

Types of Evaluations Conducted by MEASURE Evaluation

MEASURE Evaluation has extensive experience conducting **rigorous evaluations**. Our work is funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to support health system interventions and programs that address reproductive health; HIV; maternal, neonatal, and child health; nutrition; malaria; and tuberculosis.



The purpose of the evaluations we conduct is to **provide evidence of how and why interventions are or are not working in practice to further progress in USAID's key focus areas** of ending preventable child and maternal deaths (EPCMD), achieving an AIDS-free generation, strengthening health systems, and preventing and combatting infectious diseases. We are concerned with **intervention models rather than operations, seeking answers to questions of policy and best practice rather than evaluating the performance of USAID or its partners in delivering interventions**.

USAID's Evaluation Policy¹ defines two main types of evaluation: impact and performance. The U.S. President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) Evaluation Standards of Practice² defines four primary types of evaluation: process, outcome, impact, and economic. MEASURE Evaluation focuses on outcome and impact evaluations, but we also conduct economic evaluations, and some types of process evaluation. We employ both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Examples of questions for each type of evaluation are provided in Box 1 on the following page.

As the questions on the following page indicate, the types of evaluations conducted by MEASURE Evaluation seek answers to the larger picture of health impacts and outcomes. For example, **MEASURE Evaluation does not field a team of evaluators to review a project and its implementing**

partners in order to make recommendations to USAID about project operations, management, structure, or relationships with subpartners. Instead, evaluations focus on whether a particular intervention model is the right one for the outcomes expected, based on the operating theory of change.

Hallmarks of our evaluations are careful design and planning, along with a scientifically rigorous protocol appropriate to answer the evaluation question(s) of interest, in the context in which the evaluations are conducted. This focus supports the needs of USAID managers and other stakeholders as they make informed decisions about how to invest scarce resources. MEASURE Evaluation includes stakeholders from the outset of the conceptualization and design of evaluations and shares results in appropriate formats for different audiences. We also develop lessons learned from the evaluation results that can be used to inform policy and program improvements, both for the intervention evaluated and for interventions elsewhere.

Occasionally, MEASURE Evaluation's work is peripheral to evaluation implementation. For example, MEASURE Evaluation may provide **technical assistance** to an organization that is conducting an evaluation. Our role in this case is to advise on aspects of the evaluation—such as its design, implementation, and/or analysis—but not to make the final decisions about the way the evaluation will be done or to implement it ourselves. We also may support country government agencies, USAID missions, or other partners

¹ USAID Evaluation Policy. (2011). Retrieved from <https://www.usaid.gov/evaluation>

² PEPFAR Evaluation Standards of Practice, Version 2.0. (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.pepfar.gov/reports/guidance/c61317.htm>

Table 1. Illustrative research questions for outcome, impact, economic, and process evaluations

Type of Evaluation	Examples of Evaluation Questions
Outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In program areas over time, what changes are present among women of reproductive age for key outcomes, such as contraceptive prevalence, exposure to behavior change messages, satisfaction with care, and/or sleeping under an insecticide-treated net? Have outcomes met or exceeded the benchmarks set for improvement at program onset? Do levels of outcomes differ between program facilities versus nonprogram facilities?
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does participation in program activities result in lower levels of treatment default and mortality rates for direct and indirect program beneficiaries? Is the program more effective than an alternative program at improving key outcomes at the population level? What is the impact of integrating “Component 1” and “Component 2” in core program activities on use of healthcare services and disease incidence?
Economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which program approach is more cost-effective? What are the program costs and outcomes before and after the implementation of the program, compared with those of other similar programs? What would be the cost of scaling up the program?
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is the program being implemented as planned? Is the program reaching the intended population? What is the quality of the program? What are barriers and facilitators to accessing the program? How can program implementation be improved to address implementation gaps? What are facilities currently doing to address targeted outcomes? How does this differ within the program? What are the contextual factors that facilitate or challenge access to or implementation of the program? What is the level of satisfaction and what are the perceptions among clients, providers, and managers about needs, services, and management practices?

Source: Hollander, M., Miller J.A., Kadlec, H. (2010). Evaluation of healthcare services: Asking the right questions to develop new policy and program-relevant knowledge for decision-making. *Healthcare Quarterly*, 13(4): 40–47.

to **plan evaluations**. For example, we might work with a government to develop a national evaluation strategy to deal with a health issue, or work with a USAID mission to compose evaluation questions, or with a nongovernmental organization to assess the feasibility of an evaluation. MEASURE Evaluation also offers training on impact evaluation and, for countries, we can develop tailored **workshops on conducting evaluations** and how to use their findings.

Whatever the type of evaluation, we concentrate on **building the capacity** of organizations and individuals to design, implement, analyze, interpret, disseminate, and use evaluation research. Through collaborative implementation of evaluations, we help local research partners acquire or reinforce evaluation competence, while having access to our expert technical advice.

Our mission

MEASURE Evaluation supports the international development goal of maximizing program results, by systematically collecting and analyzing information about and evidence on health program performance and impact. Evaluation findings provide accountability to stakeholders and donors and inform decisions—supporting organizational learning, strengthening health systems, and improving program effectiveness so that people live healthier lives.

For more information, see <http://www.measureevaluation.org/measure/our-work/evaluation> or <http://www.measureevaluation.org/measure/about/services>.