.A. (one) 5. Asstt. Statisticians (six) 6. Jr. Associate to R.L.A. (one) 7. Eco. Intelligence Inspectors. (two)
Bihar	Directorate of Evaluation (Planning Department—1960-61) afterwards merged into Directorate of Statistics in 1964.	Evaluation Committee (Details of composition N.A.)	
Kerala	Evaluation Unit (Development Commissioner's Office) (N.A.)	State Informal Consultative Committee functions as Evaluation Committee (2-11-1960) (Details of composition N.A.)	1. Evaluation Officers with a small unit.
Punjab	No separate Evaluation Unit. The evaluation studies are conducted by the Economics and Statistical organisation.	State Evaluation Committee (Details of composition N.A.)	1. Director (No further details)
Madhya Pradesh	Evaluation Unit (Director of E & S) (Finance Department) N.A.	Departmental Committee consisting of Director, S.R.O. (N.S.S. & S.S.) and S.R.O. (Plan).	N.A.

5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Udaipur 2. Jodhpur 3. Kotah 4. Jaipur	1. REOs (four) 2. Res- earch Asstts. (four) 3. Inves- tigators (five) 4. Other staff (fourteen)	100680	129500	82000* ¹	100286	130246	70524*	*Figs. un- der cols. 9 & 12 relate to the year 1960-61
Nil	Nil	539500	585400	545000	533125	538489	N.A.	No separate Budget for evaluation wing. These figures are estimates for PRAI.
N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	
Nil	Nil	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	
Nil	Nil	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Proposed cell will consist of joint E.S.A Research Officers and other staff.
N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Evaluation of schemes costing more than Rs. 50 Lakh

1	2	3	4
Orissa	Evaluation Unit (Planning & Coordination Department) 1961--62.	State Planning Board functions as State Evaluation Board.	1. Evaluation Officer-cum-U.S. 2. Investigators (4)
Assam	Evaluation Unit is proposed.	N.A.	1 S.R.O. & 2 R. Os.
Madras	Evaluation Cell (Finance Department) 1964.	N.A.	N.A.
Himachal Pradesh	Evaluation machinery proposed	Evaluation Advisory Board proposed	Asstt. Dev. Commr. . . . 1 Statistician . . . 1 Stat. Asstts. . . 4 Sr. Computers . . 6 Supervisors . . . 9 Field Investigators . . 8
Mysore	Nil	N.A.	N.A.
West Bengal	..	Evaluation Advisory Board with Development Commissioner as Member-Secretary and Secretaries, Finance, Agriculture, Education & Health and Director, Stats. Bureau as members.	-----
Manipur	Evaluation Wing (1961--62)	Further details N.A.	-----
Tripura	Provision for setting up an Evaluation Unit has been made in the Third Plan .		

NOTE:—The headquarters of evaluation units/wings of all States are located in the capital towns of respective States.

5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Nil	Nil	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	
N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

Expenditure may not exceed Rs. 1 lakh per year.

Estimated expenditure on the proposed Evaluation cell comes to Rs. 1 lakh per year.

N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	In the Planning, Housing and Social Welfare Department one officer has been appointed to carry out evaluation (1963).
------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	---

..	Establishment of Evaluation Unit is proposed.
----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	---

Annual expenditure may be Rs. 35,000/-.....

under Statistics Department.....

APPENDIX IV—B

List of Evaluation Studies completed and undertaken in the States having Evaluation Units

I ANDHRA PRADESH

Sl. No.	Name of the scheme/programme	Year in which the study was taken up	Whether completed	Whether report finalised and issued	Year in which the report was issued
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	The working of the scheme relating to the Large and Better utilisation of Local Manurial Resources.	1962	Completed	Finalised & issued.	1962
2.	Study on the Scheme of the Housing Colonies for Harijans.	"	"	"	"
3.	Study on the working of the Employees State Insurance Scheme in Andhra Pradesh.	"	"	"	"
4.	Study on the working of the Employment Information and Assistance Bureaux in Rural Areas.	"	"	"	"
5.	Study on the working of the State Seed Farms in Andhra Pradesh	"	"	"	1963
6.	Special Schools for Adult Women	"	"	"	"
7.	Study on the working of the Crop-Estimation Surveys on Principal Food Crop in Andhra Pradesh.	"	"	"	"
8.	Study on the working of District Service Station, Chittoor.	1963	"	"	"
9.	Study on the working of the Fish Farms in Andhra Pradesh.	"	"	"	"
10.	Study on the working of the New Well Subsidy Scheme in Andhra Pradesh.	"	"	"	"
11.	Study on the working of the Beggar Home at Hanamkonda.	"	"	"	"
12.	The working of the Duck Extension Centres in Andhra Pradesh.	"	"	"	1964
13.	State After-care Homes for Men.	"	"	Not yet finalised	..
14.	The working of the Poultry Development Centres in Andhra Pradesh.	"	"	Finalised & issued	1964

1	2	3	4	5	6
15.	The working of the State After-care Homes for Women.	1963	completed	Finalised & issued	1964
16.	District Shelter for Women.	"	"	"	"
17.	Case studies on Industrial Estates	"	"	Not yet finalised	..
18.	The working of the Apprenticeship Training for workers.	"	"	"	..
19.	Evening Classes Scheme for workers..	"	"	Finalised & issued	1964
20.	Working of District Offices	"	Not yet completed
21.	The working of Minor Irrigation Programmes in Blocks.	1963	Completed	Finalised & issued.	1964
22.	Govt. Hostels and Subsidised Hostels for Scheduled Castes and Backward Classes.	"	Not yet completed.
23.	Scholarships scheme for Scheduled Castes and Backward Classes.	"	"
24.	Handloom Cooperatives	"	"
25.	Enrolment of Elementary School Children in Srikakulam and Adilabad Districts.	"	"
26.	Rabi Campaign	"	"
27.	Working of the Apprenticeship Training Scheme at the Hindustan Shipyard, Visakhapatnam and Allwyn Metal Works, Hyderabad.	1963	Completed	Finalised & issued.	1964
28.	Study on the work of the Grama Sevakas in Gollaprolu Block of East Godavari District.	"	"	"	"
29.	Work Study of District Veterinary Officers.	"	"	"	"

II. BIHAR

1. A study of the Raneshwar Community Development Block.
2. Impact of Community Development Block in Saharsa district.
3. Impact of Community Development Block on the tribal people of Tundi Block.
4. Report on Health Department Schemes of the Third Five Year Plan.

III. GUJARAT

Completed :

1. Evaluation Survey of Agricultural Demonstration Plots.
2. Case Study in respect of distribution of fertilisers.
3. Case Study in respect of Block and Departmental Expenditure in C. D. Blocks.
4. Evaluation Survey of Multiplication and distribution of improved seeds.
5. Case Studies in various fields of activity under the C.D. Programme.

In Progress :

1. Evaluation Survey of attitude of cultivators towards the package plan programme in Surat District.
2. Evaluation Survey of Industrial Estate.
3. Evaluation Survey of special schemes for the acceleration of Scheduled Tribes covering scholarships to S. T. Students, Hostels for S. T. Students, Medical aid, and Drinking Water Supply.

Under consideration :

1. Impact of Family Planning Programme.
2. Impact of C. D. Programme in Post Stage II Blocks.
3. Survey to measure the impact of the scheme of financial assistance to individuals and industrial cooperatives for purchase of tools and machinery.
4. Evaluation of Rabari Bharvad Rehabilitation Scheme.

IV. MADHYA PRADESH

Completed :

1. Bhopal Capital Project.
2. Rinderpest Evaluation Scheme.
3. Korba Thermal Power Scheme.
4. Intensive District Agricultural Programmes.

Undertaken :

5. Chambal Stage I.

V. ORISSA

1961-62

1. A survey on Public contribution in selected areas of the State.

1962-63

2. A survey analysing the problem of shortfall in admission to engineering schools in Orissa with suggested remedies.
3. A survey of unemployment in the rural areas of Orissa.
4. Evaluation of the work load of village-level workers.
5. Evaluation report of prize-winning gram panchayats.

1963-64

- *6. A survey of unemployment in 12 rural works project blocks of the second series.
- *7. Evaluation of benefits accruing to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes from development programmes of the last decade.

VI. PUNJAB

1960

1. Loan utilisation survey of selected small-scale industrial establishments with special reference to employment and investment generated.

1961

2. Survey of Low Income Group Housing Scheme in Punjab.

*Under preparation.

3. Survey of withdrawals/encashments of post office savings bank accounts and National Plan Savings Certificates.

4. Survey of the working of Industrial Training Institutes in Punjab.

5. Evaluation survey of improved agricultural practices in Punjab.

6. Evaluation survey of the utilisation of loans for minor irrigation works.

7. Evaluation survey of social education programme in C.D. areas.

8. Evaluation survey of the utilisation of artificial insemination centres and poultry survey.

9. Evaluation survey of the working of cooperative societies in C. D. Block areas.

*10. Evaluation of the extent of utilisation of loans given under cottage industries.

VII. RAJASTHAN

1961-62

Reports Printed :

1. The Panchayat elections in Rajasthan, 1960.

2. The working of Panchayati Raj in Rajasthan (April 1961 to March 1962).

Other Detailed Studies :

3. Study of the Municipal Elections in Rajasthan, 1961.

4. Study of the Minor Irrigation Projects.

5. Study of the Democratic Decentralisation Scheme in the State.

Rapid Survey and Correspondence Studies:

6. Extent to which extension methods as opposed to coercive methods are used by Government agencies in rural development programmes.

7. Methods employed to arrange supplies to the rural areas through the Panchayat Samiti.

*Under preparation.

8. Financial assistance made available by Panchayat Samiti.
9. Effect of present volume of paper work on implementation of the development programmes.
10. Relief to rural unemployment as a result of development programmes.
11. Modes of communication of knowledge.
12. Extent of urban influence on rural life.
13. Methods of communication between Research Institutions and the Field.
14. Working of Adhyayan Kendras.
15. Functions of the V. L. W.

Correspondence Studies:

16. Effect of compulsory education on income of rural families.
17. Nature of members coopted to local bodies.
18. Changes made by the Panchayat Samities in the draft model bye-laws.
19. Special programmes launched by Zila Parishads and Panchayat Samities.
20. Local development plans.
21. Reasons for irrigation wells being out of use.

1962-63

Special Studies:

22. Extent of tour by extension officers.
23. Extent of non-utilisation of funds allotted to Panchayat Samities.
24. Acceptance of family planning techniques.
25. Preparation of farm plans in Pali District.
26. Working of cooperative marketing society in Pali District.
27. Non-utilisation of irrigation potential in Gudha and Moral projects.
28. Municipal elections in 1962.
29. Panchayat Samiti Adhyayan Kendras.

VIII. UTTAR PRADESH

Rural life analysis section (Evaluation Wing) P.R.A.I.:

1. Family Planning Communication Research: Acceptance as a Function of Intensity of Contact.
2. A study of tubewell irrigation potential and its utilisation in Eastern U.P.
3. A case study of Factionalism and Leadership Change in Bhurl-
naval, Meerut, District.
4. Dehati Radio Goshthi Programme in Uttar Pradesh; an Evalua-
tion Study of the organisation and impact.
5. A baseline survey of Bal Mangal Dals in Uttar Pradesh.
6. Evaluation Report on special extension work among younger-
age-groups.
7. A baseline survey of the Decentralised Pottery Project, Gaura,
Lucknow Distt.
8. A Case Study of Communication and Leadership in Baipokhar,
Basti Distt.
9. A Case Study of Female Leadership in Dointikar (Lucknow).
10. Fly Control Projects: A survey report of Ramnagar village,
Lucknow Distt.
11. Evaluation Report of School Health Education Project.
12. A Qualitative Study of Panchayat Election, 1961, in U.P.
13. A baseline survey of Nutrition Education Programme in
Gorakhpur and Basti districts.

Evaluation & Statistics Section, P.R.A.I.:

(A) Reports printed since 1961.

Case Studies:

1. Rural Latrine Programme, U.P.—(English and Hindi).
2. Panchayat Udyog, Chinhat (English and Hindi).
3. U.P. village gives a new lead in agricultural production (A
Case Study of village Arehra, District Agra)—(English and Hindi).
4. Improved Implements Programme in P.D.P., Mahewa, Etawah—
(Hindi).

5. Construction of Primary School buildings in Etah District (A Case Study of the Construction Programme)—(English and Hindi).

6. Youth Club and Sericulture Programme (Case Study of a Youth Club)—(English and Hindi).

7. Soil Conservation Programme in Village Sherpur Sarraiya, District Etawah—(English).

Other Studies:

8. Impact of Consolidation of Holdings (An Evaluation Study).

9. A Study Report on the Orientation-Training of Non-official Members of Block Development Committees.

10. Agricultural Sample Surveys (Rabi) in Pilot Development Project, Etawah, 1956-57 to 1960-61—Seed Purity of Wheat N.P. 720.

11. Evaluation of Improved Agricultural Implements Programme in P.D.P., Mahewa, Etawah, District.

(B) Studies Completed

Case Studies:

12. Follow-up of Development Circulars (Case Study in Administrative Intelligence).

13. Cooperative Agro-Industrial Project, Ghosi, Azamgarh district.

14. Drainage Project, Newari Kalan, Etawah, district.

15. Panchayati Raj Prashikshan Kendra, Hindi Bhawan, Kalpi, Jalaun District.

Other Studies:

16. Agro-Industrial Pilot Projects in six selected blocks of U.P.

(C) Studies carried out on behalf of International Agencies.

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East:

17. Role of Community Development Programmes in the context of Economic Development with particular reference to Agriculture—(Published by ECAFE).

18. Supplementary Study of United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East on 'Contribution of Community Development to National Economic Development' (Published by ECAFE).

19. Study on 'Capital Formation in Agriculture under Community Development.'—(Published by ECAFE).

20. Report on Baseline Survey of Expanded Nutrition Programme—(Completed)

APPENDIX V-A

List of persons who participated in the deliberations of the Working Group on Evaluation in States

1. Prof. V. K. R. V. Rao, Member (E.S. & I.T.), Planning Commission—*Chairman*.
2. Shri T. P. Singh, Secretary, Planning Commission.
3. Raja Surendra Singh of Nalagarh, Adviser (P.A.), Planning Commission.
4. Dr. S. R. Sen, Adviser, (P.A.), Planning Commission.
5. Shri P. P. I. Vidyathan, Adviser (P.A.), Planning Commission.
6. Shri K. Mitra, Chief (P.A.), Planning Commission.
7. Shri Krishan Chandra, Commissioner for Planning & Evaluation, U.P.
8. Shri S. D. Srivastava, Dy. Secretary, Planning, U.P.
9. Shri C. Narasimhan, Secretary, Planning, Andhra.
10. Shri P. N. Damry, Secretary, Finance (Planning), Maharashtra.
11. Shri V. S. Tambay, Additional Development Commissioner, Maharashtra.
12. Shri G. H. Lalwani, Deputy Secretary, Planning, Maharashtra.
13. Shri T. P. Singh, Development Commissioner, Bihar.
14. Shri R. B. Lal, Director of Statistics and Evaluation, Bihar.
15. Shri A. M. Lal, Director of Evaluation & Deputy Secretary, (Planning), Rajasthan.
16. Dr. J. P. Bhattacharjee, Director, Programme Evaluation Organisation, Planning Commission,—*Convenor*.
17. Shri J. N. Tewari, Joint Director, Programme Evaluation Organisation.

APPENDIX V-B

Visits to States by the members of the Working Group on Evaluation and list of persons with whom discussions were held.

I. Itinerary

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Work done</i>
(1) 3rd & 4th Feb., 64	Bombay	Discussions with the representatives of Maharashtra Government.
(2) 5th & 6th Feb., 64	Bangalore	Discussions with the representatives of Mysore Government.
(3) 7th March, 1964	Lucknow	Discussions with the representatives of Uttar Pradesh Government.
(4) 8th & 9th April, 1964	Calcutta	Discussions with the representatives of West Bengal Government.
(5) 11th April, 1964	Bhubaneswar	Discussions with the representatives of Orissa Government.

II. List of persons with whom discussions were held during these visits.

Maharashtra

1. Shri N. T. Mone, Chief Secretary.
2. Shri P. N. Damry, Secretary, Finance (Planning).
3. Shri R. C. Joshi, Secretary, Agriculture.
4. Shri V. S. Tambay, Additional Development Commissioner.
5. Shri G. H. Lalwani, Deputy Secretary (Planning).
6. Shri M. A. Telang, Director of Economics and Statistics.

Mysore

1. Shri K. Balachandran, Chief Secretary.
2. Shri Mathias, Secretary (Finance).

3. Shri M. Vasudeva Rao, Development Commissioner.
4. Dr. B. V. Iengar, Secretary, (Planning).
5. Shri Y. C. Hombalaya, Secretary (Agriculture).
6. Chief Engineer (Irrigation), Director of Agriculture and other Heads of Development Departments.

Uttar Pradesh

1. Shri K. K. Das, Chief Secretary.
2. Shri Krishan Chandra, Additional Chief Secretary.
3. Shri M. A. Quraishi, Commissioner and Sachiv, Agriculture Production and Rural Development.
4. Shri Bhagwan Singh, Special Secretary, Cooperatives and Cane Development.
5. Shri M. L. Dave, Special Secretary, Finance.
6. Shri H. C. Saxena, Secretary, Industries.
7. Shri V. M. Bhide, Finance Commissioner.
8. Shri B. S. Seth, Secretary, Medical.
9. Shri A. R. Siddiqi, Joint Secretary (Agriculture).
10. Shri S. S. Sidhu, Joint Secretary, Planning.
11. Shri S. K. Bhatnagar, Deputy Secretary (Agriculture).
12. Shri S. D. Srivastava, Deputy Secretary (Planning).
13. Shri J. K. Pande, Director of Economic Intelligence and Statistics.
14. Dr. Ram Das, Director, Planning, Research & Action Institute.
15. Shri D. N. Sharma, Director, Medical and Health Services.
16. Shri N. Sethuraman, Additional Director of Industries.
17. Shri K. Kishen, Joint Director of Agriculture (Statistics).
18. Shri S. I. Hussain, Registrar, Cooperative Societies.

West Bengal

1. Shri S. K. Banerjee, Development & Planning Commissioner.
2. Shri R. Ghosh, Commissioner for Agriculture & Rural Development.
3. Shri D. N. Banerjee, Secretary, Forest and Fisheries.
4. Shri G. D. Goswami, Secretary, Irrigation & Cooperation.
5. Shri S. K. Chakrabarty, Secretary, Health.

6. Shri S. R. Das, Joint Secretary, Agriculture.
7. Shri H. C. Dutta, Joint Secretary, Development and Planning Department.
8. Shri B. Ghosh, Agriculture Commissioner.
9. Shri R. N. Sen Gupta, Assistant Commissioner, Agriculture & Community Development.
10. Shri K. L. Lahiri, Chief Conservator of Forests.
11. Shri S. K. Sen Gupta, Deputy Secretary, Cottage and Small Scale Industries.
12. Shri H. Das Gupta, Deputy Secretary, Development and Planning.
13. Shri J. K. Lahiri, Deputy Secretary, Commerce & Industry.
14. Shri S. Mukherjee, Deputy Secretary, Cooperation, and Small Scale Industries.
15. Shrimati C. Bose, Director of Economics and Statistics.
16. Shri N. K. Biswas, Director of Industries.
17. Shri D. N. Ghosh, Additional Director of Industries.
18. Shri D. R. Marwaha, Joint Director, Veterinary Services.
19. Shri B. N. Sen, Joint Director, Animal Husbandry.
20. Shri S. N. Das Gupta, Deputy Director, State Statistical Bureau.
21. Shri V. N. Shah, Deputy Director, Health Services.
22. Shri S. N. Ghosh, Deputy Director, Fisheries.
23. Shri S. Datta, Registrar, Cooperatives.
24. Shri S. K. Chaudhury, Deputy Registrar, Cooperatives.
25. Shri S. K. Pain, Agriculture Economist.

Orissa

1. Shri B. Patnaik—*Chairman*, Planning Board.
2. Shri M. Ramakrishnayya, Secretary, Planning and Coordination & Development Commissioner.
3. Shri H. K. Ghosh, Secretary, Finance.
4. Shri K. C. Ramamurty, Additional Secretary, Industries and Commerce.
5. Shri B. K. Mohanty, Joint Secretary, Health.
6. Shri J. K. Misra, Deputy Secretary, Planning.

7. Shri N. C. Naik, Deputy Secretary, Zilla Parishad.
8. Shri G. C. Patra, Financial Adviser-cum-Secretary (Community Development).
9. Shri B. B. Rath, Director, Gram Panchayats.
10. Shri Chakardhar Misra, Director, Bureau of Economics and Statistics.
11. Shri N. Parija, Under Secretary, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry.
12. Senior Statistician, Bureau of Economics and Statistics.