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What is Local Ownership in Evaluation?

Program participants are involved in evaluation decision making

- Evaluations won’t only reflect our or funders’ values and interests, but those of program participants as well
- Evaluations won’t just meet our needs, but also those of the people and communities we serve
- Participants have a say in what is considered success or failure
Targeting the Ultra Poor

Field Experiment

• Improve targeting of a CCT program in Indonesia
• Three targeting methodologies
  1. Proxy means testing *(status quo)*
  2. Community based targeting
  3. Self-targeting

Measures of Effectiveness

• Accuracy of targeting
• Satisfaction
• Costs

Source: Targeting the Ultra Poor: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia
Results

**Accuracy of Targeting**
1. Self targeting
2. Proxy means testing
3. Community targeting

**Satisfaction**
1. Community targeting
2. Proxy means testing
3. Self targeting

**Least Cost (overall)**
1. Community targeting
2. Self targeting
3. Proxy means testing

**Least Cost (to households)**
1. Proxy means testing
2. Community targeting
3. Self targeting
Feasible? Ethical? Appropriate?

• Will participants’ input influence decision making?
• Will participants gain something from being involved?
• Do participants want to be involved?
• Can participants be involved?
• Does the evaluation team have skills to facilitate participation in the evaluation decision-making process?
• Will participants be put at risk?
• Will involving participants in evaluation decision making raise expectations that cannot be met?
Three Dimensions of Local Ownership in Evaluation

Who

- 1. Manipulated
- 2. Decoration
- 3. Tokenized
- 4. Informed
- 5. Consulted
- 6. Involved in decision making
- 7. Lead action
- 8. Equal partners

When

- Evaluation design
- Data collection & analysis
- Findings & recs.
- Dissemination & use of results

How

- 1. Manipulated
- 2. Decoration
- 3. Tokenized
- 4. Informed
- 5. Consulted
- 6. Involved in decision making
- 7. Lead action
- 8. Equal partners
Who: Selecting Participants

- Transparent, fair process
- Cognizant of power dynamics
- Inclusive of all groups
- Seeking legitimate representatives
- Aware of biases
- Differentiating roles: decision makers vs. informants
### When: Expanding Participants’ Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developing theory of change</th>
<th>Assisting with data collection</th>
<th>Developing evaluation recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying/prioritizing eval. questions</td>
<td>Providing data</td>
<td>Hearing evaluation results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying outcomes/impacts</td>
<td>Shaping evaluation findings</td>
<td>Assisting with dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting indicators</td>
<td>Providing feedback on evaluation findings</td>
<td>Participating in decision making around evaluation results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on eval. methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How: Roger Hart’s Ladder of Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Involvement</th>
<th>Evaluation design</th>
<th>Data collection and analysis</th>
<th>Findings and recommendations</th>
<th>Disseminating and using results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Rung 8:** Participants share decision making with others as *equal partners* | Together, participants and evaluators:  
- Develop theory of change  
- Identify outcomes  
- Determine eval questions  
- Select relevant indicators  
- Identify criteria for success  
- Design data collection approaches  
- Decide data sources and samples | Participants help develop appropriate measures  
(see this [example](https://www.careinternational.org/everyday-peace-indicators))  
Participants are involved in data analysis. | Participants are involved in framing evaluation findings and developing evaluation recommendations. | Participants are involved in disseminating evaluation findings. Participants are responsible for acting on some of the evaluation recommendations. |
| **Rung 5:** Participants consulted and informed | Participants provide input into the evaluation design.  
Participants provide data and may also be involved in data collection;  
Participants assist with data analysis.  
Data is shared with participants for their input. | Participants provide feedback on/validate the evaluation findings and recommendations. | Participants provide input on how evaluation results are disseminated and used. |
| **Rung 4:** Participants informed | Information about the purpose and nature of the evaluation is provided to participants. | The data collected and evaluator-conducted analysis are shared with participants. | Participants are presented with the finalized evaluation findings and recommendations. |
A Few Examples

• Community/partner participation in baselines
• “Transparency Boards”
• Funding for post-evaluation community engagement/feedback sessions
• Conduct an assessment of current practice
• Set a “minimum standard” (see DFID report: *Beneficiary Feedback in Evaluation*)

Source: *Data by the People, for the People: Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation at The Hunger Project*
Final Thoughts

• Local ownership in evaluation should not be considered “advanced” practice or a worthwhile “extra”
• Don’t feel you have to do everything at once
• Local ownership does not mean that participants have to do everything themselves
• Use of participatory methods alone does not guarantee ownership
• Can you do use a local ownership approach if a project hasn’t been participatory?
• Isn’t evaluation too late to be participatory? Shouldn’t we be talking more about monitoring?