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Management Summary

The 2021 program

In 2021, IPDET implemented once again a completely virtual online program due to the COVID-19 pandemic. It consisted of 4 different streams of activities:

1. 10 Online Workshops | Each workshop was conducted in 5 days and covered a specialized evaluation topic. Total participation was 203.
2. Two online inhouse Trainings | One on Fundamentals of Rigorous Impact Evaluation for the African Development Bank, and one on Theories of Change for INTERPOL.
3. Global Outreach Event Series | The Event Series ‘Better policy making through evaluations’ consisted of 6 online sessions with 63 parliamentarians and their research staff from Asia Pacific. This first Global Outreach activity was implemented in close cooperation with the Asia Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA) and the Global Parliamentary Forum for Evaluation (GPFE). A follow-up on-site event is planned for late 2022.
4. Community building | In 2021, IPDET further engaged in community building. Beside developing a community building strategy, 6 online activities seeked to strengthen the IPDET evaluation community.

Main results of the program assessment

Trainings attracted high number of participants from all over the world | Participants in the 10 IPDET Online Workshops came from all over the globe with around a quarter each from Europe/Central Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa. Overall, the participants were from 73 different countries and 128 participants came from developing countries. The gender distribution of the Online Workshops showed a majority of female participants. Most participants worked in UN/UN-specialized agencies. The second and third largest groups represented non-governmental organizations and government ministries and agencies. The feedback surveys showed that the participants assessed the Online Workshops as relevant, of high quality, and they were satisfied with the knowledge acquired. The high satisfaction rates for content, delivery quality as well as the great approval of instructors’ reputation testified the successfulness of the Online Workshops.

In the Global Outreach Event Series, the majority of the 63 participants lived in 15 countries of the South-East Asia/Pacific region. They were parliamentarians and parliamentarian research staff (61) as well as two Government officials and had only little previous experience in evaluation. The feedback surveys showed that the participants rated the Event Series with an extraordinarily high satisfaction.
This also applies to the content and didactical methods. Additionally, more than 80% of the participants stated their high satisfaction with the knowledge acquired and that the skills are applicable in their work.

**Tailored online inhouse trainings were successfully carried out for target institutions** | For the African Development Bank as multilateral development finance institution a training on ‘Fundamentals of Rigorous Impact Evaluation’ was conducted with 24 participants. The training on ‘Theories of Change’ addressed 29 employees of the inter-governmental organization INTERPOL. Both trainings strengthen the cooperation between IPDET and these institutions.

**Scholarships and Global Outreach activities enabled access for more participants to M&E trainings from target beneficiary groups** | In its 10 IPDET Online Workshops IPDET provided 80 scholarships to individuals from developing countries and, therefore, made their participation possible. With the provision of the Global Outreach Event Series an additional amount of 62 parliamentarians and their research staff from developing countries in the Asia Pacific region were trained of no charge. Only due to the Worldbank Grant it was possible to provide scholarships and conduct the Global Outreach Event Series.

**E-platform and community building strategy have successfully been implemented and attracted individuals to participate in community and knowledge sharing events** | In 2021, IPDET started its community building process and developed a strategy, that seeks to offer a variety of activities for the needs of IPDET alumni, participants, and other interested individuals. This process was accompanied by the development of IPDET’s online collaboration platform including the E-Learning platform and the IPDET CoSMOS. With the implementation of 6 online events, IPDET intensified its engagement in knowledge sharing events for connecting with peers and broadening of perspectives.

**IPDET successfully contributed to GEI’s development objective to strengthen the M&E capacity of individuals within key stakeholder groups in developing countries**

IPDET, as core partner of the GEI, contributes to the specific development objective to strengthen the M&E capacity of individuals within key stakeholder groups in developing countries and works towards achieving the key results indicators:

(i) **Percentage of IPDET’s training participants that provide positive feedback on training relevance, quality and knowledge acquired.**

(ii) **Percentage of IPDET’s training beneficiaries who report use of acquired knowledge in their professional practice.**

(iii) **Percentage of IPDET community members surveyed who give positive feedback on knowledge sharing events and report broadening their perspectives**

The assessment of IPDET’s Online Workshops and the Global Outreach Event Series on the knowledge acquired, the training relevance and the training quality shows the compliance with IPDET’s Key results indicator (i). As the IPDET Tracer study will be finalized in the first half of 2022, no statement on the progress with regard to indicator (ii) could be reported yet. With regard to IPDET’s community building indicator (iii), the high satisfaction rates of the IPDET Kick-off and Closing Event indicate that the objective on positive feedback on knowledge sharing events was achieved. Due to the early stage of the community building process, no data has been collected yet on the objective on broadening their perspective.

The evaluation results show that IPDET’s current progress complies with its objectives. The detailed overview on the Project Development Objective Indicators can be found in Table 4 of the annex.
A) Evaluation Object: The 2021 IPDET Program

IPDET 2021 - in a nutshell

In 2021, IPDET joined the **Global Evaluation Initiative (GEI)** as one of its core partners. IPDET aspires to make meaningful contributions to Evaluation Capacity Development under the GEI umbrella framework. Since July 2021, IPDET gratefully receives funds from the GEI Trust Fund for financing scholarships, community building and Global Outreach activities. Only these financial contributions enable IPDET to further develop its strategy and implement activities beyond its regular training offers.

The program activities can be attributed to the following 3 components, which have been agreed with the Worldbank:

- **Component 1:** Strengthen the M&E capacity of individuals within key stakeholder groups in developing countries to conduct, commission, and use monitoring and evaluation approaches and techniques
- **Component 2:** Build a community of evaluation stakeholders at the global level
- **Component 3:** Program Oversight, Management, Implementation, and Evaluation

Component 1 and 2 consisted of the following activities in 2021:

- **10 Online Workshops:** on specialized evaluation topics with 203 participants in total from 73 countries.
- **2 online inhouse trainings:** 1) for the African Development Bank (AfDB) on ‘Fundamentals of Rigorous Impact Evaluation’, 5 days in February; 2) for INTERPOL on ‘Theories of Change’, 3 days in November.

Illustration 1 – Overview of events and participants per stream

Detailed evaluations results will be reported according to the 2 components further below. The overview on the status of the Program’s Development Objective Indicators can be found in the Annex.

**Component 1:**

**10 Online Workshops:** on specialized evaluation topics with 203 participants in total from 73 countries.

**2 online inhouse trainings:** 1) for the African Development Bank (AfDB) on ‘Fundamentals of Rigorous Impact Evaluation’, 5 days in February; 2) for INTERPOL on ‘Theories of Change’, 3 days in November.

**First Global Outreach Event Series ‘Better policy making through evaluations’:** 6 free online sessions conducted in October and November for 63 parliamentarians and their research staff from Asia Pacific...
in partnership with the Asia Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA) and the Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation (GPFE). A follow-up on-site event is planned for late 2022.

Component 2:
To enable networking and peer-to-peer learning between individuals from around the globe, IPDET engaged further in community building. This was guided by an internal design thinking process for the development of innovative community building formats. Beside creating a community building strategy, this seeks to strengthen the community and to offer more activities for their needs. IPDET officially opened the 2021 program with an online Kick-off session in April and closed it with an entertaining closing session in November, including celebrating IPDET’s 20th Anniversary. IPDET also provided space to meet and greet for all 2021 online workshop participants with two online social events.

IPDET 2021 – Program Theory
**IPDET is a core partner of GEI** GEI will partner with key Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD) players around the world and coordinate with them to achieve GEI’s strategic priorities and outcomes. Partnerships will focus on leveraging entities’ areas of strength and comparative advantage. IPDET, with its expertise in providing global M&E training and its reputation for excellence, will be an essential partner in supporting GEI’s work in building M&E stakeholders’ capacity. Under the GEI umbrella, IPDET will play a critical role as a provider of global trainings that merge global expertise with local knowledge and practice. Through GEI, there will be an ambitious aim to strengthen connections between IPDET and the in-country work of other GEI partners and World Bank country offices.

IPDET aims to contribute to the higher-level development objective of the GEI Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), namely, to improve monitoring and evaluation frameworks, capacity, and use in supported developing countries for improved evidence-informed policy making.

**IPDET’s specific development objective** IPDET intends to strengthen the M&E capacity of individuals within key stakeholder groups in developing countries to conduct, commission, and use monitoring and evaluation approaches and techniques, by providing quality M&E training and promoting networks and knowledge sharing among training participants.

**IPDET’s targeted beneficiaries** The target beneficiaries are evaluation practitioners, commissioners, and users of evidence from developing countries, who seek to develop knowledge and skills to conduct, manage, commission, and use evaluation in their work. These individuals primarily come from developing countries’ NGOs, ministries, and public administration institutions, bi- and multi-lateral development organizations, think tanks, universities, private firms, young and emerging evaluators’ organizations, as well as parliaments.

IPDET will prioritize beneficiaries who represent underserved demographics and geographies, to ensure that evaluation training is available to those who are best placed to use this knowledge. Participation support will target individuals who come from developing countries and are well placed to utilize their learning within their home countries and institutions. IPDET has always encouraged women’s participation in evaluation training, and they remain a key target group to benefit from IPDET support, as well as Young and Emerging Evaluators.
Illustration 2 – IPDET 2021 Program Theory
B) Evaluation Approach

IPDET’s different activities require different evaluation methodologies. These are described in the section below.

2.1 IPDET Online Workshops

Data sources | For the evaluation of the workshops, quantitative data has been collected through the application process and at workshop end the participants answered feedback surveys. Additional qualitative data has been collected in open comment text fields on the workshops.

Evaluation procedure | The participants’ feedback was collected after each single workshop via the software SoSci. The survey can be found in the Annex. Emails with tracking status were sent out only to the active participants and at least two reminders were sent to those who did not yet or did not completely fill in the survey. The email was sent during or after the last session for the workshops. In order to derive information on the profile of active participants, all data on background information, which they had submitted in the application form was compiled. Moreover, to gain deeper insight into the workshop ratings of specific sub-groups such as participants from different regions or with different evaluation functions, the feedback survey was matched with the participant’s background information via a unique identifier which kept the standards of anonymized data.

In order to derive trends over time, the data sets from the last two years served as comparison between the 2019 on-site, the 2020 Online Workshops, the 2021 Online Workshops and the Global Outreach Event series.

Feedback survey participation rate | For IPDET’s Online Workshops, the feedback survey participation was 78%. A detailed description of participation rates in the single online workshops is listed in the Annex (see Annex-Figure 31). Double counts are included in the total participation number (e.g., persons who attended various events). For example, one participant can have participated in two workshops. Consequently, he/she was asked to answer the feedback survey for each workshop as each single event got evaluated on its own. For the participant profile statistics, double counts were excluded to get the exact numbers on the participant’s background, independent which events they attended and how frequently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>format</th>
<th>total participation in #</th>
<th>feedback participation in #</th>
<th>feedback participation in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Workshops</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Outreach Event series</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPDET Online Inhouse Trainings</td>
<td>24 (AfDB)</td>
<td>18 (AfDB)</td>
<td>75% (AfDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 (INTERPOL)</td>
<td>11 (INTERPOL)</td>
<td>38% (INTERPOL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 – Feedback participation rate per training format*
2.2 IPDET Online Inhouse Trainings
The evaluation of the IPDET online Workshop for the AfDB contained an online survey that was sent to the applicants as follow-up.

The INTERPOL training was evaluated by filling out a short feedback survey including some open text fields. This survey was conducted by INTERPOL (see Table 1).

2.3. IPDET Global Outreach Event Series
Similar to the evaluation approach of the IPDET Online Workshops, the IPDET Global Outreach Event Series evaluation results were gained through a mix of different data collection and analysis methods:
First, general background data of participants were collected during the application process. After the Event Series a short online survey (see Annex) was sent to the selected applicants, which participated in all six virtual sessions (41 of 63 people responded) (see Table 1). Standardized questions were combined with open text fields to give further feedback on several aspects. Third, with seven of these participants, short interviews were conducted to get a deeper insight in their learnings and potential application fields of the newly acquired knowledge.

2.4 IPDET Community Building and Marketing
For the IPDET’s community building activities Kick-off and Closing event, the Zoom registration form was used to collect participants background information at the time of registration. After the event, the participants additionally filled out a survey questionnaire. Feedback on IPDET’s social events was collected by the external digital didactic experts (conex) via Mural.

For the evaluation of IPDET’s communication activities key performance indicators for marketing and outreach were assessed. These statistics were derived from the mailchimp (newsletter), gaggle (listserv) and google analytics (homepage).
C) Program Assessment

3.1 Component 1: Strengthen the M&E capacity of individuals within key stakeholder groups in developing countries to conduct, commission, and use monitoring and evaluation approaches and techniques

3.1.1 IPDET Online Workshops

Online Workshops | The following 10 workshops\(^1\) have been delivered from May to November 2021:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Workshop</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Number of self-paying participants</th>
<th>Number of scholarships</th>
<th>Total number of participants</th>
<th>Feedback survey participation rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Emerging Technology and Its Use in Monitoring</td>
<td>Introductory to intermediate</td>
<td>Kerry Bruce</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Fundamentals of Rigorous Impact Evaluation: Everything You Wanted to Know but Were Afraid to Ask</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Claudia Maldonado</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Digital Analytics for Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>Introductory to intermediate</td>
<td>Claudia Abreu, Lopes, Calum Handforth</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 National Evaluation Systems in the Public Service: Institutionalizing Evidence Informed Policymaking</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Ian Goldman, Matodzi Amisi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Blue Marble Evaluation</td>
<td>Introductory</td>
<td>Michael Patton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Collecting and managing geo-tagged data for M&amp;E, with simple tools and local skills: The Geo-enabling initiative for monitoring and supervision (GEMS)</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Maria Garrido Anilo, Elma Zahir, Annabelle Vinois</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 101 on meta-evaluation, or: how to evaluate evaluations – approaches, methods, and findings</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Stefan Silvestrini</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Monitoring and Evaluating the SDGs: Challenges and Proposed Solutions</td>
<td>Introductory</td>
<td>Wolfgang Meyer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Essentials of Theory-Based Evaluation</td>
<td>Introductory to intermediate</td>
<td>Jos Vaessen</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Theory-Based Causal Analysis</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Estelle Raimondo</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>236</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Online Workshop 2021

**IPDET Online Workshop Participant Profiles**

**Participation numbers** | The IPDET online workshops attracted 203 individuals that booked 236 workshops. The unique participants are considered for the further analysis of the participant profile statistics in this section. Out of these, 30 participants attended two workshops and 3 attended three workshops, and 80 scholarships have been awarded.

---

\(^1\) The workshop ‘What have we learned from conducting evaluations in times of Covid-19?’ had to be cancelled due to a lack of applications.
Regions and gender | Participants (n=203) came from all around the globe (73 different countries), with 128 individuals (63%) from developing countries (see Figure 1 and Illustration 3). Europe and Central Asia and Sub-Sahara Africa (33% and 26%) had the highest share. With regard to the countries with the highest participation numbers, IPDET reached 14 participants from the United States, 11 from Italy, 11 from the Philippines, 8 from France and 7 from Nigeria. In contrast to the on-site program in 2019, the virtual IPDET 2021 reached several new developing countries like Syria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burundi, Chad, Zimbabwe, Turkey and North-Macedonia. A detailed list of all participants and their respective countries can be found in the annex (see Annex – Table 3). The gender balance showed a tip towards overall more female participation with 61%.

Illustration 3 – participants profile | countries (map created with Bing Maps)

Illustration 4 – participants profile | gender

Figure 1 – participants’ profile | regions
“IPDET helped me to improve my perspective about Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) design. Due to Covid 19 we needed to start online activities and think about new ways of continuing the M&E. It was necessary not only to improve our communication methods but also to evaluate our results addressing the coronavirus pandemic and other problems as equity issues and the connection between local and global changes.” – Isabella Dias, 2021 participant

Professional Background | Regarding the type of organization in which participants work, a substantial share of participants came from UN and UN-specialized (23%) as well as non-governmental organizations (20%). An almost equally large share came from government ministries and agencies (18%). The group of international, regional and multinational organisations and the World Bank Group also made up a large share with around 15%. While some of the participants were self-employed (7%) or worked in private enterprises (4%), smaller portions of participants came from financial institutions, parliaments, foundations and research institutes (see Figure 2).

![Figure 2 – participants' profile | organizational background](image)

Regarding the years of experience in the field of monitoring and evaluation, almost half of participants had less than 5 years of experience (3% with no experience and 45% with 0-5 years). Participants with 5 to 9 years of working experience had a share of 31%, and with those with 10 to 15 years a share of 17% (see Figure 3).

![Figure 3 – participants profile | years of M&E experience](image)
The majority of participants (n=187) were practitioners who design and conduct evaluations (37%) or manage and supervise evaluations (31%). As Figure 4 on the participants’ primary evaluation function shows, a slightly smaller portion was using evaluation results (21%) and only few were involved in teaching or research of M&E (5%) or commissioning (2%). The share of those who had no evaluation function at all was 1%.

Time trends 2019-2021 | For the evaluation of the development of the IPDET program from 2019 until 2021, the different forms of the program have to be considered. In 2019, there was an on-site program in Bern while IPDET was provided fully virtual in 2020 and 2021.

The gender balance of workshop participants, shifted from a slightly female lead (55%) in 2019, to an even distribution of 50% Women (2020) and showed a majority of female participants (61%) in 2021 (see Annex - Figure 34). The distribution of the years of work experience in the field of monitoring and evaluation showed that in 2019 8% of the participants had no evaluation experiences. In comparison, just 3% of the participants in 2020 and 2021 had no experience at all. For all three years, the biggest share of participants had less than 5 years of experience (40% in 2019, 41% in 2020, 45% in 2021). Participants with 5 to 9 years of experience had a share of around 30% (27% in 2019, 28% in 2020, 31% in 2021) and represent the second largest group with regard to the participants work experience (see Annex- Figure 35).

Regarding the main evaluation function, a clear shift towards more evaluation practitioner participants could be observed. The findings show an increase of those who design/ conduct (16% in 2019, 28% in 2020 and 37% in 2021) and a decrease of those who commission evaluations (13% in 2019, 23% in 2020 and 0% in 2021) (see Annex- Figure 36).

In order to assess changes regarding the type of organization from which participants came from, solely the years 2020 and 2021 were compared. IPDET’s organizations category system was aligned in 2020. In both years the largest share of participants was from UN and UN-specialized organizations (26% in 2020 and 23% in 2021), non-governmental organizations (22% in 2020 and 20% in 2021) and from government ministries and agencies (20% in 2020 and 18% in 2021). In contrast to 2020, IPDET 2021 hosted more self-employed and private sector participants (2% to 11%) (see Annex - Figure 37). These results show that IPDET was perceived as important ECD training provider by UN organizations, NGOs and government ministries and agencies.

In 2021, the regional distribution of countries changed according to the GEI regions classifications and is, therefore, not included in the time trend analysis. However, it can be said that 128 participants from developing countries (this equals a share of 63% of all IPDET participants) took part in IPDET 2021. This is slightly higher than the share of the on-site program in 2019 with 57%. The definition of developing country is based on the GEI regions classification, and includes Low-income economies, Lower-middle-income economies and Upper-middle-income economies.
**IPDET Online Workshop Assessment**

**Online Survey Participation |** Out of the total 236 participants in the 10 online workshops, 4 persons dropped out in 2 workshops. The workshop assessment is based on the feedback surveys collected after the online workshops. The mean survey participation rate is 78%.

**Expectation |** The main reason to apply for an IPDET Online Workshop (n=196) was that IPDET was perceived as suitable training for the specific skills and knowledge by participants (44%). Another large share of participants joined because the training had been recommended by others (21%) (see Figure 5).

**Quality and Delivery |** The quality of content was measured by three variables, namely a) content of lectures and presentations, b) usefulness of examples in lectures and presentations, and c) content of small group activities and discussion. The vast majority (n=182, 90%) rated the quality of content as good or excellent.

The quality of methods was measured by five variables, namely a) delivery of lectures and presentations, b) level of interactive participation, c) implementation of small group activities, d) handling of Q&A by the instructor and e) incorporation of interdisciplinary participant’s background. A vast majority (n=182, 86%) rated the quality of methods as good or excellent. See details in Figure 6.
The didactical and organizational structure of the workshops was measured through statements. It was captured by three statements, namely a) the workshop was based on an adequate mix of didactical approaches, b) Throughout the activity there was a good balance between input and discussion and c) The quality of course material was good. The majority rated the didactical structure as good or excellent (n=183, 87%).

Accordingly, the organization regarding the workshops IT infrastructure was measured by the statements d) Collaborative tools have been applied to an adequate extend for interactive participation, e) Zoom was a suitable platform for interactive live sessions and f) the IPDET e-learning platform was easy to navigate. The results indicate that most participants rated the IT infrastructure as good or excellent (n=183, 88%).

Finally, the organizational part of time management was described by g) the management of time-zone differences was handled well and h) the time management during the workshop sessions was handled well. The vast majority of around 92% (n=183/184) assessed the statement as good or excellent. See details in Figure 7.

Personal and professional benefit, enhanced skills | The enhancement of skills through the workshops was measured through the following statements: a) the use for policy making, b) conducting evaluations, c) managing the conduct of evaluations and the use of results for d) program improvement or e) policy making (see Figure 8). The extent to which the workshop has enhanced abilities and competencies was rated with 65% to 73% in the categories considerably and strongly. A breakdown by workshop can be found in the Annex - Figure 39. Regarding the enhancement of skills per workshop, the results reveal that the Workshop on ‘Collecting and managing geo-tagged data for M&E’ reached a high rating on skills enhancement. On the other hand, the workshop on ‘M&E the SDGs’ and ‘Emerging Technologies’ could be improved with regard to the enhancement of skills.
The participants were also asked to what extent they perceived to have benefited personally and professionally from the workshop. 63% - 77% rated the statements as considerably or strongly regarding a) peer expertise sharing, b) applicability to the own work and c) newly acquired thematic expertise. As the agreement to benefits from peer exchange is the weakest, improvement could be made in that regard (see Figure 9).
Instructor assessment | The assessment of the 14 instructors of the IPDET 2021 Online Workshops by their respective workshop participants (n=182, 2 workshops had two or more instructors) confirmed the positive reputation of the IPDET faculty. The statements to characterize the instructors’ expertise were rated with overwhelming 96% (Provision of meaningful feedback) and 97% (Ability to promote and guide discussion and learning) in the categories agree and strongly agree (see Figure 10). Accordingly, the statement on the instructor’s expertise was even rated with 100% positive. A breakup for each single instructor (see Annex – Figure 40) shows that those few neutral or negative assessments apply only to a small share of the instructors.

Overall satisfaction | The overall satisfaction with the workshop was measured in an indirect and direct manner. The indirect question Would you recommend this IPDET workshop to a colleague? was answered to a high degree positively (88%, n=182, see Annex – Figure 41). The direct question How satisfied are you with this workshop overall? yielded the same results with 88% rating their satisfaction as considerably and strongly. A closer look reveals that 3 workshop did not even receive a neutral or negative rating. Additionally, only four workshops received some share of negative assessment (see Figure 11).
A breakdown of the overall satisfaction with regard to the primary evaluation function shows that the few negative voices (overall: 5% rated not at all and 6% rated little) were rather expressed from participants that wanted to use the acquired skills from the workshop for programming (15%) or for designing and conducting evaluations (17%). On the other hand, the data reveals that mainly those who manage or supervise evaluations were fully satisfied with the workshops (see Annex – Figure 42).

Time trend 2019-2021 | Overall, the high recommendation rate of the IPDET program stayed constant over time (see Annex – Figure 43). The share of positive rating on the quality of content and delivery methods increased compared to 2019 from over 60%, to 84% (2020) and to close to 90% (2021). It can be concluded that IPDET’s investments in online didactics were quite successful (see Figure 12).

Most and least useful | 138 comments were received on the participants highlights of their IPDET participation in 2021. With regard to the workshop implementation, the case studies provided by the instructors were mentioned as most useful (11 mentions) Also the explanations and expertise of respective instructor (9 mentions) and the knowledge sharing through group works (8 mentions) were highlighted. Specifically, the demonstrations and use of specific digital tools (e.g. Rapid Pro and R Studio) was recommended (9 mentions). Finally, the knowledge and use of qualitative evaluation methods like process tracing was rated as useful (6 mentions).

As least useful the participants specified problems with the provision of materials (e.g. more background information was requested) (5 mentions). Apart from that, there were issues around peer interaction and group work (5 mentions). Some participants also recommended to practice more with the qualitative evaluation software used in the workshops (e.g. MAXQDA, TextAnalytics) (5 mentions).

Suggestions for topics | 68 suggestions for future topics were submitted. They can be clustered around qualitative evaluation methods (7 mentions), impact evaluation (7 mentions), geo-data collection and analysis (7 mentions), new technology/digital analytics/big data (5 mentions), as well as building and evaluating M&E systems (6 mentions). Further interesting topics included gender-based evaluation (4 mentions) and stakeholder engagement in evaluation (4 mentions).
“I felt it was very interesting, and my expectations was already high, and the content and the instructors as well, they exceeded my expectations. It was very impressive how the workshop combined the practice with theory. This was special.” – Camila Garroux, participant of the IPDET 2021 workshop ‘Digital Analytics for M&E’

3.1.2 IPDET Online Inhouse Trainings

**Fundamentals of Rigorous Impact Evaluation for the African Development Bank** | The workshop for employees of the African Development Bank (AfDB) took part on February 1 to 5 and was conducted by Claudia Maldonado. 24 persons joined and 75% of them participated in the online feedback survey.

Through the survey, the perception on the enhancement of skills through the workshops was measured based on the following statements: a) design high quality evaluations, b) conducting evaluations, c) managing the conduct of evaluations and the d) use of results for program improvement or e) policy making. The extent to which the workshop has enhanced abilities and competencies was rated with 69.2% to 92% in the categories considerably and strongly (see Figure 13).

The participants were also asked to what extent they perceived to have benefited personally and professionally from the workshop. 63% to 78.5% rated the statements as considerably or strongly regarding a) peer expertise sharing, b) applicability to the own work and c) newly acquired thematic expertise. The agreement to benefits from peer-to-peer exchange is the smallest (see annex – Figure 44).

The overall satisfaction with the workshop was measured in an indirect and direct manner. The indirect question *Would you recommend this IPDET workshop to a colleague?* was answered to a high degree positively (88%, see Annex – Figure 45). The direct question *How satisfied are you with this workshop overall?* yielded similar results with 83% rating their satisfaction as considerably and strongly (see Figure 14).

The survey also contained some qualitative feedback text boxes. As highlights, the participants listed the beneficial mix of academic literature, practical examples and know-how from the instructor (3 times mentioned). Additionally, they also positively mentioned the group discussions conducted throughout the workshop (3 times mentioned).

**Theories of Change for INTERPOL** | On November 8 to 10, Reinhard Stockmann and Stefanie Krapp conducted a training for INTERPOL. 29 participants joined and 11 answered the feedback survey. The feedback results (see Figure 15) showed a positive overall rating and 70% assessed the training as very
good and excellent. Additionally, the statements on the usefulness of the course content (72%) and the extent to which the course objectives (90%) were achieved was rated as very good and excellent.

In the qualitative feedback the usefulness of the group works was mentioned for exercising and hands-on practicing (two times mentioned). However, it was recommended to improve the group work in the break out rooms with a moderator for guidance. With regard to workshop topic on Theories of Change the provision of more background information was recommended. Additionally, examples from implementing organisations or the participants work could be considered to improve the workshop.

**Figure 15 – workshop INTERPOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall rating of this course</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of the trainer(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of handouts (if any)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of visual aids</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of course content</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which course objectives were achieved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.3 IPDET Global Outreach Event Series: BETTER POLICY MAKING THROUGH EVALUATIONS - TRAINING FOR PARLIAMENTARIANS IN ASIA PACIFIC

**Overall objective of the Event Series** | Parliamentarians have an important role to play in the field of evaluation: Firstly, they can use evaluations for their decision making and to strengthen their control function. Secondly, they can commission evaluations themselves. And thirdly, they can assign an important role to evaluation within the framework of their legislative competence. In order to be able to use evaluations appropriately, parliamentarians – and also their (research) staff – must know the value of evaluations and potential uses of evaluations for evidence-based policy making.

IPDET together with the Asia Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA), and the Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation (GPFE) organized a virtual **ECD-training for Parliamentarians and Parliament (Research) Staff from the Asia Pacific Region**. This was the very first training offered as part of the IPDET Global Outreach strategy².

The objective of this training was to impart more in-depth evaluation knowledge to Parliamentarians and Parliament (Research) Staff ensuring evaluative evidence in the policy making process.

The training consisted of six virtual sessions held between October and November 2021 and was free of charge. Short theoretical inputs were combined with extensive practical exercises, panel discussions and Q&A-sessions. The participants that fully completed the training received an official certificate and will be eligible to take part in the on-site training event in an Asia Pacific country to be held in 2022.³

---


³ A report with details on the contents will be published soon.
Target groups

- Parliamentarians from the APEA-member countries
- (Research) Staff of parliamentarians and parliaments from the APEA-member countries
- Further interested people in the topic (e.g. VOPE leaders)

Implementing partners | The Asia Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA)\(^4\) is a non-profit, impartial organization that aims to improve the theory, practice and use of evaluation across the Asia-Pacific region. It advocates building of capacity among individual evaluators, institutions and organizations representing Asia Pacific countries – as it advances the principles of transparency, accountability, and learning toward a just and progressive society. Within the framework of the Event Series, APEA supported the IPDET team in all organizational tasks, like promoting the Event Series towards the target groups, administration of applications, follow-up of participants, support in delivering the virtual sessions. Furthermore, their representatives participated as moderators and speakers in the virtual sessions. On the other hand, the Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation (GPFE)\(^5\) is a collaborative movement of international parliamentarians, committed to improving policy outcomes and social accountability, that advocates for evidence-based decision making. It encourages policy makers and evaluation professionals to work together to build evaluation capacities around the world. Within the framework of the Event Series, GPFE especially supported the promotion of the Event Series towards the target groups and their representatives participated as speakers in the virtual sessions.

On-site event in 2022 in an APEA-member country | Based on the experiences and results from the virtual delivery of the first ever IPDET Global Outreach activity, a follow-on on-site event will be delivered in the second half of 2022. The objective of this on-site event is to deepen the newly acquired knowledge of participants in the field of M&E as well as to offer networking opportunities, where participants can meet and interact with each other.

**IPDET Global Outreach Event Series Participant Profiles**

Participant’s background | In total 263 people applied for the events series, from whom the organization team selected 79 participants. 63 of them participated in all the six virtual sessions and received an official certificate. These figures show a very high interest in and demand for ECD-training within the Asia-Pacific region, which IPDET met with its Event Series. The majority of these participants were Parliament (Research) Staff (n=46), followed by Parliamentarians (n=15), as well as Government officials (n=2). The gender distribution was 40% women, and 60% men participating in the Event Series. Participants came from

---

\(^4\) Official homepage: [https://www.asiapacificficeval.org/whatwedo](https://www.asiapacificficeval.org/whatwedo).

\(^5\) Official homepage: [https://gpffe.org/](https://gpffe.org/)
15 countries (see Illustration 5; Australia, Bhutan, Cambodia, Fiji, India, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Vanuatu).

“We were able to get the opportunity to study with well-trained and highly qualified professionals. And also we comprehensively evaluated programs and projects of other countries.” – Ayesha Godgama, Global Outreach 2021 participant

The survey data shows that with around two thirds the majority of participants had only little previous knowledge of up to three years in the field of M&E (see Figure 16). This is a clear indicator of the relevance of the Event Series offered, with the objective raising awareness among and offering professional ECD-trainings for parliaments in the Asia-Pacific region.

Advertisement by ‘word of mouth’ was crucial in spreading information about the events series (see Figure 17). The majority of participants were informed about the Event Series by colleagues (n=27) but also approached directly by APEA/GPFE/IPDET (n=10). Less importance had the information channels website, newsletter and social media.
IPDET Global Outreach Event Series Assessment

Overall satisfaction and delivery of the events series I The survey answers indicate an extraordinarily high satisfaction with the Event Series: Around 90% (n=35) indicate a considerable or strong satisfaction (see Figure 18). No one indicated that (s)he was not satisfied at all with the Event Series.

This high satisfaction is also reflected by the fact that all respondents would possibly, probably or definitely recommend the event series to other (see Annex - Figure 46).

Content and methods I Overall, with view on the quality and delivery of the events series, every item was rated as either good or excellent by more than 70%; four out the seven items with around or more than 90% (see Figure 19). Improvements can be made regarding interactional elements, which can be seen in the results of the items ‘content of group work and discussion’ and ‘level of interactive participation’ with two/three poor ratings.
The same positive feedback can be stated for the didactical and organizational structure. Every item (except for ‘Zoom was a suitable platform for interactive live sessions’) was rated with around or more than 85% being good or excellent (see Figure 20). Again, interactional elements received some rather negative assessments (item ‘Throughout the activities, there was a good balance between input and discussion’).

Ultimately, the instructors also received strong positive feedback. None of the items received a negative rating and every item was rated with around/more than 90% being positive (see Figure 21). In particular, respondents agree that the instructors possess a strong expertise in their field.

Within the open text fields and also during the short interviews, further comments were made by respondents:

- Some of the sessions were seen as rather one way-lectures with little space to interact with the instructors, panelists, country experts and/or to treat every question raised by participants. This is crucial, when it comes to concrete practical questions, e.g. how to incorporate lessons learnt from evaluations in the parliamentary work and therefore, the daily work of participants, mainly in the oversight and lawmaking process.
- The inputs, events series materials, panel discussions as well as country examples were seen as very enlightening and value adding – both content-wise as well as from a didactical perspective. Some respondents stated, that it would have been useful, to get prior reading materials to prepare for the sessions.
- The same can be stated for the work on case studies during the second session, which gave participants the opportunity for practical work and apply their new knowledge step by step. Furthermore, they were seen as adapted to the local contexts’ participants were coming from. Some – more experienced – participants, however, found practical country examples not going far enough and/or that they received too few time to work on them.
Service and Information | The service and information provided by the APEA/GPFE/IPDET organization team was rated as extraordinary positive. All items were rated with more than 95% being positive (see Figure 22). None of the items was assessed with a negative rating.

Personal Take-away | Besides the assessment of the delivery and organization, the personal take-aways and newly acquired knowledge are of special importance for the evaluation of the Event Series. Parliamentarians and Parliament (Research) Staff usually do not conduct evaluations by themselves, but rather use evaluation results for their own work. Therefore, it was a special objective of the Event Series to raise awareness regarding this aspect and teach participants how to ‘think evaluative’.

With view on the results of the survey this objective has been fulfilled: More than 80% (n=32) considerably or strongly agree, that the training enhanced their abilities to ‘Use results for program improvement’, and more than 70% (n=29) to ‘Use results for policy making’ (see Figure 23).

It is therefore also of utmost importance, that almost 80% (n=31) of respondents indicate, that the new knowledge is considerably or strongly ‘applicable to [their] own work’ which is crucial for being
used in daily practice (see Figure 24). Around 70% (n=30) also agree, that they ‘acquired new thematic expertise in the field’ in a considerable or strong way.

Figure 24 – To what extent did you personally and professionally benefit from the Event Series?

Within the open text fields of the survey and the short interviews respondents mentioned some further relevant take-aways and application fields of their newly gained knowledge:

- Many participants found it very useful, to get explanations of the fundamental evaluation aspects presented during the inputs and the possibility to apply them during the group works (e.g. perspectives, concepts, standards or utility of evaluation). With this, they gained relevant M&E-knowledge and more confidence on the guiding principles of evaluation and how evaluations can support their daily work.
- How to ‘think evaluatively’ was mentioned several times, which was the clear aim of the Event Series to raise awareness within the group of participants. Many participants feel now more confident with evaluation and how to identify and raise appropriate evaluative questions.
- Furthermore, this ability gives them also the opportunity to provide and/or analyze relevant information in a more proper way than before, to work more efficient and effective in different areas, like analyzing (progress) reports of projects/programs/bills, budget research, drafting of and/or final decision making on new laws. Some participants also stated that they will share the training materials with other people in their organizations/institutions, which goes beyond the solely individual capacity development and may lead to a further organizational development.

3.2 Component 2: Build a community of evaluation stakeholders at the global level

3.2.1 IPDET Community Building

IPDET Community Building – what and why | Community Building is the active creation and maintenance of a community that has a connection through local conditions, interests or teaching faculties. There are many different kinds of communities. For IPDET, the connection is participating in, cooperating, or working with IPDET as well as the overall interest in evaluation.

Our main goal of engaging in active community building is to strengthen the IPDET community with its around 4,000 members and to contribute to the further development of the field of evaluation. The IPDET community is intended to be a place of mutual learning and belonging. It is unique in the sense that people from all over the world, representing all kinds of organizations and job positions are united.
We feel we have a responsibility to utilize this asset to achieve an added value for those participating in our activities and in the long run for the international evaluation community.

The Process of developing a strategy and measures | To develop an IPDET community building strategy and derive relevant measures, the IPDET team engaged in a joint process guided by the Design Thinking Expert Marlene Hennicke. Design Thinking is a creative and open-minded problem-solving method. It is user-centered, multidisciplinary and iterative. The detailed description of the process and its results can be found in the IPDET Community Building Strategy Plan. In the following, a brief overview is provided. The process followed the Design Thinking Method (see Illustration 6).

In the first phase, the problem was defined by making assumptions about the needs of the target groups: IPDET alumni want to expand their know-how, seek for recognition, meet people and be part of a community. ‘Users’ (personas) were created, which are examples of individual groups with their characteristics, wishes and pain points.

The second phase was about finding the needs. Therefore, interviews with IPDET alumni have been conducted. Based on the interview results, the team created ‘How might we…?’ - questions to set a focus for the further process.

In phase three, the ideation, meaning the finding and creation of ideas to solve the ‘How might we...?’ – questions happened. The first question was ‘How can we help the general user to exchange information / experiences and to put what they have learned into practice? The second question was ‘How can we make the IPDET community tangible for general users?’ Ideas and solutions to both questions were collected and presented to alumni who beforehand participated in the interviews. The goal was to get an insight of which ideas suit the needs of the alumni best and why. Furthermore, a short survey was carried out to get insights of the potential use of the ideas from the IPDET alumni. Based on the results of the interviews and the survey, some ideas were preselected.

In phase four the results of the second interviews, the survey and the preselected ideas were compared and prioritized. For the four most prioritized ideas prototypes were started to be created. In this creation process the features, pain relievers and gain creators (features that create an additional gain) were investigated. Subsequently a business model with important information like resources and implementation structures was considered. These steps are the basis to create a concrete prototype.

In the current phase five, the testing, feedback on the prototypes (Mini Series - Tools, M&E Clinic, Meeting Monday, IPDET CoSMOS) will be gained to improve them and to decide which ideas will be a integral part of the annual planning.

3.2.2. Community Building activities

E-Learning-Platform | In 2021 the ipdet.org platform has been developed, enriched with new functions and its usability was improved. This Customer-Relationship-Management (CRM) system is used to manage IPDET ‘s application process as well as the facilitation of the workshops. For workshop facilitation, the ipdet.org platform was also improved. The eLearning Courses Section provides a
platform for the workshops and its participants that can be used before, during and after the workshops. Following a new structure of the standardized logic for all workshops, documents like videos, literature and slides are shared with the participants and quizzes can be integrated for better learning. Additionally, it is also used for communication purposes in the IPDET workshops. Therefore, it contains social components like chats and forums which ease the exchange of instructors, the participants and the IPDET staff.

**IPDET CoSMOS** | The ‘IPDET Community server – memorable online Society’ is a platform with the goal to bring IPDET alumni and other individuals together. It is a place to meet, learn and for exchange. It offers the opportunity to join in different channels with a voice and text chat as well as the option to share their screen or turn on a camera. Each channel has its own topic. Therefore, the members can meet for informal as well as formal needs. This platform is created with Discord.

“Many congratulations for 20 years! I feel so fortunate being a participant of IPDET 2012. It was great training in evaluation and management, which helped a lot in my professional career. I appreciate and wish to thank IPDET for training the M&E people over the world.” – Birthday congratulations by Narayan Gyawali

**Kick-Off Event** | The 90 minutes online Kick-Off Event on April 13 officially opened the IPDET program year in 2021. Everyone was invited to participate and it started with a short introduction about IPDET. Followed by an icebreaker, in which the participants had the opportunity to say hello in their own language. A dynamic overview of the program year was presented, including workshop pitches and the upcoming Global Outreach activities. At the end of the event all participants jointly cut a red ribbon to mark the start of the 2021 program. 47 individuals participated at the Kick-Off Event.

**Closing Event** | The 60 minutes online Closing Event on November 16 officially closed the IPDET program year by reflecting on the various IPDET activities in 2021 with a focus on the first IPDET Global Outreach activity and the ongoing process of community building. Subsequently there was a short preview of the IPDET 2022 program year. At the end, the IPDET 20th anniversary video was presented with wishes and greetings submitted by the IPDET founders, funders, supporters, instructors and alumni. This last IPDET event was attended by 33 individual persons.

**Social Events** | In 2021 IPDET offered for the first time 2 online events for workshop participants for social gathering to connect them beyond the workshops. The events took place on July 5 and October 28. Both events where co-planned and moderated by two e-didactic experts from conex. During the event the participants had the opportunity to meet and greet in small groups. In the first event participants could exchange M&E offers and needs. In the second event they shared events which will take place in 2022 and created evaluation memes in small groups.

**Webinar on the UN Food Summit Systems** | In these two 60 minutes webinars on July 15 and 16, 2021, Michael Quinn Patton informed about the upcoming global Food Systems Summit in September 2021 and how individuals can engage beforehand in dialogues on issues related to food and agriculture hosted by various countries. He said: “There are opportunities for evaluators anywhere and everywhere in the world to bring evaluative thinking into these dialogues and influence the Summit.” Participants in the webinars found out how to do so and why it matters.
**IPDET Meeting Monday** | The Meeting Monday is a regular themed meeting. The topics have a wide range with a focus on the evaluation field. Each meeting can be more informal or formal, but within the meeting there might be a mix of both. Participants can bring own topics and vote on proposed topics. The goal of these Meeting Mondays is to create space for the participants to come together. IPDET provides the place and creates a meeting with the wished topics. Participants can then explore its contents with their own experiences, exchange material, ideas and know-how. It is further a place for social gathering. In 2021 one Meeting Monday on “Reduce Food Waste” took place on the IPDET CoSMOS.

**How is everything connected** | All IPDET offers are well connected (see Illustration 8). The key point is the IPDET website with its integrated e-learning platform. This can be used for the online as well as the on-site program in Bern. Persons of interest mostly visit the website as first contact, from which they are informed about all other offers. The e-learning platform is used during the workshops as described above. Furthermore, participants of the workshops are invited to join the IPDET CoSMOS and the social events for meet & greet.

All offers can be connected to the CoSMOS, either because it is executed on this platform or the participants are invited to join the CoSMOS. The Meeting Monday takes place on the CoSMOS. There is the opportunity, to also host the Social Events there. As mentioned, the CoSMOS leads back to the website and e-learning platform due to information and linking. Reasons could be joint working on workshop tasks, workshop application and more.

The connection between the Meeting Monday and the Social Events goes both ways due to the opportunity to invite participants to join the opposite event (promotion).
3.3 Component 3: Project Management, Implementation, and Evaluation

3.3.1 Communication and Marketing

**Newsletter** | In December 2021, the subscription number was 3,818 in total. This is a gain of around 650 (20%) subscribers compared to March 2021 with 3,166 subscribers. The average opening\(^6\) rate is stable at 40%.

**Listserv** | Graduates of this year’s program could subscribe to the alumni mailing list by clicking on a link in the follow-up email after the workshop. 89 out of the 207 (unique) workshop participants i.e. 40% signed up through the listserv subscription page. In total, the IPDET listserv currently holds 3,784 members of which 379 bounce back due to invalid mails addresses.

**Homepage** | Overall, around 16,400 unique users visited the page between March 1 and December 1, 2021. Approx. 3,200 of those visited the website more than once or even frequently.

Peaks in the website traffic per week occurred at the Kick-Off Event and the upload of the Kick-Off Event recording in April (see Figure 26). Further positive access peaks can be found during May until scholarship application ended on June 1, and between July 18-24. This is probably due to the first Social Event on July 5.

Regarding the **location of users** (Figure 28), the majority of website visitors came from North American and European countries. Under the top-ranking countries also India, China, some African countries and South Korea were listed.

The **pages** with the highest number of visitors can be seen in Figure 27.

---

\(^6\) Average opening rate represents the percent of openings, comparing all newsletters and taking the audience size into account. This information is provided by mailchimp.
**First contact** | In the workshop feedback survey respondents (n=203) noted where they first heard about IPDET. For the majority (53%), IPDET was recommended by a colleague or employer. The social media channels Twitter, LinkedIn and Facebook played an important role (15%). Recommendations by IPDET alumni led to 8% of the participants. An equal amount of participants indicated that they received an email forwarded through their organization’s mailing list (8%). In comparison, other emails like regional evaluation association list and other mailing lists resulted in 4% - 6% of the participation. Pro-active internet search is only represented by 3%.

**First contact homepage** | Five main channels on how visitors find the website are distinguished (see Figure 29). The most prominent channel is the direct click, which in general indicates visits where users navigated directly to the URL (or the source of the visit is unknown). The second largest share of visitors came through organic search, which indicates visits from organic (unpaid) search results for example through Google and other search engines. A similar share was forwarded through links that were placed in social media networks (Twitter, LinkedIn, Facebook). A smaller amount came by referral, which are links placed on other homepages (excluding major search engines). A small part was traffic from links clicked in email messages (IPDET newsletter, forwarded newsletter, individual messages, etc).

**Social Media** | On the three platforms (Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter), up to 22 posts had been published per month, which at peak time in April gained up to 44,000 impressions on twitter. Over the period from March 1 – Dec 1, 2021, IPDET gained an average of 27% new followers on the social media channels (Figure 31). Followers are individuals that subscribed in a channel. Therefore, they get a notification if IPDET shares information on this channel. It also shows the persons interest in IPDET.

If we compare the different campaigns to promote the various IPDET activities and scholarship opportunities based on the overall page impressions (in relation to the number of posts), we see that most of the communication campaigns, like Scholarship Application (18%) and Meet the IPDET Faculty (17%), are equally popular (see Figure 30). Only the campaigns reminder to apply for workshops (9%) and the posts within the Community Building development (11%) gained considerably less impressions.
“These learnings will open up a wider and more exciting horizon for me, I will be able to discuss the use of quantitative back evaluation as commissioner to get much more impact from the intervention.” – Mamiseheno Rasolofonirina, participant of the IPDET 2021 workshop ‘Fundamentals of Rigorous Impact Evaluation’

3.3.2. Stakeholder mapping

Partner and Stakeholder | The IPDET Online Program 2021 was implemented by the joint effort of various stakeholders who are displayed in Illustration 9. The IPDET partner institutions (University of Bern, Center for Evaluation, IEG) held monthly Steering Group meetings to take strategic decisions on budget, contents and the further development of IPDET, and to oversee the implementation of the program. The Advisory Board provides the IPDET management with independent expertise and high-quality advice to maintain the cutting-edge and highly relevant character of the training program. In 2021, it met once to provide input and feedback on community building. The dedicated staff under the leadership of the Head of Program organized all events. External consultants supported the outreach and facilitated events. The Community Building was supported by the Design Thinking Expert Marlene Hennicke and two digital didactic trainers from conex, Merle Elsner and Philipp Busch. For the Kick-Off and Closing event, a wide range of speakers gave valuable inputs, and 14 instructors conducted the 10 online workshops, supported by 6 facilitators. For its first Global Outreach event IPDET cooperated with the Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation (GPFE) and the Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA). For the Online Workshop implementation, the trainers of conex also guided the instructors in setting up their online workshops and creating the E-Learning Platform for the workshop documentation. The fully-fledged interactive e-platform which serves the needs for customer relations management, community building as well as e-learning was implemented in the first quarter of 2021 in cooperation with Kevin Leicht, Finnto GmbH.

Funding of GEI enabled the implementation of the Global Outreach Event Series, the development of the Community Building strategy and its activities, the further development of the e-Platform, as well as the awarding of 80 scholarships for the IPDET Online Workshops.
D) Conclusions and recommendations

IPDET Online Workshops

In 2021, IPDET successfully implemented 10 Online Workshops. This strengthened the prominence of IPDET as global Evaluation Capacity Development provider and as platform for peer-to-peer learning between individuals from around the globe and for knowledge sharing.

The Online Workshops received high applications numbers for most of the workshops and had very low dropout rates. In comparison to the on-site program, the 2021 online program had the advantage of enabling participants to be led by topic interest alone without the logistical constraints of organizing or financing any travel. The participants’ profile showed a diverse and global audience. 63% of the 203 participants were from developing countries. However, there was a large share of evaluators from Europe and North America. Apart from that, around two thirds of all participants worked in their evaluation function as hands-on practitioners or managers in the field of evaluation. The perception of IPDET as excellent training provider for skills and knowledge development is the main driver behind participant’s selection of IPDET.

Overall, the quality of content and methods, as well as didactics, received very good ratings. Additionally, the share of positive ratings on the quality of content and delivery methods increased from 2019 to 2021. IPDET’s investments in digital didactics of an online training format have been proven successful. Furthermore, the high reputation of the IPDET faculty was fully approved. For future topics, participants showed great interest in the provision of workshops about hands-on practice of qualitative evaluation methods, cutting-edge insights on new technologies in the field of digital analytics and big data, rigorous impact evaluation or M&E systems. On the other hand, the online format posed clear limitations to networking, peer-learning, exchange and knowledge sharing. These purposes persist as essential advantage of the on-site format. From these evaluation results of the Online Workshops, the following recommendations can be derived:

1. IPDET should further develop the online formats as an integral part of future IPDET programs. These should be continuously improved, the quality increased and the didactics tailored to the necessities of e-learning. Additionally, an innovative diversification of the workshop formats in terms of target groups, size, timing, duration and interaction should be considered.

2. IPDET should identify an adequate mix of online and on-site formats for the next year’s programs. This combination can be as well beneficial for IPDET’s Global Outreach activities. Topics need to be carefully defined for the online and on-site delivery. Additionally, IPDET should identify blended-workshop formats, taken into account the growing fatigue in pure virtual learning as well as the added value of these formats.

3. The increase of self-employed participants or attendants from private enterprises in IPDET trainings shows that this target group needs more attention and should be addressed with specialized ECD offers in the future.

4. Together with GEI, IPDET should try to further diversify the IPDET community. A combination of online and on-site formats can be beneficial in that regard, as well as the continuation of scholarship options, Global Outreach activities, and community building events.
IPDET, as core GEI partner, should further contribute to achieving the GEI objectives, sharpen the unique profile of IPDET and identify synergies in cooperation with various organizations and partners.

In order to strengthen evaluation capacities within organizations (bi- and multilateral development organizations, NGOs, partners, etc.), as well as to identify cooperation options, tailored inhouse trainings for target institutions should be fostered.

**Global Outreach Event Series**

The IPDET Global Outreach training ‘BETTER POLICY-MAKING THROUGH EVALUATIONS – TRAINING FOR PARLIAMENTS IN ASIA PACIFIC 2021’ was the first ever activity within the framework of the IPDET Global Outreach strategy. The events series was realized in cooperation with the Asia Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA), and the Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation (GPFE).

The relevance and also the demand for such trainings was clearly proven by the very high application number as well as number of awarded participants of this first IPDET Global Outreach Event Series. This shows the strong interest as well as the enormous willingness of Parliamentarians and Parliament (Research) Staff – at least in the Asia-Pacific region – to deal with the topic of evaluative evidence and to apply it in the policy-making process. It shows further, that IPDET was able to offer a tailored Event Series, focusing on the needs of this specific audience of Parliamentarians and Parliamentary staff.

With view on the implementation and delivery of the Event Series, the strong positive feedback of respondents proved their satisfaction with it. This applies not only to the content, teaching fundamental aspects of evaluation (e.g. perspectives, concepts, standards or utility of evaluation) and didactical methods, but also – and this is of special importance – the take-aways and possible application fields in daily work. The goal to convince and equip participants with knowledge and skills to use evaluative evidence in the policy-making process was highly achieved, as participants feel now more confident with fundamental aspects of evaluation (e.g. perspectives, concepts, standards or utility of evaluation) and how to identify and raise appropriate evaluative questions. This will give them the opportunity to work more efficiently and effectively in areas like analyzing (progress) reports of projects/programs/bills, budget research, drafting of and/or final decision-making on new laws.

Eventually, the cooperation between IPDET, APEA and GPFE proved its importance with view on two main aspects: First, regarding all organization and administrative tasks in delivering the training. Second, further positioning IPDET as a professional and highly relevant provider of trainings in the field of evaluation. All this is in line with both, the IPDET mission, ‘establishing strategic partnerships to build a global, inclusive, multidisciplinary community committed to evaluative evidence improving development outcomes’, as well as this of GEI, to ‘create a world where evidence is used to increase transparency and make better decisions to improve lives’.

From these evaluation results of the events series, the following recommendations can be derived:

IPDET Global outreach activities should further focus on trainings for Parliamentarians and Parliament (Research) Staff:

- For Asia-Pacific the training should be continued and further developed in cooperation with APEA and GPFE:
  - The goal is a broadening and expansion of the topics, from mostly awareness raising to competent application and use. Contents shall focus especially on practice-orientated aspects of Parliamentarians and Parliament (Research) Staff work. This can be done for example by including self-selected case examples of participants, to create even more clarity on the content taught and to raise utility.
To gain an even greater impact and to guarantee better networking and interaction opportunities, this should be done in an on-site training in an Asia-Pacific country.

- To further raise awareness about evaluation among Parliamentarians and Parliament (Research) Staff worldwide, this training series should be also delivered in other regions. This goes hand-in-hand with an expansion to other implementing partners.
- From a more strategic perspective, it is also important to focus on the further mainstreaming of M&E in overlying parliamentary structures, which goes beyond solely individual trainings. It is of utmost importance to show ways, how participants can not only apply their new knowledge within their daily work, but also how they can create evaluative structures within their countries.

Of special importance was the cooperation with APEA and GPFE as regional and thematical partners. This kind of cooperation proved its worth in organizing and delivering the Event Series and should serve as a best-practice example applied for further IPDET Global Outreach trainings.

Community Building activities and Communication
In its new Component 2 IPDET went through a Design Thinking process to create new innovative ways of community engagement, developed a community building strategy, and implemented a set of activities. The goal was to strengthen and activate the IPDET community with its around 4,000 members and to be a place of mutual learning and of belonging. To provide these exchange opportunities the virtual collaboration platform consisting of the IPDET homepage, the E-Learning platform and the IPDET CoSMOS were developed.

Additionally, IPDET successfully improved its marketing capacities in promoting its offers via social media, and the Newsletter. The number of customer contacts increased on most of these platforms. Beside IPDET’s online communication, the recommendations by colleagues or employers were the best-functioning marketing channels.

The community building strategy should be gradually implemented in an ongoing process, which will continue for IPDET to update its community offers dependent on the community needs.

The IPDET workshop feedback as well as the interviews conducted during the community building process show the importance of IPDET Alumni and other interested individuals as source of evaluation knowledge. With their diverse evaluation experiences, international working backgrounds as well as technical expertise, people are willing to collaborate, deepen knowledge sharing and to engage in peer-to-peer learning. This asset should be increasingly integrated in IPDET community activities.

Based on the IPDET communication channels and the knowledge about the wishes and needs of the community, IPDET should specify its offer for the different target groups more precisely and sharpen outreach efforts based on the demanded contents and participant profiles. This applies especially for the IPDET Newsletter, which could be conducted topic specific.
E) Annex

A) Further Graphs IPDET Online Workshops

Evaluation Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Topic</th>
<th>Participation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory-based causal analysis</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting and managing geo-tagged data for M&amp;E,...</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 on Meta-Evaluation</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essentials of theory-based evaluation</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging technology and its use in Monitoring,...</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National evaluation systems in the public service</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital analytics for Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluating the SDGs</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Marble Evaluation</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals of rigorous impact evaluation</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 31 – Workshop | Feedback survey participation rate

Participant Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 32 – Workshop | gender distribution
### Figure 33 – Workshop Job positions of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Asia and the Pacific</strong></td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korea, Rep.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe and Central Asia</strong></td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan/Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia (North)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional total</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yemen, Rep.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Bank &amp; Gaza (Palestinian Terr.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Regional total</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Regional total</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Regional total</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-saharan Africa</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congo, Democratic Republic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ivory Coast (Cote d'Ivoire)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Tomé and Príncipe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>229</strong></td>
<td><strong>155</strong></td>
<td><strong>203</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Workshop | 2019, 2020, 2021 (High-Income Economies in bold; Frequencies)

**Time Trends 2019 – 2021**

2021 (n=202) | 61 | 39
2020 (n=148) | 50 | 50
2019 (n=155) | 55 | 45

0% female | 50% male | 100% not disclose

Figure 34 – time trend | Gender (%)

2021 (n=198) | 3 | 45 | 31 | 17 | 4
2020 (n=150) | 3 | 41 | 28 | 22 | 7
2019 (n=145) | 8 | 40 | 27 | 17 | 8

0% none | 50% less than 5 years | 100% more than 15 years

Figure 35 – time trend | M&E experience (%)
Figure 36 – time trend | Evaluation Function (%)

Figure 37 – time trend | Organization (%)
Workshop assessment

Figure 38 – Enhanced Skills per workshop (without percentage values)

Figure 39 – Personal and professional benefit per workshop (without percentage values)
Figure 40 – Instructor assessment

- 41 -

Figure 41 – Satisfaction | Would you recommend this IPDET workshop to a colleague?
Figure 42 – Satisfaction | per primary evaluation function

- Teach or research (N=2): 3% not at all, 49% little, 49% somewhat, considerably, strongly
- Use results for program (N=37): 5% not at all, 10% little, 25% somewhat, 15% considerably, 45% strongly
- Manage or supervise (N=40): 25% not at all, 75% slightly
- Design and conduct (N=35): 17% not at all, 17% little, 67% somewhat
- Commission (n=2): 4% not at all, 15% little, 46% somewhat, 35% considerably

Time trends 2019 - 2021

- 2021 (N=182): 1% definitely not, 2% probably not, 12% maybe, 17% very likely, 69% definitely
- 2020 (N=161): 2% definitely not, 4% probably not, 11% maybe, 16% very likely, 68% definitely
- 2019 (N=99): 1% definitely not, 15% probably not, 17% maybe, 65% very likely

Figure 43 – time trend | Would you recommend IPDET to a colleague?
B) Further Graphs Fundamentals of Rigorous Impact Evaluation for the AfDB

**Workshop assessment**

During the workshop I benefited from the experiences of the people in my peer group.

- 41.2%
- 41.2%
- 17.6%

The knowledge I acquired is applicable to my own work.

- 17.6%
- 47.1%
- 29.4%

I acquired new thematic expertise in the field.

- 12.5%
- 75.0%
- 12.5%

**Figure 44 - Workshop AfDB I Benefit**

---

**Figure 45 - Workshop AfDB I Recommend**

---

C) Further Graphs IPDET Global Outreach Event Series

**Workshop assessment**

Would you recommend this event series to others?

- 3%
- 4%
- 32%

**Figure 46 – Would you recommend this event series to others?**
Program of the IPDET Global Outreach Event Series:

Organization team

✓ Asela Kalugampitiya: President of Sri Lanka Evaluation Association and Asia Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA)
✓ Hasithi Samarasinghe: Co-Leader EvalYouth Sri Lanka
✓ Laszlo Szentmarjay: IPDET Global Outreach coordinator
✓ Randika de Mel: Co-Leader EvalYouth Asia and EvalYouth Sri Lanka
✓ Reinhard Stockmann – Founder and Director of Center of Evaluation (CEval) at Saarland University and Member of the Steering Group of the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET)
✓ Stefanie Krapp: Head of Program – International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET)

Format and content

The event series covered six virtual sessions in 2021.

Session 1: Use of evaluations for political steering and participation of society
18th October 2021, 90 mins., open for all applicants

The main question of the first session ‘Use of evaluations for political steering and participation of society’ was to what extent evaluations can support the work of parliamentarians. This was answered by a short input of Prof. Reinhard Stockmann and further be illustrated by means of practical examples from Kyrgyzstan, Sri Lanka and Uganda.

Resource Person:

✓ Reinhard Stockmann – Founder and Director of Center of Evaluation (CEval) at Saarland University and Member of the Steering Group of the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET)

Speakers:

✓ Alison Evans: Director General Evaluation, Vice President, Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), World Bank Group
✓ Asela Kalugampitiya: President of Sri Lanka Evaluation Association and Asia Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA)
✓ Kabir Hashim: Member of Parliament in Sri Lanka and Co-Founder and Chair of the Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation (GPFE)
✓ Stefanie Krapp: Head of Program – International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET)

Panelists:

✓ Josephine Watera (Uganda): Head of M&E Unit, Parliament of Uganda
✓ Kabir Hashim (Sri Lanka): Member of Parliament of Sri Lanka and Co-Founder and Chair of the Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation (GPFE)
✓ Natalia Nikitenko (Kyrgyz Republic): Member of Parliament of Kyrgyzstan, Chair of the Eurasian Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation and member of the Global Parliamentarians Forum (GPFE) Steering Committee

Recordings are available: https://ipdet.org/global-outreach/better-policy-making-through-evaluations/.
Session 2: Introduction to fundamentals of M&E
26th-28th October 2021, 3 x 120 mins., open only for selected participants

These three sessions gave a further as well as deeper insight into the fundamentals of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and the special role which M&E can play for policy making.

The sessions were guided by Prof. Reinhard Stockmann and consisted of theoretical input, Q&A-sessions and extensive group works, in which participants were able to deepen their new knowledge on concrete project case studies with questions on the different analytical perspective evaluations can have, which evaluation criteria can be used and also how to formulate adequate evaluation questions – and therefore, how to ‘think evaluative’.

Resource Person:
✓ Reinhard Stockmann – Founder and Director of Center of Evaluation (CEval) at Saarland University and Member of the Steering Group of the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET)

Tutors:
✓ Asela Kalugampitiya: President of Sri Lanka Evaluation Association and Asia Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA)
✓ Hasithi Samarasinghe: Co-Leader EvalYouth Sri Lanka
✓ Laszlo Szentmarjay: IPDET Global Outreach coordinator
✓ Randika de Mel: Co-Leader EvalYouth Asia and EvalYouth Sri Lanka

Session 3: Challenges in evaluating SDGs
2nd November 2021, 90 mins., open for all applicants

In his theoretical input, Prof. Wolfgang Meyer from Saarland University draw the attention to three main challenges in the framework of sustainable development – System Integration, System Change and Inclusiveness – and how National Monitoring and Evaluation Systems might accompany the resolution of these challenges. Besides that, the participants were able to get deeper insights into country experiences from Costa Rica, India, the Philippines and Sri Lanka.

Resource Person:
✓ Prof. Wolfgang Meyer: Deputy Director of Center of Evaluation (CEval) at Saarland University and Member of the Steering Group of the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET)

Country example experts:
✓ María del Pilar Garrido Gonzalo (Costa Rica): Minister of Planning and Economic Policy, Republic of Costa Rica, and Coordinator of the Technical Secretarial of the National Commission of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)
✓ Dr. Shweta Sharma (India): Development, Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO) at NITI Aayog | Govt. of India

Panelists:
✓ Mylvaganam Thilakarajah (Sri Lanka): Treasurer of the Sri Lanka Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation (SLFPE) and former member of Parliament of Sri Lanka
✓ Dr. Romulo E.M. Miral, Jr. (Philippines): Director General of the Congressional Policy and Budget Research Department, House of Representatives of the Philippines
Session 4: closing ceremony

11th November 2021, 60 mins., open for all applicants

In addition to the formulation of take-home-messages of the event by Prof. Dr. Stockmann, the awarding of certificates to 63 participants from 15 countries was the focus of the event. Furthermore, the participants had the opportunity to establish contacts with each other in a virtual speed networking session. Finally, an outlook on the IPDET program 2022 was given.

Speakers:

✓ Asela Kalugampitiya: President of Sri Lanka Evaluation Association and Asia Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA)
✓ Dugan Fraser: Program Manager of Global Evaluation Initiative (GEI)
✓ Kabir Hashim: Member of Parliament in Sri Lanka and Co-Founder and Chair of the Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation (GPFE)
✓ Marco Segone: Director Evaluation Office, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)
✓ Reinhard Stockmann – Founder and Director of Center of Evaluation (CEval) at Saarland University and Member of the Steering Group of the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET)
✓ Stefanie Krapp: Head of Program – International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET)
### D) IPDET Results Framework

#### Development Objective Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Name</th>
<th>Baseline (2019/20)</th>
<th>Current Progress (2021)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of IPDET’s training participants that provide positive feedback on training relevance, quality and knowledge acquired.</td>
<td>The indicator will be comprised of three separate data points of indicator a,b,c (line 13,18,23)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The indicator will be comprised of three separate data points of indicator a,b,c (line 13,18,23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Percentage of training participants that provide positive feedback on knowledge acquired.</td>
<td>73 Online Workshops: 77% Global Outreach: 75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>End Target: 80 75 (in 2022); 77 (in 2023); 80 (in 2024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Percentage of IPDET’s training participants that provide positive feedback on training relevance.</td>
<td>66 Online Workshops: 74% Global Outreach: 80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>End Target: 70 67 (in 2022); 68 (in 2023); 70 (in 2024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Percentage of IPDET’s training participants that provide positive feedback on training quality.</td>
<td>83 Online Workshop: 88% Global Outreach: 80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>End Target: 85 83 (in 2022); 84 (in 2023); 85 (in 2024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of IPDET community members surveyed who give positive feedback on knowledge sharing events and report broadening their perspectives</td>
<td>0.00 As no community building events have been delivered so far there are no baseline data available.</td>
<td></td>
<td>End Target: 80 60 (in 2022); 70 (in 2023); 80 (in 2024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Percentage of IPDET community members surveyed who give positive feedback on knowledge sharing events.</td>
<td>0.00 As no community building events have been delivered there are no baseline data available.</td>
<td>In the Kick-off and Closing feedback surveys 93.5% of the participants indicate their satisfaction with the content of the program</td>
<td>End Target: 80 60 (in 2022); 70 (in 2023); 80 (in 2024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Percentage of IPDET community members surveyed who report broadening their perspective.</td>
<td>0.00 As no community building event have been delivered there are no baseline data available.</td>
<td>Has not been collected</td>
<td>End Target: 80 60 (in 2022); 70 (in 2023); 80 (in 2024)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percentage of IPDET’s training beneficiaries who report use of acquired knowledge in their professional practice.

| 0.00 |

| The IPDET Tracer study will be finalized in the first half of 2022. | 0.00 |

### Intermediate Results Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Name</th>
<th>Baseline (2019/20)</th>
<th>Current Progress (2021)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tailored trainings/workshops or other relevant M&amp;E activities are carried out for target institutions/groups in priority developing countries for at least 2 different regions or countries per year.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1 Global Outreach Event Series - Better policy making through evaluations in the Asia Pacific Region 2 online inhouse trainings: 1) for the AfDB on ‘Fundamentals of RIE’; 2) for INTERPOL on ‘Theories of Change’</td>
<td>End target 5: 2 in 2021/2022, 2 in 2023, 1 in 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPDET workshops and trainings cover thematic topics of high priority of GEI, such as, gender, FCV, or climate change.</td>
<td>4 (2019), 2 (2020)</td>
<td>1 Online Workshop on Monitoring &amp; Evaluating the SDGs; 1 Online Workshop on National Evaluation Systems 1 Online Workshop on Blue Marble Evaluation</td>
<td>End target: 7 (2-3 workshops per program year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of scholarships awarded (disaggregated by country/region/gender)</td>
<td>2019: 82 for on-site program = 36%; 2020: 133 for 8 online WS = 60%; 2021 (1st half): 45 for 5 online WS = 36%; remark: in 2020 and 2021 IPDET ran a pure online program due to COVID-19; in 2020 3 donors (BMZ, SDC, IOB) financed an unusual high amount of scholarships to make sure that as many as possible individuals in need could participate; the money was already allocated for an on-site program, but as online workshop scholarships are far less expensive, it was possible to finance more scholarships as originally planned for; 80 scholarships to individuals from developing countries (38 female; 17 from Europe-Central Asia, 9 from Latin America, 6 from MENA, 5 from South- East-Asia, 43 from Sub-Saharan Africa).</td>
<td>80 scholarships to individuals from developing countries (38 female; 17 from Europe-Central Asia, 9 from Latin America, 6 from MENA, 5 from South- East-Asia, 43 from Sub-Saharan Africa).</td>
<td>End target for online program: 125 = 32% 35 (in 2nd half of 2021); 16 (in 1st half of 2022 for 2 online WS); 24 (in 2nd half of 2022 for 3 online WS); 16 (in 1st half of 2023 for 2 online WS); 24 (in 2nd half of 2023 for 3 online WS); 16 (in 1st half of 2024 for 2 online WS); remark: it is not intended to raise the number of participants per online workshop nor the number of workshops, therefore also the number of scholarships will be stable; End target for on-site program: 120 = 36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IPDET Tracer study will be finalized in the first half of 2022.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Number of participants attending IPDET knowledge sharing and community   | 0.00 As no community building events have been delivered there are no  | End target: 450  
| building events (disaggregated by gender/country/region)                 | baseline data available.                                              | 100 (in 2022); 150 (in 2023); 100 (in first half of 2024)            |
| Number of knowledge sharing and community building events carried out     | 0.00 As no community building events have been delivered so far there  | End target: 18  
|                                                                             | are no baseline data available.                                        | 5 (in 2022); 8 (in 2023); 5 (in first half of 2024)                  |
| IPDET Hackathon event held biennially.                                    | 1 (2020)                                                             | 1 (second half of 2023, or first half of 2024)                        |
| Total number of participants in Hackathon event (disaggregated by         | 150                                                                  | 200                                                                  |
|     country, region, and gender)                                           |                                                                      |                                                                      |
| Community building strategy developed.                                    | Community building strategy has been developed, Strategy paper will    |                                                                      |
|                                                                             | be finalized in 2022                                                 |                                                                      |
| Total number of people from developing countries who received IPDET       | 50 (of 2021 workshop participants)                                    | End target: 60  
|     training (disaggregated by gender, country/region)                    | 10 Online workshops with 128 participants; 54% women, and 46% men;    | 53 (in 2022); 56 (in 2023); 60 (in 2024)                              |
|                                                                             | Europe and Central Asia (11), Sub-Saharan Africa (21),               |                                                                      |
|                                                                             |                                                                      |                                                                      |
| Number of eligible requests received to provide tailored trainings/workshops to specific institutions in priority developing countries. | 4 requests in 2020 (CLEAR AA, SDC China, Saudi Arabia, AfDB) | 4 requests in 2021 (APEC, CARICOM, Costa Rica/Ecuador, interpol) | End target: 10 |

*Table 4 - Project Indicators*
E) Survey Forms

E.1. Survey IPDET Online Workshops

E.2. Survey IPDET Global Outreach Event Series: BETTER POLICY MAKING THROUGH EVALUATIONS - TRAINING FOR PARLIAMENTARIANS IN ASIA PACIFIC
Welcome to IPDET online workshop evaluation

Thank you for participating in the IPDET evaluation and giving us valuable information and feedback. We want to provide you with the best IPDET experience and continually improve the programme.

The survey will take approximately 5 minutes to complete. We will use your data for this purpose and only in aggregated manner. The evaluation results will be published on the official IPDET-website ipdet.org/.

DATA PRIVACY NOTICE

This survey is collected anonymously. At no point is any personal or identifying information collected. The collected data is used solely for evaluation purposes and analyzed in an aggregated manner. All collected data will be kept confidential: the collected information will not be made available to unauthorized persons outside of the research team. All data of the survey are collected anonymously and in compliance with the relevant confidentiality and data protection obligations (GDPR).

Your participation in the survey is voluntary. You have the opportunity to stop the survey at any time. You may also withdraw your consent to take part in the survey. For the purpose of this evaluation, the latter is possible until the 31st of November 2021. After that date, the information will have entered the evaluation report and been deleted, making it impossible to extract said information. There will not be any negative consequences for you if you decide to stop the survey or withdraw your consent.

In case you have any questions concerning the survey or in case you want to withdraw your consent to it, please contact the research team (Florian Ramsauer, f.ramsauer@ceval.de).

Data Privacy

☐ Yes, I do confirm that the data transmitted may be collected and stored electronically

Which Workshop did you attend?

[Please choose]
Content and Methods

How would you rate the quality and delivery of the workshop?

| Content of lectures/presentations (live sessions and e-learning platform) | very poor | poor | average | good | excellent |
| Delivery of lectures/presentation (live sessions and e-learning platform) |          |     |         |      |           |
| Usefulness of examples in lectures/presentations |          |     |         |      |           |
| Level of interactive participation |          |     |         |      |           |
| Content of small group activities and discussion |          |     |         |      |           |
| Implementation of small group activities (breakout groups and collaborative platforms) |          |     |         |      |           |
| Handling of Q&A by the instructor(s) |          |     |         |      |           |
| Incorporation of interdisciplinary participants background |          |     |         |      |           |

How do you assess the overall didactical and organizational structure of the workshop?

Please rate whether you agree with each of these statements

| The workshop was based on an adequate mix of didactical approaches (including self-paced learning with videos and reading material, interactive polls, group work, etc) | strongly disagree | disagree | neutral | agree | strongly agree |
| Throughout the activity there was a good balance between input and discussion |          |     |         |      |           |
| Collaborative tools (e.g. Mural) have been applied to an adequate extent for interactive participation |          |     |         |      |           |
| Zoom was a suitable platform for interactive live sessions |          |     |         |      |           |
| The IPDET e-learning platform was useful |          |     |         |      |           |
| The quality of the course material was good |          |     |         |      |           |
| The management of time-zone differences was handled well |          |     |         |      |           |
| The time management during the workshop sessions was handled well |          |     |         |      |           |
Do you have any suggestions to improve the delivery of the workshop?

PHP code

```php
if (value('WS05') == 6) {
    goToPage('I1');
}
if (value('WS05') == 1) {
    goToPage('I2');
}
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    goToPage('I3');
}
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}
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    goToPage('I5');
}
if (value('WS05') == 9) {
    goToPage('I6');
}
if (value('WS05') == 8) {
    goToPage('I7');
}
if (value('WS05') == 10) {
    goToPage('I8');
}
if (value('WS05') == 3) {
    goToPage('I9');
}
if (value('WS05') == 7) {
    goToPage('I10');
}
if (value('WS05') == 11) {
    goToPage('I11');
}
```
Instructors

How do you rate the performance of the instructor Kerry Bruce?
Please specify whether you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The instructor possessed a strong expertise in his/her field</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was able to promote and guide open discussion and learning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor provided meaningful feedback to participants’ comments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHP code

```php
if (value('WS05') == 6) {
    goToPage('PB');
}
if (value('WS05') == 1) {
    goToPage('I2');
}
if (value('WS05') == 4) {
    goToPage('I3');
}
if (value('WS05') == 5) {
    goToPage('I4');
}
if (value('WS05') == 2) {
    goToPage('I5');
}
if (value('WS05') == 9) {
    goToPage('I6');
}
if (value('WS05') == 8) {
    goToPage('I7');
}
if (value('WS05') == 10) {
    goToPage('I8');
}
if (value('WS05') == 3) {
    goToPage('I9');
}
if (value('WS05') == 7) {
    goToPage('I10');
}
if (value('WS05') == 11) {
    goToPage('I11');
}
```
How do you rate the performance of the instructor Claudia Maldonado?

Please specify whether you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The instructor possessed a strong expertise in his/her field</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was able to promote and guide open discussion and learning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor provided meaningful feedback to participants' comments</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHP code

```php
if (value('WS05') == 1) {
    goToPage('PB');
} else if (value('WS05') == 4) {
    goToPage('I3');
} else if (value('WS05') == 5) {
    goToPage('I4');
} else if (value('WS05') == 2) {
    goToPage('I5');
} else if (value('WS05') == 9) {
    goToPage('I6');
} else if (value('WS05') == 8) {
    goToPage('I7');
} else if (value('WS05') == 10) {
    goToPage('I8');
} else if (value('WS05') == 3) {
    goToPage('I9');
} else if (value('WS05') == 7) {
    goToPage('I10');
} else if (value('WS05') == 11) {
    goToPage('I11');
}
```
How do you rate the performance of the instructor Claudia Abreu Lopes?
Please specify whether you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The instructor possessed a strong expertise in his/her field</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was able to promote and guide open discussion and learning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor provided meaningful feedback to participants’ comments</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do you rate the performance of the instructor Calum Handforth?
Please specify whether you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The instructor possessed a strong expertise in his/her field</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was able to promote and guide open discussion and learning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor provided meaningful feedback to participants’ comments</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHP code

```php
if (value('WS05') == 4) {
    goToPage('PB');
}
if (value('WS05') == 5) {
    goToPage('I4');
}
if (value('WS05') == 2) {
    goToPage('I5');
}
if (value('WS05') == 9) {
    goToPage('I6');
}
if (value('WS05') == 8) {
    goToPage('I7');
}
if (value('WS05') == 10) {
    goToPage('I8');
}
if (value('WS05') == 3) {
    goToPage('I9');
}
if (value('WS05') == 7) {
    goToPage('I10');
}
if (value('WS05') == 11) {
    goToPage('I11');
}
```
How do you rate the performance of the instructor Ian Goldman?
Please specify whether you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor possessed a strong expertise in his/ her field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor was able to promote and guide open discussion and learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor provided meaningful feedback to participants’ comments

How do you rate the performance of the instructor Matodzi Amisi?
Please specify whether you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor possessed a strong expertise in his/ her field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor was able to promote and guide open discussion and learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor provided meaningful feedback to participants’ comments

---

PHP code

```php
if (value('WS05') == 5) {
    goToPage('PB');
} else if (value('WS05') == 2) {
    goToPage('I5');
} else if (value('WS05') == 9) {
    goToPage('I6');
} else if (value('WS05') == 8) {
    goToPage('I7');
} else if (value('WS05') == 10) {
    goToPage('I8');
} else if (value('WS05') == 3) {
    goToPage('I9');
} else if (value('WS05') == 7) {
    goToPage('I10');
} else if (value('WS05') == 11) {
    goToPage('I11');
}
```
How do you rate the performance of the instructor Michael Patton?
Please specify whether you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The instructor possessed a strong expertise in his/her field</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was able to promote and guide open discussion and learning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor provided meaningful feedback to participants' comments</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHP code

```php
if (value('WS05') == 2) {
    goToPage('PB');
}
if (value('WS05') == 9) {
    goToPage('I6');
}
if (value('WS05') == 8) {
    goToPage('I7');
}
if (value('WS05') == 10) {
    goToPage('I8');
}
if (value('WS05') == 3) {
    goToPage('I9');
}
if (value('WS05') == 7) {
    goToPage('I10');
}
if (value('WS05') == 11) {
    goToPage('I11');
}
```
How do you rate the performance of the instructor Maria Garrido Anllo?
Please specify whether you agree with the following statements

The instructor possessed a strong expertise in his/ her field
The instructor was able to promote and guide open discussion and learning
The instructor provided meaningful feedback to participants’ comments

How do you rate the performance of the instructor Elma Zahir?
Please specify whether you agree with the following statements

The instructor possessed a strong expertise in his/ her field
The instructor was able to promote and guide open discussion and learning
The instructor provided meaningful feedback to participants’ comments

How do you rate the performance of the instructor Annabelle Vinois?
Please specify whether you agree with the following statements

The instructor possessed a strong expertise in his/ her field
The instructor was able to promote and guide open discussion and learning
The instructor provided meaningful feedback to participants’ comments
PHP code

```php
if (value('WS05') == 9) {
    goToPage('PB');
}
if (value('WS05') == 8) {
    goToPage('I7');
}
if (value('WS05') == 10) {
    goToPage('I8');
}
if (value('WS05') == 3) {
    goToPage('I9');
}
if (value('WS05') == 7) {
    goToPage('I10');
}
if (value('WS05') == 11) {
    goToPage('I11');
}
```

---
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**How do you rate the performance of the instructor Stefan Silvestrini?**

Please specify whether you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="disagree.png" alt="Strongly disagree" /></td>
<td><img src="disagree.png" alt="Disagree" /></td>
<td><img src="neutral.png" alt="Neutral" /></td>
<td><img src="agree.png" alt="Agree" /></td>
<td><img src="strongly_agree.png" alt="Strongly agree" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The instructor possessed a strong expertise in his/her field
- The instructor was able to promote and guide open discussion and learning
- The instructor provided meaningful feedback to participants’ comments

---
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PHP code

```php
if (value('WS05') == 8) {
    goToPage('PB');
}
if (value('WS05') == 10) {
    goToPage('I8');
}
if (value('WS05') == 3) {
    goToPage('I9');
}
if (value('WS05') == 7) {
    goToPage('I10');
}
if (value('WS05') == 11) {
    goToPage('I11');
}
```
How do you rate the performance of the instructor Patricia Rogers?
Please specify whether you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The instructor possessed a strong expertise in his/ her field</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was able to promote and guide open discussion and learning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor provided meaningful feedback to participants’ comments</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHP code

```php
if (value('WS05') == 10) {
    goToPage('PB');
}
if (value('WS05') == 3) {
    goToPage('I9');
}
if (value('WS05') == 7) {
    goToPage('I10');
}
if (value('WS05') == 11) {
    goToPage('I11');
}
```

How do you rate the performance of the instructor Wolfgang Meyer?
Please specify whether you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The instructor possessed a strong expertise in his/ her field</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was able to promote and guide open discussion and learning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor provided meaningful feedback to participants’ comments</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do you rate the performance of the instructor Jos Vaessen?

Please specify whether you agree with the following statements:

The instructor possessed a strong expertise in his/her field

The instructor was able to promote and guide open discussion and learning

The instructor provided meaningful feedback to participants’ comments
How do you rate the performance of the instructor Estelle Raimondo?

Please specify whether you agree with the following statements

| Statement                                                                 | strongly disagree | disagree | neutral | agree | strongly agree |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|}
| The instructor possessed a strong expertise in his/ her field             | ☐                  | ☐        | ☐       | ☐     | ☐              |}
| The instructor was able to promote and guide open discussion and learning | ☐                  | ☐        | ☐       | ☐     | ☐              |}
| The instructor provided meaningful feedback to participants' comments    | ☐                  | ☐        | ☐       | ☐     | ☐              |}

---

**PHP code**

```php
if (value('WS05') == 11) {
    goToPage('PB');
}
```
PHP code

```php
prepare_input('EW02_01');
```

Personal Take-away

To what extent has the workshop enhanced your abilities and competencies to do the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Considerably</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design high quality evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage the conduct of evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use results for program improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use results for policy making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: ⇒ EW02_01 ⇐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent did you personally and professionally benefit from the workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Considerably</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I acquired new thematic expertise in the field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The knowledge I acquired is applicable to my own work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the workshop I benefited from the experiences of the people in my peer group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate your personal high- and lowlight of the course

What did you find most useful?

What did you find least useful?
Service and Information

Please rate the quality of information and support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

All necessary information has been adequately provided before the start of the workshop.

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Support by IPDET office was available when needed

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

The support by the facilitator was helpful

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Overall Satisfaction

Would you recommend this IPDET workshop to a colleague?

[ ] Definitely Not
[ ] Probably Not
[ ] Possibly
[ ] Probably
[ ] Definitely

How satisfied are you with this workshop overall?

[ ] not at all
[ ] little
[ ] somewhat
[ ] considerably
[ ] strongly
Comments and Recommendations

Which workshop topics would you like to see covered next year?

Do you have any further comments or suggestions?

Thank you for completing this survey!

Your answers were transmitted, you may close the browser window or tab now.

Subscribe here for the monthly IPDET newsletter to stay informed: https://ipdet.org/subscribe-to-the-ipdet-newsletter/

Stay tuned on Twitter (https://twitter.com/IPDET_community) and LinkedIn (https://www.linkedin.com/company/ipdet/)
Welcome to the evaluation of 'Better policy making through Evaluations'

Welcome to the evaluation of the joint IPDET Global Outreach activity ‘Better policy making through Evaluations’ in cooperation with the Asia Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA), and the Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation (GPFE).

Thank you for participating in this evaluation and giving us valuable information and feedback. We want to provide you with the best learning experience and continually improve the programmes.

The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. We will use your data for this purpose and only in an aggregated manner. The evaluation results will be published on the official IPDET-website: ipdet.org. We will inform you accordingly once the report has been published.

DATA PRIVACY NOTICE

The collected data is used solely for evaluation purposes and analyzed in an aggregated manner. All collected data will be kept confidential: the collected information will not be made available to unauthorized persons outside of the research team. All data of the survey are collected anonymously and in compliance with the relevant confidentiality and data protection obligations (GDPR).

Your participation in the survey is voluntary. You have the opportunity to stop the survey at any time. You may also withdraw your consent to take part in the survey.

In case you have any questions concerning the survey or in case you want to withdraw your consent to it, please contact the organization team: Randika De Mel (APEA) (apea.coordinator@gmail.com) and Laszlo Szentmarjay (IPDET) (globaloutreach@ipdet.org).

Data Privacy

☐ Yes, I do confirm that the data transmitted may be collected and stored electronically
General information

How did you find out about the event series?
Please indicate all medium you received information about this event (multiple answers possible)

- APEA/GPFE/IPDET website
- APEA/GPFE/IPDET newsletter
- APEA/GPFE/IPDET social media
- Other website, please specify:
- Other newsletter, please specify:
- Other social media, please specify:
- I was approached directly by APEA/GPFE/IPDET
- I was informed by a colleague

Which of the following describes your current job position best?

- Member of Parliament
- Former Member of Parliament
- Parliament Research Staff
- Parliament Legislative Officer
- Parliament Secretary
- Government Official
- Other, please specify:

How many years of professional experience have you dedicated to Monitoring and Evaluation before this event?

- None
- Less than one year
- 1 to 3 years
- 3 to 5 years
- 5 to 10 years
- 10 years or more
## Content and Methods

### How do you rate the quality and delivery of the event series?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very poor</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content of lectures/presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of lectures/presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How do you assess the overall didactical and organizational structure of the event series?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The events series was based on an adequate mix of didactical approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throughout the activities, there was a good balance between input and discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoom was a suitable platform for interactive live sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the event series material was good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The time management during the events series sessions was handled well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How do you rate the performance of the instructors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The instructors possessed a strong expertise in their field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructors were able to promote and guide open discussion and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructors provided meaningful feedback to participants’ comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you have any suggestions to improve the delivery of the events series?
Please name up to three aspects
### PHP code
```php
prepare_input('EW02_01');
```

## Personal Take-away

To what extent has the events series enhanced your abilities and competencies to do the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design high quality evaluations</th>
<th>little</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>considerably</th>
<th>strongly</th>
<th>not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conduct evaluations</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manage the conduct of evaluations</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use results for program improvement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use results for policy making</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drafted policy reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other: ⇒ EW02_01 ⇒</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent did you personally and professionally benefit from the event series?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I acquired new thematic expertise in the field</th>
<th>little</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>considerably</th>
<th>strongly</th>
<th>not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The knowledge I acquired is applicable to my own work</th>
<th>little</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>considerably</th>
<th>strongly</th>
<th>not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the events’ series, I benefited from the experiences of the people in my peer group</th>
<th>little</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>considerably</th>
<th>strongly</th>
<th>not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate your personal high- and lowlight of the events’ series
Please explain shortly (max. 500 characters), how you will apply your gained knowledge through the event series in your daily work:

Service and Information

Please rate the quality of information and support

- All necessary information has been adequately provided before the start of the events series
- Support by APEA/GPFE/IPDET office was available when needed
- Support by facilitators was available when needed

Overall Satisfaction

Would you recommend this event series to others?

- Definitely Not
- Probably Not
- Possibly
- Probably
- Definitely

How satisfied are you with this event series overall?

- not at all
- little
- somewhat
- considerably
- strongly
Recommendations

Do you have any further comments or suggestions?
Please name up to three aspects

To gather more information on the results of the event series, we would like to conduct short interviews (15-20 minutes) with some participants. Would you be available for such a short interview?

Yes (please indicate your contact information (e-mail and telephone number))

☐ No

Thank you for completing this questionnaire!

Your answers were transmitted, you may close the browser window or tab now.

Subscribe here for the monthly IPDET newsletter to stay informed.

IPDET – 2021