UNIT 3 EVALUATION OF CSR PROGRAMMES

Structure

3.1   INTRODUCTION

In the previous two units, we discussed the concepts of project assessment and monitoring. The other concept which closely follows them is evaluation. The demand for evaluation of CSR programmes / projects is rising as funding agencies and stakeholders want to know from the CSR professionals:

- What did you do with the money?

- Why should we continue to fund CSR programmes / projects?

- Are the CSR programmes effective?

- How will you improve or terminate ineffective CSR programme / projects?

Evaluation of CSR programmes / projects is essential to answer the above questions with evidence.

After studying this unit you should be able to:

- Understand the meaning of evaluation and differentiate between appraisal, monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment.

- Discuss different types, tools, techniques, designs, approaches and challenges in evaluation of CSR programmes.

3.2   WHAT IS EVALUATION ?

Evaluation is a systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and outcomes of a programme/project as a basis of judgment to improve its effectiveness and/or to inform decisions about current or future programming (USAID, 2011). Evaluation is one of the essential core competencies required for all CSR professionals in order to provide evidence and establish accountability of CSR programmes / projects.

Various steps in design and execution of an evaluation study are summarized in Box 3.1.

Box. 3.1: Steps in CSR Programme Evaluation

1. Writing evaluation proposal with :

  - Need for evaluation - economic /technical / social / environmental benefits

  - Research / evaluation questions

  - Objectives

  - Evaluation framework
    - o   Bennett's Hierarchy
    - o   LFA

  - Budget

2. Designing and approval of evaluation survey instrument

3. SPSS coding, pre-testing, recoding SPSS & data collection

3. Data entry & analysis

4. Evaluation report writing & communicating findings - Short reports / Longer

---

3.3   APPRAISAL vs. MONITORING vs. EVALUATION vs. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Though they are often interchangeably used, following distinctions exists between them:

- *Appraisal:* It is a critical examination of a CSR programme / project proposal, normally before implementation and funding with respect to economic viability, technical feasibility, and / social desirability. It is basically a CSR planning and project formulation activity guided by evaluation findings of similar programmes / projects already been

implemented under CSR *(Please refer Unit 1, Block 2 for more details on project appraisal / assessment).*

- *Monitoring:* It is a continuous process that starts and ends with a CSR programme / project which is required for immediate use and mid-course correction. It is usually done by implementing personnel by covering all aspects of CSR programme / project for its correction or management. Monitoring is a symptomatic and early warning system *(Please refer Unit 2 , Block 2 for more details on monitoring of CSR programmes).*

- *Evaluation:* It is an in-depth one shot operation at a point of time, usually at completion or mid way of CSR programme. It is undertaken for future planning/ replication/ expansion. It is a learning and diagnostic process usually done by outside agency covering a sample.

- *Impact Assessment:* Building on appraisal, monitoring and evaluation, the focus of impact assessment is on longer-term and wider-ranging changes beyond the immediate results of the CSR programme or project.

3.3.1   What Are We Evaluating?

In general, evaluation is conducted to assess the progress, outputs, outcomes and impact of CSR programmes or projects. A few commonly used analytical aspects of evaluation described by Dale (2004) are given in Box 3.2.

Box 3.2: Commonly Used Analytical Aspects of Evaluation

Relevance: To what extent has the CSR programme or project addressed, or is addressing, problems of high priority, as viewed by actual and potential stakeholders, especially beneficiaries?

Effectiveness: To what extent are the planned outputs, expected changes, intended effects (immediate and effect objectives) and intended impact (CSR development objective) being, or have been, produced or achieved?

Impact: The overall consequences of the CSR programme or project for the intended beneficiaries and any other people;

Efficiency: The amount of outputs created and their quality in relation to the resources (capital and human efforts) invested by CSR department;

Sustainability: The maintenance or augmentation of positive achievements induced by the evaluated CSR programme or project (or any component);

Replicability: The feasibility of repeating the particular CSR programme or project, or parts of it, in another context, i.e., at a later time, in other areas, for other groups of people, by other organisations, etc.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: (a) Write your answer in about 50 words.

(b) Check your answer with possible answers given at the end of the unit.

1. Ask some of your colleagues what they mean by evaluation? Compare their views with the one given in this section and identify the common features.

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

2. What is the major difference between appraisal, monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment?

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

3.4 EVALUATION - TYPES AND DESIGNS

3.4.1 Types of Evaluation

Evaluations are of the following types based on the programme phase(s) (planning, implementation, and conclusion) at which evaluation is conducted:

i. **Baseline Evaluation:** Needs assessment is a form of baseline evaluation to find out the target group and their perceived needs/expectations from the CSR programme. If collected, this will also establish baseline data to compare programme results later. *Example:* Capacity Building in Corporate Social Responsibility through Open and Distance Learning: A Need Assessment Study (Varghese and Sasidhar, 2018).

ii. **Formative Evaluation:** It is undertaken during the programme implementation stage to determine whether the programme is going as per plan, and changes, if any, are required to meet the objectives. It is also termed as process/mid-term/concurrent evaluation. Generally, formative evaluations are undertaken in long-term programmes/projects for cross checking/corrective measures. *Example:* Formative evaluation of Kisan Call Centres in Tamil Nadu (Karthikeyan et al., 2006).

iii. **Summative Evaluation:** It is undertaken once the programme achieves a stable state of operation or towards the end of a programme to find out its results, effectiveness, impact and further course of action. Summative evaluation findings help CSR functionaries/funding agencies to make decisions on programme continuation, modifications, further expansion, reduction, or closure. If summative evaluation is done immediately after completion of a project it is called terminal/outcome evaluation. If it is done some time after completion of a project, it is called ex-post evaluation.

Example: Evaluation of Corporate Social Responsibility from a Stakeholder's Perspective – A Case Study of Aparajitha Corporate Services in India (Preetha and Vanniarajan, 2017).

iv. **Follow-up Evaluation:** It is undertaken long after completion of the programme to see whether there are any long-term changes among beneficiaries. When follow-up evaluations are repeated at set time intervals to study the long term benefits, sustainability of results and outcomes, they are called longitudinal evaluations. *Example:* Evaluation of a distance education radio farm school programme in India: Implications for scaling up (Sasidhar et al., 2011).

Various evaluation techniques used at different programme stages are displayed in Box 3.3.

Box 3.3: Evaluation Tools and Techniques by Programme Stage			
Programme Stage	Evaluation Type	Evaluation Questions	Evaluation tools and techniques
Planning stage	Needs assessment Feasibility study Base line study	• What are the felt and unfelt needs of beneficiaries? • Do they fit into CSR programme mission? • Can CSR programme address these needs? • Is CSR programme feasible (socio-economic & environmental)?	Survey FGD Observation Content analysis of records Economic analysis B:C ratio
Implementation stage	Formative evaluation	• Is the CSR programme meeting its objectives of indented	Annual monitoring reports Technology adoption patterns KASA change

		outcomes? • Are beneficiaries satisfied with the CSR programme?	Satisfaction surveys
Conclusion stage	Summative evaluation	• Are the needs addressed? • Are the desired outcomes achieved? • What is the cost effectiveness of the CSR programme?	Pre & post programme data Cohort studies Panel studies Economic analysis

Source : Suvedi and Vander Stoep, 2014

3.4.2 Evaluation Designs

Following are two major evaluation designs:

i. ***Pre vs. Post-programme Evaluation:*** It is undertaken through comparison on present situation and situation prior to the CSR programme. It suffers from 'memory or recall bias' of the respondents. To overcome this, it is always advisable to have 'baseline' or 'bench mark' study and 'post-programme' study. Unfortunately in most programmes, baseline studies are not undertaken or when available data is inadequate.

ii. ***With-Without Programme Evaluation:*** A comparable sample of CSR beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries are to be selected within programme area. Alternately, a comparable adjoining area where CSR programme has not been implemented can also studied along with the programme area.

Example: The Tata Motors Limited (TML) transformed the lives of tribal community from forest gatherers to entrepreneurs through CSR interventions. We can have a comparative evaluation of this initiative (with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries) (TML, 2021).

Combination of above two designs is most appropriate.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: (a)   Write your answer in about 50 words.

(b)   Check your answer with possible answers given at the end of the unit.

1.   Name different types of evaluation.

……………………………………………………………………

123

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

2. Name the evaluation type to be suitable during the following programme stages:

-   Planning stage **:**   ………………………………………………………………

-   Implementation stage: …………………………………………………………

-   Conclusion stage: ………………………………………………………………

3.5 EVALUATION - DATA COLLECTION METHODS

The different methods to collect evaluation data (Dale, 2004; Bagnol, 2007 and 2014; Suvedi and Kaplowitz, 2016) are given below:

3.5.1 Conventional Methods

Quantitative Methods: They measure a limited number of predetermined CSR outcomes and are appropriate for judging effects, attributing cause, comparing or ranking, classifying and generalizing results (*Example:* Survey and census data).

Qualitative Methods: Through descriptions, they help in understanding the CSR programme context and problems, clarifying relationship between programme objectives and implementation, identifying unintended programme consequences and conducting in-depth impact analysis (*Example:* FGD, participant observation, case study).

Mixed Methods: They combine qualitative and quantitative methods to complement each other. They are appropriate for understanding complex social phenomena allowing plurality viewpoints in a CSR programme.

3.5.2 Participatory Methods

They involve stakeholders in CSR programme evaluation through partnerships and dialogues taking into account the aspects that are often left over by evaluators and can only be identified by stakeholders themselves. (*Example:* Participatory rural appraisal (PRA), Participatory learning methods (PLM), Participatory assessment monitoring and evaluation PAME) *(Please refer Unit 3 & 4, Block 1 for more details on participatory methods)*.

A few basic participatory methods are given in Box.3.4 and a case study in Box 3.5 for your understanding.

Box 3.4. Basic Participatory Methods

1. **Meetings** – Arranging and conducting meetings with stakeholders, like project beneficiaries, development agents, etc., and proceedings are used as evaluation reports. The main disadvantage is that it involves only little interaction and in-depth assessment is not possible.

2. **Informal Group Discussion**– The evaluator comes into an unplanned group setting in which a relevant discussion takes place, coordinated by the evaluator.

3. **Facilitated Group Discussion**– Group discussions may also be planned and arranged, and will normally be moderated by the evaluator. It is highly interactive and is an in-depth discussion on the effect of the CSR programme.

4. **Workshop-based Participatory Analysis** – The CSR beneficiaries and CSR agencies jointly explore problems, plan or evaluate, in a workshop setting. Participatory rural appraisal (PRA), participatory learning methods (PLM), Participatory assessment monitoring and evaluation (PAME) are a few examples of this approach.

5. **Collective Brainstorming**– Intensive and open-minded communication event that a group of persons agree to embark on in a specific situation. Useful method for analysing problems, which occur suddenly and require an immediate solution.

(Source: Dale, 2004)

Box 3.5: Participatory Evaluation of Disease Control Through Vaccination Campaigns

The KYEEMA Foundation implemented the "Regional Newcastle Disease Control Project" in Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia with the support of AusAID. A participatory evaluation was carried out in 3 villages of Malawi to evaluate the impact of vaccination campaigns. All the male and female farmers interviewed had chickens vaccinated 3 times by community vaccinators in March, July and November 2011.

The first question asked was: *Since the first vaccination did the number of chickens in the flock increase, stay the same or decrease?* Each participant was asked to respond by placing a stone on one of three possible answers written on a flip chart on the ground. The answers were used to generate the following table.

Response	Village 1		Village 2		Village 3	
	12 Women	**10 Men**	**7 Women**	**8 Men**	**16 Women**	**7 Men**
Increased	11 (92%)	8 (80%)	7 (100%)	6 (75%)	12 (75%)	7 (100%)
Stayed the same	1 (8%)	0	0	0	2(12.5%)	0
Decreased	0	2 (20%)	0	2 (25%)	2 (12.5%)	0
Total	12 (100%)	10 (100%)	7 (100%)	8 (100%)	16 (100%)	7 (100%)

The same exercise also included the following questions:

- Since the 1st vaccination did the number of birds that died increase, stay the same or decrease?

- Since the 1st vaccination did the number of chickens sold increase, stay the same or decrease?

- Since the 1st vaccination did the number of chickens consumed increase, stay the same or decrease?

To evaluate the increase in size of household flocks since vaccination in 2011, the participants were asked to state the number of chickens they had in January 2010, and later the number of chickens they had in January 2012. By analysing the median and the average or calculating the average percentage increase per household, it is possible to see the evolution of flock size. Similarly, it is possible to evaluate the number of chickens sold and consumed.

(Source : Bagnol, 2014)

3.6 EVALUATION APPROACHES

Though several approaches are available, Logical Framework Approach (Box 3.6) and Bennett's Hierarchy Approach (Bennett, 1979) (Box 3.7) provides a comprehensive framework to evaluate inputs, outputs and outcomes of a CSR programme. Both these approaches provide a process by examining the chain of means (*what actions we do in CSR programme*) and ends (*the result of actions*) through different levels.

Box. 3.6: LFA Pertaining to Evaluation of Kisan Call Centers in Tamil Nadu

Inputs	Output		Outcome
	Activities	**Participants**	
1. level I, II and III centre staff	1. Instant reply to farmers at level I.	Farmers	Short term
2. Telephone, ICT, and Ag. technology	2. Escalating the unanswered calls to level II and III from level I office.		
3. Dedicated line with a toll free number identified by MOA, GOI.	3. Documentation and reporting to DAC by level III centre.	Scientists	
5. IVRS	4. Reply to farmers within 72 hours through post/e-mail through off-line mode by level III centre.		Medium term
6. Fund by DAC			
7. Knowledge Management System			
8. Service timings: 6:00 A.M to 10:00 P.M	5. M&E by level III.	Level I officers	
9. Documentation of Ag. technologies and FAQs.	6. Data base using KMS.		Long term
10. Capacity building	7. Training to level I officials		
	8. Documenting FAQs		
	9. Mass media adds.		

Outcomes		
Short Term	**Medium Term**	**Long Term**
1. Awareness about KCC 2. Participation in KCC	1.Adoption of the advices recommended by KCC 2. Gratification of the services of KCC 3. Information sharing about 1551 and advices given by KCC	1. Overall development of agriculture through TOT 2. Reduction of gap between research extension and farmer linkage.

Situation
Mission Objectives of KCC

Assumptions
Environmental factors
What do you want to know?

(Source : Karthikeyan et al., 2006)

127

Box.3.7:	**Bennett's Hierarchy Applied in Evaluation of Contract and Non Contract Broiler Farming Systems**	
Evaluation hierarchy	Measurement	Indicators
Level 7 : End results	Socio-economic changes and impacts	• SWOT parameters • FGD on: selection of contract farmers; terms and conditions applicable in CBF
Level 6 : Practice change	Technical advices adoption	• Non-adoption, discontinuation, partial adoption and full adoption of technical advices
Level 5: KASA	Farmers' perceptions	• Perceptions on inputs (chicks, feed, medicines and EAS) and outputs (broiler birds, manure value and payment system)
Level 4 : Reactions	Farmers' feedback	• Factors of motivation to do CBF and NCBF • Reasons to change integrator(s) or input providers in the past two years
Level 3 : Outputs	Technical and economic performance	• Broiler birds (flock size, mortality number, birds sold, sale age, sales rate and birds lifting days) • Productivity (mortality percentage, birds sold, feed consumption and body weight) • Efficiency (FCR, sale age, weight gain/day) • Economics of inputs and outputs • EAS (frequency of information from various sources)
Level 2 : Activities	Activities in CBF and NCBF	• Physical and human resource activities in CBF and NCBF
Level 1: Inputs	Investments and Demographics	• Fixed and variable costs • Age, gender, education, social category, family and size, poultry occupation and experience

(Source : Sasidhar and Suvedi, 2015)

3.6.1 Challenges in Programme Evaluation

The results of CSR programme, especially knowledge, skills, aspiration changes and long term outcomes are often intangible to measure. Suvedi and Vander Stoep (2014) outlined three major challenges in evaluation:

a) Frequent use of descriptive, one-shot case study for impact evaluation and lack of precise and straight assessments of cause-and-effect outcomes of programme. The CSR department needs to establish a scientific knowledge base and generate evidence on its work. *Example:* Do farmers who attend trainings adopt new technologies earlier than those who do not?

b) It is difficult to establish a control or comparison group, maintain uniform treatments and measure long-term impacts of CSR programme.

c) Non-availability / inadequate baseline and monitoring data on impact indicators to see expanded impacts over time.

Check Your Progress 3

Note: a) Write your answer in about 50 words.

b) Check your answer with possible answers given at the end of the unit.

1. Give examples for the following conventional evaluation data collection methods.

   Quantitative Methods: …………………………………………………………

   Qualitative Methods: …………………………………………………………

2. Do you agree that in participatory evaluation methods have advantage in terms of stakeholders' involvement? Justify your answer.

   …………………………………………………………………………………

   …………………………………………………………………………………

   …………………………………………………………………………………

   …………………………………………………………………………………

   …………………………………………………………………………………

3. Name two comprehensive evaluation approaches.

   …………………………………………………………………………………

   …………………………………………………………………………………

   …………………………………………………………………………………

   …………………………………………………………………………………

   …………………………………………………………………………………

   …………………………………………………………………………………

3.7 LET US SUM UP

Evaluation has been neglected and mistakenly seen as a fault finding mechanism. It is to be understood that evaluation of CSR programmes and projects is a learning process and our past experiences guide us to a better future. Therefore every CSR professional should acquire evaluation as a core competency to assess the impact of their programmes.

In this unit, we discussed the meaning, steps in evaluation and differentiated between appraisal, monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment. Later we discussed important types, tools and techniques of evaluation by CSR programme stage and analyzed evaluation designs, evaluation data collection methods, and evaluation approaches. At the end we discussed the challenges in evaluation of CSR programmes.

3.8 KEYWORDS

Appraisal: It is a critical examination of a programme / project proposal, normally before implementation and funding with respect to economic viability, technical feasibility, and / social desirability.

Baseline Evaluation: Needs assessment is a form of baseline evaluation to find out the target group and their perceived needs/expectations from the CSR programme.

Evaluation: It is a systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and outcomes of a CSR programme/project as a basis of judgment to improve its effectiveness and/or to inform decisions about current or future programming.

Follow-up Evaluation: It is undertaken long after completion of the programme to see whether there are any long-term changes among beneficiaries.

Formative Evaluation: It is undertaken during the CSR programme implementation stage to determine whether the programme is going as per plan, and changes, if any, are required to meet the objectives.

Impact Assessment: Building on appraisal, monitoring and evaluation, the focus of impact assessment is on longer-term and wider-ranging changes beyond the immediate results of the programme or project.

Monitoring: It is a continuous process starts and ends with a programme / project which is required for immediate use and mid-course correction.

Summative Evaluation: It is undertaken once the CSR programme achieves a stable state of operation or towards the end of a programme to find out its results, effectiveness, impact and further course of action.

3.9 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SELECTED READINGS

Bagnol, B. (2007.) Participatory Tools for Assessment and Monitoring of Poultry Raising Activities and Animal Disease Control. HPAI Communication Workshop, Bangkok: FAO.

Bagnol,B. (2014.) Conducting Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation. Pages 81-85 in FAO, Decision tools for family poultry development. FAO Animal Production and Health Guidelines, No. 16, Rome, Italy: FAO.

Bennett, C.F. (1979.) Analyzing Impacts of Extension Programs. Washington, D.C., USA: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Dale R, (2004.) Evaluating Development Programmes and Projects, New Delhi, India: Sage Publications

Karthikeyan, C., Vijayaraghavan, K. and Lavanya, P. (2007). Formative Evaluation of Kisan Call Centres. Tamil Nadu. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 43(1 &2):20-25.

Preetha, S. and Vanniarajan, T. (2017). Evaluation of Corporate Social Responsibility from a Stakeholder's Perspective – A Case Study of Aparajitha Corporate Services in India. *Asian J Bus Ethics* 6, 41–55 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1007/s13520-016-0068-0.

Sasidhar, P. V. K., Suvedi, M., Vijayaraghavan, K., Singh, B., and Babu, S. (2011.) Evaluation of a Distance Education Radio Farm School Programme in India: Implications for Scaling-up. *Outlook on Agriculture*, 40(1):89-96.

Sasidhar, P.V.K. and Suvedi, M. (2015.) Integrated Contract Broiler Farming: An Evaluation Case Study in India. Urbana, IL: USAID-MEAS.

Suvedi, M., and Vander Stoep, G. (2014.) Improving the Monitoring and Evaluation of Agricultural Extension Services. Discussion Paper. East Lansing, Michigan, USA: Department of Community Sustainability, Michigan State University.

Suvedi, M. and Kaplowitz, M.D. (201 6.) Process Skills and Competency Tools – What Every Extension Worker Should Know – Core Competency Handbook. Urbana, IL: USAID-MEAS.

TML (2021). Tata Motars Limited *Annual CSR Report (2020-21).* *https://www.tatamotors.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/30063751/annual-csr-report-2020-21.pdf*

USAID (2011.) Evaluation Policy. Washington, D.C., USA: Bureau for Policy and Planning.

Varghese, N. and Sasidhar P.V.K. (2018). Capacity Building in Corporate Social Responsibility through Open and Distance Learning (ODL): A Need Assessment Study. *Management Research Review*, 8(1):   104-115.

3.10 CHECK YOUR PROGRESS – POSSIBLE ANSWERS

Check Your Progress 1

1. Evaluation is a systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and outcomes of a programme/project as a basis of judgment to improve its effectiveness and/or to inform decisions about current or future programming.

2. Appraisal is a critical examination of a programme proposal, normally before implementation and funding with respect to economic viability, technical feasibility, and / social desirability. Monitoring is a continuous process starts and ends with a programme / project which are required for immediate use and mid-course correction. Evaluation is an in-depth one shot operation at a point of time usually at completion or mid way of programme undertaken for future planning/ replication/ expansion. Impact Assessment focus is on longer-term and wider-ranging changes beyond the immediate results of the programme or project.

Check Your Progress 2

1. Baseline, formative, summative and follow-up evaluations are different types of evaluation.

2. Planning stage (Needs assessment, Feasibility study and Base line study); Implementation stage (Formative evaluation); Conclusion stage (Summative evaluation)

Check Your Progress 3

1. Quantitative Methods (Survey and census data); Qualitative Methods (FGD, participant observation, case study).

2. Yes. They involve stakeholders in programme evaluation through partnerships and dialogues taking into account the aspects that are often left over by evaluators and can only be identified by stakeholders themselves.

3. Logical Framework Approach and Bennett's Hierarchy Approach provides a comprehensive framework to evaluate inputs, outputs and outcomes of a development programme.